

Commander in Chief might take under the language of his amendment.

I recognize, as the Senator from West Virginia stated in his remarks, that the chances for the Cooper-Church amendment becoming law are remote. Nevertheless, I believe the Senate has an obligation to state, as clearly as possible, its will with regard to our future policy in Cambodia, and that such statement should be within the prerogatives of the legislative branch under our Constitution and consistent with the constitutional prerogatives granted the President as Commander in Chief.

The Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Byrd) has stated that he is opposed to the use of U.S. forces in Cambodia to support Cambodian forces. He has also stated that should his amendment be adopted and subsequently the Cooper-Church language, as amended, adopted, that this would represent a clear voicing of the sentiment of the Senate against American involvement in a war for Cambodia or in support of any Cambodian Government.

Aside from this interpretation by the Senator of the limitation his amendment expresses to the President as Commander in Chief, I should like to know what the sponsor believes is the President's right, as Commander in Chief, under the language of his amendment.

Mr. President, I might say that the Senator from West Virginia has assured me that he will address himself in future debate to these questions, which I am presently placing in the RECORD.

I repeat, I should like to know if the language of the Byrd amendment contemplates the President's right as Commander in Chief to do the following under the language of that amendment:

First. To prevent enemy forces from

crossing the border into South Vietnam and to pursue and destroy such forces as they attempt to leave South Vietnam for Cambodia? This contemplates a distance into Cambodia of no more than 2 or 3 miles.

Second. To destroy enemy supplies, staging area, headquarters, and so forth, in a relatively narrow zone along the Cambodian-South Vietnamese border? This contemplates a zone into Cambodia of approximately 20 miles in width.

Third. To attempt to find and engage any enemy troops within the zone just described, irrespective of whether they are on the verge of entering South Vietnam or whether they are just returning from it?

Fourth. To attempt to occupy and hold the zone in question, thus denying it to the enemy?

Fifth. To engage in any or all of the types of activity described in questions 2, 3, and 4, but to do so throughout all of Cambodia, or at least in parts of it beyond the 20-mile zone near the border?

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, under the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 10, 1970, at 10:30 a.m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 9, 1970:

#### DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Elliot L. Richardson, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

#### IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of section 8962, title 10 of the United States Code:

#### To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Sam Maddux, Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx FR (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officer to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, United States Code:

#### To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Eugene B. LeBailly, xxx-xx-xxxx FR, Regular Air Force.

#### IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the staff corps indicated subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

#### MEDICAL CORPS

William C. Turville.  
Oscar Gray, Jr.  
Charles L. Waite.

#### SUPPLY CORPS

Charles Becker.  
Philip Crosby.  
Kenneth L. Woodfin.

#### CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Foster M. Lalor, Jr.

#### DENTAL CORPS

Vernon L. Anderson.

The following-named officers for permanent promotion to the grade of captain in the Navy in accordance with article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution:

Comdr. John W. Young, U.S. Navy.  
Comdr. Eugene A. Cernan, U.S. Navy.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, June 9, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

*Be doers of the word and not hearers only.—James 1: 22.*

O God, our Father, who art the creator of the world and the sustainer of life, into Thine ennobling presence we lift our spirits this day. Awaken in us the realization that Thou hast a purpose for each one of us, that life is filled with meaning, and that Thou dost even now speak to us in a still, small voice. Hushed we stand in Thy presence, seeking Thy guidance, eager to do Thy will, and ready to make our land a safe place in which to live.

Somehow we have failed in many ways. This Nation is not what it ought to be. There is too much violence, too much ill will, too much division. We pray that through the power of Thy spirit we, the representatives of our people, may bring a new unity of purpose to our country, a higher value of true patriotism, a greater conception of what it means to be an American, and a more passionate concern for the welfare of our citizens.

May our example in maturity help

bring maturity to those younger than we. In the Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 14306. An act to amend the tobacco marketing provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11102) entitled "An act to amend the provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to the construction and modernization of hospitals and other medical facilities by providing separate authorizations of appropriations for new

construction and for modernization of facilities, authorizing Federal guarantees of loans for such construction and modernization and Federal payment of part of the interest thereon, authorizing grants for modernization of emergency rooms of general hospitals, and extending and making other improvements in the program authorized by these provisions."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate (S. 1479) entitled "An act to amend chapter 19 of title 38, United States Code, in order to increase from \$10,000 to \$15,000 the amount of Servicemen's Group Life Insurance for members of the uniformed services," with amendments in which concurrence of the House is requested.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Public Works; which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 8, 1970.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,  
Speaker of the House,  
The Capitol,  
Washington, D.C.

My DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, and the Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriation Act, 1969, the House Committee on Public Works on June 4, 1970, approved the following projects:

Grand Rapids, Michigan, Courthouse and Federal Office Building (Construction) (Revision); and

Detroit, Michigan, Department of the Treasury, Internal Revenue Service National Data Center (Lease Construction) (Revision), with the amendment that the project be approved subject to the condition that the facility leased pursuant to said prospectus be located within the city limits of Detroit, Michigan.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. FALLON,  
Chairman.

#### THE LATE HONORABLE CLIFFORD DAVIS

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House the passing late yesterday evening of our former colleague and friend, Clifford Davis, of Memphis, Tenn.

Cliff passed away quietly at his home yesterday evening while watching the news on television, shortly after returning home from his law office.

Cliff Davis served in the House for 24 years. He was an able and popular Member. He diligently and ably represented his district, State, and Nation. At the time of his retirement from the Congress he was dean of the delegation in the House from Tennessee.

He was an outstanding legislator who served on the Committee on Public Works and the Armed Services Committee.

As a member of the Committee on Public Works, he was chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control and chairman of the Subcommittee on Property Acquisition. He was also chairman of the House Select Committee on Campaign Expenditures.

Among his outstanding legislative achievements was sponsorship of the Appalachian Regional Development Act. He was also cosponsor of the Federal Interstate Highway Act.

He sponsored major legislation strengthening and supporting the Tennessee Valley Authority.

He made great contributions to water resource development and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Public Works Committee, he had the responsibility of authorizing and approving all major water resource development projects in the Nation. Many outstanding water resource projects throughout the Nation are monuments to the foresight and dedication of Cliff Davis, who worked for the building of a greater and stronger America.

Cliff Davis was a great Tennessean, a great American, and a grand gentleman.

He was a genial, warm, and personable friend.

We are all saddened by the passing of Cliff Davis—a wonderful man. I want to take this means of conveying to his lovely and devoted wife, Carrie, and other members of the family this expression of my deepest and most sincere sympathy. Mrs. Evins joins me in these expressions and sentiments.

Funeral arrangements are incomplete and will be announced later. Friends may visit at Gawler's Funeral Home—but services will be in Memphis, Tenn.

Mr. Speaker, a special day and time will be announced later to give all Members an opportunity of paying tribute to the life and service of Clifford Davis of Tennessee.

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCCORMACK. While a special day will be set later, I do want to take this opportunity, however, to express my keen regret at the passing on of my dear friend and our late beloved former colleague, Congressman Cliff Davis of Tennessee.

Cliff Davis served in this body with outstanding distinction for at least 24 years. He has left his imprint and his mark on the pages of American history, and particularly on the pages of American legislative history.

He was a bulwark of strength in connection with the national defense of our country. He was one of the great leaders of our country in utilizing and building up our natural resources for the benefit of our country, particularly in the development of the great rivers of our country and the building of dams for flood control and flood protection, and for other purposes, where our natural resources could be so utilized.

It was only the other day that Cliff Davis dropped in to see me and, as always, I was glad to see him on those visits he always paid me when he was up on Capitol Hill.

He was one of the most charming men I have ever met. His personality was very impressive. He possessed a beautiful and rich mind.

In his relationship to human beings, he was possessed of profound and deep understanding. Coming from a section of his State where oftentimes he might have been misunderstood, but inadvertently so, although that was the fact, he was a leader in the fight—always a leader in the fight for the passage of legislation to bring about a better understanding among Americans in fighting the battle for justice, which is oftentimes more effectively done by fighting the battle against injustice.

Cliff Davis was one of the most valuable Members of the House, one of the most dedicated Members, one of the hardest working Members with whom I have ever served. He was always willing to do a favor for a colleague of his, without regard to party, in having projects approved, bills approved, fighting for appropriations which would bring

security and safety to the people of our country. That middle aisle, as I have said so many times, means nothing where friendship is concerned, and it certainly meant nothing, no hindrance or no obstacle, where Clifford Davis was concerned. To him friendship meant something; it was not a one-way street, but it was a two-way street.

Furthermore, I want to pay my respects to him as a great American. During a most trying period of our world's history he served this great country of ours on one of our great national defense committees, doing so with great courage, great distinction, and outstanding ability. We who know Cliff Davis have had our lives enriched by that knowledge and our associations with him.

Cliff Davis has made his mark in print, as I have heretofore said, upon the legislative pages of our Government.

For Mrs. McCormack and myself—and I know I also bespeak the sentiments of my colleagues who served with Cliff Davis or who knew him—I extend to Mrs. Davis and her loved ones the sympathy of not only Mrs. McCormack and myself, but that of all my colleagues in her great loss and sorrow.

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I join the distinguished Speaker in paying my respects to Cliff Davis.

When I first came to the House, I was assigned to the Committee on Public Works. Cliff Davis was a relatively senior member of that committee on the opposite side of the aisle. He was most helpful to me. He was extremely friendly in every way that one could be as a senior member in his relationships with a new member. I learned a great deal about the committee and the legislative process through my association with Cliff Davis. I expressed to him when he left my gratitude for his help and assistance.

I think Cliff Davis had one of the most wonderful senses of humor of any man that I have ever served with in this body. He was a terrific storyteller, a master of ceremonies who was the very best.

On the other hand, he could be extremely serious and very constructive in his approach to the problems that we face in committee or in the House of Representatives as a whole. I think Cliff Davis did leave an indelible mark in his committee work as well as on the floor of the House, and when he left, I thought he left a void that would be hard for anyone to fill. It was always wonderful to see Cliff when he came back. He was back here not many weeks ago to renew his friendships with the people with whom he had served.

It is a sad and sorrowful day to learn that Cliff Davis has passed away, and to Mrs. Davis and to his family I extend the deepest condolences of Mrs. Ford and myself.

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I join my distinguished



friend from Tennessee, Mr. EVINS, the Speaker, the minority leader, and others in expressing my own feeling of deep personal loss and sorrow over the death of Cliff Davis. Many fine things have already been said about him; many more could be said. He was an able Member of the House. He was a constructive Member of the House. He was a builder. He was a great American as well as a great Tennessean. He was loyal to his party, but he always put his country first.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that Cliff's death was a personal loss to me. No Member of the House ever befriended me more. None was ever more helpful. He was always there to give a hand when a hand was needed. Mr. Speaker, I loved Clifford Davis.

Cliff and his wonderful wife, Carrie Davis, made outstanding contributions to the community life of Washington and their own city of Memphis. They were towers of strength in the Democratic Party. Their total contributions to our party were unsurpassed by any family team I have ever known. We who belong to the Democratic Party will be eternally grateful to them.

Cliff was a man of good humor, a man of great wit and keen understanding. He was a man of the highest integrity, great personal loyalty, and deep fidelity to his loved ones and to his friends.

To his good wife Carrie and to all their loved ones and host of friends my wife, Mary, joins me in extending our deepest sympathy. May God comfort them in their grief.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUYKENDALL).

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished chairman of our delegation in expressing deep personal sorrow over the death of our mutual friend and fellow Tennessean, the Honorable Clifford Davis.

The citizens of my city sent Cliff Davis to this body for 24 years, and he derived a large pleasure from helping them with their problems.

Even after he returned to private law practice in Washington, he never grew tired of helping people. I know this from personal experience, having been the beneficiary of his kindness when I came here as a green freshman in 1967. I listened to his counsel and profited from his knowledge of the House, while his lovely wife Carrie was at the same time answering the many questions that Mrs. Kuykendall had for her.

He was a man who had faced death in the official performance of his duty. Some of the furniture in this room still bears the bullet scars from the 1954 incident when he was one of five Members who were shot from the gallery; and he was returning to his district in 1962 when a plane crash in Knoxville almost took our Representative from us. He escaped the first incident with a bullet wound in his leg, and the second one without a scratch.

There are many monuments to Cliff Davis' legislative career in Memphis. But I am sure the one he is proudest of is our magnificent Port of Memphis with its industrial complex on President's Is-

land. As the chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee on Flood Control, he had a vital interest in the Nation's waterways, and this interest reached its zenith in the harbor and the industrial complex that was truly "the house that Cliff built."

Those of us who knew him well have lost a true friend, and we all pray that God grant Mrs. Davis the strength to endure her loss.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished whip of the House, the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOGGS).

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from Tennessee and the others who have expressed sadness at the passing of our old and beloved colleague, Clifford Davis.

Those of us who live in the lower Mississippi Valley, particularly at the very end of it, owe a great debt of gratitude to Cliff Davis. When he first came to the House of Representatives the comprehensive flood control and navigation projects that are now accepted as if they had existed always were not built. It was Cliff Davis' vision and foresight and diligence and hard work that made possible the magnificent flood control protection which now prevails throughout the Mississippi River system.

In addition to that, there were his contributions to the development of the great inland waterway system. Today, there is more traffic carried on the inland waterways of our country than at any time in our history. This is a monument to Cliff Davis. It was Cliff Davis who had the vision and responsibility for the legislation which made this possible.

Finally, as the other speakers have said, Cliff Davis was a friend, a good friend, a good Member of the House, considerate of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and a man of compassion. His dear wife Carrie, I think, is as beloved in Memphis as in Washington. She and Mrs. Boggs have been lifelong friends. We were shocked this morning to read in the press of the passing of our friend and we extend to Carrie and the family our own sense of loss.

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I realize we are to have another day in which to eulogize and pay our respects to our late friend Clifford Davis. I expect to speak at that time. However, I would not let this occasion pass without comment. Clifford Davis originally was from my home State.

I probably had the privilege of knowing him longer than anyone here. I was district attorney just below Memphis, Tenn., when he was city commissioner there.

Through the years it has been my privilege to work with Cliff Davis. His career has been not by appointment or anointment, for Cliff fought his way into the organization which later supported him. A fine and able man, a true friend and great Congressman; his works will live on.

I wish at this time to convey to his be-

loved wife Carrie and his fine family our sincere and heartfelt sympathy at this time of sorrow.

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BOLLING. I should like to add a word to the tributes paid to Cliff Davis. It was my privilege to know him well.

He was one of that large group of Members of the House of Representatives who, while well known in their districts and well known in the House of Representatives, are little known to the general public. Cliff Davis was an unusually able and dedicated public servant. I wish that more people in the United States understood how many Members of the House of Representatives fall into the category I have just described.

He also was blessed with a most remarkable wife. To her I express my deepest sympathy.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I am distressed to hear of the death of my former colleague and good friend.

I served with Cliff for many years. I have never known a man in this House with a sweeter disposition than he had. To know him was to love him. He was a man of tremendous ability. I have seen him show that ability on the floor of the House many, many times.

He was a good, loyal American, and I shall certainly personally miss him.

I had the pleasure of being with him here on the floor a few weeks ago. I always felt better when I met and talked with Cliff Davis. We will miss him.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, although I come before you with a saddened heart, I am still honored to pay tribute to a former colleague of this great governmental body, Hon. Clifford Davis.

While I did not have the privilege of serving in the House of Representatives with this great statesman, his reputation and example of dedication to his people have been an inspiration to me.

Cliff Davis was not only a Congressman from Tennessee, but rather a Congressman for Tennessee, as he represented his people with pride and distinction. Yet, a friend to all, he maintained his high ideals of justice and fairness which will live longer than any moral body can contain.

The best recollection I have about Cliff, was his strong sense of humanism and his dedication to the morality that has pervaded the American people and made them able to endure all the hardships that befall a great nation.

His 24 years of service in the House of Representatives will long be remembered by all. And we all mourn him.

This tribute of recognition is a small way in which to express deep gratitude to a man that has done so much for his fellow mankind, but his deeds will live forever.

My family joins me in extending heartfelt sympathy to his beloved wife and family.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, Cliff Davis

was a real individual. He was one of those people one meets in life and always remembers. He had a talent for friendship. He had a talent for leadership and a unique talent for being a wonderful, warm human being. Cliff Davis has passed away and I have lost a friend. Yet, Cliff Davis will remain in our memories for the long years of association with him in this body, for the work we did together, and for the good times we had together. Our lives have been enriched for knowing him.

I shall miss Cliff Davis. As all of those who knew him well, he was always referred to respectfully as "the Judge." He was elected to the House of Representatives in 1940 after a successful career in Memphis, Tenn., as a municipal court judge, vice mayor, and commissioner of public safety. He served in the House of Representatives with distinction through 1964, a period of 24 years. From the first day I came to the House of Representatives, I knew Cliff Davis. I worked with him in the Committee on Public Works and I saw the many contributions he made as a legislator to his district, to his State, and to his country. He served with distinction as chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition of the Committee on Public Works, and was appointed by the Speaker of the House to serve as chairman of the Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures for the House of Representatives for five consecutive terms.

Cliff's contribution to this country's development can be seen in the fine Corps of Engineers' projects built across this country which have provided safety, well-being and needed recreation to millions of our citizens. His contribution to this country can be seen in the Appalachia program, its development, and the help it has given and the hope it has created in the hearts of millions of our citizens in these poverty stricken areas. His contribution to this country will be seen in many other ways in legislation, some of which is enacted, and some of which is still to be enacted, such as a far-reaching and important Federal land acquisition and relocation program.

Cliff's contribution to this country can be seen, of course, in the tremendous work he did to develop the Southeastern part of the United States for his long fight to see that the Tennessee Valley Authority would have its rightful place in the development of America's economy.

Cliff Davis is gone and I will miss him. To Mrs. Davis, to Cliff's sons, Clifford, Jr., and Ray, and to his daughter, Mrs. George Chauncey (Barbara), Mrs. Fallon and I extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in their expressions of personal loss and sympathy in the death of our beloved former colleague, Cliff Davis.

Judge Davis was a wonderful friend on the House Committee on Public Works during my early service on that committee. He was never too busy to listen to a colleague's problems, and he was wonderfully effective in helping to solve the problems of a friend.

I never met a man with a more de-

lightful since of humor and I never knew a man with more friends than Cliff Davis.

He was a great human being, and he will be missed by all who knew him.

My wife joins me in sending our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Davis and the family.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute today to a distinguished former Member, the Honorable Clifford Davis, who has passed away.

I have never had a closer relationship with anyone serving in the Congress than I had with him.

He was the most effective legislator I have ever served with. He had a complete knowledge of his subject matter and engaged it in the service of his country. No one has done more during their tenure to add to the strength of this country than Cliff Davis.

He was entertaining and enjoyable to be around. He was one of the most engaging speakers we have ever known.

He was courteous, considerate, and kind.

He was never so intemperate of mind that it destroyed his purpose to accomplish things which were most beneficial to the people of this Nation.

He was never sectional in his outlook as is attested by the fact that not a State of the Union has escaped his handiwork in building a multitude of water resource projects. Not a drop of water falls in America today and flows through our streams without benefit of the influence of Cliff Davis.

I have lost a fine companion, a great adviser, a stalwart for purpose and, above all else, I have lost a devoted, kind, and generous friend.

To his family, I offer my most heartfelt sympathy at this time of their great loss and bereavement.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in mourning the death of the Honorable Cliff Davis. Even though I did not have the opportunity to serve in the House with Congressman Davis, I have heard for years of the effectiveness of this outstanding leader for the people of Memphis.

Having grown up just across the river in Arkansas, I followed the activities of Congressman Davis closely and feel that I have learned from him. I can well remember the occasion when I first met Congressman Davis, and I will never forget that experience.

During my travels throughout eastern Arkansas, I have continued to encounter persons who asked about Congressman Davis. They would then share an experience that they had had with him.

I join with my colleagues in expressing my sympathy to the family of Congressman Davis. My thoughts are with them in this hour of sorrow. Memphis and the Midsouth have lost a true friend.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who care to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life, character, and service of the late Honorable Cliff Davis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

#### PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, because of committee business I am not recorded on two record votes. Had I been present, I desire to announce, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall 139 as well as "yea" on rollcall 143.

#### PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 158]

Abernethy	Downing	Nichols
Alexander	Edwards, Ala.	Ottlinger
Anderson	Edwards, Calif.	Passman
Tenn.	Fisher	Pelly
Ashbrook	Ford	Pepper
Aspinall	William D.	Pickle
Ayres	Gallagher	Pike
Baring	Gaydos	Pollock
Beall, Md.	Gettys	Powell
Blester	Gibbons	Pryor, N.C.
Blatnik	Gilbert	Price, Ill.
Bray	Gray	Pryor, Ark.
Brock	Hansen, Wash.	Pucinski
Brown, Calif.	Hébert	Reifel
Carey	Hungate	Reuss
Celler	Jarman	Rivers
Clark	Kirwan	Rooney, N.Y.
Clay	Koch	Roudebush
Conte	McCarthy	Scheuer
Conyers	McMillan	Schwengel
Corman	Mann	Symington
Coughlin	May	Teague, Calif.
Cowger	Meskill	Whitehurst
Daddario	Minshall	Wilson, Bob
Dawson	Morgan	Wold
Diggs	Morton	
Dorn	Moss	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 353 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 11102, MEDICAL FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION AND MODERNIZATION AMENDMENTS OF 1970

Mr. STAGGERS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 11102) to amend the provisions of the Public Health Service Act



relating to the construction and modernization of hospitals and other medical facilities by providing separate authorizations of appropriations for new construction and for modernization of facilities, authorizing Federal guarantees of loans for such construction and modernization and Federal payment of part of the interest thereon, authorizing grants for modernization of emergency rooms of general hospitals, and extending and making other improvements in the program authorized by these provisions:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 91-1167)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11102) to amend the provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to the construction and modernization of hospitals and other medical facilities by providing separate authorizations of appropriations for new construction and for modernization of facilities, authorizing Federal guarantees of loans for such construction and modernization and Federal payment of part of the interest thereon, authorizing grants for modernization of emergency rooms of general hospitals, and extending and making other improvements in the program authorized by these provisions, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

#### SHORT TITLE; DEFINITION

SECTION 1. (a) This Act may be cited as the "Medical Facilities Construction and Modernization Amendments of 1970".

(b) As used in the amendments made by this Act, the term "Secretary", unless the context otherwise requires, means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

#### TITLE I—GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION AND MODERNIZATION OF HOSPITALS AND OTHER MEDICAL FACILITIES

##### PART A—EXTENSION OF GRANT PROGRAM

##### AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

SEC. 101. (a) Section 601 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 219a) is amended—

(1) by striking out "next five" in paragraph (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "next eight";

(2) (A) by striking out "\$70,000,000" in subparagraph (1) of paragraph (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$85,000,000",

(B) by striking out "\$20,000,000" in subparagraph (2) of such paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof "\$70,000,000", and

(C) by striking out "\$10,000,000" in subparagraph (3) of such paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof "\$15,000,000"; and

(3) by striking out in paragraph (b) "and \$195,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970," and inserting in lieu thereof "\$195,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, \$147,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, \$152,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and \$157,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; and".

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect with respect to appropriations made under such section 601 for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1970.

##### AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR MODERNIZATION GRANTS

SEC. 102. (a) Effective with respect to appropriations made under section 601 of the Public Health Service Act for fiscal years be-

ginning after June 30, 1970, such section is further amended—

(1) by striking out in paragraph (b) the following: "and for grants for modernization of such facilities and the facilities referred to in paragraph (a)";

(2) by adding after paragraph (b) the following new paragraph:

"(c) for grants for modernization of the facilities referred to in paragraphs (a) and (b), \$65,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, \$80,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and \$90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; and

(3) by inserting "AND MODERNIZATION" after "CONSTRUCTION" in the section heading.

#### STATE ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 103. (a) Effective with respect to appropriations pursuant to section 601 of the Public Health Service Act for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1970, section 602(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 291b) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Each State shall be entitled for each fiscal year to an allotment bearing the same ratio to the sums appropriated for such year pursuant to subparagraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively, of section 601(a), and to an allotment bearing the same ratio to the sums appropriated for such year pursuant to section 601(b), as the product of—

"(A) the population of such State, and

"(B) the square of its allotment percentage,

bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all of the States.

"(2) For each fiscal year, the Secretary shall, in accordance with regulations, make allotments among the States, from the sums appropriated for such year under section 601(c), on the basis of the population, the financial need, and the extent of the need for modernization of the facilities referred to in paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 601, of the respective States."

(b) Effective with respect to allotments from such appropriations, section 602(b) (1) of such Act is amended by—

(1) striking out "\$25,000" and "\$50,000" in subparagraph (A) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$50,000" and "\$100,000", respectively;

(2) striking out "\$50,000" and "\$100,000" in subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$100,000" and "\$200,000", respectively;

(3) striking out "\$100,000" and "\$200,000" in subparagraph (C) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$200,000" and "\$300,000", respectively; and

(4) striking out "or" at the end of subparagraph (B), inserting "or" at the end of subparagraph (C), and adding after and below subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

"(D) \$200,000 for the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, or Guam and \$300,000 for any other State in the case of an allotment for grants for the modernization of facilities referred to in paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 601."

(c) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall conduct a study of the effects of the formula specified in section 602(a) (1) of the Public Health Service Act for allotment among the States of sums appropriated for construction of health facilities, and shall report to the Congress on May 15, 1972, the result of such study, together with recommendations for such changes, if any, in such formula as he may determine to be desirable, together with his justification for any changes so recommended.

#### TRANSFER OF ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 104. Effective with respect to allotments from appropriations made pursuant to section 601 of the Public Health Service Act for fiscal years beginning after June 30,

1970, section 602(e) of the Public Health Service Act is amended to read as follows:

"(e) (1) Upon the request of any State that a specified portion of any allotment of such State under subsection (a) for any fiscal year be added to any other allotment or allotments of such State under such subsection for such year, the Secretary shall promptly (but after application of subsection (b)) adjust the allotments of such State in accordance with such request and shall notify the State agency; except that the aggregate of the portions so transferred from an allotment for a fiscal year pursuant to this paragraph may not exceed the amount specified with respect to such allotment in clause (A), (B), (C), or (D), as the case may be, of subsection (b) (1) which is applicable to such State.

"(2) In addition to the transfer of portions of allotments under paragraph (1), upon the request of any State that a specified portion of any allotment of such State under subsection (a), other than an allotment for grants for the construction of public or other nonprofit rehabilitation facilities, be added to another allotment of such State under such subsection, other than an allotment for grants for the construction of public or other nonprofit hospitals and public health centers, and upon simultaneous certification to the Secretary by the State agency in such State to the effect that—

"(A) it has afforded a reasonable opportunity to make applications for the portion so specified and there have been no approvable applications for such portion, or

"(B) in the case of a request to transfer a portion of an allotment for grants for the construction of public or other nonprofit hospitals and public health centers, use of such portion as requested by such State agency will better carry out the purposes of this title,

the Secretary shall promptly (but after application of subsection (b)) adjust the allotments of such State in accordance with such request and shall notify the State agency.

"(3) In addition to the transfer of portions of allotments under paragraph (1) or (2), upon the request of any State that a specified portion of an allotment of such State under paragraph (2) of subsection (a) be added to an allotment of such State under paragraph (1) of such subsection for grants for the construction of public or other nonprofit hospitals and public health centers, and upon simultaneous certification by the State agency in such State to the effect that the need for new public or other nonprofit hospitals and public health centers is substantially greater than the need for modernization of facilities referred to in paragraph (a) or (b) of section 601, the Secretary shall promptly (but after application of subsection (b) of this section) adjust the allotments of such State in accordance with such request and shall notify the State agency.

"(4) After adjustment of allotments of any State, as provided in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection, the allotments as so adjusted shall be deemed to be the State's allotments under this section."

#### PART B—OPERATION OF GRANT PROGRAM

##### PRIORITY OF PROJECTS

SEC. 110. Effective with respect to applications approved under title VI of the Public Health Service Act after June 30, 1970, section 603(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 291c) is amended—

(1) by striking out "rural communities and areas with relatively small financial resources" in clause (1), and inserting in lieu thereof "areas with relatively small financial resources and, at the option of the State, rural communities";

(2) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (2), and

(3) by adding after clause (3) the following new clauses:

"(4) in the case of projects for construction or modernization of outpatient facilities, to any outpatient facility that will be located in, and provide services for residents of, an area determined by the Secretary to be a rural or urban poverty area;

"(5) to projects for facilities which, alone or in conjunction with other facilities, will provide comprehensive health care, including outpatient and preventive care as well as hospitalization.

"(6) to facilities which will provide training in health or allied health professions; and

"(7) to facilities which will provide to a significant extent, for the treatment of alcoholism;"

#### AREAWIDE AND STATE HEALTH PLANNING AGENCIES

SEC. 111. (a) Effective with respect to applications approved under title VI of the Public Health Service Act after June 30, 1970, clause (4) of the first sentence of section 605(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 291e) is amended by striking out "State agency and" and inserting in lieu thereof "State agency, opportunity has been provided, prior to such approval and recommendation, for consideration of the project by the public or non-profit private agency or organization which has developed the comprehensive regional, metropolitan area, or other local area plan or plans referred to in section 314(b) covering the area in which such project is to be located or, if there is no such agency or organization, by the State agency administering or supervising the administration of the State plan approved under section 314(a), and the application is for a project for which".

(b) Section 314(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 246) is amended by adding after the first sentence the following new sentence: "No grant may be made under this subsection after June 30, 1970, to any agency or organization to develop or revise health plans for an area unless the Secretary determines that such agency or organization provides means for appropriate representation of the interests of the hospitals, other health care facilities, and practicing physicians serving such area, and the general public."

#### PORTION OF ALLOTMENT AVAILABLE FOR STATE PLAN ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 112. Effective with respect to expenditures under a State plan approved under title VI of the Public Health Service Act which are made for administration of such plan during any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1970—

(1) the first sentence of subsection (c) (1) of section 606 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 291f) is amended (A) by striking out "2 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "4 per centum", and (B) by striking out "\$50,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$100,000"; and

(2) paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of such section 606 is amended by striking out "June 30, 1964" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1970".

#### FEDERAL SHARE

SEC. 113. Effective with respect to projects approved under title VI of the Public Health Service Act after June 30, 1970, the section of such Act herein redesignated as section 645(b) (42 U.S.C. 291o) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) (1) The term 'Federal share' with respect to any project means the proportion of the cost of such project to be paid by the Federal Government under this title.

"(2) With respect to any project in any State for which a grant is made from an allotment from an appropriation under section 601, the Federal share shall be the amount determined by the State agency designated in accordance with section 604, but not more than 66 $\frac{2}{3}$  per centum or the State's allotment percentage, whichever is the lower, except that, if the State's allot-

ment percentage is lower than 50 per centum, such allotment percentage shall be deemed to be 50 per centum for purposes of this paragraph.

"(3) Prior to the approval of the first project in a State during any fiscal year the State agency designated in accordance with section 604 shall give the Secretary written notification of the maximum Federal share established pursuant to paragraph (2) for projects in such State to be approved by the Secretary during such fiscal year and the method for determining the actual Federal share to be paid with respect to such projects; and such maximum Federal share and such method of determination for projects in such State approved during such fiscal year shall not be changed after such approval.

"(4) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection, the Federal share shall, at the option of the State agency, be equal to the per centum provided under such paragraphs plus an incentive per centum (which when combined with the per centum provided under such paragraphs shall not exceed 90 per centum) specified by the State agency in the case of (A) projects that will provide services primarily for persons in an area determined by the Secretary to be a rural or urban poverty area, and (B) projects that offer potential for reducing health care costs through shared services among health care facilities, through inter-facility cooperation, or through the construction or modernization of free-standing outpatient facilities."

#### DEFINITION OF HOSPITAL

SEC. 114. (a) Effective with respect to applications approved under title VI of the Public Health Service Act after June 30, 1970, paragraph (c) of the section of such Act redesignated (by section 201 of this Act) as section 645 is amended—

(1) by inserting after "nurses' home facilities," the following: "extended care facilities, facilities related to programs for home health services, self-care units,"; and

(2) by inserting a comma immediately before "operated" and inserting immediately before "but does not include" the following: "and also includes education or training facilities for health professions personnel operated as an integral part of a hospital."

#### STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS

SEC. 115. Effective July 1, 1970, section 604 (a) (3) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 291d) is amended—

(a) by inserting "(A)" after "shall include", and

(b) by inserting after "rehabilitation services, and" the following: "representatives particularly concerned with education or training of health professions personnel, and (B)".

#### CHANGE IN NAME AND CLARIFICATION OF FUNCTIONS OF DIAGNOSTIC OR TREATMENT CENTER

SEC. 116. (a) Sections 601(a)(2) and 602 (b) (1) (B) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 291a, 291b) are each amended by striking out "diagnostic or treatment centers" and inserting in lieu thereof "outpatient facilities".

(b) Section 604(a)(4)(C) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 291d) is amended by striking out "diagnostic or treatment centers" and inserting in lieu thereof "outpatient facilities" and by striking out "such centers" and inserting in lieu thereof "such facilities".

(c) Section 604(a)(5) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 291d) is amended by striking out "diagnostic or treatment centers" and inserting in lieu thereof "outpatient facilities".

(d) Section 609(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 291i) is amended by striking out "diagnostic or treatment center" and inserting in lieu thereof "outpatient facility".

(e) Section 605(e) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 291e) is amended by—

(1) striking out "a diagnostic or treatment

center" and inserting in lieu thereof "an outpatient facility"; and

(2) inserting before the period at the end thereof "or which provides reasonable assurance that the services of a general hospital will be available to patients of such facility who are in need of hospital care".

(f) Paragraph (f) of the section of the Public Health Service Act redesignated (by section 201 of this Act) as section 645 (42 U.S.C. 291o) is amended—

(1) by striking out "diagnostic or treatment center" and inserting in lieu thereof "outpatient facility";

(2) by inserting after "means a facility" the following: "(located in or apart from a hospital)";

(3) by inserting after "ambulatory patients" the following: "(including ambulatory inpatients)"; and

(4) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "; or" and by adding after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) which offers to patients not requiring hospitalization the services of licensed physicians in various medical specialties, and which provides to its patients a reasonably full-range of diagnostic and treatment services."

(g) The amendments made by subsection (e) and paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (f) of this section shall apply with respect to applications approved under title VI of such Act after June 30, 1970.

#### DEFINITION OF FACILITY FOR LONG-TERM CARE

SEC. 117. Effective with respect to applications approved under title VI of the Public Health Service Act after June 30, 1970, paragraph (h) of the section of such Act redesignated (by section 201 of this Act) as section 645 (42 U.S.C. 291o) is amended by inserting after "means a facility" the following: "(including an extended care facility)".

#### GRANTS FOR EQUIPMENT

SEC. 118. Effective with respect to projects approved under title VI of the Public Health Service Act after June 30, 1970, paragraph (1) of the section of such Act redesignated (by section 201 of this Act) as section 645 (42 U.S.C. 291o) is further amended by inserting before the semicolon "and, in any case in which it will help to provide a service not previously provided in the community, equipment of any buildings".

#### INCLUSION OF THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

SEC. 119. (a) (1) Subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of section 602 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 291b) are each amended by inserting "the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands," after "American Samoa,".

(2) Paragraph (2) of such subsection is amended by inserting "the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands," after "American Samoa,".

(b) Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of such section is amended by inserting "the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands," after "American Samoa,".

(c) Paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (d) of such section are each amended by inserting "the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands," after "American Samoa,".

(d) The section of such Act redesignated (by section 201 of this Act) as section 645(a) (42 U.S.C. 291o) is amended by inserting "the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands," after "American Samoa,".

(e) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to allotments (and grants therefrom) under part A of title VI of the Public Health Service Act for fiscal years ending after June 30, 1970, and with respect to loan guarantees and loans under part B of such title made after June 30, 1970.

#### WAIVING OF RIGHT OF RECOVERY

SEC. 120. Section (3)(b) of the Hospital and Medical Facilities Amendments of 1964



(Public Law 88-443) is amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and by adding after such paragraph the following new paragraph:

"(6) the provisions of clause (b) of section 609 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by this Act, shall apply with respect to any project whether it was approved, and whether the event specified in such clause occurred, before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act, except that it shall not apply in the case of any project with respect to which recovery under title VI of such Act has been made prior to the enactment of this paragraph."

#### FINANCIAL STATEMENTS FOR FACILITIES ASSISTED UNDER TITLE VI OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

Sec. 121. Title VI of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

##### "FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

"SEC. 646. In the case of any facility for which a grant, loan, or loan guarantee has been made under this title, the applicant for such grant, loan, or loan guarantee (or, if appropriate, such other persons as the Secretary may prescribe) shall file at least annually with the State agency for the State in which the facility is located a statement which shall be in such form, and contain such information, as the Secretary may require to accurately show—

"(1) the financial operations of the facility, and

"(2) the costs to the facility of providing health services in the facility and the charges made by the facility for providing such services,

during the period with respect to which the statement is filed."

##### CARRYOVER OF ALLOTMENTS

Sec. 122. Effective with respect to allotments made from appropriations under section 601 of the Public Health Service Act for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1970, section 602(d)(1) of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "for the next fiscal year (and for such year only)" and inserting in lieu thereof "for the next two fiscal years (and for such years only)", and (2) by striking out "purpose for such next fiscal year" and inserting in lieu thereof "purposes for such next two fiscal years".

#### AVAILABILITY OF EXTENDED CARE SERVICES TO PATIENTS OF GENERAL HOSPITALS

Sec. 123. Section 604(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 291d) is amended by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (11), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (12) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and by adding after paragraph (12) the following new paragraph:

"(13) Effective July 1, 1971, provide that before any project for construction or modernization of any general hospital is approved by the State agency there will be reasonable assurance of adequate provision for extended care services (as determined in accordance with regulations) to patients of such hospital when such services are medically appropriate for them, with such services being provided in facilities which (A) are structurally part of, physically connected with, or in immediate proximity to, such hospital, and (B) either (i) are under the supervision of the professional staff of such hospital or (ii) have organized medical staffs and have in effect transfer agreements with such hospital; except that the Secretary may, at the request of the State agency, waive compliance with clause (A) or (B), or both such clauses, as the case may be, in the case of any project if the State agency has determined that compliance with such clause or clauses in such case would be inadvisable."

#### TITLE II—LOAN GUARANTEES AND LOANS FOR MODERNIZATION AND CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITALS AND OTHER MEDICAL FACILITIES

##### LOAN GUARANTEES AND LOANS FOR MODERNIZATION AND CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITALS AND OTHER MEDICAL FACILITIES

Sec. 201. Title VI of the Public Health Service Act is amended by redesignating part B as part D; by redesignating sections 621 through 625 (42 U.S.C. 291k-291o), and all references thereto, as sections 641 through 645, respectively; and by inserting after section 610 (42 U.S.C. 291i) the following new part:

##### "PART B—LOAN GUARANTEES AND LOANS FOR MODERNIZATION AND CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITALS AND OTHER MEDICAL FACILITIES

##### "AUTHORIZATION OF LOAN GUARANTEES AND LOANS

"SEC. 621. (a) (1) In order to assist nonprofit private agencies to carry out needed projects for the modernization or construction of nonprofit private hospitals, facilities for long-term care, outpatient facilities, and rehabilitation facilities, the Secretary, during the period July 1, 1970, through June 30, 1973, may, in accordance with the provisions of this part, guarantee to non-Federal lenders making loans to such agencies for such projects, payment of principal of and interest on loans, made by such lenders, which are approved under this part.

"(2) In order to assist public agencies to carry out needed projects for the modernization or construction of public health centers, and public hospitals, facilities for long-term care, outpatient facilities, and rehabilitation facilities, the Secretary, during the period July 1, 1970, through June 30, 1973, may, in accordance with the provisions of this part, make loans to such agencies which shall be sold and guaranteed in accordance with section 627.

"(b) (1) No loan guarantee under this part with respect to any modernization or construction project may apply to so much of the principal amount thereof as, when added to the amount of any grant or loan under part A with respect to such project, exceeds 90 per centum of the cost of such project.

"(2) No loan to a public agency under this part shall be made in an amount which, when added to the amount of any grant or loan under part A with respect to such project, exceeds 90 per centum of the cost of such project.

"(c) The Secretary, with the consent of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, shall obtain from the Department of Housing and Urban Development such assistance with respect to the administration of this part as will promote efficiency and economy thereof.

##### "ALLOCATION AMONG THE STATES

"SEC. 622. (a) For each fiscal year, the total amount of principal of loans to nonprofit private agencies which may be guaranteed or loans to public agencies which may be directly made under this part shall be allotted by the Secretary among the States, in accordance with regulations, on the basis of each State's relative population, financial need, need for construction of the facilities referred to in section 621(a), and need for modernization of such facilities.

"(b) Any amount allotted under subsection (a) to a State for a fiscal year ending before July 1, 1973, and remaining unobligated at the end of such year shall remain available to such State, for the purpose for which made, for the next two fiscal years (and for such years only), and any such amount shall be in addition to the amounts allotted to such State for such purpose for each of such next two fiscal years; except that, with the consent of any such State, any such amount remaining unobligated at the

end of the first of such next fiscal year may be reallocated (on such basis as the Secretary deems equitable and consistent with the purposes of this title) to other States which have need therefor. Any amounts so reallocated to a State shall be available for the purposes for which made until the close of the second such next two fiscal years and shall be in addition to the amount allotted and available to such State for the same period.

"(c) Any amount allotted or reallocated to a State under this section for a fiscal year shall not, until the expiration of the period during which it is available for obligation, be considered as available for allotment for a subsequent fiscal year.

"(d) The allotments of any State under subsection (a) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and the succeeding fiscal year shall also be available to guarantee loans with respect to any project, for modernization or construction of a nonprofit private hospital or other health facility referred to in section 621(a)(1), if the modernization or construction of such facility was not commenced earlier than January 1, 1968, and if the State certifies and the Secretary finds that without such guaranteed loan such facility could not be completed and begin to operate or could not continue to operate, but with such guaranteed loan would be able to do so: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not apply to more than two projects in any one State.

##### "APPLICATIONS AND CONDITIONS

"SEC. 623. (a) For each project for which a guarantee of a loan to a nonprofit private agency or a direct loan to a public agency is sought under this part, there shall be submitted to the Secretary, through the State agency designated in accordance with section 604, an application by such private nonprofit agency or by such public agency. If two or more private nonprofit agencies, or two or more public agencies, join in the project, the application may be filed by one or more such agencies. Such application shall (1) set forth all of the descriptions, plans, specifications, assurances, and information which are required by the third sentence of section 605(a) (other than clause (6) thereof) with respect to applications submitted under that section, (2) contain such other information as the Secretary may require to carry out the purposes of this part, and (3) include a certification by the State agency of the total cost of the project and the amount of the loan for which a guarantee is sought under this part, or the amount of the direct loan sought under this part, as the case may be.

"(b) The Secretary may approve such application only if—

"(1) there remains sufficient balance in the allotment determined for such State pursuant to section 622 to cover the amount of the loan for which a guarantee is sought, or the amount of the direct loan sought (as the case may be), in such application,

"(2) he makes each of the findings which are required by clauses (1) through (4) of section 605(b) for the approval of applications for projects thereunder (except that, in the case of the finding required under such clause (4) of entitlement of a project to a priority established under section 603(a), such finding shall be made without regard to the provisions of clauses (1) and (3) of such section),

"(3) he finds that there is compliance with section 605(e),

"(4) he obtains assurances that the applicant will keep such records, and afford such access thereto, and make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may reasonably require, and

"(5) he also determines, in the case of a loan for which a guarantee is sought, that

the terms, conditions, maturity, security (if any), and schedule and amounts of repayments with respect to the loan are sufficient to protect the financial interests of the United States and are otherwise reasonable and in accord with regulations, including a determination that the rate of interest does not exceed such per centum per annum on the principal obligation outstanding as the Secretary determines to be reasonable, taking into account the range of interest rates prevailing in the private market for similar loans and the risks assumed by the United States.

"(c) No application under this section shall be disapproved until the Secretary has afforded the State agency an opportunity for a hearing.

"(d) Amendment of an approved application shall be subject to approval in the same manner as an original application.

"(e) (1) In the case of any loan to a nonprofit private agency, the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant the amount of any payments made pursuant to any guarantee of such loan under this part, unless the Secretary for good cause waives its right of recovery, and upon making any such payment, the United States shall be subrogated to all of the rights of the recipient of the payments with respect to which the guarantee was made.

"(2) Guarantees of loans to nonprofit private agencies under this part shall be subject to such further terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be necessary to assure that the purposes of this part will be achieved, and, to the extent permitted by subsection (f), any of such terms and conditions may be modified by the Secretary to the extent he determines it to be consistent with the financial interest of the United States.

"(f) Any guarantee of a loan to a nonprofit private agency made by the Secretary pursuant to this part shall be incontestable in the hands of an applicant on whose behalf such guarantee is made, and as to any person who makes or contracts to make a loan to such applicant in reliance thereon, except for fraud or misrepresentation on the part of such applicant or such other person.

#### "PAYMENT OF INTEREST ON GUARANTEED LOAN

"SEC. 624. (a) Subject to the provisions of subsection (b), in the case of a guarantee of any loan to a nonprofit private agency under this part with respect to a hospital or other medical facility, the Secretary shall pay, to the holder of such loan and for and on behalf of such hospital or other medical facility amounts sufficient to reduce by 3 per centum per annum the net effective interest rate otherwise payable on such loan. Each holder of a loan, to a nonprofit private agency, which is guaranteed under this part shall have a contractual right to receive from the United States interest payments required by the preceding sentence.

"(b) Contracts to make the payments provided for in this section shall not carry an aggregate amount greater than such amount as may be provided in appropriations Acts.

#### "LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF LOANS GUARANTEED OR DIRECTLY MADE

"SEC. 625. The cumulative total of the principal of the loans outstanding at any time with respect to which guarantees have been issued, or which have been directly made, under this part may not exceed the lesser of—

"(1) such limitations as may be specified in appropriations Acts, or

"(2) in the case of loans covered by allotments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, \$500,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, \$1,000,000,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, \$1,500,000,000.

#### "LOAN GUARANTEE AND LOAN FUND

"SEC. 626. (a) (1) There is hereby established in the Treasury a loan guarantee and loan fund (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'fund') which shall be available to the Secretary without fiscal year limitation, in such amounts as may be specified from time to time in appropriations Acts, (i) to enable him to discharge his responsibilities under guarantees issued by him under this part, (ii) for payment of interest on the loans to nonprofit agencies which are guaranteed, (iii) for direct loans to public agencies which are sold and guaranteed, (iv) for payment of interest with respect to such loans, and (v) for repurchase by him of direct loans to public agencies which have been sold and guaranteed. There are authorized to be appropriated to the fund from time to time such amounts as may be necessary to provide capital required for the fund. To the extent authorized from time to time in appropriation Acts, there shall be deposited in the fund amounts received by the Secretary as interest payments or repayments of principal on loans and any other moneys, property, or assets derived by him from his operations under this part, including any moneys derived from the sale of assets.

"(2) Of the moneys in the fund, there shall be available to the Secretary for the purpose of making of direct loans to public agencies only such sums as shall have been appropriated for such purpose pursuant to section 627 or sums received by the Secretary from the sale of such loans (in accordance with such section) and authorized in appropriations Acts to be used for such purpose.

"(b) If at any time the moneys in the fund are insufficient to enable the Secretary to discharge his responsibilities under this part—

"(i) to make payments of interest on loans to nonprofit private agencies which he has guaranteed under this part;

"(ii) to otherwise comply with guarantees under this part of loans to nonprofit private agencies;

"(iii) to make payments of interest subsidies with respect to loans to public agencies which he has made, sold, and guaranteed under this part;

"(iv) in the event of default by public agencies to make payments of principal and interest on loans which the Secretary has made, sold, and guaranteed, under this part, to make such payments to the purchaser of such loan;

"(v) to repurchase loans to public agencies which have been sold and guaranteed under this part.

he is authorized to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury notes or other obligations in such forms and denominations, bearing such maturities, and subject to such terms and conditions, as may be prescribed by the Secretary with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, but only in such amounts as may be specified from time to time in appropriations Acts. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities during the month preceding the issuance of the notes or other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations issued hereunder and for that purpose he is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchase of such notes and obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other

obligations acquired by him under this subsection. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States. Sums borrowed under this subsection shall be deposited in the fund and redemption of such notes and obligations shall be made by the Secretary from such fund.

#### "PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO LOANS TO PUBLIC FACILITIES

"SEC. 627. (a) (1) Any loan made by the Secretary to a public agency under this part for the modernization or construction of a public hospital or other health facility shall require such public agency to pay interest thereon at a rate comparable to the current rate of interest prevailing with respect to loans, to nonprofit private agencies, which are guaranteed under this part, for the modernization or construction of similar facilities in the same or similar areas, minus 3 per centum per annum.

"(2) (A) No loan to a public agency shall be made under this part unless—

"(i) the Secretary is reasonably satisfied that such agency will be able to make payments of principal and interest thereon when due, and

"(ii) such agency provides the Secretary with reasonable assurances that there will be available to such agency such additional funds as may be necessary to complete the project with respect to which such loan is requested.

"(B) Any loan to a public agency shall have such security, have such maturity date, be repayable in such installments, and be subject to such other terms and conditions (including provision for recovery in case of default) as the Secretary determines to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this part while adequately protecting the financial interests of the United States.

"(3) In making loans to public agencies under this part, the Secretary shall give due regard to achieving an equitable geographical distribution of such loans.

"(b) (1) The Secretary shall from time to time, but with due regard to the financial interests of the United States, sell loans referred to in subsection (a) (1) either on the private market or to the Federal National Mortgage Association in accordance with section 302 of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act.

"(2) Any loan so sold shall be sold for an amount which is equal (or approximately equal) to the amount of the unpaid principal of such loan as of the time of sale.

"(c) (1) The Secretary is authorized to enter into an agreement with the purchaser of any loan sold under this part under which the Secretary agrees—

"(A) to guarantee to such purchaser (and any successor in interest to such purchaser) payment of the principal and interest payable under such loan, and

"(B) to pay as an interest subsidy to such purchaser (and any successor in interest to such purchaser) amounts which when added to the amount of interest payable on such loan, are equivalent to a reasonable rate of interest on such loan as determined by the Secretary, after taking into account the range of prevailing interest rates in the private market on similar loans and the risks assumed by the United States.

"(2) Any such agreement—

"(A) may provide that the Secretary shall act as agent of any such purchaser, for the purpose of collecting from the public agency to which such loan was made and paying over to such purchaser, any payments of principal and interest payable by such agency under such loan;

"(B) may provide for the repurchase by the Secretary of any such loan on such terms



and conditions as may be specified in the agreement;

"(C) shall provide that, in the event of any default by the public agency to which such loan was made in payment of principal and interest due on such loan, the Secretary shall, upon notification to the purchaser (or to the successor in interest of such purchaser), have the option to close out such loan (and any obligations of the Secretary with respect thereto) by paying to the purchaser (or his successor in interest) the total amount of outstanding principal and interest due thereon at the time of such notification; and

"(D) shall provide that, in the event such loan is closed out as provided in subparagraph (C), or in the event of any other loss incurred by the Secretary by reason of the failure of such public agency to make payments of principal and interest on such loan, the Secretary shall be subrogated to all rights of such purchaser for recovery of such loss from such public agency.

"(d) The Secretary may, for good cause, waive any right of recovery which he has against a public agency by reason of the failure of such agency to make payments of principal and interest on a loan made to such agency under this part.

"(e) After any loan to a public agency under this part has been sold and guaranteed, interest paid on such loan and any interest subsidy paid by the Secretary with respect to such loan which is received by the purchaser thereof (or his successor in interest) shall be included in gross income for the purposes of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

"(f) Amounts received by the Secretary as proceeds from the sale of loans under this section shall be deposited in the loan fund established by section 626, and shall be available to the Secretary for the making of further loans under this part in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) (2) of such section.

"(g) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, for deposit in the loan fund established by section 626, \$30,000,000 to provide initial capital for the making of direct loans by the Secretary to public agencies for the modernization or construction of facilities referred to in subsection (a) (1)."

#### AMENDMENT TO FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION CHARTER ACT

SEC. 202. The first sentence of section 302 (b) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act is amended by inserting after the first semicolon the following: "and to purchase, service, sell, or otherwise deal in any loans made to a public agency under part B of title VI of the Public Health Service Act;"

#### TITLE III—GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OR MODERNIZATION OF EMERGENCY ROOMS OF GENERAL HOSPITALS

SEC. 301. Title VI of the Public Health Service Act is further amended by adding after part B (added by section 201 of this Act) the following new part:

##### "PART C—CONSTRUCTION OR MODERNIZATION OF EMERGENCY ROOMS

###### "AUTHORIZATION

"SEC. 631. In order to assist in the provision of adequate emergency room service in various communities of the Nation for treatment of accident victims and handling of other medical emergencies through special project grants for the construction or modernization of emergency rooms of general hospitals, there are authorized to be appropriated \$20,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and the next two fiscal years.

###### "ELIGIBILITY FOR GRANTS

"SEC. 632. Funds appropriated pursuant to section 631 shall be available for grants by

the Secretary for not to exceed 50 per centum of the cost of construction or modernization of emergency rooms of public or nonprofit general hospitals, including provision or replacement of medical transportation facilities. Such grants shall be made by the Secretary only after consultation with the State agency designated in accordance with section 604(a) (1) of the Public Health Service Act. In order to be eligible for a grant under this part, the project, and the applicant therefor, must meet such criteria as may be prescribed by regulations. Such regulations shall be so designed as to provide aid only with respect to projects for which adequate assistance is not readily available from other Federal, State, local, or other sources, and to assist in providing modern, efficient, and effective emergency room service needed to care for victims of highway, industrial, agricultural, or other accidents and to handle other medical emergencies, and to assist in providing such service in geographical areas which have special need therefor.

###### "PAYMENTS

"SEC. 633. Grants under this part shall be paid in advance or by way of reimbursement, in such installments and on such conditions, as in the judgment of the Secretary will best carry out the purposes of this part."

#### TITLE IV—EVALUATION OF HEALTH PROGRAMS

SEC. 401. (a) Title V of the Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new section:

###### "EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS

"SEC. 513. Such portion as the Secretary may determine, but not more than 1 per centum, of any appropriation for grants, contracts, or other payments under any provision of this Act, the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act, the Community Mental Health Centers Act, the Act of August 5, 1954 (Public Law 568, Eighty-third Congress), or the Act of August 16, 1957 (Public Law 85-151), for any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1970, shall be available for evaluation (directly, or by grants or contracts) of any program authorized by this Act or any of such other Acts, and, in the case of allotments from any such appropriation, the amount available for allotment shall be reduced accordingly."

(b) (1) Effective with respect to appropriations for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1970—

(A) section 304(d) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 242b) is amended by striking out "; except that for any fiscal year ending after June 30, 1968" and all that follows down to but not including the period;

(B) section 309(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 242g) is amended by striking out "(1)", and by striking out ", and (2)" and all that follows down to but not including the period;

(C) section 314(d) (1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 246) is amended by striking out ", except that, for any fiscal year ending after June 30, 1968" and all that follows down to but not including the period;

(D) section 314(e) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 246) is amended by striking out the last sentence;

(E) section 797 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 295h-6) is repealed; and

(F) section 901(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 299a) is amended by striking out the last sentence.

(2) Effective with respect to appropriations for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1970, section 262 of the Community Mental Health Centers Act (42 U.S.C. 2688p) is repealed.

#### TITLE V—MARIHUANA

###### CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS

SEC. 501. The Congress finds that the use of marihuana is increasing in the United States, especially among the young people thereof, and that there is need for a better

understanding of the health consequences of using marihuana. The Congress further finds that, notwithstanding the various studies carried out, and research engaged in, with respect to the use of marihuana, there is a lack of an authoritative source for obtaining information involving the health consequences of using marihuana.

###### HEALTH-RESEARCH REPORTS

SEC. 502. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after consultation with the Surgeon General and other appropriate individuals, shall transmit a report to the Congress on or before January 31, 1971, and annually thereafter (1) containing current information on the health consequences of using marihuana, and (2) containing such recommendations for legislative and administrative action as he may deem appropriate. A preliminary report shall be transmitted to the Congress by the Secretary concerning current information on the health consequences of using marihuana not later than ninety (90) days after the date of enactment of this title.

###### SHORT TITLE

SEC. 503. This title may be cited as the "Marihuana and Health Reporting Act".

#### TITLE VI—AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 601. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, unless enacted after the enactment of this Act expressly in limitation of the provisions of this section, funds appropriated for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1973, to carry out any program for which appropriations are authorized by the Public Health Service Act (Public Law 410, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended) or the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 (Public Law 88-164, as amended) shall remain available for obligation and expenditure until the end of such fiscal year.

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,

JOHN JARMAN,

PAUL G. ROGERS,

W. L. SPRINGER,

ANCHER NELSEN,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,

HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,

EDWARD M. KENNEDY,

GAYLORD NELSON,

THOMAS F. EAGLETON,

ALAN CRANSTON,

HAROLD E. HUGHES,

PETER H. DOMINICK,

JACOB K. JAVITS,

GEORGE MURPHY,

WINSTON PROUTY,

WILLIAM B. SAXBE,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

###### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11102) to amend the provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to the construction and modernization of hospitals and other medical facilities by providing separate authorizations of appropriations for new construction and for modernization of facilities, authorizing Federal guarantees of loans for such construction and modernization and Federal payment of part of the interest thereon, authorizing grants for modernization of emergency rooms of general hospitals, and extending and making other improvements in the program authorized by these provisions, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the

conferes and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendments struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text and provided a new title for the House bill.

With respect to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the House bill, the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. The differences between the Senate amendment and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below except for minor technical and clarifying changes made necessary by reason of the conference agreement.

#### GENERAL SUMMARY

As passed by the House, the bill provided a 3-year extension of the existing program under title VI of the Public Health Service Act (generally known as the Hill-Burton program), together with a 3-year program of guarantees of loans to private, nonprofit groups for medical facility construction or modernization, with a 3-percent interest subsidy, and a program of guaranteed loans (without interest subsidy) for construction of modernization of publicly owned health facilities.

The Senate amendment provided a 5-year extension of the existing program, with increased appropriation authorizations over the House passed levels; a 5-year loan guarantee program for private, nonprofit groups, with an interest subsidy; and a program of direct loans for construction of modernization of publicly owned facilities.

The conference substitute provides a 3-year extension of the existing grant program, with appropriation authorizations above the House levels but below the Senate levels; a 3-year guaranteed loan program for construction or modernization of private, nonprofit health facilities; and a program of direct loans for construction or modernization of public facilities, with \$30 million initial capital for such loans, with the loans being sold thereafter, with interest on the obligations securing the loans losing their tax-exempt status, and the proceeds of the sale being used for further loans to public agencies.

The remainder of this statement will discuss the details of the differences between the House version of the bill and the conference substitute.

#### GRANT PROGRAM

##### Authorizations

The House bill contained authorizations for matching grants as follows: facilities for long-term care, \$70 million per year; diagnostic and treatment centers (redesignated by the conference substitute as "outpatient facilities"), \$20 million per year; rehabilitation facilities, \$10 million per year; construction of hospitals and public health centers, \$135 million per year. For modernization of facilities, the House bill authorized \$50 million for fiscal year 1971; \$55 million for fiscal year 1972; and \$60 million for fiscal year 1973.

The conference substitute authorizes \$85 million a year for facilities for long term care; \$70 million a year for outpatient facilities; and \$15 million per year for rehabilitation.

For construction of hospitals and public health centers, the conference substitute authorizes \$147.5 million for fiscal year 1971; \$152.5 million for fiscal year 1972; and \$157.5 million for fiscal year 1973. For modernization, the conference substitute authorizes \$65 million for fiscal year 1971; \$80 million for fiscal year 1972; and \$90 million for fiscal year 1973.

##### Allotments

The House bill continues the existing formulas for allotments among the States, with

funds for modernization being allotted on the basis of financial need, population, and need for modernization. Construction funds are allotted on the basis of population and the square of the State's allotment percentage. This latter method of allotting funds among the States provides larger sums proportionately for those States having lower per capita income as compared to States whose residents have higher per capita incomes. This formula was the subject of considerable discussion during the conference, and as a result, an amendment was added to the conference substitute providing for a study by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with recommendations to be made to the Congress on May 15, 1972, with respect to this formula.

Although the managers on the part of the House insisted on retention of the existing formula for allocation of construction funds, it is expected that consideration will be given to possible modification of the formula to take into account the need for construction of new beds. The recommendations of the Department of HEW will serve as the basis for study and action by the Congress when this program is next considered for renewal.

##### Transfers of allotments

The House bill left existing law unchanged with respect to transfers of allotments among the various categories of assistance authorized under the program, except that authority for transfers from the modernization category to the allotment for construction of hospitals and public health centers was eliminated. The managers on the part of the House receded from this provision, and accepted the transfer authorities contained in the Senate amendment as follows:

First, any State may make transfers, in the discretion of the State agency, of any amount up to the minimum amount allotted to any State for a particular category.

This provision will benefit the smaller States, by permitting them to shift relatively small sums from one allotment category or another without being required to comply with relatively elaborate certification requirements.

Secondly, all amounts above these minimums may be transferred from one category of assistance to another (for example, from construction of facilities for long-term care to modernization) without restriction on the amounts, except that (1) no funds may be transferred from the rehabilitation facilities category or (except as indicated in the next sentence) to the new hospital construction category, and (2) all other transfers must be justified on the basis that either there are no approvable applications in the category from which funds are transferred, or, in the case of transfers from the new hospital construction category, the purposes of the program will be better served by such a transfer. Further, transfers may be made from the modernization category to the category of new hospital construction if the state agency certifies that the need for the latter is greater.

##### CHANGES IN NAME AND CLARIFICATION OF FUNCTIONS OF DIAGNOSTIC OR TREATMENT CENTERS

The Senate amendment would change the name of diagnostic or treatment centers to "outpatient facilities," would make it clear that the definition of this term includes facilities which offer to patients not requiring hospitalization the services of licensed physicians in various medical specialties, and provide a reasonably full range of diagnostic and treatment services. In addition, the Senate amendment continues the requirement in existing law that the applicant be either (1) a public agency, or (2) a nonprofit private organization which either owns and operates a hospital, and adds, as an alternative, a requirement that the application be for a facility which provides

reasonable assurance that the services of a general hospital will be available to patients of the outpatient facility who are in need of hospital care. The House recedes. The managers on the part of the House, in agreeing to the Senate amendment, feel that these modifications in the role and functions of outpatient facilities should provide improved availability of medical care to many persons who are not adequately served today, while still assuring that hospital services will be available to patients of the outpatient facilities who need such care.

##### AVAILABILITY OF EXTENDED CARE SERVICES

The House bill provided that, effective July 1, 1971, no project for general hospital construction or modernization could be approved unless reasonable assurances were provided that extended care services would be available to patients of the hospital in facilities which (A) are structurally part of, physically connected with, or in immediate proximity to, the hospital, and (B) either are under the supervision of the professional staff of the hospital or have organized medical staffs and have in effect transfer agreements with the hospital. The House bill authorized a waiver of the requirements of clause (A) by the Secretary upon request of the State agency. The conference substitute authorizes a similar waiver in the case of the requirements of clause (B); however, it is intended that these requirements be complied with in all appropriate cases, as a means of encouraging use of facilities for the care of patients which are less expensive than are general hospital beds.

##### CARRYOVER OF ALLOTMENTS

Existing law authorizes a State to carry over its allotments under this program for the next fiscal year. The Senate amendment authorizes carryovers for an additional fiscal year. The House recedes.

##### EMERGENCY ROOMS

The House bill proposed to authorize \$10 million annually for project grants for modernization of emergency rooms of general hospitals. The conference substitute authorizes a \$20 million program for construction and modernization of emergency rooms, including specific reference to transportation facilities as a part of project costs.

##### FEDERAL SHARE

The House bill provided that the Federal share of the cost of any project (which today may be not less than  $\frac{1}{3}$  nor more than  $\frac{2}{3}$  of such costs) would hereafter be in such amount, not in excess of  $\frac{2}{3}$ , as the state agency determined. The Senate amendment would have authorized a higher Federal share (up to 90 percent) in the case of rural or urban poverty projects, and facilities which might reduce health costs through shared services, interfacility cooperation, and free-standing ambulatory care centers. The conference substitute combines both the House amendment and the Senate revisions discussed herein.

##### EQUIPMENT PROJECTS

The Senate amendment would authorize projects providing equipment of buildings in any case in which it will help to provide a service not previously provided in the community. The House bill did not contain a comparable feature. The House recedes.

##### PRIORITIES

The House bill would have retained priorities as set forth in existing law, except that it provided that the state agency could waive the priority for construction in rural areas. The Senate amendment contained the same provision with respect to waiver of construction priorities for rural areas, and added a number of additional categories.

The conference substitute provides that priority shall be given to projects for construction or modernization of out-patient facilities which are limited in and provide



services for residents of rural or urban poverty areas; projects for facilities which, alone or in conjunction with other facilities, will provide comprehensive health care; projects for facilities which will provide training in health or allied health professions; and projects for facilities which will provide to a significant extent for the treatment of alcoholism.

#### AVAILABILITY OF EXTENDED CARE SERVICES

The House bill provided that after July 1, 1971, before any project for construction or modernization of a general hospital could be approved, reasonable assurances would have to be provided for extended care services for patients of the hospital, with those services being provided in facilities which are structurally part of, physically connected with, or in immediate proximity to the hospital. The state agency was authorized to waive this requirement. In addition, the House bill also provided that the extended care services are required to be provided in facilities which were either under the supervision of the professional staff of the hospital, or had recognized medical staffs and effective transfer agreement with the hospital.

The Senate amendment contained somewhat similar provisions, except that the Senate bill provided for a priority in construction of facilities having transfer agreements.

The conference substitute is the same as the House bill, establishing as a requirement for approval of projects that both the requirements with respect to the location of the extended care facility and its staffing be as provided in the House bill; however, the state agency is authorized to waive either or both such requirements upon the determination that compliance therewith would be inadvisable in the particular case.

#### LOAN GUARANTEES

The House bill established a program of guaranteed loans for public or private nonprofit agencies for the construction or modernization of any of the facilities for which grant assistance is provided under this program. The House bill authorized an interest subsidy of 3 percent per annum on loans to private nonprofit agencies, but provided no subsidy in the case of loans for public facilities.

The Senate amendment would have provided guaranteed loans at the rate of \$500 million per year for 5 fiscal years, beginning with fiscal year 1971 (as contrasted with 3 fiscal years provided in the House bill), with an interest subsidy of one-half of the first 6 percent interest, and one-third of all interest payments above 6 percent. In addition, the Senate amendment would have provided for direct loans for construction or modernization of public facilities with the loans thereafter being sold by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, with the proceeds of the sale being reloaned to public agencies. The Senate amendment also authorized use of fiscal year 1970 or 1971 allotments for the guarantee of loans to private nonprofit organizations for construction or modernization where the construction began after January 1, 1968.

The conference substitute provides a 3-year program of Federal guarantees of loans made to private nonprofit organizations for construction or modernization of health facilities, at a total amount of loans guaranteed, or made in the case of public facilities, of \$500 million per year, allocated among the States in accordance with their population, financial need, and respective needs for construction and modernization of facilities. The conferees intend that this program begin at the earliest practicable date.

A limited form of retroactivity is contained in the conference substitute. In the case of any project for construction or modernization, which was not commenced earlier than January 1, 1968, a State's allotments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and the succeeding fiscal year, may be made avail-

able to guarantee loans for not more than two projects in the State. The State must certify, and the Secretary must find, that unless the loan is guaranteed under this amendment, the facility cannot be completed and begin to operate, or (if completed) cannot continue to operate; but with the guaranteed loan, the facility will be able to do so. It is not intended by this amendment to provide for the payment of operating costs of any facility; the intent, rather, is to cover those emergency situations where the interest charges and repayment schedules on loans heretofore made for construction provide such a serious financial drain upon the applicant that the more liberal financing available under this legislation will alleviate the financial pressure upon the applicant sufficiently to enable the completion and operation of the facility.

The conferees found, after investigation, that it was necessary to provide restrictions upon eligibility for this retroactive feature in view of the fact that, without such restrictions, potentially over 1,000 facilities could have qualified, thereby potentially using up all the funds that otherwise would be available for construction or modernization of new facilities. The interest subsidy authorized in the case of guaranteed loans for private nonprofit facilities is the same 3 percent provided in the House bill, modified slightly to conform to traditional financing arrangements.

This same title also authorizes the making of loans to public agencies for construction or modernization of health facilities, with \$30 million in initial capital provided for the making of such loans. This amount is contained in the budget already requested for fiscal year 1971 by the Department. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be required to make such loans to public agencies at a rate of interest comparable to the current rate of interest prevailing with respect to loans to nonprofit private agencies which are guaranteed in the same or similar areas minus 3 percent. The Secretary is required to give due regard to achieving an equitable geographical distribution of loans made under this provision.

After making a loan, the Secretary would be required to sell the loan either on the private market or to the Federal National Mortgage Association, at an amount approximately equal to the unpaid principal of the loan as of the time of sale. After the loan is sold, interest paid by the borrower would not be tax exempt, so that it may be necessary for the Secretary, in order to recover the face value of the loan, to pay an interest subsidy to the purchaser. The amount of the interest subsidy will depend upon the terms and conditions of the sale, which, in turn, will depend upon the prevailing rate of interest payable on obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States at the time of sale.

To the extent authorized in appropriation acts, the Secretary may then take the proceeds from the sale of these loans and relend them to public agencies, selling these loans, again subject to a guarantee and interest subsidy, with the proceeds again being similarly available for relending.

The amount available for loans for construction or modernization of publicly owned facilities will depend, of course, upon the length of time it takes the Secretary to complete loans, and sell them on the private market, so that it is impossible to tell in advance the maximum amount of loans which may be made under this provision; however, the overall \$500 million per year limitations on loans made or guaranteed under this provision will continue to apply. Of course, when a direct loan is made to a public agency within a State, the amount of that loan will be charged against the State's overall allotment for loans (guaranteed or direct) under this program during the fiscal year involved.

#### EVALUATION OF HEALTH PROGRAMS

The Senate amendment authorizes the Secretary to utilize not more than 1 percent of any appropriation under the Public Health Service and other Acts for evaluation of programs. In addition, the Senate amendment consolidates into one section a number of evaluation authorities contained in other programs. The House recedes.

#### MARIHUANA STUDY

The Senate amendment provides that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall report to the Congress on or before January 31, 1971, and annually thereafter on (1) current information on the health consequences of using marihuana, and (2) such recommendations for legislative and administrative action as he may deem appropriate. A preliminary report is also called for within 90 days after date of enactment of this amendment. The House recedes.

#### AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate amendment would have provided that funds appropriated for any fiscal year to carry out any program under the Public Health Service Act, the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963, certain acts relating to Indian health programs, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, the Clean Air Act, the Solid Waste Disposal Act, and Title V of the Social Security Act would remain available for obligation and expenditure until the end of the fiscal year for which appropriated.

The conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment, except that it is limited to funds appropriated for fiscal years ending before July 1, 1973, and applies only to funds appropriated to carry out programs under the Public Health Service Act or the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963. The purpose of this amendment is to prevent administratively imposed freezes, reductions, and rollbacks from applying to health programs authorized under these Acts. Where a program authorizes availability of appropriations for more than one fiscal year, and funds are appropriated to cover more than one fiscal year, the conferees intend that the amendment shall apply to the entire period covered by the appropriations.

The managers on the part of the House also receded on the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill.

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,  
JOHN JARMAN,  
PAUL G. ROGERS,  
W. L. SPRINGER,  
ANCHER NELSEN,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

#### CONTROL OF POLLUTION

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

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, in our troubled and disturbed times it is very heartening when the youth of our land express deep interest in the solutions of our more pressing problems. Such an expression came to my attention last week. The social studies class of Kemble School in my hometown of Utica, N.Y., had been studying the threat of pollution. One of the members of the class, Anthony Pugliese, undertaking to alert people to this danger, prepared and circulated a petition addressed to the Congressman asking his support of legislation to control this blight. Through his determined efforts he secured seven hundred and four signatures and his teacher, Mr. Joseph Bottini, was so impressed that he felt a

personal presentation was deserved. With this I agreed, so I visited the school and, at an assembly before several hundred grade students, the petition was delivered to me by Anthony.

After I had expressed my pleasure over his activity and pledged my sympathetic response, I took part in a question-answer forum for an hour. The spontaneity and perspective of their questioning was thrilling, embracing a concern and knowledge worthy of mature people. I congratulated Anthony on his initiative. His was a fine job and I am pleased to call it to the attention of my colleagues.

I was able to tell the students that Congress is moving steadily and objectively toward the control of pollution. I pointed out that arbitrary actions against offending manufacturing plants could disturb our economy and result in unacceptable job losses. Therefore, we will be reasonable in our approach to industry but will firmly insist that pollution of the air and water be curbed. The sustained support of good citizens should keep this goal in sight until adequate protection is realized.

#### SIoux CITY RIVERCADE

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

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, last July I stood in this well and invited my colleagues to come to Sioux City to help us celebrate the famous Sioux City Rivercade, an annual affair during which the Greater Siouxland territory pays tribute to that mighty river, the Missouri, which courses through our heartland. Founded in 1964, the Rivercade has grown steadily each year and now attracts thousands of visitors from throughout the Midwest. This year's 5-day program includes carnivals, riverboat rides, an air show, parades both land and waterborne, teenage activities, boat and water ski shows, Boy Scout jamborees, helicopter rides, wildlife exhibits, sky divers, professional boat races, clowns, and queens. Fishing contests will be held each day. The committee in charge of arrangements will enthusiastically welcome any Member of this body who can arrange his schedule to be with us in Sioux City at any time during this memorable event.

So, on behalf of Commodore Robert Sabel and his staff of hard workers, I renew my invitation to my colleagues and to all who devour the daily prose in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to come to Sioux City on July 29 for the first of 5 days of the greatest Sioux City Rivercade ever.

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration

of the bill (H.R. 17923) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 3 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LANGEN) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 17923, with Mr. WRIGHT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LANGEN) will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, from the beginning man's progress, man's supply of the good things in life, has been measured by how many things he has left after providing for food, clothing, and shelter. Judged by that standard, we certainly have had the finest standard of living man has ever had.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to make the point of order that a quorum is not present. This is the most important matter that will come before this House this year.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

#### [Roll No. 159]

Abernethy	Dawson	Hébert
Anderson,	Diggs	Hungate
Tenn.	Dorn	Jarman
Ashbrook	Downing	Kirwan
Aspinall	Dulski	Kleppe
Ayres	Edwards, Ala.	Kuykendall
Baring	Edwards, Calif.	McCarthy
Beall, Md.	Feighan	McKneally
Blatnik	Fisher	McMillan
Boggs	Flowers	May
Brademas	Ford	Meskill
Bray	William D.	Minshall
Brown, Calif.	Fraser	Mizell
Camp	Frelinghuysen	Montgomery
Carey	Fulton, Tenn.	Moorhead
Clark	Gallagher	Morton
Clay	Garmatz	Moss
Conable	Gaydos	Murphy, N.Y.
Conyers	Gettys	Nichols
Corman	Gibbons	O'Hara
Coughlin	Gilbert	Ottinger
Cowger	Gray	Passman
Culver	Hanna	Pepper
Daddario	Hansen, Wash.	Pettis

Poff  
Pollock  
Powell  
Preyer, N.C.  
Price, Ill.  
Pucinski  
Reid, N.Y.  
Reuss  
Rivers

Roberts  
Rooney, N.Y.  
Rooney, Pa.  
Roudebush  
Scheuer  
Schwengel  
Scott  
Sisk  
Smith, Calif.

Springer  
Stafford  
Stuckey  
Thompson, N.J.  
Whitehurst  
Wilson, Bob  
Wilson,  
Charles H.  
Wold

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WRIGHT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 17923, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 333 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose, the gentleman from Mississippi had been recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, as we come to this appropriation I hope we may have the attention of the Members of the House. Actually, when we get to this subject, we find that fewer and fewer have a back-home realization that it is still the key part of their existence.

It has been said, as I pointed out earlier, that man's well-being and his standard of living are tied to how much of his time he has to use to provide for the necessities of life; food, clothing, and shelter. Judged by that standard, no nation has ever reached the peak this Nation has reached, because only a little over 5 percent of the people are engaged in agriculture. What does that mean? It means on the average only 5 percent of man's time as a group is taken up with the basic things, leaving 95 percent of his time for the other things that go toward our standard of living.

But this has with it problems. This is the reason why I want the attention of the membership.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN).

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make the comment at this point that anyone who criticizes the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN), or his subcommittee, for their attitudes on providing food assistance for the needy are criticizing the wrong people. From the time the food stamp program was initiated by President John F. Kennedy in early 1961 until the present, I think there was only one occasion when the Whitten subcommittee declined to recommend the full budget amount for the program—and then, if memory serves me right, Mr. WHITTEN himself recognized the insufficiency and recommended a supplemental appropriation to meet the deficiency.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee and to his colleagues on Appropriations for recommending a doubling of the food stamp program during the coming fiscal year from \$610,-



900,000 to \$1,250,000,000, just as the 1970 fiscal year appropriation represented a doubling of the amount available in 1969. The added funds will enable the Department to install food stamp programs in many additional areas and, equally important, increase substantially the benefits derived by those who participate in the program.

As I have said on numerous occasions, the food stamp program is not a solution for all of our social ills but it can do one thing well—and that is assure adequate diets for those families which cannot afford to buy enough of the right foods. It has faults—it has had many faults—but none of them that sufficient appropriations cannot solve, provided there is a willingness by local welfare officials to make the program work effectively, and a willingness here in Washington to insist upon fair treatment for all participants and upon vigorous prosecution of the relatively few merchants or customers who might violate the law in the handling or use of the stamps.

I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for yielding, but more importantly, I thank him for his consistent support of increased appropriations for this program.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri who was so instrumental in the beginning of this program and in its continuation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me get to a point which I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

We live in a country—and let me repeat again—where only about 5 percent of our people are engaged in agriculture, leaving the other 95 percent to engage in the performance of other things. We are dealing with a subject upon which our very health depends and that is the supply of food and clothing, as well as the biggest and the best market that industry and labor has. We are dealing here today with a department that has to do with nutrition, a subject to which it

now seems that everyone has become awakened to its need and to see that it is taken care of.

Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with the one Department that has been spending through the years millions and millions of dollars annually promoting the protection of our environment in which some 1.1 million participants joined in by putting up about two-thirds of the cost. We are dealing here with the very staff of life. However, we are dealing with it at a time when it is threatened and if it is threatened, it threatens you.

Since we have gotten the news media and since we have become urbanized, few people realize that life itself is tied to the land. Farmers are quitting. A check of the record shows that today 17 percent of those engaged in agriculture are 65 years of age or older, 22 percent are 55 to 64 years of age. And, listen to this now. I am talking about the keystone to the economy of this country as well as your own well-being.

Since 1940 the amount of money that it takes for a man to farm has increased from approximately \$6,500 in 1940 to \$85,000 in 1969—and remember weather in any one year may reduce a crop by more than 25 percent or more.

Now, I do not remember this—but I am old enough to remember the effects of the last depression, and I know also as a student of history what happened. Do you realize that every depression we have had has started with the breakdown of farm income of those engaged in agriculture? And, contrary to the belief of a whole lot of my urban friends and some of my rural friends who I do not believe have studied this, may I say to you that conditions do not look good today.

There are folks who honestly believe that a pickup of a few points in the stock market is an increase in wealth, when they should know that the stock market and all the rest is tied to the wealth of our country, which in turn comes from the land.

This bill carries the following amounts:

	Budget request	Recommended in bill	Change
Title I—General activities.....	\$2,649,897,500	\$2,954,986,150	+\$305,088,650
Title II—Credit agencies.....	574,198,000	623,522,000	+49,324,000
Title III—Corporations (including Public Law 480) and other assistance programs.....	4,307,680,000	3,827,680,000	-480,000,000
Title IV—Related agencies.....	(4,226,000)	(4,054,000)	(-172,000)
Total.....	7,531,775,500	7,406,188,150	-125,587,350

#### ESTIMATED OBLIGATIONS FOR PESTICIDES RESEARCH AND REGULATION OF THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, 1963-71<sup>1</sup>

Item	[In thousands of dollars]							
	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
Agricultural Research Service:								
Salaries and expenses:								
Research.....	19,198	23,942	38,812	40,206	41,640	41,865	43,716	45,549
Plant and animal disease and pest control.....	28,289	28,646	33,769	35,994	40,621	40,833	41,710	45,297
Total, salaries and expenses.....	47,487	52,588	72,581	76,200	82,261	82,698	84,886	90,846
Cooperative State Research Service: Payments and expenses.....	4,621	4,768	11,010	9,330	9,409	8,977	9,417	9,420
Extension Service:								
Payments and expenses:								
Payments to States and Puerto Rico.....	1,805	1,900	3,985	3,990	4,142	4,180	4,180	4,370
Federal Extension Service.....	95	100	205	210	218	220	220	230
Total, Extension Service.....	1,900	2,000	4,100	4,200	4,360	4,400	4,400	4,600
Economic Research Service.....			500	500	500	512	528	460
Forest Service: Forest protection and utilization.....	1,800	2,000	3,400	3,500	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,100
Total, pesticides research and regulation.....	55,808	61,356	91,591	93,730	100,230	100,487	103,331	109,426

<sup>1</sup> Includes obligations for pesticides research and regulation which relate to pollution and which are included in the table on pollution research, abatement, and control.

#### THE IMPACT OF AGRICULTURE

For several years many on the committee have considered changing the title of this bill. The current title, Department of Agriculture and related agencies appropriation bill, has never adequately conveyed the full range of effects on all the American people.

Some, but not enough, people know that the few on the farm free the rest of us to provide the machines and gadgets of modern day living. Many people do not stop to realize that those who have left the farm have been replaced by machines and expensive materials; and that the man on the farm has to have sufficient income to buy the machines, equipment, chemicals, and other materials; otherwise many people now in our cities, who make the machines, would have to go back to the farm as we saw in the depression of the late 1920's and 1930's.

The Department of Agriculture, identified with 5.1 percent of our people on the farm, in reality represent the 94.9 percent of the nonfarmers more closely than does any other department, for it represents the source of food, clothing, and shelter for all Americans, and further, represents the largest individual market for labor and industry.

#### PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

We might term this "an appropriation for protection of the public health," for it carries funds for inspection of the meats and vegetables which go on our tables. Funds are included in this bill to provide for inspection of 100 percent of the red meat marketed in the United States for the first time in our history. This same goal will soon be reached for poultry.

The bill strengthens and improves the programs for the control of pests and pestilence, which has contributed so much to the improvements in our food supply. Conversely, the bill includes major increases for the development and control of more efficient pesticides. This includes additional staff for recently completed major pesticide laboratories at Gainesville, Fla.; College Station, Tex.; Stoneville, Miss.; Durant, Okla.; and Savannah, Ga. The bill includes \$5.3 million for the enforcement of pesticide regulations including the teams ready to move to determine the facts when unfortunate pesticide accidents do occur.

The total recommended for pesticides research and regulation in 1971 has nearly doubled since 1963 as shown on the following table:

## THE ECONOMY

Or perhaps we should term this a bill "for the protection of industry and labor," since those few, the approximately 5 percent left on the farm have had to substitute huge investments in machinery and equipment for those who have moved to town, thus becoming perhaps industry's and labor's biggest market.

The producers of agricultural products spend nearly \$30 billion a year for goods and services to produce crops and livestock; another \$12 billion a year is spent for the same products that urban residents purchase—food, clothing, drugs, furniture, appliances, and other products and services. Each year the farmers' purchases include \$3.4 billion in new farm vehicles, machinery, and equipment. It takes 120,000 nonfarm employees to produce this farm equipment alone.

His annual purchases also include \$3.4 billion for fuel, lubricants, and maintenance of machinery and motor vehicles. Farm production uses more petroleum than any other single industry. Each year the farmer buys products containing 320 million pounds of rubber—about 9 percent of the total used in the United States, or enough to put tires on nearly 6 million automobiles. He consumes 28 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity annually. Every year he uses 5 million tons of steel in the form of machinery, trucks, cars, fencing, and building materials. Farm use of steel accounts for 40,000 jobs in the steel industry.

## RURAL DEVELOPMENT

On the other hand, the bill might be called the Rural Development Act of 1971, for this bill provides funds to continue and improve the rural development programs of the Department, including the activities of the Soil Conservation Service, the Farmers Home Administration, the Extension Service,

and the Rural Electrification Administration.

It is clear that in the years ahead we must look more to our rural areas for development of homes, jobs, and recreation for the millions of additional Americans anticipated. With such a small percentage of Americans on farms, it is clear that such development cannot be solely tied to a farm economy. These agencies have the loan, grant, and technical service programs providing the fundamental elements of rural development such as sewer systems, telephones, electricity, and water-resource development necessary for industrial and commercial development of rural America.

In fiscal year 1969 the Farmers Home Administration made the following number of loans in rural areas, to be repaid with interest: Farm ownership loans, 13,702; soil and water loans, 989; operating loans, 50,811; rural housing loans, 54,102; emergency credit loans, 20,686; and water and sewer grants, 678.

The Soil Conservation Service has built or planned 440 multiple-purpose reservoirs and is operating 68 resource conservation and development projects, bringing to bear its technical services on the economic problems of multi-county development. The committee is providing for five new projects in 1971.

In this bill, the budget estimate is raised by \$20 million for the rural electrification and telephone programs which have brought the amenities of urban living to rural areas but not the city problems.

The committee has restored sufficient funds to provide coordination of the many Federal programs available to contribute to rural development. Agencies contributing to this development include Commerce, Housing and Urban Development, and Health, Education, and Welfare, as well as the several agriculture agencies.

For example, the recently passed independent offices and Housing and Urban Development appropriation bill included \$500 million for water and sewer facilities in towns and cities above 5,500 in population, \$800,000,000 was provided in 1970 for waste treatment facilities, and the President is proposing a 4-year program of \$1 billion per year through 1975.

In addition, the Economic Development Administration, from 1965 through April of 1970, has spent \$832 million for projects located outside the major urban areas.

## ANTIPOLLUTION BILL

This bill could be cited as "the anti-pollution bill," for included are funds for watershed protection and flood prevention, in the agricultural conservation program and the Soil Conservation Service.

Under the flood prevention and watershed programs, there are built or planned 8,944 floodwater retarding structures, and 440 multiple-purpose reservoirs, which will catch 2.9 billion tons of sediment near their source. Such sediment is a known carrier of pollution.

In addition, the ACP program, restored by the committee, has contributed over 2 million smaller on-farm structures where the farmer provides about two-thirds of the cost, including his labor. The ACP program, with technical advice from the Soil Conservation Service, has fought pollution with measures such as terracing, strip cropping, and permanent sod waterways.

The committee has also strengthened the research programs in pollution control, with increased staffs for water quality research at Durant, Okla.; the National Sediment Laboratory at Oxford, Miss.; soil and water research at Pendleton, Oreg.; and animal waste management at Fort Collins, Colo., and Bushland, Tex.

A summary of pollution-related activities of the Department follows:

ESTIMATED OBLIGATIONS FOR POLLUTION RESEARCH, ABATEMENT, AND CONTROL PROGRAMS OF THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, 1963-71

(In thousands of dollars)

Item	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
<b>Agricultural Research Service:</b>									
Salaries and expenses:									
Research	30,262	35,733	52,124	54,982	58,043	59,432	59,646	65,203	66,230
Plant and animal disease and pest control	1,541	1,749	3,046	3,144	3,737	4,117	10,359	11,514	13,414
Total, salaries and expenses	31,803	37,482	55,170	58,126	61,780	63,549	70,005	76,717	79,644
Cooperative State Research Service: Payments and expenses	5,155	6,315	9,487	11,177	11,405	11,070	12,400	12,800	14,000
<b>Extension Service:</b>									
Payments and expenses: Payments to States and Puerto Rico	4,252	4,725	5,675	6,615	7,575	8,525	9,000	9,243	9,656
Federal Extension Service	248	275	325	385	425	475	500	557	644
Total, Extension Service	4,500	5,000	6,000	7,000	8,000	9,000	9,500	9,800	10,300
<b>Soil Conservation Service:</b>									
Conservation operations	33,600	34,800	37,100	39,100	40,100	41,800	48,700	51,900	51,900
Great Plains conservation program	9,500	10,700	11,700	12,600	14,800	13,200	13,900	13,400	13,400
Watershed works of improvement	10,600	11,700	12,100	12,700	13,600	13,300	13,900	18,000	20,500
Flood prevention	7,200	7,500	7,900	7,600	7,500	7,200	6,900	7,200	7,200
Resource conservation and development			150	340	900	1,300	2,200	36,000	5,900
Total, Soil Conservation Service	60,900	65,700	68,950	72,340	76,900	76,800	85,600	94,100	98,900
Economic Research Service			20	20	50	90	200	200	200
Consumer and Marketing Service	40	42	43	45	46	48	50	60	60
<b>Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:</b>									
Agricultural conservation program	182,100	182,800	184,600	179,500	188,800	170,200	159,400	156,100	185,000
Emergency conservation program	3,700	5,800	12,100	5,700	3,600	7,900	11,100	12,000	13,600
Administrative expenses for ACP and ECM	28,225	27,354	29,301	29,482	32,298	37,996	33,000	32,900	15,000
Cropland adjustment program				7,100	500	600			
Cropland conversion program	2,000		1,900	200					
Appalachian land stabilization and conservation program					6,500		3,000	3,300	
Total, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service	216,025	215,925	227,901	221,982	231,698	216,296	206,500	204,300	28,600



Item	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Farmers Home Administration: <sup>1</sup>									
Water and sewer system loans:									
Direct.....	8,400	11,300	13,100	27,500	82,900	79,400	74,600	64,000	74,000
Insured.....	5,500	22,100	37,000	84,700	92,000	83,100	90,000	80,000	86,000
Subtotal, water and sewer system loans.....	13,900	33,400	50,100	112,200	174,900	162,500	164,600	144,000	160,000
Rural water and waste disposal grants.....				18,600	22,500	23,000	25,000	42,000	52,000
Administrative expenses.....	209	501	752	1,962	2,961	2,783	2,500	2,900	3,100
Total, Farmers Home Administration.....	14,109	33,901	50,852	132,762	200,361	188,283	192,100	188,900	215,100
Forest Service: Forest protection and utilization.....	30,500	31,600	34,000	36,500	41,300	48,000	54,700	57,200	62,900
Total, pollution research, abatement, and control.....	363,032	394,994	452,423	539,952	631,540	613,136	631,055	644,077	694,704

<sup>1</sup> Excludes loan repayments.

#### NUTRITION

This bill could be called the peoples bill because of its contribution to human nutrition and aid to those who for one reason or another do not have an adequate diet.

The record of the Department of Agriculture, made possible by the actions of the Congress and this committee, is long and strong in the support of nutrition and cost of production research, research on marketing, and support of other agriculture programs designed to improve the basic structure of agriculture and to enable the American people to spend only 16 percent of their income on food. This remarkable achievement is largely unnoticed. The committee is proud of another part of this record which is also unnoticed. That is this committee's direct support of food aid.

Two years ago the Congress adopted, at the committee's request, some important new language for the section 32 appropriation. This language provided \$45 million for a number of expanded and innovative programs. The amount was raised to \$100 million in the 1970 budget. The language follows:

(4) In addition to other amounts provided in this act, not more than \$100 million (including not to exceed \$2 million for State administrative expenses) for (a) child feeding programs and nutritional programs authorized by law in the School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act, as amended, (b) additional direct distribution or other programs, without regard to whether such area is under the food stamp program or a system of direct distribution, to provide, in the immediate vicinity of their place of permanent residence, either directly or through a State or local welfare agency, an adequate diet to other needy children and low-income persons determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be suffering, through no fault of their own, from general and continued hunger resulting from insufficient food, and (c) milk for children in nonprofit high schools and schools of lower levels, child-care centers, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children.

This language has meant valuable flexibility in meeting many emerging needs for our food programs. In 1970 a total of \$67 million has been allocated to supplement the funds available from the child nutrition direct appropriation to provide for:

First. Special cash assistance which provides schools with a higher rate of cash reimbursement for serving free or reduced price lunches to needy children;

Second. Serving school breakfasts to

children in schools that draw attendance from low-income areas and those in which a substantial portion of the children must travel long distances; and

Third. Equipment necessary for serving these lunches and breakfasts.

The primary emphasis in the use of these funds is the extension of program benefits to needy children.

The \$2 million designated for State administrative expenses is allotted to the States on the basis of detailed plans and justification of need for supervising and giving technical assistance to local school districts for additional activities undertaken by them to reach more needy children with lunch and breakfast programs.

The \$20 million of these funds allocated for the special milk program are being used to supplement the \$84 million appropriated to increase the consumption of fluid milk by children. All nonprofit schools of high school grade and under, all nonprofit summer camps, and childcare institutions devoted to the care and training of children are eligible to participate.

A special experimental program authorizing free food stamps to persons with little or no income was started in March 1969 in Beaufort and Jasper Counties, S.C., with \$5,000 of these funds, and this project is continuing at this level in 1970.

The special supplementary food package program makes available enriched foods for new and expectant mothers, infants, and young children in food stamp areas. The program is operated through local health facilities such as clinics, with doctors and public health nurses prescribing for clients those foods offered by the Department of Agriculture.

A new experimental program involving the issuance of a special purpose food certificate is being tested in a limited area of Chicago. Eligible recipients—low-income new and expectant mothers and infants—use this food voucher to purchase milk, infant formula and baby cereal in local retail stores. The remaining \$10,995,000 budgeted for 1970 is to be used for these two programs.

Last year the Congress appropriated a total of \$610 million, an increase of \$270 million, for food stamps. The committee helped this program grow from a small experiment conducted under section 32 to be the major food aid program of the Department.

For example, in 1967 the conference agreed and the Congress directed that \$5 million of the funds for the food

stamp program go to especially needy persons.

The committee has supported a strong nutrition education program. Last year's report stated:

The committee has approved an appropriation of \$30 million for the nutrition aide program initiated last fall. This is in line with the latest budget recommendation and places existing programs on a yearly basis. Of this sum, \$7,500,000 shall be available for professional workers to promote 4-H type programs in the depressed areas of our cities. This program involves educational work among low-income groups to reduce the incidence of malnutrition, by providing homemaker aides who will use available information, knowledge and skills to teach needy people to utilize all resources toward the achievement of a more nutritionally adequate diet.

In this connection, the Committee feels that full use should be made of the Nation's 3 million 4-H Club members to promote 4-H Club-type work with the youth of our towns and cities. The success of this program in rural areas has forcefully demonstrated the effectiveness of this approach. It may well be found that the most successful results from nutritional education of low-income families will come through work with the younger members of the family.

For these and other reasons, clearly established in the record, the committee is proud of its efforts to achieve better nutrition.

For 1971, the committee has restored the special milk program recommended for deletion in the budget estimate. This will provide about 3 billion half-pints of milk to about 17 million schoolchildren.

The committee has provided the full budget estimate of \$1,250 million for food stamps, which of course has to await authorization before expenditure, and congratulates the Department on the establishment of the Food and Nutrition Service, an agency which is doing a good job.

The committee has raised by \$5 million the recently authorized equipment program to a total of \$17.5 million in 1971.

Included in the bill is \$200 million for free and reduced-price lunches for an estimated 6.6 million needy children. Unfortunately, the fact that the Children's food service program was signed into law on May 14, 1970, made it impossible to obtain a budget recommendation or hold hearings in time to include funds for this purpose. The amended program will have the attention of the committee in the first supplemental.

A summary of the dramatic expansion of these programs follows:

## ESTIMATED OBLIGATIONS FOR HUMAN NUTRITION PROGRAMS, INCLUDING FOOD ASSISTANCE, RESEARCH, AND EDUCATION OF THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, 1963-71

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Agricultural Research Service: Salaries and expenses, Research.....	2,053	2,055	3,981	3,943	3,786	3,654	3,734	4,097	4,272
Cooperative State Research Service: Payments and expenses.....	852	874	997	1,092	1,151	1,188	1,232	1,677	1,792
Extension Service:									
Payments and expenses:									
Payments to States and Puerto Rico.....	2,305	2,350	2,448	2,495	2,571	2,646	11,702	31,788	52,142
Federal Extension Service.....	95	100	102	105	109	114	406	1,325	1,410
Total, Federal Extension Service.....	2,400	2,450	2,550	2,600	2,680	2,760	12,108	33,113	53,552
Removal of Surplus Agricultural Commodities—Section 32:									
Commodities and administrative expenses.....	93,380	258,503	229,222	119,095	176,985	164,390	339,995	366,619	268,794
Special feeding program.....							45,000	100,000	186,058
Total, section 32.....	93,380	258,503	229,222	119,095	176,985	164,390	384,995	466,619	454,852
Food and Nutrition Service:									
Special milk program.....	94,036	99,721	97,759	96,552	99,289	102,574	102,677	84,000	104,000
Child nutrition programs.....	169,167	181,133	191,141	201,114	211,846	220,205	246,088	315,338	331,753
Food stamp program.....	20,415	30,479	35,135	70,440	115,515	187,284	250,982	610,000	1,250,000
Total, Food and Nutrition Service.....	283,618	311,333	324,035	368,106	426,650	510,063	599,747	1,009,338	1,685,753
Commodity Credit Corporation—domestic commodity donations and administrative expenses.....	294,523	293,425	163,578	126,182	138,898	237,442	236,413	112,969	267,809
Office of Information.....	153	148	177	159	203	132	200	197	192
Total, human nutrition.....	676,979	868,788	724,540	621,177	750,353	919,629	1,238,429	1,628,010	2,468,222

In determining the amounts considered to be essential for these purposes for the next fiscal year, it is important to review some of the conditions facing the 200 million American consumers as well as the economic strength of this Nation at home and abroad in the years ahead.

## FARMING NO LONGER ATTRACTIVE

The number of agricultural producers providing food and fiber for our rapidly expanding population continues to decline and is now down to about 5 percent of the people in this country. Trained and experienced farm labor is in increasingly short supply.

Long hours of hard work, more rigorous living conditions, hazards of weather, threats from insects and diseases, increasing financial risks, and decreasing financial returns are causing farming to become less and less attractive to each succeeding generation of young people. Fewer and fewer farm children are turning to farming as a career. More and more of their parents are moving to "greener pastures" in town as the monetary return for their labor, investment, and managerial skills decrease on the farm.

As a business venture, farming is becoming less attractive as the necessary farm investment increases and the net return on the investment decreases. Figures from the Department of Agriculture show that average farm investment has increased nearly fourteenfold in the past 25 years, from \$6,158 in 1940 to \$85,402 in 1969. They also indicate that the average return on farm equities has dropped more than 50 percent during this period, from 7.1 percent in 1945-49 to 3.1 percent in 1968.

It is entirely understandable, therefore, why fewer and fewer people are remaining on the Nation's farms, and why some 5 percent of our population on the farms is now feeding the other 95 percent in addition to themselves. This undesirable imbalance can be expected to be further aggravated as movement away from agriculture continues.

According to Department figures, an average of nearly 800,000 people have left the farms in each of the last 5 years. The farm population has decreased to about 10 million today, as compared to more than two and a half times that number in 1950.

The trend away from the farm is also evidenced by the steadily decreasing amount of land in farms and the size of farms. The total land in farms in 1950 was 1.2 billion acres as compared to 1.1 billion acres in 1965, a reduction of 100 million acres. The average size of a farm increased from 213 acres to 377 acres in that same period.

As the committee has pointed out many times, the farmer or agricultural producer can afford to quit, but the consumer cannot afford to have him do so.

## AGRICULTURE REMAINS BASIC

In the opinion of the committee, the growing tendency to consider agriculture as a less essential part of our national economy, and to reduce funds needed for its continued support, threatens our Nation at home and abroad. It could have a serious effect on the future food supply of this country and could weaken our ability to meet our future responsibilities as a leader of the nations of the world.

History teaches us that the food-deficit countries of the world started on their decline by failing to give adequate attention to the protection and development of their basic natural resources. They failed to provide necessary protection and development through research, control of insects and diseases, conservation and other programs needed to assure the preservation of their capacity to meet the needs of their people for food, clothing, and shelter. This is true of nearly every country we aid today. We must not make the same mistake.

One of our major problems today is that, though agriculture is our best market for industry and labor and the most economical supplier of the consumer, so few people are engaged in agriculture

that its voice is weak in the legislative halls of a majority of the States and of the Nation. No longer does agriculture figure prominently in the planning of those who would appeal to the majority. This leaves a major task for those who recognize that the national welfare depends on a sound and healthy agriculture.

## LOW FARM INCOME TRIGGERS FINANCIAL DEPRESSION

It has been stated that the seeds of the Great Depression were sown in the agricultural depression of the 1920's which followed the First World War. The failure to maintain farm exports or to support farm prices and thus to maintain farmers' purchasing power weakened banking and business. Yet, people refuse to remember the lessons of the terrible financial crises of the 1920's and 1930's. It was graphically illustrated in 1921, in 1929, and again in 1937 that if the farmer's prices and purchasing power collapse, the whole economy suffers.

Let us now briefly review the history of farm prices in the late twenties and the thirties, when a drop in the purchasing power of those engaged in agriculture not only wrecked farming, but dragged down the economy of the whole Nation.

After the First World War ended the Government announced that it would no longer support the price of wheat. The wheat which had brought \$2.94 a bushel in Minneapolis in July 1920, brought \$1.72 in December 1930, and 92 cents a year later. Agricultural prices in general collapsed. Cotton fell to a third of its July 1920 price and corn by 62 percent. The Yearbook of Agriculture of 1922 shows that the total value of agricultural products dropped from \$18,328 million in 1920 to \$12,402 million in 1921. As a result of the agricultural crash of 1920-21, 453,000 farmers lost their farms. Many others remained in serious financial trouble which, in turn, was reflected by failures of local banks.

Average wheat prices for the years 1924



to 1927 stayed pretty much in a range between \$1.19 and \$1.44 a bushel as compared to a parity price of approximately \$1.40 for that period. Corn prices in these same years varied between 70 cents a bushel to \$1.06 a bushel versus a parity price of about \$1. Cotton prices were 12.5 cents a pound in 1926 but averaged 20.7 cents for the other years, compared to a parity price of 19.1 cents. In 1928 these prices were: wheat, \$1; cotton, 18 cents; and corn, 84 cents. By 1931 wheat was 38 cents; cotton, 5.5 cents; and corn, 32 cents—roughly one-third of the pre-1928 price levels. Starting in August of 1929, wheat prices for the dominant futures on the Chicago Board of Trade fell from \$1.43 average price to 76 cents in November of 1930, a drop of over 50 percent in 15 months. The Dow-Jones stock price averages followed by declining from a high of 381.2 in September to a low of 41.2 in July of 1932. The decline of the price of wheat on the commodity exchanges was particularly significant since there were nearly \$250 million of open contracts in October 1929, almost 2½ times the number of contracts in normal years. A great many of these speculators were ruined.

It has been said that there were more suicides during this period among those that didn't know what a farm was as a result of the breakdown in farm or commodity prices—which had led to a fall in prices and values throughout the economy—than in any other period in our history.

It was a sad way to learn it, but people at that time came to realize that real wealth starts with material things—corn, wheat, cotton, food crops of all kinds, and other raw materials—and that the general economy was primed by the sale of raw materials since, in general, the total national wealth averages some seven times the sale value of the farm or raw material production.

We learned several lessons in the twenties and thirties.

First, that when farmers cannot get a fair return for their production, the land suffers. Remember, the price of food, clothing, and shelter is going to be paid either by those who use them, or by the land from which they come. Congress, reacting to the terrible depletion of our natural resources, passed the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936. Yet, today these same facts get little recognition.

Second, we sometimes seem to forget that some form of effective control over farm production and marketing is necessary. In 1937 heavy crops caused surpluses and low prices for wheat and cotton, and a severe drop in commodity prices corresponded to another decline through the economy.

Our farm programs today seem often to be predicated on the belief that cheap raw materials made this country great. That is undoubtedly true; however, we wasted half our natural resources in the process. The high payments which are the result of these policies have engendered a great animosity, in the minds of some, toward our agricultural producers.

It shall be remembered that the price of food, clothing and shelter is going to be paid either by those who use them, di-

rectly or through taxes, or by the land from which they come.

The people of India and China throughout the centuries demanded food and fiber below the cost of production. The cost was paid by the land from which it came. As a result, the land is worn out. Yet we in this country wore out more rich land in a shorter time period than any nation in history, largely because we had land to waste. This is no longer the case.

#### PAST ACHIEVEMENTS OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

The efficiency of American agriculture has been a blessing to the consumers of the world. It has provided a plentiful supply of wholesome and nutritious foods which U.S. consumers have come to accept and take for granted. It has produced quantities in excess of domestic needs which have become a significant factor in our international programs of aid and assistance to the less fortunate peoples in other nations of the world.

Because of the remarkable achievements of American agriculture, the people of the United States for years have enjoyed a standard of living never before attained anywhere in the world.

These achievements have been made possible by cooperative Federal, State, and local efforts in the various agricultural programs of the Nation. The leadership of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the land-grant universities, and the States and local agricultural agencies, have developed an agricultural industry in the United States which is the envy of the entire world.

As a result of our high level of efficiency in agricultural production, and certain governmental policies which have failed to make U.S. commodities competitive in world markets, this country has had supplies of commodities which have been surplus to U.S. needs during certain periods in the past several decades. National policies and farm programs have been directed toward meeting this situation. It is pointed out that, while these supplies were surplus to domestic U.S. demands, they were by no means surplus to world needs. Also, it is the opinion of many responsible officials and experts in this country that it is much better for the United States to have too much rather than too little of the things necessary to feed, house, and clothe our people. The cost of handling and storing surpluses has been small indeed, compared to the benefits to the American consumer and to the position of strength in world affairs which our agricultural production has enabled us to maintain.

#### A FIRM SUPPLY OF FOOD ESSENTIAL

Aside from the possibility of nuclear conflict, hunger is probably the foremost problem of the world today. Approximately half of the world's 3.5 billion people suffer from malnutrition. The World Food Congress was told in 1963 that around 10,000 persons die every day from starvation.

India had a food crisis in 1963. Short-staple wheat and the so-called miracle rice has helped, but that vast subcontinent still has a year-round hunger problem; so do many other areas in the world. The present outlook is that hunger will grow more and more intense with the

passage of time. The world's population increase is almost unbelievable. Each year births exceed deaths by almost 60 million.

This alarming population expansion can be fully appreciated when it is realized that the population of the world, which reached the first billion by the year 1830, took only 100 years, 1830 to 1930, to reach 2 billion and only 30 years, 1930 to 1960, to reach 3 billion. It is expected to exceed 6 billion people by the turn of the century. The population growth in the United States increased from 13 million in 1830 to 123 million in 1930 and 179 million in 1960. It is expected to reach 300 million by the year 1990.

The Secretary, testifying recently before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, stated:

We must, of course, project the future in order to plan for it. But there is a strong tendency, I think, to project from present conditions, without accounting enough for variables. Weather, for instance, can cause as much as 25 percent fluctuation in Agriculture production.

Although the Secretary was speaking of worldwide agriculture, this statement is just as applicable at home. It should be added that there is an equal danger in projecting past solutions. For this reason, volume 1 of the hearings includes testimony taken by the subcommittee from Secretary Benson in 1957. These hearings demonstrate that policies quite similar to those being followed today, including massive land retirement, forced thousands of farm families to migrate to the cities. Recent events have proven this migration to be a disaster. The policies caused us to lose our foreign markets, as well, by holding an umbrella over the world markets with high prices. Foreign suppliers got the market and we became a residual supplier. Such price levels have encouraged foreign planting of commodities such as cotton and wheat that have further reduced our exports.

#### COMPETITIVE EXPORT SALES NECESSARY

For the past 20 years, the committee has done everything possible to encourage and require exportation of U.S. agricultural commodities and has continued to insist that such commodities be offered continuously in world markets on a competitive basis. During those years when U.S. commodities have been kept competitive, export sales have increased substantially and the pressure of surpluses has been removed from the domestic markets.

Despite unlimited authority to sell competitively in world markets the Department's failure to sell competitively in the early 1950's, caused CCC commodity inventories to increase from \$1 billion as of June 30, 1952, to \$5 billion as of June 30, 1955. During this period, CCC holdings of cotton increased from \$418,000 to \$1.2 billion.

In 1955, at the insistence of this committee, the first cotton was offered for sale abroad for dollars on a competitive basis and 1 million bales were sold in a few weeks. Subsequently about 7 million bales were sold soon after they were offered. Then in 1956, despite this most satisfactory experience, the Department

took steps to again hold U.S. cotton off world markets. This caused Congress to enact the Export Sales Act of 1956 requiring sales for dollars to regain and retain the U.S. historical share of world markets.

Notwithstanding this legislation, the Department in 1958 again refused to offer cotton at competitive prices. The Comptroller General ruled this to be a violation of the 1956 Export Sales Act. Cotton exports again dropped—from 7.6 million bales in 1956 to 2.8 million bales in 1958. This action cost the CCC and the American taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars, and did great damage to U.S. cotton producers.

In 1959, under increased pressure from Congress, competitive sales were re-instituted and exports again increased—to a level of 6.5 million bales in 1959. Despite the outstanding success of the competitive sales program each time it has been used, however, the Department continues to favor the export "payment-in-kind" approach, which has not been effective and which has been extremely costly to the Government.

The history of our export programs clearly demonstrates that the "payment-in-kind" program is not a satisfactory substitute for competitive sales abroad. Like most exporting nations of the world, we should sell what we produce and don't need for what it will bring in the world markets. Past experience has shown that, when buyers have the opportunity to support world prices by their bids, markets throughout the world are strengthened and commodities flow freely through the normal channels of trade. Loss of markets to our competitors has proved the dangers of an artificial price umbrella over world markets, fixed by a governmental agency.

The Export Sales Act of 1956 referred to above also requires the Secretary of Agriculture to establish an export goal at the beginning of each year and, in the opinion of the committee, requires him to announce such figure to the public. No such goals have been announced in recent years, despite the provisions of law. This has had a depressing effect on U.S. exports. While the historical U.S. share of the world cotton market is around 6 million bales annually and while the law requires the export of this amount, cotton exports dropped to 3.3 million bales in 1962, 4.7 million bales in 1967, and 2.5 million bales estimated for 1970.

In view of these factors, the committee insists that the Department: first, return to offering commodities for sale on a competitive bid basis; second, make "payment-in-kind" payments from commodity stocks in lieu of cash payments; and third, conform to the Export Sales Act of 1956 by announcing to the world the quantity of cotton the United States will intend to sell each year on world markets. The same policy would be good for other commodities. These exports should be from private stocks and handled through private channels where possible and from Government stocks where necessary. The Export Marketing Service should maintain the right to determine when and how much to offer at various times during the year to reach the total goal.

The ability of this country to provide the most abundant supply of wholesome and delicious food at the lowest cost ever known to the people of the United States—and in addition feed substantial numbers of hungry people throughout the world—has been one of our greatest strengths in meeting domestic needs and in dealing with world problems.

The failure of Communist agriculture, a failure which is chronic and deep-seated, has tremendous implications to the hundreds of millions constantly plagued by hunger. The Communist inability to produce efficiently and abundantly is due in large part to a lack of adequate and well-directed research and related agricultural programs, under a system which has tied the hands of Soviet agricultural scientists.

This must not be permitted to happen in the United States. We cannot allow any change in emphasis or direction which would weaken or damage our successful research, extension services, soil conservation, and marketing programs which have given this country its efficient and productive agricultural system. These basic programs of the Department of Agriculture, the land-grant colleges, and related institutions, must be continued at least at present levels.

#### WHAT WE FACE

The individual agricultural producer has many special problems. For instance, if he is engaged in dairy production, he will learn that, about the time he gets his equipment paid for, some local, State, or Federal Department of Health—frequently acting at the instance of Members of Congress or other legislative bodies, or the press, catering to the 95 percent of nonfarmers—has passed regulations requiring entirely new equipment to meet "newly adopted" standards for the handling and distributing of milk.

If he tries to meet this requirement, he may learn that, because of new pesticide residue-testing methods which can measure a part in a trillion, he has to dump his milk. He may have to do this even though there be absolutely no evidence that the minute traces found by modern testing methods endanger anything. Of course, the Government promises—and sometimes pays—an indemnity.

If, like most, his dairy is on rolling grassland just outside a fast-growing city, his land increases in value so rapidly that in self-defense and because of increasing taxes he must develop his land or sell. He comes out fine financially, but there will be no more dairying for him.

If he is a producer of perishable commodities, he finds that his Government has set the rate of pay for labor, plus other requirements, at such a high level that his competitors go across the border into Mexico where labor is paid about the same per day as the American producer's Government makes him pay per hour.

If the American farmer is in the poultry business, he may find that not only must he meet standards of health; but, also, he must observe other requirements of consumer groups that may have nothing to do with health. When he develops a foreign market, such as he did

in Germany and many of the countries of Western Europe, he finds that the Common Market, promoted and sponsored by the United States, has set up uncalculated-for requirements so as to fence him out of this market. Of course, those countries do not provide a "tariff," they just simply require an equalizing payment, which has the same effect.

If our American producer happens to be a cotton farmer, he finds that his Government—instead of carrying out the law calling for U.S. production at a level sufficient to meet domestic demand and supply our normal share of world markets—has set up regulations under law restricting annual production. He finds that, while in effect charging the American farmer a dollar a bale for promoting cotton, we do not have U.S. cotton of desirable quality available for world markets.

Our American producer further learns that while his Government will pay him to leave a part of his land out of production, the press—instead of giving him credit for having foregone—unwisely, if I may say so—the use of part of his land in order to earn the money—pictures him as somewhat of a misguided, getting something for nothing, Government dependent.

Whatever he produces, the agricultural producer will take the brunt of public criticism for high retail food prices, though the high prices come from consumer demand for processed, packaged, and frozen foods, and not from the price he receives.

If the American farm producer grows grain, he may find that, just about the time he begins to get a fairly decent price for his production, the Commodity Credit Corporation will sell enough from its supply to bring down the price he receives. If he looks abroad, he finds that for more than 15 years, under the AID or foreign aid program, his Government has been educating foreign peoples to produce the very commodity that he himself produces. Furthermore, his Government has been making competitors out of former customers, and furnishing U.S. technicians to do it—738 at one time, according to our investigation a few years ago. And so it goes.

#### WHAT IT ADDS UP TO

When all this is said and done, you can easily see why fewer and fewer people are staying on the farm, why fewer and fewer young people are studying agriculture in our colleges. Of course, they can quit; but you and I cannot afford to have them do so.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, it becomes a rather easy assignment to fulfill this role in explaining the bill before us, following the very eloquent and precise statement made by the chairman of the subcommittee.

I think by now all realize the extent to which he is informed in great detail of the problems as they relate to agriculture, the extent to which moneys are provided in this bill to deal with each of those problems, and the extent to which he has attempted to satisfy the great needs of rural America as well as the rest of the country.

He and, in fact, all of the members of



the subcommittee have been most adequately assisted by the committee's counsel, Jerry Boling. This is the first year that Jerry has filled that difficult role; but, watching him in action, one would never know it. I have been most impressed with his quick grasp of the difficult material that the subcommittee must deal with and his ability to promptly supply us with needed information and advice.

I want to take this opportunity to direct the attention of every Member to the excellent committee report which accompanies this bill. It contains a wealth of information about the vital role agriculture has played, and continues to play, in our Nation's life. It also demonstrates the importance of the many programs funded by this bill to all Americans and points out the error of looking upon this bill as important only to farmers and rural America. Surely, anyone who reads this committee report cannot help but be impressed with the importance of this bill to the future of our country.

Mr. Chairman, there is a rather old joke that has been floating around for several years to the effect that the Congress ought to pass a law to prohibit the Department of Agriculture from employing more people than there are farmers. Perhaps there is some humor in this for those who are not familiar with the activities of the Department of Agriculture or with the conditions confronting our farmers in rural America. However, for those of us who are familiar with the situation, it has a rather hollow ring because this old joke is based on some false assumptions. I think that this is a good time to clarify those assumptions. The first assumption is that the Agriculture Department is primarily engaged in serving and assisting the interests of the farmer. This is not true as I will demonstrate shortly. The second assumption is that the Agriculture Department is a mushrooming bureaucracy that is soaking up an inordinate share of Federal funds. This also is not true as I will explain later. It is true that the number of farmers and the number of Department of Agriculture employees are coming closer together, but the reason for that is the economic conditions which exist in rural America are forcing the farmer off the farm. We are fast approaching the point where only the largest and most well established farmers are able to make a decent living on the farm producing the food and fiber that the rest of us are dependent upon. From 1960 to 1968, the total farm population declined by over 30 percent from 15.6 million to 10.5 million. This continued hemorrhaging of the vitality of rural America must be ended for it has a damaging effect on the lives of everyone. Rural communities lose their most valuable asset—their young people who find they have no future there. Soon these communities find that they are unable to provide adequate services to their populations, thus driving away more people and businesses. On the other hand, our urban centers are being inundated by folks from rural areas beyond their capacity to absorb them. The results are overcrowding, pollution, inadequate job opportunities, crime, and all the other ur-

ban ills with which we have become so familiar.

That this bill deals with several areas of national concern can be seen by even the briefest reading of the committee report. Pollution, conservation, nutrition, welfare, housing, community development, and consumer protection, all familiar terms in today's headlines; and all are dealt with in the bill which we are now considering. Unfortunately, we do not have sufficient time to consider in the detail the many features of this bill which deal with items of current public concern. However, I believe that a brief recital of the highlights of this aspect of the bill will be sufficient to convince my colleagues who do not have a particular interest in agriculture that this bill merits their support. In fact, as it has for the past several years, this appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture contains more funds for programs of concern to urban citizens than for programs of particular interest to the farmer.

Recognizing the importance of pollution control, the committee has recommended an appropriation of \$56 million for rural water and waste disposal grants. This figure is an increase of \$10 million over last year's appropriation and \$32 million over the budget estimate. This \$56 million will be sufficient to provide for 315 planning grants and 745 development grants to small, rural communities whose resources are inadequate to finance these vital facilities. Not only will these small communities benefit by an improved and healthful water supply as well as a better environment, but all of us will benefit by the decreased pollution of our streams, rivers, and lakes that will result from the construction of these facilities.

Additionally in the field of pollution control, we are recommending an appropriation of \$112.7 million to operate pesticide research and regulation programs during fiscal 1971. The chart on page 3 of the committee report shows us the funding history of these programs; as one can easily see, there has been a dramatic growth in congressional support for these activities in recent years—we have doubled their funding in the past 8 years. This is the result of a legitimate concern over the impact of these chemicals and other agents on our environment. The Department of Agriculture has responded to this concern with considerable vigor. The beefed-up funding provided in this bill should enable the Department to deal more effectively and more intelligently with this difficult problem.

In the broader area of conservation, of which pollution control is an important part, this bill also responds to the concern of the Nation. The committee is recommending that the agricultural conservation program be restored to the same level as it is operating at during the current fiscal year—\$195.5 million. This important conservation program enables thousands of individual farmers to institute conservation practices on their farms each year. The benefits that accrue to each of us from this program are many and varied: The development of needed recreation areas and wildlife habitats; the ending of stream pollution

by siltation; the restoration of depleted land to assure us a continuing, abundant supply of food. These are just examples of the fruits of this program.

The elimination of funds for ACP, as recommended in the budget, would necessitate the addition of such amounts to the other conservation and watershed programs administered by the Department if we are to maintain our commitment to conserving our natural resources. This program provides the best possible means for getting conservation practices applied to the land. Until a better program is proposed, and I am not sure that there is one, it would be a real mistake to fail to support this key conservation program.

The Soil Conservation Service, the principal conservation arm of the Agriculture Department, provides professional leadership in soil, water, and plant conservation, working directly with locally managed soil conservation districts and local sponsors of watershed projects. We have recommended an increase of almost \$10 million to fund the Service's conservation operations. Additionally, we have recommended an increase of \$10.4 million in the important watershed works of improvement program which will provide for 70 new construction starts. The program assists local watershed districts to undertake needed flood prevention and soil erosion prevention activities of a magnitude beyond the resources of the local district. Finally, the committee recommends a \$3.6 million increase for resource conservation and development—R.C. & D.—projects. This increase will allow seven projects which are ready to begin construction to proceed and will permit five new planning starts in fiscal 1971.

Our obligation to do everything possible to assist those in need achieve a nutritionally adequate diet has long been recognized by this committee and we have acted in support of that recognition to the fullest extent possible. A brief summary of the committee's record in this area is contained on pages 8 to 11 of the committee report. It is an impressive record and one that we are proud of. As the chart on page 11 demonstrates, we have quadrupled the funds that are devoted to human nutrition programs over the past 8 years; and just this year alone, we are recommending a \$1 billion increase in these programs.

The committee has restored the special milk program in this bill and recommends an appropriation of \$104 million to fund it; the same level it was funded at for the current fiscal year. The Department of Agriculture has estimated that almost 3 billion half pints of milk were served to 16.6 million children through this program in fiscal year 1969. Additionally, approximately 16,000 schools participate in the special milk program that do not participate in the national school lunch programs. This means, of course, that the special milk program is the only child nutrition program that the children attending these 16,000 schools are able to participate in. Undoubtedly, these 16,000 schools are concentrated in poorer urban neighborhoods and small rural communities that have been unable to support a school lunch program—the very schools that

most need our support. For these reasons, we feel that it is particularly important that the special milk program be continued at this time.

For the other child nutrition programs, the committee has recommended increases totaling over \$105 million—\$65 million of this increase is slotted for free and reduced priced lunches for needy children.

For the food stamp program, the full \$1.25 billion has been recommended even though the program has not been authorized beyond December 1970, at a level of \$170 million. Consequently, we have had to insert language prohibiting the expenditure of these funds until they are properly authorized. As we have in the past, the committee has once again funded the food stamp program to the fullest extent possible.

Our commitment to assist the poor to obtain an adequately nutritious diet does not end here. Last year, the Congress, upon the recommendations of this committee, provided \$30 million for the new nutrition aide program which employs homemaker aides to teach needy people to utilize all of their resources toward the achievement of a more adequate diet. This has proven to be an effective program, and we are recommending a \$20 million increase for it.

As I stated earlier, this committee is proud of its record in support of nutrition programs administered by the Department of Agriculture. This bill adds substantially to that record.

Another problem of national proportions that this bill deals with is our effort to provide decent housing for our citizens. Although too few people realize it, the housing crisis in rural America, which contains well over half of this country's substandard housing, is much more acute than it is in urban America. This committee has responded to this crisis in rural America.

First, we are recommending that the rural housing direct loan account in the Farmers Home Administration be restored to its 1970 level of \$30 million. Of this amount, \$27 million will be allotted for direct loans to individuals for very low income housing repair loans and for low- to moderate-income building loans.

FHA's major loan programs are financed through its two insurance funds—the agricultural credit insurance

fund and the rural housing insurance fund. The budget anticipates loans totaling \$2.2 billion will be made from these funds in fiscal 1971. The fiscal 1970 budget had projected that \$2.2 billion of these loans would be made during the current fiscal year. For various reasons, present estimates place the total at \$1.6 billion. In order to assist the Farmers Home Administration achieve the \$2.2 billion goal in fiscal 1971, we are recommending an additional \$9.5 million to enable FHA to employ an additional 900 persons to administer these vital programs.

We have also provided funds to administer the new loan programs for Indian Tribes that are authorized by Public Law 91-227 which was signed into law on April 11 of this year.

In order that the rural electric and rural telephone systems continue their vital function in the development of rural America, the committee recommends the full budget estimate for each of these loan accounts—\$322 million and \$123.8 million respectively. In recognition of the acute need for these loans in rural America, we are recommending that an additional \$20 million be placed in budgetary reserve to be released by the Bureau of the Budget to these programs as the need is demonstrated.

The Consumer and Marketing Service is responsible for administering the consumer protection and regulatory programs and the marketing programs of the Department of Agriculture. Its activities include meat and poultry inspection, the inspection, classification, and grading of other commodities to assure the housewife that grade A really is grade A and programs to assure the efficient and orderly marketing of agricultural products. We are recommending an increase, including pay costs, of almost \$15.7 million for the Service over the fiscal 1970 appropriation. \$9.2 million, or 60 percent of this increase will be devoted to expanded meat and poultry inspection activities.

Another agency whose activities have a significant impact on all Americans is the Foreign Agricultural Service which has the primary function of expanding the sales of U.S. agricultural products abroad. In view of our balance-of-payments situation which has been deteriorating for the past several years, the

efforts of the Foreign Agricultural Service to increase the sales of our farm products for dollars become increasingly important to our economic stability. Last month, I had the opportunity to attend an agricultural attachés' conference in Canberra, Australia, which considered the potential for U.S. sales in the Far East. In the near future, I submit a detailed report on the agricultural conditions in these nations as they were discussed at the conference.

At this time, I can report that these Far Eastern countries are expanding their markets for food and fiber. There is an excellent opportunity for us to expand our exports of agricultural products; but to take advantage of this opportunity, we will have to compete vigorously in these markets. We will have to expand our sales efforts, and we will have to be prepared to deliver high quality products in forms that are desirable in these societies. In order to accomplish this, the committee is recommending an additional \$250,000 for FAS to be devoted solely to the attaché service in the field in these Far Eastern markets.

Mr. Chairman, I have attempted to, as briefly as possible, demonstrate the importance of the many programs administered by the Department of Agriculture to every American. However, there is another contribution that the Department has made to all of us that has gone virtually unrecognized. With the inflationary ravages that have been afflicting us in recent year, that contribution becomes more significant and hopefully will serve as a standard for other departments of the Government. That contribution is the fact that the Department of Agriculture's expenditures for agriculture and rural development programs have not been a factor in the creation of the inflation which has infected our economy.

In order to clearly establish this fact, I would like to include in the RECORD at this point two charts. These charts are based on the figures presented on pages 66 through 68 of "The Budget in Brief for Fiscal Year 1971." Chart A contains the actual 1969 and estimated 1971 budget outlays for each function and subfunction listed plus the percentage change for each item. Chart B contains the same items for fiscal 1960 and fiscal 1970. The charts follow:

BUDGET OUTLAYS BY SUBFUNCTION, 1969 AND 1971

[In millions of dollars]

Function and subfunction	1969 actual	1971 estimate	Percentage of change (increase or decrease)	Function and subfunction	1969 actual	1971 estimate	Percentage of change (increase or decrease)
<b>National defense:</b>				<b>International affairs and finance:</b>			
Department of Defense-Military:				Economic and financial assistance.....	2,420	2,357	-2.6
Military personnel (including retired)....	23,818	24,104	+1.2	Food for peace.....	975	852	-12.6
Operation and maintenance.....	22,227	19,650	-11.6	Conduct of foreign affairs.....	371	412	+11.0
Procurement.....	23,988	18,799	-21.6	Foreign information and exchange activities.....	237	241	+1.6
Research and development.....	7,457	7,382	-.01	Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-217	-273	+25.8
Military construction and other.....	525	1,421	+170.6				
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-135	-163	+20.7	<b>Total international affairs and finance.....</b>	<b>3,785</b>	<b>3,589</b>	<b>-5.17</b>
<b>Subtotal, Department of Defense-</b>				<b>Space research and technology:</b>			
<b>Military.....</b>	<b>77,877</b>	<b>71,191</b>	<b>-8.58</b>	Manned space flight.....	2,781	1,937	-30.3
Atomic energy.....	2,450	2,411	-1.6	Space science and application.....	569	612	+7.5
Military assistance.....	789	600	-23.9	Space technology.....	344	306	-11.0
Defense-related activities.....	260	-51	-119.6	Aircraft technology.....	168	184	+9.5
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-138	-572	+314.0	Supporting space activities.....	390	376	-3.6
				Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-6	-15	+150.0
<b>Total national defense.....</b>	<b>81,240</b>	<b>73,583</b>	<b>-9.4</b>	<b>Total space research and technology.....</b>	<b>4,247</b>	<b>3,400</b>	<b>-19.9</b>



Function and subfunction	1969 actual	1971 estimate	Percentage of change (increase or decrease)
<b>Agriculture and rural development:</b>			
Farm income stabilization.....	5,000	4,467	-20.6
Agricultural land and water resources.....	343	317	-7.6
Rural housing and public facilities.....	318	-176	-155.3
Research and other agricultural services.....	645	799	+23.8
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-85	-41	-193.2
<b>Total agriculture and rural development.....</b>	<b>6,221</b>	<b>5,364</b>	<b>-13.7</b>
<b>Natural resources:</b>			
Water resources and power.....	2,256	2,940	+30.3
Land management.....	643	771	+19.7
Recreational resources.....	372	546	+46.7
Mineral resources.....	71	110	+54.9
Other natural resources programs.....	160	183	+14.3
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-1,373	-2,048	+49.1
<b>Total natural resources.....</b>	<b>2,129</b>	<b>2,503</b>	<b>+17.5</b>
<b>Commerce and transportation:</b>			
Ground transportation.....	4,413	4,881	+10.6
Air transportation.....	1,042	1,668	+60.0
Water transportation.....	864	938	+8.5
Area and regional development.....	584	710	+21.5
Postal service.....	920	382	-58.4
Advancement and regulation of business.....	206	425	+106.3
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-157	-217	-38.2
<b>Total commerce and transportation.....</b>	<b>7,873</b>	<b>8,785</b>	<b>+11.5</b>
<b>Community development and housing:</b>			
Low and moderate income housing aids.....	871	1,499	+72.1
Community environment.....	632	1,173	+85.6
Community facilities.....	146	237	+62.3
Concentrated community development.....	684	1,242	+81.5
Community planning and administration.....	47	95	+102.1
Maintenance of the housing mortgage market.....	-406	-464	+14.2
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-13	( <sup>1</sup> )	
<b>Total, community development and housing.....</b>	<b>1,961</b>	<b>3,781</b>	<b>+92.8</b>
<b>Education and manpower:</b>			
Elementary and secondary education.....	2,480	2,710	+9.2
Higher education.....	1,230	1,449	+17.8
Science education and basic research.....	490	490	0
Vocational education.....	262	329	+25.5
Other education aids.....	373	411	+10.1
Manpower training.....	1,193	1,720	+44.1
Other manpower aids.....	810	1,034	+27.6

Less than \$500,000.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS—LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE  
COMPARATIVE DATA ON FEDERAL BUDGET OUTLAYS: FISCAL YEARS 1960 AND 1970 (ESTIMATED)

Function and subfunction	Outlays (millions) 1960	Outlays (millions) 1970 (estimate)	Percentage in- crease (+) or decrease (-)
<b>National defense:</b>			
Department of Defense—Military:			
Military personnel (including retired personnel).....	\$11,738	\$25,158	+114.3
Operation and maintenance.....	10,223	21,500	+110.3
Procurement.....	13,334	21,550	+61.6
Research and development.....	4,710	7,300	+55.2
Military construction and other.....	1,750	1,139	+34.9
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-275	-140	
<b>Subtotal, Department of Defense—Military<sup>1</sup>.....</b>	<b>41,479</b>	<b>76,505</b>	<b>+84.4</b>
Atomic energy <sup>1</sup> .....	2,623	2,461	-6.2
Military assistance <sup>1</sup> .....	1,631	495	-69.7
Defense-related activities.....	244	119	-51.2
Deductions for offsetting receipts <sup>2</sup> .....	-69	-150	
<b>Total national defense.....</b>	<b>45,908</b>	<b>79,432</b>	<b>+73.0</b>
<b>International affairs and finance:</b>			
Economic and financial assistance.....	1,391	2,746	+97.4
Food for Peace.....	1,458	971	-33.4
Conduct of foreign affairs.....	214	396	+85.0
Foreign information and exchange activities.....	137	237	+73.0
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-146	-237	
<b>Total international affairs and finance.....</b>	<b>3,054</b>	<b>4,113</b>	<b>+34.7</b>
<b>Space research and technology:</b>			
Manned space flight.....	113	2,355	+1,984.1
Space science and application.....	133	634	+376.7
Space technology.....	52	337	+548.1
Aircraft technology.....	72	180	+150.0
Supporting space activities.....	30	387	+1,190.0
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	-6	
<b>Total space research and technology.....</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>3,886</b>	<b>+869.1</b>
<b>Agriculture and rural development:</b>			
Farm income stabilization.....	2,383	4,485	+88.2
Agricultural land and water resources.....	324	344	+6.2
Rural housing and public facilities.....	333	830	+149.2
Research and other agricultural services.....	312	726	+132.7
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-29	-43	
<b>Total agricultural and rural development.....</b>	<b>3,322</b>	<b>6,343</b>	<b>+90.9</b>

See footnotes at end of table.

CXVI—1196—Part 14

Function and subfunction	1969 actual	1971 estimate	Percentage of change (increase or decrease)
<b>Education and manpower—Continued</b>			
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-13	-14	+7.7
<b>Total, education and manpower.....</b>	<b>6,825</b>	<b>8,129</b>	<b>+19.1</b>
<b>Health:</b>			
Providing or financing medical services.....	9,315	12,106	+29.9
Development of health resources.....	1,918	2,235	+16.5
Prevention and control of health problems.....	465	618	+32.9
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-2	-1	-50.0
<b>Total health.....</b>	<b>11,696</b>	<b>14,957</b>	<b>+27.8</b>
<b>Income security:</b>			
Retirement and social insurance.....	32,240	41,895	+29.9
Public assistance.....	4,272	7,035	+64.6
Social and individual services.....	888	1,454	+63.7
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-1	-1	0
<b>Total income security.....</b>	<b>37,399</b>	<b>50,384</b>	<b>+34.7</b>
<b>Veterans benefits and services:</b>			
Income security.....	5,528	6,018	+8.8
Hospital and medical care.....	1,566	1,796	+14.6
Education, training and rehabilitation.....	701	1,206	+72.0
Housing.....	102	315	+208.8
Other veterans benefits and services.....	237	269	+13.5
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-493	-498	+1.0
<b>Total veterans benefits and services.....</b>	<b>7,640</b>	<b>8,475</b>	<b>+10.9</b>
<b>General Government:</b>			
Central fiscal operations.....	1,094	1,345	+22.9
Law enforcement and justice.....	534	1,027	+92.3
General property and records management.....	567	632	+11.4
Legislative and judicial functions.....	302	377	+24.8
National Capital region.....	162	414	+155.5
Central personnel management.....	146	184	+26.0
Executive direction and other general gov- ernment.....	299	360	+20.4
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-238	-255	+7.1
<b>Total general Government.....</b>	<b>2,866</b>	<b>4,084</b>	<b>+42.5</b>
<b>Interest.....</b>	<b>15,791</b>	<b>17,799</b>	<b>+12.7</b>
Allowances.....		2,575	
Undistributed intragovernmental transac- tions.....	-5,117	-6,639	+29.7
<b>Total outlays.....</b>	<b>184,556</b>	<b>200,771</b>	<b>+8.7</b>

Function and subfunction	Outlays (millions) 1960	Outlays (millions) 1970 (estimate)	Percentage in- crease (+) or decrease (-)
<b>Natural resources:</b>			
Water resources and power.....	1,241	2,325	+87.3
Land management.....	305	746	+144.6
Recreational resources.....	125	447	+257.6
Mineral resources.....	30	116	+286.7
Other natural resources programs.....	66	178	+169.7
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-748	-1,325	
<b>Total natural resources.....</b>	<b>1,019</b>	<b>2,485</b>	<b>+143.9</b>
<b>Commerce and transportation:</b>			
Ground transportation.....	2,984	4,810	+61.2
Air transportation.....	568	1,290	+127.1
Water transportation.....	509	919	+80.6
Area and regional development.....	120	717	+497.5
Postal service.....	525	1,247	+137.5
Advancement and regulation of business.....	193	597	+209.3
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-125	-144	
<b>Total commerce and transportation.....</b>	<b>4,774</b>	<b>9,436</b>	<b>+97.7</b>
<b>Community development and housing:</b>			
Low- and moderate-income housing aids.....	\$145	\$1,153	+695.2
Community environment.....	105	1,122	+968.6
Community facilities.....	18	200	+1,011.1
Concentrated community development.....	-72	960	
Community planning and administration.....	787	-469	
Maintenance of the housing mortgage market.....	-11	( <sup>3</sup> )	
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-11	( <sup>3</sup> )	
<b>Total community development and housing.....</b>	<b>971</b>	<b>3,046</b>	<b>+213.7</b>
<b>Education and manpower:</b>			
Elementary and secondary education.....	397	2,668	+572.0
Higher education.....	272	1,395	+412.9
Science education and basic research.....	120	490	+308.3
Vocational education.....	39	266	+582.1
Other education aids.....	58	434	+648.3
Manpower training.....	4	1,368	+34,100.0
Other manpower aids.....	399	929	+132.9
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-11	( <sup>3</sup> )	
<b>Total, education and manpower.....</b>	<b>1,286</b>	<b>7,538</b>	<b>+486.2</b>
<b>Health:</b>			
Providing or financing medical services.....	146	10,582	+7,147.9
Development of health resources.....	554	2,142	+286.6

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS—LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE—Continued  
COMPARATIVE DATA ON FEDERAL BUDGET OUTLAYS: FISCAL YEARS 1960 AND 1970 (ESTIMATED)—Continued

Function and subfunction	Outlays (millions)		Percentage increase (+) or decrease (—)	Function and subfunction	Outlays (millions)		Percentage increase (+) or decrease (—)
	1960	1970 (estimate)			1960	1970 (estimate)	
Health—Continued				General Government:			
Prevention and control of health problems...	58	542	+834.5	Central fiscal operations.....	573	1,257	+119.4
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-2	-1		Law enforcement and justice.....	263	772	+193.5
Total, health.....	756	13,265	+1,654.6	General property and records management.....	351	631	+79.8
Income security:				Legislative and judicial functions.....	158	364	+130.4
Retirement and social insurance.....	15,597	37,106	+137.9	National Capital region.....	30	256	+753.3
Public assistance.....	2,293	5,381	+134.7	Central personnel management.....	82	166	+102.4
Social and individual services.....	88	1,347	+1,430.7	Executive direction and other general Government.....	108	426	+294.4
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-1	-1		Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-238	-253	
Total income security.....	17,977	43,832	+143.8	Total general Government.....	1,327	3,620	+172.8
Veterans benefits and services:				Interest.....	8,299	17,821	+114.7
Income security.....	4,054	5,950	+46.8	Allowances.....		475	
Hospital and medical care.....	963	1,787	+85.6	Undistributed intragovernmental transactions.....	-2,297	-6,088	
Education, training, and rehabilitation.....	531	1,000	+88.3	Total.....	92,223	197,885	+114.6
Housing.....	206	162	-21.4	Total outlays.....	83,929	176,152	
Other veterans benefits and services.....	187	266	+42.2	Total.....	176,152	21,733	
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-514	-484					
Total veterans benefits and services.....	5,426	8,681	+60.0				

<sup>1</sup> Entries net of offsetting receipts.

<sup>2</sup> Excludes offsetting receipts which have been distributed by subfunction above.

<sup>3</sup> Less than \$500,000.

Source: U.S. Executive Office of the President. The budget in brief, fiscal year 1971, pp. 66-68.

Taking chart A first, we see that Federal expenditures for agriculture and rural development programs will actually decline by 13.7 percent from fiscal 1969 to fiscal 1971. Only space research and technology will experience a larger decline, and only national defense and international affairs and finances will experience declines. All other areas will experience increases ranging up to 92.8 percent for community development and housing. The total budget will grow from \$184.6 billion to \$200.8 billion, an increase of 8.7 percent. However, had the rest of the Federal Government followed the pattern of agriculture and rural development programs, total outlays in fiscal 1971 would be under \$160 billion—\$40 billion less than they are expected to be.

If we consider expenditures over the past decade, chart B shows that outlays for agriculture and rural development programs grew by 91 percent from 1960 to 1970. The only categories which increased by a smaller percentage were national defense, international affairs and finance, and veterans' benefits and services. Other programs experienced substantial increases: Natural resources up 144 percent; community development and housing up 214 percent; education and manpower up 486 percent; space research and technology up 869 percent; and health up a staggering 1655 percent. Total Federal outlays over the decade increased from \$92.2 billion to \$197.9 billion, an increase of 114.6 percent. Had the growth in the total Federal budget been restricted to the growth in agriculture expenditures, the fiscal 1970 budget would have been \$176.2 billion—\$21.7 billion below the level it is now expected to be.

The point I am attempting to make is with those critics of agriculture who contend that the Federal Government's expenditures for agriculture and rural development are excessive and therefore must bear a substantial share of the blame for the inflation we are now ex-

periencing. Rather, I think it is clear that had the rest of the Government's expenditures followed the pattern of expenditures for agriculture and rural development, we would not be experiencing the inflation that has been upon us for the past few years.

Not only would we have been free of inflation, but just think how different our budget situation would be. Instead of experiencing deficits, we would have surpluses. Legislation to raise the limit of the national debt, such as we passed last week, would have been unnecessary. In fact, the debt could have been reduced. We would have been able to reduce taxes without raising economic havoc.

Gentlemen, the record of our expenditures for agriculture and rural development programs is outstanding for its modesty. When we seek to fix the blame for inflation, we are going to have to look elsewhere; it obviously does not rest here.

Mr. Chairman, many a housewife these days has been chagrined to look at her grocery bill and see a total that seems inordinately high. I imagine it is only natural for her to blame the farmer for the increases that she sees. However, if one takes the time to look at the record, it is clear that this is not the case. In the first place, the food and fiber we consume has never been cheaper in relation to our cost of living. The average family spends only 16.5 percent of its income for food in the United States. Never has it been so low, and it is far ahead of what any other nation has achieved.

Furthermore, whatever increases have occurred in food costs have not been the result of increased prices received by the farmer. This becomes evident when one compares the parity ratios for 1960 and 1970. In 1960, it stood at 80; but by May, 1970, it had declined to 73. Two glaring examples of this are wheat, which declined from \$2.03 per bushel in 1960 to \$1.42 in 1970, and oats, which dropped from \$.78 per bushel to \$.64. While other

commodity prices may have increased, very few have done so at a rate comparable to the rise in the housewife's food costs. Clearly, she has no justified grievance with the American farmer.

Inadequate prices for the food and fiber he produces has actually brought the American farmer close to the point of economic collapse. If he does not receive an equitable price for his product, he cannot long continue to produce the world's most abundant supply of inexpensive and high quality food and fiber.

Last year, discussing the fiscal 1970 appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, I said:

Agriculture is the base on which our society has been able to build the magnificent, complex economic structure we have today. Our industry and commerce that are able to supply us with a fantastic array of consumer and industrial goods would not be possible without the American agricultural system. Agriculture is truly the Atlas on which our rich and diverse economy rests.

Mr. Chairman, none of us can afford to allow this Atlas to collapse. The importance of the programs and activities funded by this bill to every American has not diminished over the years; in fact, they become more important each year.

It is my opinion that the committee's judgment in reporting this bill to you is well founded, and I heartily recommend it as it now stands for your approval.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEN. I should be glad to yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. The gentleman from Mississippi and Minnesota have made splendid statements. Those who are not interested in agriculture particularly, but who demonstrate such a great interest in environmental quality and pollution control, should realize that siltation is still the greatest polluter of water in America. We are talking about spending \$1.25 billion on secondary treatment. We can give primary, second-



ary and tertiary treatment to municipal waste and then chlorinate the water after that and the chemicals, the nitrogen and the phosphate, which have naturally leached from the land to pollute the water, are still in that water. There is only one way to take care of the problem of water pollution we have, and that is through the soil conservation program, which the gentleman from Minnesota has so ably supported.

Mr. LANGEN. I thank the gentleman for his very cogent remarks. Certainly they are pertinent.

Let me refer to one other item in that connection that bears great significance. We have restored funds for the ACP. As the gentleman has just stated, one of the real sources of pollution is that of siltation from the streams. Of all the programs that have long since started, the various projects of the ACP have proved particularly successful in reducing the problem of siltation. Consequently, the committee has seen fit to restore those funds at this time.

The committee has had the same regard for the Soil Conservation Service and the great amount of commendable work that that agency has done in improving the productivity of land and guarding against the extent to which we might be eroding the land and contributing to pollution and the many other problems of productivity that go along with it.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, my colleague.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege to read this report and I commend the gentleman in the well, my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, as well as the chairman of the subcommittee and the committee members for the really significant report they have made. We often listen in vain in these Halls for the really basic discussion of our fundamental industry of agriculture. In this report that is brought out.

Furthermore, in the fields of conservation and nutrition, and many other of the avenues, the committee has done a real service in bringing to the House the basic principles of agriculture and its importance to the people of our country.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, for those eloquent and appropriate remarks. I know about the gentleman's diligent service on the Agriculture Committee. He understands the problems of rural America and it is a compliment indeed when he recognizes the extent to which the bill before us contributes to rural America.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, my chairman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota.

At this time I just want to say this is a subcommittee. I do not know of any group that works more closely together,

and I know of nobody who makes a greater contribution than the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LANGEN). In the stress of time I do not always take time to say those things, but the same thing applies to all the Members on both sides of the aisle. It is a subcommittee that works together.

Mr. LANGEN. I thank the chairman for his very kind remarks. I believe this bill benefits every citizen of this country and ought to have the unanimous approval of this House. I recommend it to you on that basis.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, today we are considering a bill that affects everybody. Some of the legislation which we consider does not directly affect everybody in the United States and indirectly all of the people in the world, but this bill does—because everyone must eat to survive. So this bill is directly related to every citizen in this country.

The marvel of this century has been what agriculture has been able to do to provide food and fiber for the people at an extremely low cost. Of course, processing and transportation and other items may often run up the cost to the consumer, but the price paid to the producer is very, very small indeed.

Mr. Chairman, the report on this bill is, in my judgment, the best report that has ever been written on the subject of agricultural appropriations. On yesterday I commended the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. WHITTEN, the ranking minority member, Mr. LANGEN, and other members of the subcommittee for conducting their hearings in such a manner and for preparing a report of such dramatic and striking quality on such highly significant matters.

I cannot believe that the Members of the House would want to try to write a new farm bill in this appropriation bill. As all of us know, the Committee on Agriculture is working on a regular farm bill. There is where the original version of the farm program for next year must be written.

We all know that the present farm program expires on December 31 of this year. I cannot believe that a majority of the Members of the House—regardless of their views as to what kind of new farm program we should have—will try to usurp the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and write a new farm program into this pending appropriation bill. It would be an act of futility and it would really be an outrage against one of the great legislative committees of the House.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, first I want to pay my compliments to the distinguished chairman and ranking member of our subcommittee for doing an outstanding job, particularly in the preparation of this report. I wish that all of you would take the time to read it thoroughly, because it gives you in capsule

form the problem that confronts this country out on the farms and gives you a much better understanding, particularly if you are from a city or urban district, of the problems that have to be dealt with here.

Mr. Chairman, both the chairman and the ranking member of our subcommittee have in their presentations made the point as to how much of this bill, while charged to agriculture, is actually going for the benefit of all of the people. And, serving as I do as the ranking member on the Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations—a bill which will be coming on this floor within another month—having to do with a myriad of problems, I am reminded anew of what is included in this bill directly benefitting those people that we commonly would think of as being taken care of in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare bill.

Mr. Chairman, the biggest item contained in this bill is to restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation but the next largest item is \$1.25 billion for food stamps. I suspect that next year the request will be something in the neighborhood of \$2 billion. This is going to be a multibillion-dollar program in a few years, and with our providing free stamps for the most needy, I thought we ought to compute this cost into the welfare floor when we consider the welfare reform legislation. Furthermore this food stamp program now is practically blanketing the country, or will do so within a few months.

Then, Mr. Chairman, if we take the school lunch program we add another \$200 million, and the school milk program in the amount of \$104 million. There you have \$1,554 million that certainly could with no stretch of the imagination be charged up against agriculture, but has to be regarded as a program for all the people throughout the country, and practically all for the poor and needy.

Then, if you take the Extension Service that in the old days used to simply provide from our State universities' services out into the rural communities, we see these services now extended into the urban centers and ghetto areas of the country. The Extension Service in 1963 was in this bill for \$4.5 million. This year it is \$10.3 million. Why? To get these services delivered to the urban centers and ghetto areas.

Further, Mr. Chairman, the child nutrition programs which are over and above the school lunch and school milk programs are funded at \$131.7 million in this bill.

The consumer protection marketing and regulatory activities now total \$149.2 million, up \$15.6 million from last year, and these again are of principal benefit to the consumer public.

We have \$83 million in here for real estate loans through the Farmers Home Administration, an increase of \$37.5 million from last year's bill—and this is certainly not going for building luxury homes on the ranches of the bigger spreads around the country, but it is going for the smaller, low-income farmers around the country.

Take the research service as another item, while we are trying and attempting to produce more with higher quality—I would like to say that we are also accomplishing it at less cost, but such is not the case, for our farmers throughout the country are caught in a cost-price squeeze. The high cost of seed, the increasing cost of fertilizers, the skyrocketing cost of machinery—produced in the urban centers in the main—increased cost of fuel, labor, and marketing, and yet with all those increases the farmer seems to be getting just about the same as he did 10, 20, or even in some cases 30 years ago. But the cost to the consumer continues to shrink in terms of percentage of income one has to pay for food. I think now the latest figures show that a little more than 16 percent of the average American family's income, goes for food. Over in Japan I think it is something like one-third, and in the Soviet Union it is nearly half of one's income that has to go for food.

These are some of the things we ought to be talking about.

I suppose the real cost of our farm programs could best be reflected in the amount needed to restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation. That is the \$14.5 billion corporation which now requires a restoration of \$3.3 billion to bring its books in balance. That was the budget presentation. We actually, in this bill, have \$3,113,000,000 for that purpose. I suspect this could be termed a phoney or a paper cut in our bill, but from past experience we know the other body is inclined to fully restore that capital impairment. I suspect when this bill comes back from conference it might very well be fully restored. But that gives you, I think, in capsule form the cost of these agricultural programs over the past year. And if we get to the point of fully restoring the capital impairment of the CCC and enact a new farm bill I think it will be much easier to determine the actual cost of these programs in the next few years when we have once and for all finally balanced up the books of the CCC. I recall just 2 years ago, when we were funding in this bill the capital impairment item, it dated back to the years 1960 and 1961. When you are over 6, 7, 8, or 9 years behind in restoring that capital impairment, it is high impossible to try and figure out what each specific agricultural program is costing you. Now, I wonder how many people actually realize that we have approximately 3 million farmers in this country today, but 85 percent of the total agricultural output in this country is produced by only 12 to 13 percent or less of our farmers. Think of it.

I am reminded of the very interesting conversation I had with the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LANGEN), after his return from Australia recently, in which he recited the incident where two cotton farmers from this country are now producing practically all of the domestic requirements for the entire country of Australia.

Two American cotton farmers who found out how best to produce cotton efficiently and moving to a foreign country and producing within a year or two

all of that country's domestic requirement.

You know what that does to our export market?

Getting to the subject of limitation on payments, I understand that an amendment will be offered which will have to do with individual farmers rather than limitations on individual and specific crops. I think this in the first instance makes it completely unworkable and unmanageable.

I have fought limitations being imposed on the appropriation bills although I have been in sympathy with it when we have had the subject discussed on authorizing pieces of legislation. But going back again if you please to that few number of farmers who in the main produce the bulk of our agricultural commodities here, if we are going to have a control program, you cannot conceivably make it work unless you include the big operators with the small operators. Otherwise, you might as well toss any kind of control program out the window and let everybody produce everything that they want to. We know what kind of problem that got us into in some years past.

I am not unmindful of the fact that our friends in the news media, no matter how much we explain this thing—and we can take a half hour or an hour, to make the point—are still going to be telling the general public that these are outlandish payments; therefore, the whole program ought to be scotched.

I should like to make the point that we have gone back and forth on this thing two or three times. I have supported it in some measure on authorizing legislation and absolutely opposed it on appropriation bills.

The chairman said that the present act expires on December 31, 1970. I want to see a new farm bill enacted and this is going to be the last time I personally am going to oppose this limitation on an appropriation bill.

We have gone through this exercise about three different times. If we do not get something reasonable worked out as I think can be done on authorizing legislation, and we end up scuttling any attempt to get a new bill or end up simply reenacting the current program, next year I will have to take a different posture because I think I have been reasonable enough in providing the time to work this thing out.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the gentleman would not want to leave the wrong impression about the amendment I intend to offer.

The amendment is so constructed as to make it clearly apply per person and per commodity and not per farm.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman for correcting me on that particular point. I have not had an opportunity to read the gentleman's amendment very thoroughly.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make several other points with respect to the rural electrification program, the research program at the Peoria Regional Labora-

tory and other research and statistical items.

The appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for 1971—H.R. 17923—as reported by the Committee on Appropriations provides for a loan authorization of \$322,000,000 for the rural electrification program and \$123,800,000 for the rural telephone program. These are the same amounts as President Nixon requested in his budget for 1971. In addition, the bill would create a contingency reserve of \$20,000,000, "to be made available by the Bureau of the Budget on the same terms and conditions to the extent that such amount is required during the current fiscal year under the then-existing conditions for expeditious and orderly development of the rural electrification and rural telephone programs."

This reserve was made available to provide REA with some flexibility of additional funds where deemed necessary by the Budget Bureau. It was not requested in the 1971 budget.

As the committee points out in its report this loan authorization will enable the Administrator to make new electric loans totalling \$345,000,000 in 1971. The Administrator told the subcommittee in its hearings that careful use of the budget request would permit the REA to meet the essential needs of the borrowers on an orderly basis in 1971. It would appear that the \$20 million contingency will assure that any unforeseen emergency can be cared for.

The hearings also revealed that requests for distribution facilities would represent the largest amount of unfilled loan applications that the REA will have pending before it at the beginning of 1971. In the subcommittee hearings the REA Administrator updated the December 31, 1969, estimate of pending loan applications so as to reflect the situation likely to exist on June 30, 1971. About \$630,425,000 of loan applications in the electrification program would be on hand as of this date—possibly \$100 million of these would be acted on by June 30, 1970, according to the testimony. Of this \$630 million total estimate presented by the Administrator, \$288,424,000 are loans for distribution facilities, while \$168,824,000 are estimated for generation and \$173,177,000 for transmission purposes. Consequently, the loan authorization provided in this bill should adequately meet all of the pending loan applications for distribution facilities with funds available to meet any critical generation or transmission requests.

The Appropriations Committee report reiterated again this year:

It is essential that generation and transmission loans be held to a minimum until the urgent needs for distribution are first met.

It points out appropriately that distribution borrowers can be supplied with wholesale power from available sources in the area but that other suppliers cannot, under State law and territorial agreements, serve individual customers or distribution borrowers. One of the major reasons priority to distribution loans has been recommended by this committee is that individual customers



of a borrower have no alternative means of receiving service, whereas distribution systems usually have several alternative sources of power.

The committee likewise suggests that the Administrator "give special consideration" to borrowers "with the lowest load density of customers and major problems." The committee for years has supported the concept of area coverage. Although 98.4 percent of the United States has central station electric power available, in sparsely populated areas, particularly those with severe weather conditions, there are major problems for rural electricity and rural telephones. In those cases, loans over a longer period of time might be in order to justify what might not otherwise be feasible.

Now we come to something which concerns me a great deal. It should concern every member of this body who believes that a loan contract between REA borrowers and the Government is a commitment to repay the Federal Treasury as scheduled unless the deferral of payments are requested to protect the Government's security in its loan.

The bill as presented to the full committee erroneously carried a provision, as permanent legislation, that after full assurance of fiscal integrity and security of investment the Administration could suspend for up to 3 years, its repayment provisions of any loan.

I want to make it perfectly clear that I do not agree with the language in our report which reads as follows:

The REA borrowers themselves are likewise seeking other means within their own organization to meet their obligation to their consumers. They are forming the National Rural Utilities Finance Corporation to commence operations this year. Whether this system works will have to await the action of the money markets.

Because of this, the Committee suggests language providing that where the financial condition of a borrower is sound and where the Government's interest is adequately safeguarded, the Administrator consider deferring repayments on outstanding loans for up to three years. Such action where necessary would enable the cooperatives to more fully subscribe the stock of this new lending institution.

The original bill contained no language concerning how this money might be used by the borrower during this 3-year period but the committee report inferred that this provision was recommended to provide borrowers with funds to purchase capital stock in the National Rural Utilities Finance Corporation. This then in effect would have amounted to a Federal loan at 2 percent interest to borrowers of funds that could be used by them to buy capital stock in this corporation. At a time when the yield on Federal long-term bonds recently has been over 6.8 percent a loan at 2 percent constitutes a significant subsidy.

This language as I mentioned, would have been permanent language in an appropriation bill. It would not have applied only to the loan authorization made available by this bill. It stated that it would apply to any loan "made pursuant to the cumulative rural electrification and rural telephone program authorization provided by law." In fact it would not be useful or meaningful if it applied only to loans made subject to the loan

authorization contained in this bill because payments of interest and principal on all loans are deferred during the first 3 years.

This language was not requested by the Department of Agriculture, the REA Administrator, or by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Nor has it been approved by either of those officials.

It could have led to the differral of a considerable sum of money. For example, the total amount of principal and interest due on debt obligations of REA borrowers—both programs—would amount to \$984,500,000 during the 3-year period including fiscal years 1971, 1972, and 1973. Of course, I am not alleging that under the terms of the original language in the bill that all of this amount could have been deferred or that all of the borrowers that might qualify would make such requests. I present this figure only to indicate the possible maximum magnitude of the funds that could be involved.

Because of the important problems raised by this language, I called this provision to the attention of the Bureau of the Budget. I received a letter from Mr. Robert P. Mayo on June 4, the morning the bill went to full committee, opposing suspension of repayments to the Treasury.

In this letter Mr. Mayo stated:

Based upon our understanding of this provision, such a provision could have serious adverse effects on Treasury receipts and result in a substantial increase in interest subsidy costs. This is due to the fact that Treasury borrowings at 6-plus percent would have to be continued for period of as long as three additional years in order to "carry" the 2 percent REA electric loans during this period.

Mr. Mayo is absolutely correct. This would in effect have provided a Federal loan with interest at 2 percent to REA borrowers thus permitting this to buy capital stock in the National Rural Utilities Finance Corporation—commonly referred to as CFC—while the yield on long-term U.S. bonds this year has been as high as 6.86 percent.

Mr. Mayo concluded this letter by recommending that the language in question should be deleted from the bill. He wrote:

In view of the foregoing, we believe the proposal being considered by the Committee should be deleted pending further review of the entire REA financing problem by the executive branch. If such a review shows evidence of a clear need to provide Federal assistance to the CFC, appropriate actions will be proposed.

The Committee on Appropriations saw fit to delete this language from the text of the bill. It was stated during our "markup" session that the permissive language would not change the Administrator's present authority. This probably referred to the fact that section 12 of the Rural Electrification Act as amended permits the Administrator to extend the repayment period for up to 5 years—2 years facility loans. The purpose of section 12, however, was to permit deferral when the Government's security was in jeopardy, and certainly not to use such deferred funds to set up a new financing plan.

If Congress had included the language

deleted from the bill it would have been a legislative mandate to the Administrator to defer loans so as to permit borrowers to more easily subscribe to the stock of the bank.

As our report now reads it appears to indicate that the Appropriations Committee would not oppose the Administrator if he desired to defer payments due from borrowers so as to enable such borrowers to use such funds to provide capital for the CFC, and I am opposed to this.

I desire to remind the Members here today that the Budget Bureau opposes this entire proposal of suspending repayment, however it may be accomplished, because "it would have serious adverse effects on Treasury receipts and result in a substantial increase in interest subsidy costs." This opposition of the Bureau is as applicable to the use of statutory language approved by Congress as it is to suggestions from the Appropriations Committee. Of course, with the language removed from the bill there is no question of Congressional disapproval of this proposal. Obviously the Director of the Budget speaks for the President, it is up to the Administrator as a part of the administration to follow the policy indicated by the Director. I am submitting the entire text of the letter of the Director of the Budget so that all Members of the House can consider it:

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,  
Washington, D.C. June 4, 1970.

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MICHEL: It has been brought to my attention that the Appropriations Committee is considering a provision for inclusion in the 1971 Appropriation Bill for the Department of Agriculture which would have the effect of a moratorium on electrification loan repayments in certain instances for a period of as long as three years.

Based upon our understanding of this provision, such a provision could have serious adverse effects on Treasury receipts and result in a substantial increase in interest subsidy costs. This is due to the fact that Treasury borrowings at 6-plus percent would have to be continued for periods of as long as three additional years in order to "carry" the 2 percent REA electric loans during this period.

We are aware of the need for additional funds by the REA electric borrowers and we have supported the establishment of the private bank, the so-called CFC. We also appreciate the fact that the provision outlined above would make it less costly for the REA electric borrowers to purchase capital participation certificates in the new bank by relieving them of their obligation to the Federal Government. However, the proposal has received no consideration in the executive branch, and we are inclined to feel that there may be other less costly ways of aiding the CFC.

In view of the foregoing, we believe the proposal being considered by the Committee should be deleted pending further review of the entire REA financing problem by the executive branch. If such a review shows evidence of a clear need to provide Federal assistance to the CFC, appropriate actions will be proposed.

Sincerely,

ROBERT P. MAYO,  
Director.

The committee has provided \$3,197,000 above the request that benefits may be received from the construction of the

15 new labs and five utilization laboratories. This amount will provide about 1,000 scientists and supporting staff.

This, of course, does not come anywhere meeting the need. In order to fully staff the Northern Utilization Research and Development Laboratory in Peoria, for example, 149 full-time employees at a cost of \$2,695,000 would be needed.

Often, when we do fund more positions the total staff is not increased. In fact in Peoria it has dropped from 451 on June 30, 1968, to an expected 430 on June 30 of this year. This comes about because the cost of research, equipment, supplies, services, and so forth, has gone up. Also budgetary decreases in the base fund program have been made.

The following is an example of what could be done if the lab was fully staffed:

PROGRAM NEED: (To COMPLETE STAFFING OF NEW WING) NORTHERN UTILIZATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION, PEORIA, ILL.

Examples of high priority work (SMY—Scientist GS-11 or above, plus supporting staff for 1 year; annual cost estimated at \$55,000, including salaries, equipment, supplies, etc.):

#### CEREAL GRAINS

1. *Reinforcement of rubber with starch*, 5 SMY (\$275,000): (Increased emphasis, presently 3.4 SMY—potential benefit new market for 1.7 billion lbs. corn starch through replacement of higher cost reinforcing agents such as silicas, resins, and some carbon blacks for specialty rubber products—estimated benefit \$54 million).

2. *Paper improvement with starch products*, 6.5 SMY (\$358,000): (New research—Increase speed on papermaking machines through increase of wet-web strength of sheet being formed, providing new market for 50 million lbs. corn starch—potential benefit \$22 million).

3. *Fortification of cereal grains and food products*, 4.5 SMY (\$247,000): (New, with some research background—to provide more nutritious foods for domestic use by fortification of cereal grains (except wheat) and derived food products with iron, calcium, and other vital minerals, essential amino and fatty acids, and protein and carbohydrate supplements).

4. *Nutrient values of cereal grains and food products*, 4 SMY (\$220,000): (New, with considerable research background—to facilitate public nutritional programs and improve nutrition and health by obtaining adequate, reliable information on the nutrient composition and nutritional quality of cereal grains (except wheat), their milled products and derived cereal foods).

5. *Improved feed formulation technology*, 4 SMY (\$220,000): (New, with some research background—development of rapid and comprehensive methods for protein and amino acid compositional analysis for computer-controlled feed formulation—potential benefit \$55 million based on saving of 1% cost of mixed feeds).

6. *Flocculating agents, starch graft copolymers*, 4 SMY (\$220,000): (Expansion, directed toward pollution abatement, based on extremely promising results of screening survey of products recently prepared in the Laboratory—new market for starch through potential applications in disposal of waterborne wastes from mining, ore refining, etc.).

7. *Conversion of feedlot wastes to useful products*, 3 SMY (\$165,000): (New, based on expertise in fermentology and limited exploratory work—to reduce feedlot pollution by controlled composting of animal wastes to produce a superior, low BOD fertilizer or aesthetically acceptable nutritious animal feed).

#### OILSEEDS

1. *Linseed oil for improving concrete*, 4 SMY (\$220,000): (New phase of linseed oil work—to overcome deterioration problems with low-quality stone and gravel by pre-coating with linseed oil before mixing concrete, providing new market for 2.5 million lbs. oil—potential benefit \$288 million—if initial results are promising, effort will be increased).

2. *Soybean oil refining*, 3 SMY (\$165,000): (Increased effort directed toward pollution abatement based on promising results; presently 1.5 SMY—lower cost process for refining the oil with reduction of water pollution—potential benefit \$15 million).

3. *Nutrient composition of soybeans and soybean food products*, 4 SMY (\$220,000): (New, with considerable research background—to facilitate public nutritional programs and improve nutrition and health by obtaining adequate, reliable information on the content and biologic availability of nutritionally important constituents of soybeans and soybean food products).

4. *New lubricants from high-erucic seed oils*, 2 SMY (\$110,000): (New, based on exploratory studies—using such high-erucic oils as crambe and rapeseed, to produce better lubricants for airplane engines, other machinery, and other uses such as steel casting and rolling, new market for some 900 million lbs. oil from new crop acreage of over 1 million acres—potential benefit \$36 million).

#### NEW CROPS

1. *Discovery and evaluation of new vegetable gums*, 2 SMY (\$110,000): (New, based on limited screening work, subject to increase later—new crops to meet expanding industrial needs for hydrocolloids, eliminate dependence on imports of gums having variable quality and price, and providing for such applications as oil well drilling, papermaking, textile processing, mining and ore flotation, and numerous food-thickening uses—potential benefit \$17 million).

2. *Improved processing of kenaf for papermaking*, 3 SMY (\$165,000): (Increased emphasis, present effort 1.1 SMY—to provide a new farm crop and more effective use of farm acreage through development of a satisfactory and practical sequence of operations to process kenaf, an annual pulp source, to fully acceptable commercial-grade papers, thereby filling the need for a supplement to the diminishing supply of Southern hardwood pulpwood—potential benefit \$16 million).

#### Summary of examples

SMY:	
Cereal grains (31)-----	\$1,705,000
Oilseed crops (13)-----	715,000
New crops (5)-----	275,000
Total (49)-----	2,695,000

Turning to our problems of disease with our pigs and hogs, TGE or transmissible gastroenteritis, a disease which affects pigs only a few weeks old, is becoming a real problem throughout the Nation's pork belt. The committee has recommended that the economic losses faced by the hog industry as a result of TGE justify additional emphasis enabled by the research contingency fund. This disease wipes out entire pig crops.

The committee has also included some \$500,000 for hog cholera eradication. By January 1973, we are hopeful that we will have eradicated this disease in this country. State programs are reaching a stage where an all-out effort is being made to eradicate the disease. During the remainder of this time we expect to be faced with additional needs for indemnity payments due to comprehensive

investigations of each outbreak and tracing all movements from them.

And finally, Mr. Chairman with respect to white corn production, our committee has included \$100,000 to provide estimates of white corn production.

There has not been a national white corn survey since about 1946. Within recent years, particularly the last 2 years, the value and the price of white corn has been going up and fluctuating inordinately. There is a rising demand and apparently the big reason for the rapid fluctuating is due to lack of knowledge of acreage and supply.

Farmers do not have the information enabling them to get the price they ought to be getting. They do not know if they should hold it or sell it right away or shift to white corn production from yellow corn.

Processors say they do not know enough about current or prospective supplies to help stabilize the price.

The program will include an annual cycle of three surveys in 18 States: Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska, Kansas, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Arkansas, Texas, and California.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Chairman, first let me congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN), and the members of his subcommittee for an excellent and comprehensive agriculture appropriations bill.

I have reviewed this legislation carefully, and feel that the subcommittee has cut costs where possible, while providing adequate funds for those programs that are vital to all Americans, and particularly, rural Americans.

When I testified before the agriculture appropriations subcommittee in behalf of essential conservation programs, I emphasized the fact that soil and water conservationists have been frontline troops in the fight against pollution for three decades. I am delighted, Mr. Chairman, that the committee report has chosen to emphasize the antipollution aspects of soil conservation as well.

The legislation before us today obligates over \$694.7 million for pollution research, abatement, and control programs of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Of first rank among these programs is the agriculture conservation program, or ACP.

All of us from rural America know of the inestimable value that ACP has been to our constituents. The \$195 million devoted to ACP for fiscal year 1971 will continue vital soil and water conservative efforts that have preserved hundreds of millions of acres from destruction, and hundreds of streams and lakes from silt and chemical pollution in past years.

Let me just add this note, Mr. Chairman. The report from the committee on this bill is a classic statement of the position of agriculture in our national economy. It is a classic statement of the board range of responsibilities that USDA discharges with competence on



behalf of all Americans, urban and rural. This may be an agriculture appropriations bill, but it funds programs that keep meat and produce at the highest standards of cleanliness for all consumers—urban and rural. Wholesome food is but one of a multitude of services that the Department quietly performs with funds provided in this bill.

Countless millions in distant countries have been saved from starvation and famine in years past, because agricultural research conducted by employees or on contract has developed higher yielding varieties of life-giving commodities, and better all-around agricultural practices. Through Public Law 480, countless millions have been supplied with food in times of crisis and chronic need. This legislation, Mr. Chairman, is therefore the most genuinely humanitarian work of the Congress in any session.

The committee report should be required reading for each and every concerned American. It is perhaps the best statement on modern agriculture and agricultural appropriations that has ever been written.

I congratulate the gentleman from Mississippi for his record of public service and for his leadership. I congratulate the chairman, and all the members of his subcommittee, for the priorities they have established and pursued in this legislation are priorities of a compassionate, concerned, and enlightened Nation.

I urge all Members to support this important measure.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER), the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Appropriations Committee once again brings to the floor of the House for your approval the annual appropriations bill for the Department of Agriculture. We recommend a total appropriation of \$7,406,188,150 for the fiscal year 1971. This is a reduction of \$125,587,350 in the total budget requests which call for \$7,531,775,500. The total new budget obligation authority for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year 1970 totaled \$8,037,098,150.

Mr. Chairman, more than one-half of the total amount recommended in this bill applies directly to benefits for the consumer.

The American farmer is in trouble today, Mr. Chairman, and certainly this is not the time for us to turn our back on agriculture. In considering the question of prosperity insofar as agriculture is concerned, we must keep in mind that the average capital investment in farms today is about \$85,400. The average farm investment has increased nearly 10-fold in the past 25 years from \$6,158 in 1940 to the present sum of \$85,402. We also know that the average return on farm equities has dropped more than 50 percent during this period. The drop is from 7.1 percent in 1945-49 to 3.1 percent in 1968. This gives us a better understanding as to why fewer and fewer people are remaining on the Nation's farms, and why some 5 percent of our population on the farms is now feeding the other 95 percent in addition to themselves.

An average of nearly 800,000 people have left the farms in each of the last 5 years. The farm population has decreased to about 10 million today as compared to more than 2½ times that number in 1950. The total land in farms in 1950 was 1.2 billion acres as compared to 1.1 billion acres in 1965 which is a reduction of 100 million acres. The average size of a farm increased from 213 acres to 373 acres in that period.

Today a great many of our young people on farms have no chance to get started in agriculture unless they either inherit a farm or succeed in borrowing a large sum of money to invest in land which is adequate for a livelihood.

One way to assist agriculture is to keep our good farmland in production. Our soil conservation programs, our ACP programs, and our research programs generally will be of assistance to us in carrying out such a program.

In order to remain strong we must have on hand certain surplus commodities to meet any and all emergencies. Not in excess, but in an adequate amount. As long as our surplus commodities are manageable then we are in good shape. When the opposite confronts us certainly we must do something about it.

Agriculture is our largest industry. Its assets exceed those of any of the next 10 largest industries. Agriculture employs more workers than any other major industry and, in fact, employs seven times the number of people in the mining industry, 23 times the number in the coal and oil industry, and five times the number in the automobile industry. Agriculture is one of the major markets for the products of labor and industry. It spends more for equipment than any of the other large industries. Agriculture uses more steel in a year than is used for a year's output of passenger cars. It uses more petroleum products than any other industry in this country. It uses more rubber each year than is required to produce tires for 6 million automobiles. Its inventory of machinery and equipment exceeds the assets of the steel industry and is five times that of the automobile industry.

Our farmers' assets now are approximately \$305 billion.

In 1950 the farmers' share of the retail food dollar was 47 cents. Today it is down to 41 cents.

Our American farmers know how to produce and today our country is the world's largest exporter of food to the other nations of the world.

Three-fourths of our land area is in private ownership and 60 percent is in farms and ranches. We must keep in mind that 70 percent of our people now reside in our cities and they occupy only a small percentage of the land in this country.

If our country is to survive and prosper we must continue to be interested in and to assist when necessary our custodians of the natural resources in this country. We must reforest our lands, protect our watersheds, harness our streams for electricity, and conserve our soil and water. It is imperative that we leave to the future generation a fertile land and a land sufficient to produce

food for our people. Mr. Chairman, as you well know, in this country, today we have 204 million people.

In this bill, Mr. Chairman, we recommend the sum of \$146,143,200 for research. We further recommend \$98,619,750 for plant and animal disease and pest control.

The total amount recommended for Agricultural Research Service is \$249,762,950.

We recommend \$65,076,000 for Cooperative State Research Service.

For our Extension Service we recommend \$161,351,000.

For our Soil Conservation Service we recommend a total of \$268,884,000.

For economic research, Mr. Chairman, we recommend the sum of \$14,592,000. The sum of \$17,716,800 is recommended for Statistical Reporting Service.

For Consumer and Marketing Service we recommend the sum of \$150,847,000.

For our special milk program, which as you know, Mr. Chairman, was deleted, we recommend the amount of \$104,000,000 and insist that this program be restored. For child nutrition programs we recommend \$90,395,000 along with the necessary transfer from section 32 funds of \$238,358,000 which then makes a total of \$328,753,000 for child nutrition programs. We recommend \$1,250,000,000 for our food stamp program. Here we have a right good example, Mr. Chairman, or a large sum of money which the consumer is very much concerned about in this country. We recommend \$27,140,000 for Foreign Agriculture Service. For Commodity Exchange Authority we recommend \$2,552,000.

We recommend the sum of \$221,469,000 for Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

For a period of over 10 years now, Mr. Chairman, we have been confronted with either reductions or total deletions as far as amounts and authorization for our agricultural conservation program is concerned. This year was no exception to the rule. We restore and recommend advance authorization for our agricultural conservation program in the sum of \$195,500,000. For the cropland adjustment program we recommend \$77,800,000. This then makes a total of \$514,590,000 for Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

We recommend \$3,508,650 for Packers and Stockyards Administration.

The full budget estimate of \$322,000,000 in new authorization is recommended for Rural Electrification and the full budget estimate of \$123,800,000 is recommended for telephone loans. These new authorizations, together with carryover funds will enable the Administrator to make new loans of \$345,000,000 and \$125,000,000 respectively.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, we recommend \$20 million over the budget estimate to be placed in budgetary reserve and released by the Bureau of the Budget to either the electric or telephone programs when necessary. This, as you know, Mr. Chairman, is equal to the \$20 million placed in budgetary reserve and not released in fiscal year 1970. Failure of the Bureau of the Budget to release this \$20 million was a serious mistake.

Mr. Chairman, as you well know, our Soil Conservation Service is more important today than at any time in the history of this Service. When we consider the need for more food and fiber and keep in mind that some of our best land is now being used for airports, interstate highways, subdivisions and for recreation purposes generally, we must preserve as much of our best land as possible and at all times have tillable land in production which will produce enough food for our people. Today in our country we have in cultivation some 385 million acres. Of course, the acreage in cultivated crops varies from year to year, due to changes in land use. We have today some 289 million acres in crops harvested, 7 million acres of crop failure, 37 million acres of fallow, and some 52 million acres in grasses and lagoons. The situation is serious today, Mr. Chairman, from the standpoint of the loss of great quantities of our best farmland and certainly now is the time to correct this situation.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I want you to know that I am definitely of the opinion that we still have serious problems in agriculture and again I want to say that this is not the time to turn our back on the American farmer. The interest of the consumer, of course, must be protected and at the same time we must see that the American farmer receives a fair price for his produce.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations I serve on three subcommittees. We have 13 subcommittees on our Committee on Appropriations. I am No. 2 on each of the subcommittees of Agricultural Appropriations and Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare. I am the chairman of the third subcommittee that I serve upon and that is the District of Columbia Budget Subcommittee. My assignment to the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee is one of the most important assignments that I have as a Member of Congress, and, Mr. Chairman, all down through the years it has been a distinct honor and privilege for me to serve on this particular subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, our committee recommends this bill to the Members of the House.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON).

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, the times when the Federal Government has simultaneously pursued programs and policies that overlap, compete, or are inconsistent with one another are probably too numerous to list or for anyone to recall. It goes on all the time, but becomes of particular concern to us—or at least it should—during periods of enforced budgetary stringency such as we are now experiencing.

But, whether we sail stormy or smooth economic seas, it is just plain absurd for our Federal Government to initiate and conduct programs which aim at mutually exclusive objectives.

We have, today, just such an absurd situation before us.

On the one hand, Mr. Chairman, through this bill and by virtue of other existing legislation we support tobacco prices, acreage retirement, and export

subsidies, while at the same time—through other appropriation bills and other existing legislation—we channel substantial sums of moneys into research to determine, if we can, the true relationship between smoking and cancer, and the harmful effects of tobacco on the human heart and respiratory system.

While some object to this dichotomy on moral grounds, I—as a pipe smoker who has stopped even that use of tobacco on several occasions and hope some day to finally win that battle with myself—can only object to it as being fiscally illogical, but illogical in the extreme.

How so?

Well, Mr. Chairman, I have had to gather my figures rather hastily, and perhaps stand to be corrected as to some of them. But, to the best of my knowledge, the cost of tobacco price supports during the 1969 fiscal year was \$4.9 million. Additionally, so I understand, each year the Department of Agriculture pays for the grading of tobacco leaves at a cost of about \$3 million. Then, since a significant amount of our tobacco is exported—but since the world price is lower than the U.S. price—there are export subsidies, amounting again in the 1969 fiscal year to about \$28 million. These direct expenditures need, however, to be put in further perspective—running as they do at between \$36 and \$50 million a year, depending upon whose figures are used—by reference to the further fact, as I understand it, that the Federal Government presently has more than \$750 million in loans outstanding from the Commodity Credit Corporation to support the price of tobacco, which effort cannot be wholly self-supporting.

At the same time, then, while spending these large sums of money, we are financing with tax dollars efforts not only to determine how to make a non-harmful cigarette, but also to determine how to cure diseases caused or complicated by smoking. The Department of Agriculture, again as I understand it, itself spends some \$7.8 million a year for research in this area, not to mention the \$6 million or so a year spent through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the same general purposes.

Besides which, the Federal Government has rightly or wrongly taken the position that smoking is harmful—witness the warning now on cigarette packs—and large sums of private moneys are spent, each year now, in advertising against cigarette smoking.

Is it not incongruous for us to support the price of a commodity which we, ourselves, say is harmful—or can be harmful—to those who use it?

I am not unaware of the financial problems that would be created in certain States if tobacco price supports were to be eliminated. The loss of Federal moneys always has such an effect. However, it seems to me that the arguments in favor of eliminating price supports substantially outweigh those favoring continuation thereof.

To lessen the economic impact of a cutoff of funds, I—for one—would endorse a gradual reduction of supports over a period of 4 or 5 years, thereby giving the tobacco farmers and the industry

an opportunity to shift to other products, or other endeavors, if they could not economically continue tobacco production. And, parenthetically, it is interesting to note that the industry, itself, looking at the handwriting on the wall, has already begun to shift its attention to other areas.

So, as I say, Mr. Chairman, this notion of expending moneys simultaneously for two contradictory programs or purposes strikes me as being both fiscally irresponsible and philosophically inconsistent. And it is my belief that this dichotomy ought to be resolved by the systematic reduction of moneys spent for price supports and tobacco promotion.

I would introduce an amendment to this bill to accomplish such a goal if I were expert enough—as I am not in agriculture matters—to draft it properly, and if I did not feel that, even then, a parliamentary objection might well lie against it.

However, I will surely be glad to work with any of my colleagues who may be interested in this subject in sponsoring such an amendment to the pending farm bill—if, and when, such a vehicle is brought before us this year.

For to continue to support tobacco—by means of price supports, free grading, export subsidies, and advertising—is in direct conflict with our growing knowledge of the probable harmful effects of smoking and our expenditures, both public and private, to try to prevent such harm.

Surely, the time to remedy this inconsistency is long overdue.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBISON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out to the gentleman in the well and to the Members of the Committee the fact that the tobacco industry in this country is a \$10 billion industry. The tobacco industry pays into the Federal, State, and local treasuries a little more than \$4 billion in taxes each year.

A number of years ago, I say to my distinguished friend, a member of the Committee on Appropriations, we decided on this subcommittee to find out if tobacco was harmful to the health of our people, and starting in 1958 we have made small requests for additional funds for research.

I talked with the Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, and asked him if he would have the legislature appropriate the necessary money to build a building which would be used for research. This established a precedent because the Federal Government not only has to build the facility for research but has to appropriate all the money as a general rule.

The Commonwealth of Kentucky appropriated money for and built a building costing \$4.5 million to be used for tobacco research. We have a small amount in this bill for research and my home State recently passed a law that will provide about \$2 million for this purpose.

In the year 1964, Dr. Terry, the Sur-



geon General of the United States, appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and I would like to tell you what he said upon issuing the report on smoking and health. He said, upon being questioned:

When you burn tobacco and spinach you have the same result—when you burn tobacco and spinach.

That is what he told the Committee on Agriculture. He said:

We do not know for sure.

And when questioned carefully admitted that no specific research project established a connection between tobacco and cancer.

I serve on the Subcommittee on Labor and Health, and the Surgeon General has been examined each year concerning this subject and we receive the same answers. I say to the distinguished gentleman in the well that we asked the Surgeon General, why he pointed his finger at tobacco.

We asked:

What specific research program do you have underway at this time which shows tobacco is harmful to the health of our people and is causing cancer?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBISON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. He could not answer the question.

I want the Members of the Committee to know that the people in the States of Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, Alabama, Virginia, and all the other States—21 of them—that produce tobacco want to know if tobacco is harmful to the health of our people. If it is we want to do something about it. Now, Mr. Chairman, not 10 years from now.

I say to my distinguished friend in the well, all we ask you to do is to give us a chance. The same applies to any other commodity.

I say to the gentleman frankly, when we talk about destroying a \$10 billion industry and one which pays into the Federal, State, and local communities \$4 billion in taxes, it is a right serious matter.

I understand my friend's position, and I want to say to him that we are going to continue our efforts in Kentucky and in all of our tobacco States to follow this matter carefully.

Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

Mr. ROBISON. I appreciate the gentleman's comments and I understand his concern, but I am not sure at all in my own mind that the reduction of or the gradual elimination of tobacco price supports would "destroy" that industry. That certainly is not my objective.

My objective was and is to point out the inconsistency of our going two directions here at once, and to encourage some early resolution by all concerned of that seeming inconsistency.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Certainly the good intentions and the contributions made by my colleagues who preceded me are fully appreciated. I do not know of two finer people who have the welfare of the people more at heart than they do.

If I could have the attention of the gentleman from New York, I should like for him to listen to this. He used the word "inconsistency."

I assure the gentleman that this is an appropriations subcommittee rather than a legislative committee. The fact is that price supports are made available only for reducing or restricting the production of tobacco. If we were to take the price support away the chances are this would threaten the production of tobacco.

History shows that if one reduces the price—and there is no question about it—the producer, trying to offset that loss of income through the reduction in price, will increase his production. If his price is cut, he increases the volume.

I appreciate the gentleman's frankness in saying that he had not studied the mechanics of this. I would point out that the mechanical proposition of the thing he directs attention to, which is the price support, as a practical matter would result in greatly increased quantity.

What we need to do is to find out what the element is, if there be an element, which is causing a health hazard, and correct it. If there is not, we should do something legislatively, to see if tobacco is being used in excess.

I am saying, to strike at the price would have the opposite effect from reducing quantity. If we want to slow down total consumption, that is one thing; if we should reduce the price, it would greatly increase the production.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROBISON. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding so that I can respond.

My purpose is not to try to present or even suggest a solution to the problem here before us.

I merely want to point up again that there is a problem and that we ought to continue to recognize that problem and the appropriate committees, including this committee, ought to focus their attention on this problem.

Mr. WHITTEN. I want to say that there is no fairer person than my friend from New York.

Mr. ROBISON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in his remarks earlier described as ridiculous the proposal I have made which would affect a \$20,000 per commodity limitation on total payments to any farmer. Well, in the realm of ridiculous, I would like to call the attention of this body to section 508 of the bill

which appears on page 39 and reads as follows:

No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used to change any price support program payment or payments, or commodity loan or loans in any manner, the effect of which is to modify substantive law.

Then over in the committee report on page 51 by way of explanation to the curious provision is the line:

A new section 508 has been added to the bill clarifying its relationship to general farm legislation which must pass in this legislative session.

Now, speaking of ridiculous, I just wonder whether that word might be applied to this unusual provision. Nothing like it has ever appeared in an Agriculture Appropriation Act before, and I just wonder if there might be a little devilish thought involved here to try to thwart the will of the House with regard to payment limitations.

Could the gentleman clarify that?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not believe I have ever found out how to thwart the will of the House.

Mr. FINDLEY. It looks like an impressive effort.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am glad the gentleman recognizes it as a little unusual and a rather sound statement. I believe this language is written in proper form and the language is in proper place and in the proper part of the bill, and it was written by the subcommittee and approved by it. I thought that was the way to handle legislation.

Mr. FINDLEY. It is an interesting contribution to an appropriation bill. I suppose, if it succeeds, it is not really so ridiculous after all.

Now, also on the point of ridiculous, when you consider a \$20,000 payment limit as ridiculous, I wonder how you would describe the payment in 1969 to the U.S. Sugar Corp. of Florida in the amount of \$1,181,195. I would say from the standpoint of the poor suffering taxpayer extracting a sum of that kind out of the U.S. Treasury and handing it to one sugar corporation certainly is bordering on the ridiculous. In the same category there was a payment to the Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Corp. for a payment in 1968 of \$1,311,268. I would think payments of that sort, at that level more deserve the word ridiculous than an amendment which would put a ceiling of \$20,000 per commodity per person on the payments under a program authorized or funded by this act.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in his remarks arguing for this appropriation and against any limitation said that this bill affects everybody. Well, it affects every congressional district in the Nation. I believe that is very plain. But it affects some people in some congressional districts a little more than others.

Let me illustrate. The 19th District of Texas, with which I am sure the chairman of the Appropriations Committee the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) is familiar, in 1969 received payments of \$110,374,230. Now, that is the third-ranking congressional district in the Na-

tion in terms of total receipts for farm payments for that year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, my district in Illinois is among the 50, it happens to be No. 49, and just to illustrate the point that this bill affects some districts more than others, let me point out that the total payments in the 20th District of Illinois in that same year were \$22 million as contrasted with \$110 million. Further, let us assume that there are a lot more farmers in the 19th District of Texas, but the 1964 farm census showed 9,782 farms in the 19th District of Texas and a grand total of 16,103 in the 20th District of Illinois.

One of the concerns that has been expressed by the Department of Agriculture and by some Members of this body is that the administration of the farm program payment limit is a difficult item for the Department of Agriculture.

First, difficulty in administration of an item is no valid reason for this body to fail to act when the need, as apparent as the need for placing limitations on giant farm program payments is, becomes apparent. There are many programs which are difficult to administer that are being conducted and operated by the Federal governmental departments daily. To say that the farm program payment limitation would be an unusually difficult task for the Department of Agriculture to administer is to indicate a genuine lack of knowledge of the fact that there has been or currently are at least five farm program limitations administered by the Department of Agriculture.

The first of these payment limits is the conversation reserve of the soil bank from 1956 to 1960. This program had an administrative limitation of \$5,000 per person for all farms for 1 year. By the end of the term of this program the administration of it was perfected to a fine art. Much has been said about "slip-page" or the fact that a number of large farmers will make considerable attempt to evade the provisions of any payment limit. I cite here language supplied me by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's General Counsel's office relating to the limitation on payments of the conservation reserve as the most effective and well developed set of definitions regarding who a person or producer is for purposes of administration of the act. The provisions developed by the Department of Agriculture to administer the conservation reserve payment limit provide an excellent pattern or set of guidelines for administration of the farm program payment limit which I am offering for consideration today. I insert here section 485.521, "Limitation on Payments," taken from the conservation reserve program regulations, and reprinted from the Federal Register of October 3, 1959:

§ 485.521. Limitation on payments.

(a) The total of all annual payments under the conservation reserve program to any producer for any year with respect to all farms in which he has an interest shall not exceed \$5,000.00. All or any part of the annual payment which otherwise would be due any producer shall be withheld, or required to be refunded, if he has adopted, or participated

in adopting, any scheme or device, including the dissolution, reorganization, revival, formation, or use of any corporation, partnership, estate, trust or by any other means designed to evade, or which has the effect of evading the provisions of this section. A family trust created on or after August 16, 1966, will be considered a scheme or device to evade the provisions of this section if it results in the settlor and beneficiaries of the trust receiving in the aggregate annual payments under the Conservation Reserve Program for any year of the contract period in excess of \$5,000. For purposes of this provision, members of the family include husband or wife of the settlor, children of the settlor, their husbands and wives, and members of the immediate household of the settlor; and payments to a trustee shall be regarded as payments to the beneficiaries of the trust. For purposes of this section, a family shall include grandchildren of the settlor, step-children of a child of the settlor, and any minor related to the settlor by blood or marriage.

(b) For purposes of applying the payment limitation prescribed in paragraph (a) of this section, the rules contained in subparagraph (1) through (6) of this paragraph shall be effective to determine whether certain individuals interested in farming operations as landowners, landlords, tenants or sharecroppers are to be treated as one producer or as separate producers. In cases in which more than one rule would appear to be applicable, the rule which is most restrictive on the number of producers shall apply.

(1) A partnership shall be considered as a producer. Individual members of the partnership may be recognized in another capacity as landowners, landlords, tenants, or sharecroppers, on the same farm or another farm only if (i) the individual members operating in a separate capacity are not identical with the membership of the partnership, and (ii) the individual members also operated as separate producers or in a separate capacity as producers on the farm during 1959.

(2) A corporation or association shall be considered as a producer. A stockholder who owns a majority of the stock of a corporation shall not be considered as a separate producer on the same farm nor recognized in any other capacity on the same farm as a landowner, landlord, tenant, or sharecropper.

(3) An estate or trust shall be considered as a producer unless the estate has only one heir or the trust has only one beneficiary, in which case only the sole heir or the sole beneficiary shall be considered as a producer. Subject to the provisions of paragraph (a) of this section, an individual who is not the sole heir of the estate or the sole beneficiary of the trust may be considered as a separate producer or recognized in a different capacity as landlord, landowner, tenant, or sharecropper, on the same farm or on another farm, provided such separate producer status is established to the satisfaction of the county committee.

(4) Two or more individuals operating as a group under an arrangement which, although lacking the legal elements of a partnership or corporation, is in the nature of a joint undertaking shall be considered as a producer. (Clubs, societies, fraternal and religious organizations, as well as informal arrangements between two or more individuals, are examples of such groups.) Individual members of the group shall not be considered as separate producers on the same farm nor recognized on the same farm in any other capacity as landowners, landlords, tenants, or sharecroppers.

(5) Husband and wife shall not be considered as separate producers nor recognized in any other capacity as landowners, landlords, tenants, or sharecroppers, on the same farm or on different farms. Other individuals having any family relationship may be con-

sidered as separate producers if they are participating on different farms. Such individuals may be considered as separate producers on the same farm or recognized in different capacities on the same farm as landlords, landowners, tenants, or sharecroppers only if such individuals operated as separate producers or in separate capacities during 1959.

(6) Individuals having a joint or common interest arising out of their interests in the ownership of any part of the farm as joint tenants, tenants by the entirety or tenants in common shall not be considered as separate producers on the same farm nor recognized in any other capacity on the same farm as landlords, landowners, tenants or sharecroppers.

The second program limitation is a statutory limit of \$3,000 per producer for all crops produced in 1958 as part of the acreage reserve program of the soil bank. I quote here that limitation as contained in Public Law 85-118:

That no part of this appropriation shall be used to formulate and administer an acreage reserve program which would result in total compensation being paid to producers in excess of \$500,000,000 with respect to 1958 crops, or in total compensation being paid to any one producer in excess of \$3,000 with respect to 1958 crops.

The third payment limitation I cite is the \$50,000 per person price support limitation for any one commodity annually for field crops in surplus. This was a legislative limitation. Section 477.101 of the agricultural credit provision of the \$50,000 payment limitation on non-recourse price support for the 1960 crop—reprinted from the Federal Register of February 5, 1960—reads in part:

No part of the authorization for Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year 1960 shall be used to formulate or carry out a price support program for 1960 under which a total amount of price support in excess of \$50,000 would be extended by Commodity Credit Corporation to any person on the 1960 production of any agricultural commodity declared by the Secretary to be in surplus supply.

The cropland conversion program in operation in 1963 to 1965 contained an administrative limit of \$10,000 per producer annually. Section 751.64 of chapter 7, title 7 of that program reads, in part:

The maximum adjustment payment to all persons with respect to the farm or ranch under an agreement shall be \$10,000 for the entire period of the agreement. The Deputy Administrator may establish a different limit where two or more farms are combined into a farming or ranching enterprise which effectuates the purposes of the program. All or any part of any adjustment payment which otherwise would be due may be withheld or required to be refunded if any scheme or device has been adopted which has been designed to evade, or which has the effect of evading, maximum adjustment payment limitation.

The fifth and final payment limitation is one which has occurred frequently over the years and in relation to the Agricultural Conservation Program limitation of \$2,500 per person which has been written into the appropriations bill. Public Law 91-127 of November 26, 1969 reads, in part:

Except that no participant shall receive more than \$2,500, except where the participants from two or more farms or ranches



join to carry out approved practices designed to conserve or improve agricultural resources of the community.

From these very brief examples it is easy to determine that the Department of Agriculture has the background, the experience, and no doubt the staff to carry out effective payment limitations which will result in a minimum of evasion on the part of large farm operators.

On May 14, 1970, I placed in the RECORD a list of the 50 largest congressional districts in terms of Federal farm program payments. These districts appear on a map I have prepared showing the geographical location of these large volume of payments.

When I announced that these districts

were receiving the largest volume of Federal payments, I said I was continuing my investigation of what caused this situation.

In several of these big payment districts, irrigation water has resulted in crop production patterns vastly different than would be possible without this supplemental moisture. No one can oppose the possible future need for irrigation water to grow crops for our growing population, but during a period when we are spending millions of dollars to reduce the size of our agricultural production, it seems illogical to be paying taxes both to support the development of irrigation projects to increase crop production on one hand and then use additional tax

funds to reduce crop production on the other hand. Irrigation water for our towns and cities is vitally important, but to permit the continuance of giant farm program payments to reduce crop production in these areas makes little sense. In addition, some of these same regions have seen the steady rise in the yield of crops as a result of the supplemental water which provides a decided disadvantage for farmers in nonirrigated sections of the Nation.

Attached to these remarks is a listing of the congressional districts, which are part of the 50 largest payment recipients, and the costs of the irrigation projects currently functioning:

## BUREAU OF RECLAMATION IRRIGATION PROJECTS

Congressional district	Irrigation project	Federal cost	Counties in unit	Total payments	Congressional district	Irrigation project	Federal cost	Counties in unit	Total payments
Kansas—1	Almena unit	(1)	Norton	\$1,987,304		Lower Marias unit	(1)	Valley	\$3,657,908
			Phillips	2,423,088				Chouteau	6,636,031
	Courtland and Scandlin units	(1)	Cloud	2,711,494				Hill	4,396,214
			Jewell	3,786,441		Nickwall unit	(1)	McCone	2,670,447
			Republic	3,377,217				Richland	(2)
	Cedar Bluff unit	(1)	Ellis	2,298,459		Yellowstone Division	(1)		
			Trego	2,190,472				Savage unit	(2)
	Kirwin unit	(1)	Osborne	2,952,303				Stipek unit	(2)
			Phillips	(2)				Colgate unit	
			Smith	3,158,975				Marsh unit	
	Webster unit	(1)	Osborne	(2)				Crackerbox unit	
			Rooks	2,491,712				Sun River project	10,450,657
								Shoshone project	24,746,535
Total				24,885,753				Cascade	2,713,696
								Carbon	917,281
					Total				34,345,012
Nebraska—3	Mirage Flats project	3,101,835	Sheridan	1,354,262	Washington—4	Columbia Basin project	1,021,302,000	Adams	5,939,741
	Ainsworth unit		Brown	583,914				Franklin	2,930,625
	Franklin unit	(1)	Franklin	2,236,239				Grant	5,291,786
			Webster	2,225,948				Walla Walla	4,581,981
	Superior unit	(1)	Webster	(2)				Benton	1,686,902
			Nuckolls	2,632,660				Kittitas	399,177
	Farewell unit	(1)	Howard	2,023,078				Yakima	1,889,400
			Sherman	1,614,386	Total				22,719,612
	Frenchman unit	(1)	Hitchcock	2,034,196	California—18	Central Valley project	2,398,947,000	Kern	24,004,703
			Red Willow	2,372,816				Tulare	13,975,014
	Meeker-Driftwood unit	(1)	Hitchcock	(2)	Total				37,979,717
			Red Willow	(2)					
	Red Willow unit	(1)	do	(2)	Oklahoma—4	W. C. Austin project	12,309,007	Greer	2,390,173
			Furnas	2,612,690				Jackson	5,142,987
	Cambridge unit	(1)	do	(2)	Total				7,533,160
			Harlan	1,908,809	New Mexico—2	Carlsbad project	9,332,403	Eddy	2,354,816
	Sargent unit	(1)	Custer	4,494,693				DeBaca	223,328
			Valley	1,920,565				Socorro	296,299
	North Platte project	34,777,850	Morrill	1,158,570				Valencia	125,393
			Scotts Bluff	1,996,785				Dona Ana	3,761,079
			Sioux	398,117				Sierra	265,766
Total				30,640,128	Total				7,026,681
					California—16	Central Valley project	2,398,947,000	Fresno	24,270,300
North Dakota—2	Lower Yellowstone project	3,697,842	McKenzie	2,778,785				Merced	3,586,960
	Fort Clark unit	(1)	Mercer	2,117,029	Total				27,857,260
			Oliver	1,135,767	Arizona—2	Gila project	74,247,873	Yuma	5,857,341
	Heart Butte unit	(1)	Grant	2,526,636	Texas—15	Lower Rio Grande project	17,005,299	Cameron	9,651,585
			Morton	3,141,330				do	(2)
	Buford-Trenton project	1,462,617	Williams	4,395,674				Hidalgo	10,971,106
Total				16,095,221	Total				20,622,691
	Buffalo Rapids project	5,255,588	Custer	857,425					
			Dawson	2,805,044					
			Prairie	875,692					
	Huntley project	1,921,208	Yellowstone	2,381,597					
	Intake project	87,513	Dawson	(2)					
	Lower Yellowstone project	3,697,842	Richland	3,197,498					
			Dawson	(2)					
	Milk River project	10,695,450	Blaine	1,331,468					
			Phillips	1,454,691					

<sup>1</sup> Part of the Missouri River Basin project; cost included in Bureau of Reclamation unit estimated or actual costs to June 30, 1968, of \$1,345,662,454.

<sup>2</sup> Included above.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, may I say—and I do it at this point in view of the statement just made—that is one side of the story. The other side of the story is that the sugar producers have made available to the American people ample and dependable supplies of this basic commodity at a cheaper average price than the people of any other nation in history has enjoyed.

To offset those payments processing taxes are levied in a larger amount. The

Government actually makes a profit. So, if you look at the two sides of the coin, you can see it does make sense.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague on the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I think this committee has done an excellent job in revising the budget for the U.S. De-

partment of Agriculture and most especially in restoring the funds for the ACP and the Soil and Water Conservation Service as well as the special milk program.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to indicate my support for this bill because I believe, in general, it does an excellent job of providing funds for several agriculture programs which have proven their worth.

The committee recommended, among other things, that funding for the ACP and special milk programs be restored.

While President Nixon recommended no funding for either of these programs in his budget, I am most happy that the committee restored both to roughly their funding levels of this year.

The committee also has my full support in its recommendation that the Bureau of the Budget release \$20 million which will be put into a special reserve fund for rural electric co-ops.

I am also pleased with the committee recommendation of \$56 million for water and waste disposal grants to be made by the Farmers Home Administration, a recommendation which exceeds the administration request by \$32 million.

Mr. Chairman, with these recommendations, the Appropriations Committee has recognized the importance of conservation and pollution prevention programs, rural development and the need to continue to provide nutritious foods to thousands of our children through school programs.

These programs have proven their worth in the past, they have earned their continuation for the future.

I rise at this time also, to announce that at the proper time I will be offering an amendment to increase by \$1.5 million the funds available under this bill for research in nonchemical methods of controlling pests.

In the past 10 years the threat to our environment presented by the excessive use of pesticides has been broadly recognized. Indications are that the problem will be even more serious 10 years from now, unless we develop alternatives to chemical methods of pest control.

Manufacturer sales of pesticides have been increasing 10 to 15 percent annually. By 1985, they will increase another sixfold.

We all know of the recent studies which found DDT in 584 of 590 samples of fish taken from 45 rivers and lakes across the United States, dieldrin in 75 percent of the lakes and rivers sampled, and heptachlor and/or heptachlor epoxide in 32 percent, and chlordane in 22 percent.

The U.S. Public Health Service has reported the detection of pesticides in 76 of 79 samples of drinking water supplies around the country. At the present time, the USDA reports residues of aldrin and dieldrin are already equivalent to maximum acceptable daily intake recommended by the health organization.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I will be introducing today is based on an exchange of letters between officials at the USDA and Senator GAYLORD NELSON of Wisconsin.

One month after presenting their budget to the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, Department officials wrote to Senator NELSON admitting that, in addition to the funds requested, they could utilize effectively \$4.4 million for research on nonchemical means of pest control, and \$2.6 million for the staffing of pesticide research laboratories.

The additional research funds could be used for such research projects as biological control of citrus fruit insects, the development of nonpersistent pest control methods, including hormonal insecticides, research on biological control of cotton insects, and expanded research on biological control of the cotton boll weevil, including the use of the sterile male technique.

To their great credit, this committee recommends the addition of \$2.3 million for the staffing of these pesticide laboratories. It did not, however, add the \$4.4 million for research programs, and that is why this amendment is here.

Under normal circumstance, I am sure that none of us would find surprising a Government agency admitting that it could use more money. But in light of the extremely slow pace at which the USDA responded to the problem of pesticides and to pesticide use, I think their admission now that they can effectively use these funds is significant.

We need a total commitment to seek nonchemical means of pest control. The report of the Commission on Pesticides and Their Relationship to Environmental Health—Mark report—recently recommended that a "vigorous specific program should be created to bring the 100 most serious insect pest species of the United States under optimal control." These 100 most wanted culprits, the report indicated, require about 80 percent of the insecticides now in use. The American Chemical Society recently reported that the eradication of just three pests—the boll weevil, the bollworm, and the codling moth—could reduce the amount of insecticides applied annually in the United States by an estimated 40 percent.

I represent one of the 15 most agricultural districts in the Congress. I am also vitally interested in conservation. The argument is often made: Don't ban pesticides such as DDT and other chlorinated hydrocarbons until we have the facts, until we know what alternatives are available.

I am saying with this amendment: All right, let us make a greater effort to find these answers.

I would like to find some of these answers to pest control questions before our farmers are backed up against a wall.

This amendment will not go far in that regard, but it will be a signal to the USDA to be more aggressive in their approach to this problem.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, we just heard a statement made about payment limitations, and payment limitations are the quick and easy way of getting headlines today. There are those politicians who would have everyone in urban American areas think that they are going to get food cheaper, and that they are going to have their tax dollars cut down, if only we have payment limitations.

I think frankly that we do need to put payment limitations into effect if for no other reason than to preserve the farm program that is providing this Nation with abundant food at a lower cost than any other country in this world, but I do not believe we should enact payment limitations by following the headline hunters without at least knowing the basic facts.

One of the objections brought up was the fact that there was a large payment to a sugar cane company in a State not my own, Florida, I believe, and another one in the State of California. I represent sugar beet growers, and there is not a single sugar beet grower in my district who would be hurt by the \$20,000 limitation the gentleman is proposing so supposedly I could go along with the amendment. But, it is not fair to intimidate people who are contributing to the economy of the United States by producing cane sugar here in this country—and by limiting cane payments the entire sugar program would be in jeopardy.

I have in my hand a GAO report, "Comptroller General's Report to the Congress," it is Report No. B-118622, and it is dated September 23, 1969. It says: The General Accounting Office (GAO) undertook this review to determine why domestic sugar producers were not marketing the amount of sugar authorized by the act, since it appeared that substantial benefits—

And these are their words— including a beneficial effect on the U.S. balance-of-payments position, were available if domestic sugar producers marketed sugar to the extent of their authorized quotas.

They go on to their findings and they say: GAO believes that the continuing severity of the U.S. balance-of-payments situation should be a major consideration in allocating continuing, long-term deficits.

They go on to say further: In view of the significant benefits which would accrue to the domestic sugar industry and the beneficial effect on the U.S. balance-of-payments position through a reduction in the outflow of dollars, GAO—

And obviously, this is a noninvolved group— GAO recommends that the Congress in its extension of the legislation—which expires on December 31, 1971—consider modification of the deficit allocation provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to allocate continuing, long-term deficits of a domestic area to other domestic areas rather than to foreign countries.

Here the General Accounting Office finds that it is in the taxpayers' best interest for us to produce more of our sugar here because of the favorable effect on the balance of payments and reduction of the outflow of dollars.

The sugar act is not a money consuming program—it is a money earning program. I think in fairness this side of the picture should be brought out in the debate instead of just dragging these big payments through the press in order to gain headlines.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I am glad to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly agree with my dear friend, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS). The gentleman will recall that last year we prevailed upon the House to exclude sugar from



the limitation on subsidy payments. We appealed to the House on the basis that the sugar program is entirely different from programs covering wheat, cotton, feed grains, and other crops. We pointed to the fact that while on the one hand subsidy payments are made to those who do not grow anything, on the other hand, in the case of sugar, compliance payments, not subsidies, are paid to sugar growers out of a special tax imposed on sugar growers alone for sugar grown and processed. By payment of this processing tax the sugar industry has paid into the Federal Treasury in excess of \$500 million over and above the cost of the program since 1948 when the Sugar Act was first enacted.

To treat sugar on the same basis as other agricultural commodities, therefore, would be doing a grave injustice to the sugar producers. As the gentleman from North Dakota has well pointed out, the program has been of benefit to the taxpayers. It has not cost him a penny and he has in fact profited from the Sugar Act, which is the most effective agricultural measure ever enacted by Congress. The consumer too has benefited. While in Russia consumers pay as much as 50 cents a pound for sugar, here in the United States the consumer has paid a stable price of about 12 cents a pound ever since the Sugar Act was enacted.

Prior to the enactment of the Sugar Act, the price of sugar was jumping from 10 cents up to \$1 a pound, dependent upon the supply. But since the Sugar Act was enacted, the consumer in America has enjoyed a stable and most reasonable price of any country in the world.

The amendment which the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) proposes to offer includes a limitation on sugar compliance payments. It carries with it an injustice which should not be allowed by this House.

I voted against the Conte amendment last year, even though it exempted sugar from its limitation provision. I was strongly of the belief then that it would have ruined an agricultural program which has maintained stability in our most essential agricultural industry. I am still of that belief.

The Findley amendment would go further and destroy an even more successful program—the Sugar Act. I therefore urge the defeat of the amendment which the gentleman of Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) proposes.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the contribution of my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Hawaii.

I think that in summation, we want to point out that the sugar program is a program from which the Government makes a profit and, secondly, the consumer of sugar in this country gets his or her sugar at a cheaper price than the average price paid by sugar consumers in other countries.

Let me again make the record explicitly clear, because there will be those who will dig out the so-called world price of sugar and say that it is 3 cents or 4 cents.

The so-called world price of sugar is

not the price that most people pay. The world price is a distress price for dumped sugar that has no home. Virtually 95 percent of sugar that moves in world trade moves under agreements and the cost to the average consumer wherever they are, in Russia as my colleague suggested, or in Europe or in South America, is higher than it is here in the United States.

I would hope that in the discussion of payment limitation we do not go off the deep end and begin talking about programs without considering all the facts that are involved in these specific programs.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL), a member of the committee.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 17923. Chairman WHITTEN and his subcommittee have done an outstanding job in fashioning a bill that is responsive to the changing needs of agriculture and at the same time giving full weight to the increasing responsibility placed upon the Department of Agriculture to provide additional services for the entire population.

As pointed out in the committee report, the bill appropriately could be termed "an appropriation for protection of the public health," or "for the protection of industry and labor." It could be called the "Rural Development Act of 1971," or "the antipopulation bill." It provides funds for all of the responsibilities the Congress has assigned to the Department.

Appropriate emphasis is placed by the committee on the essential nature of agriculture in the economy of our Nation and history's lesson that the seeds of the Great Depression were sown by the failure of our Government to maintain farm exports and the farmers' purchasing power.

It is particularly heartening to note the recognition given in the bill to the need for additional personnel within the Department to handle the increase in workload brought about by greatly expanded programs. Funds are provided for an additional 2,533 employees to carry out the expanded programs of meat and poultry inspection, to staff increased efforts to alleviate hunger and malnutrition through food distribution undertakings, to meet vital research needs, soil conservation programs, and to handle greatly enlarged responsibilities of the Farmers Home Administration.

The Farmers Home Administration would receive the largest number of additional positions, 903, with meat and poultry inspection and related consumer protection programs close behind at 749.

Earlier this year, I provided Chairman WHITTEN's subcommittee with factual information about the large increase in workload since 1965 of a Farmers Home Administration office in my district. In that year the office processed about 150 applications for loan assistance with only three staff members. In 1969, the caseload had risen to 300, with only an additional part-time employee. This doubling of the work occurred due to congressional expansion of programs for rural housing, water and sewer facilities in

rural areas, and such innovations as self-help housing for low-income residents.

Since 1960, FHA's program levels have increased 624 percent; loans outstanding have increased 472 percent, and collections have risen 248 percent. To assure the proper functioning of this agency, which is a principal arm of the Federal Government in dealing with the problems of rural America, it is essential that adequate administration and technical services be provided.

Mr. Chairman, this is a carefully developed bill, designed to meet the needs of our rural population and urban residents who depend upon the services we have assigned to the Department of Agriculture. I urge its approval.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague from Minnesota such time as he may desire.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the Committee on Appropriations for the step they are taking today to assure every child from a household with an income below the poverty level a free or reduced-price lunch. With House approval of committee action we will be well on the way toward achieving our goal of ending hunger and malnutrition in this country.

Less than 1 month ago, the President signed H.R. 515, a bill amending and improving child feeding programs conducted under the National School Lunch Act and Child Nutrition Act. That act was initiated by this House and sponsored jointly by myself and my colleague from Kentucky, the distinguished chairman of our Committee on Education and Labor, CARL PERKINS. One of its major provisions calls upon the Secretary of Agriculture to establish national standards for the poverty level, which shall be used by all school districts that serve school lunch with the aid of Federal cash or commodities to determine who is eligible for a free or reduced-price lunch. Application for eligibility is to consist of a simple certification of income level by the child's parents or guardian.

Now the time has come to make sure there are sufficient funds available to enable school districts to meet the demand for these free and reduced-price meals. Such meals must be served to all children from farm households of four with incomes of less than \$3,200 and nonfarm households of four with incomes of less than \$3,800. Exactly how many children that will cover neither we nor the administration are sure, but we believe that the cost will far exceed the \$200 million sought by the administration for this portion of the school lunch program.

Last May, the gentleman from Kentucky and I introduced legislation to secure an additional \$100 million to support the free and reduced-price lunch program, and the House backed us almost unanimously. The Senate insisted on providing only \$30 million. We compromised to be sure of obtaining that amount in time to help schools that were facing a funding emergency. To do the job contemplated by our authorizing legislation is going to require an indefinite sum. Nobody can project this far in advance of the start of the school year the ultimate costs. Therefore, the ap-

proach taken by the Appropriations Committee today is the best possible one at this juncture.

I commend the committee in its report on this bill for their recognition of the problem and their recommendations:

The Administration has not had time to provide estimates on which the Committee can act, and funds provided, though extensive, are not specifically based on these amended provisions. The Committee recognizes their far-reaching effect and, where necessary, authorizes the administration of the program at a quarterly rate in excess of the annual amounts recommended in this bill until such time as the program estimates can be reviewed in connection with the first supplemental.

Mr. Chairman, that action means that the Congress is releasing both the administration and local school governments to do their utmost to fulfill our intent in passing the authorizing legislation. As the President's adviser on nutrition, Dr. John Mayer of Harvard, said last Christmas Eve:

To feed needy children, it will cost what it will cost.

That is the only way to implement our bill, to seek out every needy child and place lunch before him rather than awaiting funds before attempting to perform this outreach task. I congratulate the committee on the leeway and on the impetus it has given in its bill.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to imagine a more ill-timed amendment than that offered by the gentleman from Illinois. It can result only in mischief. It would seem to apply to the combination of all payments formulated or made by the Department of Agriculture for the 1971 crop year programs. Obviously, there could be no payments for crops for which no legislative authorization exists. Apparently, as of the present legislative situation, it would apply only to extra-long-staple cotton and sugar. It would apply to wheat certificate payments, provided the wheat program passed by the Congress in 1962 was approved by farmers in a referendum to be held later this summer. However, the result of the referendum held in 1963 indicates that farmers would not approve this program by the necessary two-thirds majority and there would be no authority for making wheat certificate payments.

Let me emphasize that at present there is no legislative authority for making any payments for the 1971 crops of upland cotton, wool, and feed grains. It would appear that this amendment is intended to apply to substantive law that has not yet even been approved by the Congress. At best, this would appear to be a dubious and counter-productive procedure for this House. I do not see how it could do anything but complicate the problem of passing sound farm legislation to replace that expiring with the 1965 act. This issue has been before the House several times before, accompanied by voluminous statistics to show the number of payees that would have been affected in the past year had such a limitation been in effect and the amount

of dollars that would have been saved. Despite all this, the issue is one that is still not fully resolved in the Agriculture Committee.

The position of the Department of Agriculture, as set out today, is as follows:

It is our feeling that consideration of all limitations at this time is premature in view of the likelihood that new farm legislation will be before you soon. As we stated to you last year when this matter was under consideration, we feel strongly that payment limits could be handled on a sound basis as a part of a total legislative program. To enact a limit before the total program is known runs the risk of creating great confusion and uncertainty and perhaps unsound legislation.

It is our strong view that any limits established should be on the basis of individual crops and not on a total farm basis because individual crops are harvested at different times during the year and payments are made at different times. The application of a total farm limit becomes administratively very difficult. However, the administrative difficulty is not the most important objection. The most important one is the difficulty that would be created for individual farmers to whom the individual limits might apply. Amounts of some payments would not be known until after the cropping season and it would, therefore, be almost impossible for a farmer to properly apportion his acreages to take full advantage of the commodity program without penalty.

It is also our strong conviction that any limitation on payments should be based on a sliding scale rather than a specific dollar limit.

We are now beginning to grasp some of the complexities and hope soon we will be able to share our findings and views with our colleagues. At this time, let me point out a few outstanding examples of the confusion surrounding this issue. All of us implicitly or explicitly tend to think in terms of one farmer corresponding to one farm and one crop. This is not the situation at all. For example, only about 5 percent of the feed grain payments of \$20,000 or more go to farmers who grow no wheat, cotton, or wool. In fact, a limitation of this size applied to all commodity programs combined would drive about one-fifth of the feed grain cooperating acreage in Texas outside of the program. Participating acreage in California and Arizona would drop about one-half and three-fourths, respectively. There would thus be no effective feed grain program in these States. This obviously would mean low corn prices in Illinois or else higher diversion at additional cost in the other feed grain areas.

An even more important complication, however, is not the combinations of various crops, but rather the combinations of multiple producers on one farm combined with the fact that most large producers have some interest in a crop on more than one farm. These aspects are still being studied by the Agriculture Committee and the Department of Agriculture. There is some evidence that the assumed one to one correspondence between a farm and a payee under these programs is typical of only one-fifth to one-third of the situations that would be affected by such a payment limitation. This may be another way of saying that perhaps the advocates of this limitation may be only 20-percent correct in their

analysis of the results thereof. Certainly, the House should not express itself again on this issue until it has been acted on by the appropriate committee and supported by a committee report. This is especially true since if we resist dubious and harmful prejudgments, prospects are good that such a proposition adequately studied and supported will very soon be put before the House.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, before making my speech, I want to ask the gentleman from Mississippi, the chairman of the committee, my good friend, Mr. WHITTEN, a question. I am referring to section 508 on page 39, to which I was going to offer an amendment on farm subsidy payments. I will explain later what I was going to do on this, but would the gentleman agree with me that this section here will not carry over to June 30, 1971?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I say to my colleague that it would do so, but if the gentleman will bear with me and if the gentleman will yield to me, I will yield him additional time, and I will explain what is involved in this.

Having handled this in other years and having faced other amendments which would change substantive law, at least we had the law before us, and it was my belief as chairman of the subcommittee, concurred in by the Members I have had a chance to talk to, that with the farm legislation not even reported as yet to the House and not passed by the Congress, and since it will have to be renewed this year, it was our belief that we, as the Appropriations Committee, and as an arm of the House, should not in advance by an appropriation bill try to tie the hands of the Congress as well as that of the committee in whatever farm legislation we wish to pass, so we wrote the provision—I wrote it frankly—strictly on the basis that whatever we do here should not tie the hands of the Congress itself in substantive law.

I do think my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, may have misconstrued this—at least, he construes it differently from what I do, so I may explain it the way I construe it. I am reading section 508:

No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used to change any price support program payment or payments, or commodity loan or loans in any manner, the effect of which is to modify substantive law.

So any substantive law that we may pass would stand on its own and would not find itself modified by something we passed before that substantive legislation was passed by the House. So what this does is maintain the status quo of any law we may hereafter pass. That was the intent. The sole purpose was to keep us from trying to dictate legislation against desires of the committee.

If, when we get to section 508, we have not amended in advance the legislation that has not yet been passed, I would have no objection personally to recommending to the subcommittee that



we delete it on the ground that we no longer need it.

Mr. CONTE. I think that is a fair statement by the gentleman from Mississippi, and I appreciate it, because I understand that an amendment to limit farm subsidies will be offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

As the author of the amendment for a \$20,000 payment limitation, the only one that has ever passed this House, which I offered on two different occasions, which was passed by this House on roll calls on two different occasions, The Members can realize how deeply interested I am in this subject matter. I have fought long and hard for this reform.

I certainly would prefer that we avoid the battle today.

A year ago my amendment to limit subsidies passed by an 82-vote margin, a net gain of 12 votes over the margin of victory in 1968. Nevertheless, the other body failed to go along.

This year I am convinced that the chances for success in the other body are excellent. I would not want to jeopardize those chances today by a vote that reflects less than the total support existing here in the House.

A year ago, when my amendment to the 1970 appropriation bill was under discussion, opponents said that the place to consider such an amendment was on the authorizing legislation. We were able to counter that objection by noting that a farm bill was not expected for another year. We cannot make that argument today, for, despite the present logjam in the House Agriculture Committee, I am convinced that sooner or later, perhaps within a month, we will have a farm bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Sooner or later, perhaps within a month, we will have a farm bill. Then will be the most appropriate time to enact a comprehensive amendment which limits subsidies, and does so within maximum effect.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is worth noting that progress has been made toward adopting this reform not only as reflected in public opinion polls, but in the actions and statements of Agriculture Secretary Clifford M. Hardin as well. A few months ago the Secretary unveiled a proposal for a payment limitation on a sliding scale that would permit payments up to \$110,000 per crop to a producer. While I consider that level ridiculously high, and have so advised the Secretary, it is nonetheless significant that for the first time a Secretary of Agriculture has come out for a subsidy ceiling.

More recently, Assistant Secretary Clarence D. Palmby reportedly indicated to the House Agriculture Committee that the Department was prepared to support a substantially lower ceiling.

So there has indeed been some progress, Mr. Chairman.

Now I am not under any illusion that the House Agriculture Committee is likely to report a bill with a payment limitation low enough to produce the sav-

ings I consider essential. But I am prepared to give them that chance.

The gentleman from Illinois knows, and I know that this is not the proper place. We have talked about it. I want to lay my cards on the table with him, because I talked to him on Thursday, and told him I thought this was not the proper place. I tried to reach him in Illinois on Friday, to tell him this was not the proper place.

What good is a limitation if we allow the gigantic corporate farmers, the people who have large entities, to subdivide their properties and get around the law? Then we do not save the taxpayers anything.

Surely, we could grab a headline for back home, but what will we have done to save the taxpayers any money? That is what I am interested in.

My \$10,000 per crop limitation would put firm, hard language in there to prevent them from subdividing, and would save the taxpayers up to \$338 million a year.

Let me state something else. The gentleman from Illinois and I and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], met with an ad hoc committee of the Committee on Agriculture, a very fine group of people, including Mrs. MAY, Mr. KLEPPE, Mr. PURCELL, and several others. We hammered away at this thing, trying to come out to a compromise figure. We had reached an informal agreement where we had a compromise figure which would have saved the taxpayers millions. They were going to bring that back to the Committee on Agriculture, to get a vote from them. Of course, we all know the rest of the story. That thing blew up.

As I have said repeatedly, an agriculture bill will come to the floor of the House one way or the other, and what if they don't pass a farm bill out of committee, the experts tell me that if it does expire, we do not have to worry about limitations any longer aside from sugar, because then the whole payment program goes out the window and they come back with a loan program.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. I would briefly like to say to the gentleman I commend him for stating the true facts of what is going on in an attempt to come up with a reasonable and livable solution on ceiling payments. We have been very grateful to the gentleman from Massachusetts, and the gentleman from Illinois for meeting with our bipartisan ad hoc committee appointed by the chairman of the full Committee on Agriculture really to join this issue in a wise way based on the facts and the desires of the House. That is why I am so grateful that he spelled this out to show how serious a mistake we would make if we attempt to legislate at this time in the wrong area when there is such a very good chance that we are going to be able to do it in the right way.

I thank the gentleman for making this clear.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I commend the gentleman for bringing this point out and describing the amendment as it has been proposed in previous years as completely unworkable. Land operated by a person or corporation can be divided and subdivided and I defy anybody to come up with any language that will avoid getting around such a limitation when on an appropriation bill. It seems to me the best way to apply a limitation really, if you want a limitation, is to provide that the Secretary shall limit the total payments to a percentage of the value of the crop, and then it is up to him by regulation which can be changed as necessary to do the job.

So, Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for bringing out how unworkable the language is that can be attached under our rules to an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Massachusetts 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I think we can come up with language and some real tight language here, but we just cannot do it in an appropriation bill, because we would be legislating on an appropriation bill. So this is a very hard pill for me to swallow, because I have carried the fight myself here a number of times. But unfortunately I lost it in the Senate. If we do win on the legislative bill—and I am sure that we will win on it next year—we will have an appropriation bill coming up and we will carry the fight on there. But we do have a legislative bill which is on the threshold of coming out, that is the best bill to tack on my amendment.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. QUIE. I commend the gentleman for the position he has taken on the appropriation bill. I would also be strongly in favor of a limitation of payments in this bill if we did not have an authorizing bill coming up very soon. Even though the Committee on Agriculture is in a rather dismal position on the bill, I am sure that they will get a bill out, and I am confident that they will. I am also confident that they will come out with a limitation of payments. It takes a great deal of study to bring an acceptable limitation of payments here. It is interesting on the sugar bill that we had a limitation for a long time in the sugar act and we should have something further on other commodities as well, but the only way that we can do it really is in an authorization bill. We have tried it previously—and I supported it—in appropriation bills. This is the last thing that we can do. We did not have any other means at that time, but this time I am confident we will do it in the authorization bill and it will be a much better job and it will work.

I commend the gentleman, and I am willing to try to impose limitations in

an authorization bill, but I am unwilling to impose them in this appropriation bill.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman very much; again I want it clearly understood that if we do not prevail with a payment limitation on the legislative farm bill, I will be back year after year on the agricultural appropriation bill.

Thank you.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) desires a few extra minutes, so I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I know the time is getting on, but I think we all want to keep the facts straight. This is the only bill which will be considered by this body this year through which a limitation on sugar payments can be effected. It is the only bill through which a limitation on payments for the production of long-staple could be effected.

Now, it may well be that the limitation I have proposed is too low to really suit some of the Members of this body and I recognize that fact. But from my standpoint, I think it is plenty high. It is \$20,000 per person per commodity. If the Committee on Agriculture in its wisdom should say we want to establish a sliding scale ranging from \$10,000 to \$20,000 or \$30,000, why not? But, at least, this gives the House some means of giving the Committee on Agriculture some idea as to the outer limits that it can expect to get through this Congress when and if this legislative bill may come down the track. We have had 14 months within which to come up with a farm bill. These confident forecasts that we will have a legislative bill this year are a little bit hard for me to have confidence in. We have had 14 months which has been described as nearly twice the gestation period. So, I think we should face the problem here today and write into this appropriation bill a reasonable top limit on the number of dollars that any farmer can get under any programs which may be authorized for the 1971 crop.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if it is not true that if there is no action this year on an authorization bill for agriculture, we will revert back to the old law on which there will be no payments on any commodities other than sugar. There will be no payments to limit, therefore, there will not be any effect to the amendment which the gentleman proposes to offer.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the way to get at this question is through the authorization bill which will be up this year. With reference to sugar, if we want a greater limitation, we will have to wait until next year.

Mr. FINDLEY. A way to get at the legislative bill is by means of a limitation on the appropriation bill. The limitation on payments on this appropriation bill would definitely be effective for the two commodities I did list, sugar and long-staple cotton.

Mr. QUIE. I think the way in which

to work with the authorization committee is to work in good faith with them. We do not need to use this means again to get across to them our views as to what the limitation should be. The Committee on Agriculture members are reasonable people and I think we ought to give them an opportunity to add to the authorization the type of limitation we will accept.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a few points about the bill now under consideration. In particular, I would like to commend the committee for its recognition of the dire need in this country for improved water and waste disposal facilities in small communities.

As shown on page 63 of the committee report, the bill as it now stands includes a total of \$56 million for rural water and waste disposal grants, an increase of \$32 million above the budget request. This is a significant increase, and demonstrates that the committee recognizes the urgency of the needs of our smaller communities.

Nevertheless, as the committee itself points out, 34,763 small communities have been reported as being without public water systems and 44,567 that do not have adequate waste disposal facilities. This would mean that if all the necessary projects could be funded out of this appropriation, only slightly more than \$700 of direct grant money, on average, could be made available for each project. Clearly, not every one of these problems could be solved as a result of any single appropriation, nor would we be sensible in attempting any such feat. Still, while this example is oversimplified, the figures indicate something of the magnitude of the problems faced by communities of less than 5,500 population. I sincerely hope that in the near future our overall budgetary situation will permit a more fully adequate level of funding for these programs.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, there is a strong undercurrent moving through this country that is truly a minority movement. A special, select 5 percent of our people are reaching the boiling point and we may have a major crisis on our hands shortly.

Mr. Chairman, I refer to the farmers, the 5 percent who are feeding the other 95 percent of the United States—and a portion of the entire world. If this Congress does not reverse the trend to eliminate, to cut back, to reduce the present farm programs, then we will be guilty of fostering a revolt among the Nation's food producers. This revolt carries a real potential for disaster that would make the students, the ghetto, and the environment crusaders take a back seat.

Mr. Chairman, there are few hercs left in the field of farm legislation. Too often, the rural-oriented, or even rural-interested, Members will be content to mumble that the "city boys" in Congress have the votes now and they are hurting the farm programs.

Frankly, the farmer is growing weary of this line of reasoning. I do not know what it will take—perhaps a massive education program or a massive attack against the prejudices of the big city

boys—to convince the city dwellers of the very vital impact agriculture has not only at the dinner table, but at the economic tables. Perhaps it is time that the rural legislators drop back to basic politics and barter and trade and finesse to get adequate farm legislation on the books.

I think the time has come to stand and fight. For too many years, the farm programs have been eroded into hollow shells of what should be the laws governing the use of our land.

Somehow or other the farmer is given the image of one who grows fat for not growing food. That is a false connotation. The farmer has gotten less for his crops each year. His costs have steadily risen. His profits have gone from bad to worse. Today, his profit is razor thin. If we do not pass legislation that will help the farmer, we will discourage this great group of Americans to continue the honorable pursuits of agriculture—the very trade that started this country. If we pass restrictive legislation we are apt to start a revolution of protest that will become bitter and even dangerous.

Mr. Chairman, the farmer has also had it up to here. The breaking point is near. We must help the farmer—not drive him out of business. We cannot reduce his profits one bit more. The Congress had better listen. A revolt is in the making if we hurt the farmer any more by unfair legislation.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, the most recent Department of Labor statistics shows that the cost of living soared more than 6 percent during the last year. The American people are greatly apprehensive as to where this inflationary spiral is leading us, and it is absolutely essential that we halt this assault on the integrity, stability, and purchasing power of the dollar.

It is generally agreed that one of the first steps to remedy this grave situation is to eliminate nonessential Federal spending. In my view, one of the first programs which should be halted is the Federal welfare program for wealthy farmers.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 24 and 26, 1970, there is a listing of some 7,800 farm operators who received \$25,000 or more for crop support programs in 1969.

According to this report in the RECORD, seven companies were paid in excess of \$1 million, with the highest payment, \$4,370,657, going to the J. G. Boswell Co., of Corcoran, Calif.

Others receiving substantial payments under the program were the States of Montana and Washington, and State prisons in Arizona, Louisiana, and Texas. The Southern National Bank of Lumberton, N.C., was paid \$224,254, and two other North Carolina banks received in excess of \$58,000 each. The First National Bank of Dumas, Tex., was given \$70,000 under the program.

This legislation was originally intended to help our small family farmers. However, we now find that money urgently needed for a number of critical farm and urban programs is being diverted to those who need no Federal farm assistance whatsoever.



I have strongly opposed this program during the last 2 years, and it is even more imperative today that we end this gigantic giveaway to wealthy landowners. The report in the RECORD, previously referred to, which lists nearly 8,000 farm operators who share a total bonanza of \$366.7 million, is a tragic testimonial to the bankruptcy of our farm program.

This program is nothing short of highway robbery of our taxpayers. It is taking the hard-earned money from the people of New York, who are burdened with perhaps the highest State and local taxes in the Nation, and donating these funds to wealthy farm operators who have no need for this totally unwarranted subsidy.

My constituents will never be convinced that the Standard Oil Co. of Oil-dale, Calif., is a poor farmer. Yet, the report in the RECORD shows that this company received a subsidy of \$127,995 in 1969.

To restore confidence in the dollar, and to restore confidence in the wisdom of our legislative process, it is imperative that this program be immediately terminated.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am voting for this bill because its expenditures have been legally authorized and the money must be forthcoming. I did support the amendment to limit farm subsidy payments for any one producer to \$20,000.

In voicing my support for this amendment, I felt that I fairly stated the concern of my constituents that Congress must realign Federal expenditures to reflect domestic priorities. Pouring money into this program which cost American taxpayers over \$659 million last year weakens taxpayer confidence in governmental spending objectives and retards progress toward achieving lasting solutions to critical national problems.

In 1969, one payee under this program received \$4,370,657 as a subsidy payment, and approximately 8,000 farmers received \$25,000 or more each in payments. It is interesting to note that while the committee report has indicated from year to year that the number of farmers is constantly decreasing, in 1969 the number of farmers who received \$25,000 or more in subsidy payments actually increased by more than 1,800 over 1968.

Last week when the House was considering H.R. 17803, to increase the public debt ceiling, I said that I was supporting the bill because raising the public debt limit is to some extent a formality, while the real place to reduce obligations is in the authorizing bills as they come to the floor.

I have supported cutbacks in military and space appropriations when I felt that these programs were receiving a disproportionate share of Federal funds and I think that the farm subsidy program similarly qualifies for sharp paring.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation and wish to take this opportunity to commend the committee on its recommendations. In particular, I have the strongest praise for Mr. WHITTEN, the subcommittee chairman, for his wisdom and judgment in

bringing before us a bill vital to every American. Without a sound agricultural program, and without adequate appropriations therefor, we would lack sufficient food, clothing, and shelter.

I was impressed by the hearings on this bill wherein Mr. WHITTEN brought out that American consumers spend 17 percent of their income on food, while 28 percent is spent in England and 50 percent in Russia. Surely this points up the efficiency of American agriculture and the need to keep it strong. Agriculture is truly the backbone of our Nation's economy and the orderly production and distribution of food and fiber are basic to our well-being.

The aspects of this bill have been eloquently explained and justified by Mr. WHITTEN and other distinguished members of the committee. Nevertheless, I wish to comment on a few items.

#### THE FIRE ANT MENACE

I am most pleased that the committee has recommended an increase of \$2,000,000 to step up the cooperative effort to eradicate the imported fire ant. As I have said many times, this pest has caused more damage to Mississippi agriculture than any pest since the boll weevil. These added funds, with matching State and local funds, should provide for an effective eradication program in the affected States.

#### EXTENSION SERVICE

The Extension Service performs vital functions through its programs of education, demonstrations, nutrition training, and 4-H Club work. The committee's recommendation for increased funds for these important services will pay large dividends in the future.

#### SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

The conservation of our soil and water resources is an economic necessity. While I personally would like to see additional funds for conservation, I recognize that we have overall budgetary problems and must do everything possible to have a balanced budget. However, I would stress that water and soil conservation prevents pollution and if we had not had this program over the years, the pollution problems of this Nation would be many, many times greater. The watershed improvement programs have made immense contributions to the health and welfare of our citizens.

#### AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

The ASCS has played a leading role in preventing pollution of our environment. The curtailment of soil erosion, the improvement of soil fertility, the development of forest resources—and other practices—all enhance our opportunity to preserve our natural surroundings.

#### FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

The FHA is critically involved with successful farming. Operating loans, housing loans, ownership loans, emergency loans, soil and water conservation loans, watershed and flood prevention loans, grants and loans for water and sewer systems, and other functions, are all important to maintaining a healthy national economy.

Mr. Chairman, time does not permit extensive comment on all of the agen-

cies and activities covered by this appropriation bill. I have covered only a few subjects among the important many. Food stamps, the special school milk program, rural electrification and telephone loans, Federal crop insurance, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Farm Credit Administration, meat and poultry inspection, Consumer and Marketing Service, Cooperative State Research, statistical reporting, and other equally important functions, are funded in this bill.

There has been a great deal of undeserved criticism of our agricultural programs and policies. As one who was born and raised on a farm and who has vivid memories of depressed farm prices, rampant unemployment, and widespread poverty, I firmly believe this bill is a sound economic investment, which will prohibit such from happening again.

It is not difficult to recall that I had little enthusiasm in the 1930's for my entire family to work 10 to 12 hours a day and sell cabbage for \$6 a ton, or 3 pounds for a penny. We sold tomatoes for less than 1 cent a pound; cotton brought 8 cents a pound.

To repeat, Mr. Chairman, this bill is a sound economic investment. Again, I commend Mr. WHITTEN for bringing to the floor a reasonable appropriation measure of benefit to all Americans.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa which would increase the appropriation for rural water and waste disposal grants from \$56 million to \$100 million. It is seldom that I ever take the floor to applaud any proposal for increasing spending, but this amendment proposes to do something about one of our Nation's top priorities.

Even without this amendment, the Committee on Appropriations had done the best they felt they could do, I am sure, because they had increased the appropriation for rural water and waste disposal grants by quite a considerable sum to the recommendation that \$56 million be made available in fiscal 1971.

It seems to me we should pause for a moment to recall that the administration budget for this purpose for fiscal year 1970 was \$46 million. For fiscal year 1971 the administration proposed an entirely and altogether inadequate figure of \$24 million. Our Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee demonstrated recognition of one of our greatest present-day problems by increasing that figure to \$56 million.

However, the gentleman from Iowa, a member of the full Appropriations Committee, took a much more realistic view of the need in rural America to improve water systems and waste disposal units, when he proposed to add \$44 million or increase the appropriation for fiscal 1971 from \$56 million to \$100 million.

Mr. Chairman, on April 21, many people in America celebrated what was called Earth Day. There was an effort to focus attention on the problems surrounding ecology. There was an emphasis on the necessity for environmental cleanup. We were told at that time that there is no more urgent necessity or

higher priority than the effort to clean up our environment. That is what this amendment is all about, because the funds under this section of H.R. 17923 are to provide money for the FHA to make grants for rural water and waste disposal purposes, for those communities under 5,500 population. Approximately 30,000 rural communities in this Nation do not have adequate water systems; 45,000 are without sewer systems. In almost all instances these communities cannot even consider the installation of such systems without the supplement of Federal funds for these purposes.

All of those who participated in the celebration of our first Earth Day should now support this amendment. Facts are that money for pollution control under Housing and Urban Development has not been simply increased or doubled but has been substantially trebled. Why is it, then, that the rural areas should be downgraded and those places under 5,500 population should be shortchanged?

We hear a lot about the concept of rural revitalization, which means the effort to prevent further migration of our population from the rural areas to our big cities. The only way that is going to be accomplished will be to make life in the rural areas and our smaller towns and cities more attractive as well as more healthful. That the Farmers Home Administration has been doing, but it has been woefully underfunded. Perhaps the one overriding problem in America today, of what appears to be long-range duration, is the rural-urban imbalance. That can only be corrected by trying to located light industry in our farming communities, in order that as the size of farms increases and fewer farmers are needed, they will locate in our small towns and smaller cities rather than migrating to big cities to further compound the almost insoluble problems faced today in administration of our larger cities.

Mr. Chairman, President Nixon's Task Force on Rural Development recently made about 30 recommendations. Foremost among these recommendations was a call for adequate funding for rural water and sewer construction. It was most unusual that the President approved these recommendations, and yet the budget for water and waste disposal grants was reduced about 50 percent from the \$46 million budget figure of fiscal 1970 to the \$24 million budget figure of fiscal 1971.

I know members of the Appropriations Committee may oppose this increase to \$100 million, and there may be some suggestions that there is not adequate planning already in existence to use these increased funds. I do not know the situation in other congressional districts, but in my own there are literally dozens of applications, as many as two, three, or four in each of our 12 counties, that are standing in line with all planning completed waiting for grants, both from the unincorporated areas and in those communities of under 5,500 population.

This amendment should be adopted. No Member should find it distasteful to support this amendment. All of those who spoke so strongly for an environmental cleanup on Earth Day should

support it. All of those who have advocated the concept of rural revitalization should support this amendment. Most of all, even those who say they are for economy can support this amendment, because the amount spent on rural water supply districts and small town sewer plants is not really money spent, but money invested in one of the highest priority projects in America today.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes; namely:*

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 160]

Abernethy	Frelinghuysen	Philbin
Addabbo	Frey	Pollock
Anderson,	Gaydos	Powell
Tenn.	Gilbert	Preyer, N.C.
Ashbrook	Hansen, Wash.	Price, Ill.
Ayres	Hébert	Pucinski
Biaggi	Hollifield	Reid, N.Y.
Bray	Hungate	Reuss
Brown, Calif.	Keith	Rivers
Buchanan	Kirwan	Rooney, N.Y.
Carey	Kuykendall	Rosenthal
Celler	McCarthy	Roudebush
Clark	McMillan	Sandman
Clay	Macdonald,	Scheuer
Corbett	Mass.	Schwengel
Corman	Meskill	Springer
Coughlin	Miller, Calif.	Stratton
Cowder	Morse	Taft
Daddario	Murphy, N.Y.	Waggonner
Dawson	Nichols	Whitehurst
Downing	Olsen	Wilson, Bob
Dulski	O'Neill, Mass.	Wilson,
Esch	Ottinger	Charles H.
Fisher	Passman	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. WRIGHT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 17923, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 361 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose the Clerk had begun to read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk will resume the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Research: For research and demonstrations on the production and utilization of agricultural products; agricultural marketing and distribution, not otherwise pro-

vided for; home economics or nutrition and consumer use of agricultural and associated products; and related research and services; and for acquisition of land by donation, exchange, or purchase at a nominal cost not to exceed \$100; \$146,143,200, and in addition not to exceed \$15,000,000 from funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, pursuant to Public Law 88-250 shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation, except that \$1,000,000 of the foregoing amount shall be available for matching with funds utilized for research under Public Law 89-502, and \$1,500,000 shall remain available until expended for plans, construction, and improvement of facilities without regard to limitations contained herein: *Provided*, That the limitations contained herein shall not apply to replacement of buildings needed to carry out the Act of April 24, 1948 (21 U.S.C. 113a).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY: on page 3, line 14, after "a nominal cost not to exceed \$100;" strike out "\$146,143,200," and insert "\$147,643,200".

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, knowing that this House is used to dealing with billions of dollars, I am almost embarrassed to bring this small item to the attention of the House, but on behalf of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the gentleman from California (Mr. McCloskey), and myself, I am introducing at this time an amendment to increase by \$1.5 million the funds available under this bill for research in the nonchemical control of pests. As I stated previously, this amendment is based on an exchange of letters between Department of Agriculture officials and Senator GAYLORD NELSON, of Wisconsin, during the past year.

In that correspondence Department officials admitted that "additional funds for this research could be utilized effectively" in fiscal year 1971, including \$4,420,000 for research on nonchemical means of pest control and \$2,620,000 for the initial staffing of pesticide research laboratories. The committee wisely agreed to the staffing of laboratories, but did not agree to the funds for added research projects, and that is why this amendment is here.

Included in the \$4.4 million increase, which they said could be effectively utilized for nonpesticidal research, the Department included the following:

Accelerating research and development related to the mass rearing of insects for biological control programs, \$2.15 million;

Expanded research on biological control of cotton boll weevil, \$1.5 million;

Research on biological control of citrus fruits insects, \$150,000;

Research on biological control of tropical fruit flies, \$150,000;

Development on nonpersistent pest control methods, including hormonal insecticides, \$150,000;

Research on biological control of grain sorghum insects, \$100,000;

Research on biological control of cotton insects, \$100,000;

Research on biological control of ar-



throphod vectors of equine piroplasmosis, \$60,000—tickets on horses; and

Research on biological control of aquatic weeds using insects, \$60,000.

Mr. Chairman, nonchemical methods have shown much promise of success.

Methods such as insect sterilization, the method used so successfully to control the screwworm fly has saved livestock producers an estimated \$120 million.

Light and soundwaves are also methods being tested at the present time to control insects. Scientists used blacklight for example, to attract male cabbage loopers in large field cages where they exposed the insects to a chemical which sterilized them. With this technique, scientists controlled 90 percent of the loopers.

Sex attractants have also been used by scientists, luring insects into their destruction. Tests with such attractants have been more successful in attracting the male bollworm moths than the female insects own lure. Synthetic attractants have been developed for the boll weevil also, as well as for the European corn bore.

In laboratories, insects have been awakened from their usual winter resting periods with the addition of artificial light to simulate the coming of spring. In one experiment a flash of light as short as one-thousandth of a second, given nightly during the larval stage of the imported cabbage worm, forced this insect to develop into the adult stage ahead of schedule and so out of step with nature that it could not live.

Great successes have also been achieved with the importation of parasites which are the enemies of insects. As early as 1888 the Vedalia beetle was imported from Australia to control the cottony-cushion scale which was a major menace to the California citrus industry. That beetle is still doing a highly successful job of this today.

The wasp is being used increasingly as a control insect. Wasps imported from Asia have been successfully used to destroy the red scale, a pest of concern to citrus growers. The wasp is being used by the USDA to destroy the cabbage worm, a destroyer of cabbage, cauliflower, and broccoli, and it has eliminated over 99 percent of the cabbage-worms from test projects—with no need of insecticides. Tests are being conducted to see if the wasp, imported from France, can be used to control the cereal leaf beetle, a pest extremely destructive of oats, wheat, and barley. And over a 3-year period the alfalfa weevil has declined about 90 percent in areas in which USDA scientists released wasps to control the pest, saving farmers in these areas more than \$600,000 in 1969. These results are as good, say USDA officials, as those farmers obtain with conventional insecticides.

Important and successful tests have also been conducted in California and Florida using about a dozen imported species of weed-eating insects to control weeds which would otherwise be controlled with herbicides. In light of the significant increase in the use of herbicides, research of this sort could be a

first step leading toward a reduction in their use.

And let me say, Mr. Chairman, before I lose the interest of a good many of the Members on the floor that they may be interested in learning that USDA research has also found that beer—stale or rich with foam—has been successfully used as an attractant for slugs. I am told any brand works.

Another thing that bothers me is the amount of money which must be directed from other programs to continue with present research on the cotton boll weevil. I am all for research in this area, even on a crash basis if necessary, if for no other reason than that approximately 45 percent of the DDT used each year in the United States is required for the control of the boll weevil. But Department plans to deal with the boll weevil in the next fiscal year mean that other programs will have to be cut. Programs, which, according to the Department, they will not be able to provide the financial support for. These projects include:

A pilot test to determine if sterilized corn earworm moths can be used to control this major pest of several agricultural crops;

A proposal to undertake research on attractants for the range caterpillar in New Mexico. This is an important pest of range grasses in New Mexico that has recently reached epidemic proportions, and insecticides available for its control are considered potentially hazardous to the environment;

A pilot test to determine if the mass production and sustained release of parasites of the pea aphid can control this insect on alfalfa to prevent transmission of virus disease to field-grown peas in the State of Washington;

Similar tests to determine if mass produced parasites will control the green bug on sorghum and potato aphids on potatoes; and

A research proposal to determine the potential value of a protozoan pathogen for the control of the tobacco budworm. This insect, which also attacks cotton and other crops, has developed resistance to insecticides, and alternative biological control methods are urgently needed.

Other research to gain more information on how the boll weevil might be controlled by sex attractants will also have to be put off as well as research on the identification and synthesis of chemical components produced by the pink bollworm for the attraction of males.

The shift in funds necessitated by the concentration on the boll weevil research will also require the Department to delay the planned expansion of parasite and predator rearing programs for gypsy moth and cereal leaf beetle programs.

Mr. Chairman, I am not here today to say that any one program suggested by the USDA is more important than another, or that the \$1.5 million I am asking this House to allocate should go to any one particular program over one of the others. I am not qualified to do so in any event. I am saying that the Department indicates that there are programs that could profitably be carried out during the next fiscal year if in-

creased funds were allocated. I am urging my colleagues to indicate their support of such research by providing about one-third of these funds in the next fiscal year.

It seems to me that when DDT is found in almost 100 percent of fish samples taken from our rivers and lakes, when dieldrin is found in 75 percent of the lakes and rivers sampled, then I believe it is time to end the business-as-usual attitude about the problem of pesticides.

I represent one of the 15 most agricultural districts in the Congress. I am also vitally interested in conservation. The argument is often made, "Do not ban pesticides such as DDT and other chlorinated hydrocarbons until we have the facts, until we know what alternatives are available." I am saying with this amendment, "All right, let us make a greater effort to find these answers." I would like to find some of these answers to pest control questions before our farmers are backed up against a wall.

This amendment will not go far in that regard, but it will be a signal to the USDA to be more aggressive in their approach to this problem.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, our colleague deals with a subject that comes close to all of us.

But it is extremely difficult, if I may say so, to get results for the money you spend. While we have just about every agency in Government that is dealing with this problem in the Department of Agriculture, the sum total spent in the overall activities of research service in this general area on such problems as fundamental biology; improved means of nonpesticidal control; improved pesticide use patterns; toxicology, pathology, metabolism, and fate; economics of pest control, use, supply, and requirements; pest control; monitoring; and regulation amount to \$94,500,000.

We are spending now about \$18 million in research in trying to find nonchemical controls. We are all familiar with the screw-worm and the success we have had with that.

But when you name that one, it gets extremely hard to find other places where we have had these kinds of breakthroughs.

Your committee has brought in a bill that gives an increase of \$2 million above what they had for the present year. Certainly, we wish to meet this problem so far as we can, but scientists with the knowhow and the ability to contribute to this overall problem are not easy to come by.

This bill should pass, if the other body acts on it as it should by the first of July. But you do not snap your fingers and get top scientists so the chances are a big part of the year will go by while they are trying to find these people.

I respectfully submit that where we have raised last year's level by \$2 million in the overall field and where in this particular area they are spending \$18 million, and in the overall area \$94 million—I would hope in the interest and in view of everything we face as a Congress such as inflation and unbalanced

budget, I hope you will agree with us that if we are just giving \$18 million worth of personnel to work that is a pretty good "chunk" of manpower. As big as the problem is, what we want is results. We figure we will get more results if we ride close herd over operations and even at that we have gone ahead with an extra million dollars over this year's funds.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I will very briefly reiterate what the gentleman from Mississippi has already indicated that the committee has been very generous in this field. We have added a million dollars over and above the existing budget request. This will accommodate as many additional positions, as are available.

There are not enough scientists, because this is a very scientific field, to add further to the pace at which you can hope to have accomplishment in this field.

Consequently, I hope that the amendment is defeated.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, I am well familiar with the problem raised by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. I wish to commend him and the subcommittee for having gone as far as they have gone. I believe the time has come for this Nation to understand that we must stop the unwise use of pesticides.

When my subcommittee held hearings on the legislation which ultimately created the Council on Environmental Quality, distinguished conservationists came before our committee and pointed out that if it were packaged in any other kind of container, mother's milk, under the Food and Drug Act, could not be shipped across State lines. Pesticides are not a problem. There is an environmental danger that is approaching, it fit has not already crossed the point of being a major disaster.

Fatty tissue in human beings now exceeds the level at which meat would be barred from interstate commerce. We do not know the effect of what these are doing.

Just this morning a release went across my desk pointing out that the birds of prey, the American eagle and the osprey, are now in serious danger. It made mention of the fact that there are now only something like 7,000 eagles, our national bird, in the United States. And it pointed out that the cause of this is not assumed to be, but is proven to be DDT and aldrin, and it pointed out the abnormally high levels of both DDT and aldrin in both chickens' eggs and the brain tissue of birds. It pointed out that most of the predatory birds are no longer able to nest because of the fact that DDT affects the shell development to the point at which the bird cannot successfully nest.

We have had in this country some very successful programs to reduce insect populations through the use of biological controls, and I believe it is the hope of

not only the game populations of this Nation but also it is the hope of the people who are here that we should at an early time develop biological controls, because if we do not, the hazards to our population perhaps exceed anything that we understand at this time.

It is fair to say that two major programs have already had remarkable success. The screw-worm in the Southwest has almost been entirely obliterated through a wise program of biological controls, a program using irradiated males. In the southeastern part of the United States we have already had great success with the Mediterranean fruitfly by doing the same thing. There is an abundance of steps that can be used to substitute much more cheaply, much more effectively, and much less hazardous through the use of biological controls.

The amount of money proposed is very modest, \$1.5 million, and that \$1.5 million is one-fourth the amount the Department of Agriculture says it can well and sufficiently spend on expanded research into biological controls so that instead of spreading into land and polluting our air, water, and soil, our flesh and the milk of our mothers, that we can finally begin doing something which will get us on a program which will control our insect pests by devices which create no hazard to the soil, to the air, to the water, to human life, to fish, to game resources, and if you do not think this is a major problem, I point out that we are fighting pesticides that are polluting not only our flowing waters but also subsoil waters, and we are finding that the level of pollutants in the subsoil water is so high that the coho salmon, the silver salmon, are being killed in Lake Michigan. They are not only failing to reproduce, but under food and drug legislation now in existence, we cannot sell them for human consumption from the Great Lakes because of the abnormal and dangerously high level of aldrin and DDT that is present in the flesh.

So here we have an opportunity to support legislation which will give us a more viable and a more wholesome environment, and I urge the House to adopt the amendment.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to my distinguished Chairman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the very fine statement that has been made and the great interest in the subject that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) has mentioned here. There are some arguments on facts, but I rise now to say that so frequently we judge what effort we are making by the amount of money we see in an appropriation bill. I say this to those who do. I have dealt with the folks in the Department of Agriculture. They are fine people.

But there is not a Member within the sound of my voice who could not go down tomorrow to the Department about anything who would not be told, even though they have \$161 million, that something could be done if we would give

them more money. I say that about many leaders particularly in the research department.

I would like to call the attention of Members to the fact that in this particular phase they have \$18 million now to do this research. We have given them an additional \$2 million. That does away with the argument that our friend, the gentleman from Michigan has made.

I urge we vote down the amendment.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I urge the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. OBEY) there were—ayes 39, noes 81.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HATHAWAY

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HATHAWAY: On page 3, line 14, strike "\$146,143,200" and insert in lieu thereof "\$146,243,200".

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment to add \$100,000 to the amount that is now going to the soil and water research facility at Orono, Maine, which is the only facility in the Northeast for that purpose, is that this facility will be able to purchase much needed equipment and fund some additional personnel while awaiting the construction money which was authorized by the 86th Congress. In the 86th Congress, along with similar projects, this facility was given priority No. 26, but unfortunately priorities listed only through 24 have been funded to date. Last year the other body approved \$450,000 to start construction, but unfortunately this body did not so approve, and this body prevailed in the conference.

Maine's position in potato production has been deteriorating in the last decade, one reason being that there is not sufficient effective research in water and soil conservation.

Maine is now engaged in production of sugar beets also, so the need for this facility is much greater than it was previously. Of course, soil and water are basic natural resources, the proper management of these resources is important to our Nation, and these are being taxed further by urban development and industrialization demands. As a result, there is much greater need for water and soil resources, and based on that, water and soil research is necessary based on increasing need caused by the urban and industrial and recreational uses.

The point of this amendment is simply to insure that in the transition time between now and the time we are able to get the funds to construct a proper facility in this area we do have some funds so we can at least expand the existing facilities by a little more equipment, because if this potato yield problem is not taken care of immediately, and the yield of other crops in the area, another year may be too late.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HATHAWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.



Mr. WHITTEN. I can appreciate the gentleman's problem and appreciate the problems in Maine. We have them in my State and elsewhere.

Let me give our situation as to this matter of new laboratories. Some years ago the committee had a study made to see what laboratory facilities were needed all over the United States. We thought we would get a thorough study by the Department. Instead, they sent out letters all over the country, and brought them up, figuratively, in a bushel basket and dumped them at our feet. Our friends on the other side took those and gave a list of priorities. That is how the priorities got into it.

This is the immediate situation: The laboratories have been appropriated for by the Congress in recent years. This year we had to go along with \$3.5 million over the budget, not in the budget, for staffing new laboratories which in many instances were standing idle.

This year, due to circumstances, three-fourths of the new starts for construction early in the year were frozen.

So the committee did not review these overall requests for laboratories, of which there were quite a number that were not budgeted. We decided we would have to study them A to Z to go through with them.

That is the reason why I would have to oppose the amendment. I will be glad to join with the gentleman in trying to see what can be done with the money the Department does get, to see if within the funds they do have they can give special attention to this, until such time as they get back into the construction phase. I would be glad to go into it as fully as I know how, and to try to help as much as I know how.

This is one of a great number in here. If we make this exception we would have no basis for not going along with any other one.

I hope the gentleman will not press his amendment at this time, because I would have to oppose it, but I am in accord with what he seeks.

Mr. HATHAWAY. I thank the gentleman for his very cooperative attitude.

Let me ask the gentleman this question: Would not an additional \$100,000 help the gentleman in his bargaining with the Department?

Mr. WHITTEN. They either construct or they do not. When it gets into these other areas, the Department has many, many authorities which permit them to allocate funds to carry on work. As to the construction, we either have to do it or not do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. HATHAWAY).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND  
CONSERVATION SERVICE

EXPENSES, AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND  
CONSERVATION SERVICE

For necessary administrative expenses of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, including expenses to formulate and carry out programs authorized by title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1301-1393); Sugar

Act of 1948, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1101-1161); sections 7 to 15, 16(a), 16(d), 16(e), 16(f), 16(i), and 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 590g-590q); subtitles B and C of the Soil Bank Act (7 U.S.C. 1831-1837, 1802-1814, and 1816); and laws pertaining to the Commodity Credit Corporation, \$152,690,000: *Provided*, That, in addition, not to exceed \$68,779,000 may be transferred to and merged with this appropriation from the Commodity Credit Corporation fund (including not to exceed \$30,228,000 under the limitation on Commodity Credit Corporation administrative expenses): *Provided further*, That other funds made available to the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service for authorized activities may be advanced to and merged with this appropriation: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated or made available under this Act shall be used (1) to influence the vote in any referendum; (2) to influence agricultural legislation, except as permitted in 18 U.S.C. 1913; or (3) for salaries or other expenses of members of county and community committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, for engaging in any activities other than advisory and supervisory duties and delegated program functions prescribed in administrative regulations.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINDLEY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FINDLEY: On page 23, line 8, after the word "regulations", strike the period, add a colon and the following:

"*Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this act shall be used during the period ending June 30, 1971 to formulate or carry out any 1971 crop-year program under which the total amount of payments to a person under such program would be in excess of \$20,000."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, this is not a new issue to this body. Even though there has been some shifting of allegiance for payment limitations from year to year and even hour by hour by some people, it has been my feeling all the way through that we should seize every opportunity that comes along in an effort to impose a reasonable ceiling on the total number of dollars that any farmer may receive under any commodity program.

Now, some of you will have before you a letter from Secretary Hardin. It is out of date and, in fact, it is erroneous because it assumes something that is not correct; namely, that my amendment applies to a farm when, in fact, the limitation goes to a commodity.

It is interesting to note, too, that Secretary Hardin's position seems to change from time to time. A year ago he was against the limitation. Later on he came out in favor of \$110,000 per commodity.

Then subsequently he came out and stated that this was too high. Now, it is not too surprising, perhaps, that he finds my limitation too low, but I live in hopes that tomorrow perhaps he will be with me.

My friend from Massachusetts, Mr. CONTE, has indicated that he will not support this amendment, which I regret

very much, because he gave it good support last time and on a previous appropriation bill he was fervently for a limitation. In fact, earlier this afternoon he did inform me that he would offer a limitation on this bill. So I live in hopes that when the time comes for vote maybe he too, will be with me.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of discussion about the sugar limitation. That is the principal issue, in effect, of my amendment. I will not go to great efforts to impose a limitation on payments thereto, but I do call the attention especially of Members on this side of the aisle to John H. Schnitzler, Under Secretary of Agriculture under President Johnson, who stated publicly in testimony to the Congress that in his opinion the payments to farmers under the sugar program in the amount that they presently exist serve no public purpose.

It is also important that we be clear about what my amendment does. It establishes the payment limit at \$20,000 per commodity.

This level has been thoroughly researched and discussed and many of us have taken surveys on it. All of you have been asked as to your opinion with reference to a limitation of this level.

My amendment affects 1971 crops only. It would not affect in any way current crops. It would only affect those grown for harvest in 1971. Therefore, it is not retroactive.

The "snap back" provision about which we heard so much a year ago, no longer has any meaning because it expires with the expiration of the Agricultural Act, as amended. It is my belief and understanding that none of the proposals that have come before the committee carries such a provision.

But, I want to call your attention to a very curious provision of this appropriation bill and that is section 508, a section which in my opinion was deliberately put in here in a very inconspicuous manner in an effort to negate a payment limitation should such be adopted by this body. Section 508 appears on page 39 of the bill. This makes it doubly hard to get a limitation voted today.

This amendment applies only to single-year commodity programs. Payments through the cropland retirement program are not affected because many of those are multiyear programs. It would apply to feed grains, cotton, wheat, sugar, and wool; that is, any payments thereunder would apply to payments only and not to crop loans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FINDLEY was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, another important item is that the limitation applies to a person. This is a word of art that has been defined and established under Department operations in the past few years. The Department—which may be a surprise to some of you—has had broad experience in administering farm payment limitations. There have been five different programs in recent years under which the Department has administered limitations.

Its effect is to put a ceiling on income

support. Its principal impact is on cotton and sugar production. Under the sugar program every dime paid to a farmer who produces sugar—and this reaches the amount of some \$100 million a year—every dime of those payments is income supplement. There is no land retirement required. The Department of Agriculture has certified that two-thirds of the dollars paid out to farmers under the cotton program are likewise income supplement. Less than one-third of the dollar paid into the cotton program can be attributed to payment for resource adjustment, that is, land retirement.

This amendment will not put anyone in the poor house. If adopted, it would permit a farmer to receive as much as \$20,000 per commodity. A Government guaranteed income at \$20,000 a year compares very favorably to the other levels of guaranteed income that we have talked about.

It has been argued that we ought to wait for the Committee on Agriculture to bring out a bill dealing with this subject matter. Over a year ago we were told that a new farm bill was just ahead and we ought to delay approving a limitation on the appropriation bill last year because we ought to let the legislative processes work. However, 14 months after the Committee on Agriculture took up the question, the committee seems no nearer agreement than at the outset. There is no certainty that a legislative bill will be enacted this year. But whether it is or not, it is the prerogative of this body under the rules of the House to impose a limitation on the use of appropriated funds. If this is done, in my opinion, it will serve as constructive notice to the Committee on Agriculture that when it does report a legislative bill, to limit the payments to not more than \$20,000.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman tell me whether "a person" is also a corporation?

Mr. FINDLEY. I will say to the gentleman that I am putting in the RECORD today the details of the regulations which have been used by the Department in the past few years which spell out the definitions of "person." If a person has a corporate interest the amount of income he acquires from that corporation will be counted in computing that limitation.

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

(On request of Mr. MELCHER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FINDLEY was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield further to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MELCHER. I thank the gentleman for again yielding to me.

I would also like to ask the gentleman how the proposed amendment would treat a State with a vast amount of school land, and how it would treat Indian reservations with numerous Indians who do not farm, but whose land is farmed?

Mr. FINDLEY. Any association or governmental subdivision which signs up as a cooperator under the commodity program would be classified as a person.

Mr. MELCHER. In other words, the State school land would be limited to \$20,000?

Mr. FINDLEY. That is correct, and I think it should be.

Mr. MELCHER. I thank the gentleman for his explanation, but I must point out that Montana schools and Montana Indians might seriously be damaged by this amendment. Unless consideration is given to the practical effect of what appears to be a simple amendment we could fund Montana school land and Indian lands farmed by tenants or on a share basis forced out of the farm program. This would greatly reduce the income of both the schools and the Indians. In both cases this can be avoided by properly drafting a payment limitations. Such is not the case with this amendment.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I originally reserved a point of order on the amendment, if I may call that to the attention of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on his point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do, Mr. Chairman.

If the Chair will note, the amendment is offered to a particular section of the bill, but the language provides that "none of the funds appropriated by this act," so it is a limitation, which means it applies to the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Commodity Credit Corporation was created under the laws of Delaware in 1933. It was given the power, it was given the right, and it was given the obligation of making payments, to make loans under the Corporation Control Act, and it was provided that nothing in that act should let the Congress prevent the corporation from discharging its functions. I might say the same thing applies to the TVA.

I respectfully, therefore, submit, Mr. Chairman, that to change the Corporation Control Act and to relieve it of its responsibilities which have been carefully protected by the Congress on at least two occasions, even in the Anti-Deficiency Act, which was some years later, would take legislation. It can only be done that way, and since it would require legislation to change it, anything that has that effect here of necessity must be legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FINDLEY. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the point of order. This is the similar argument that has been extended by the gentleman from Mississippi on several previous occasions. One such occasion was January 26, 1965; another occasion was June 6, 1967, and another occasion related to an amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) on May 26, 1969.

On each of those occasions the limitation went to the entire act, as does this

amendment. It stated on each occasion that "no part of this appropriation shall be used, or none of the funds appropriated by this act,"—language of that sort. The language applies to administrative salaries of ASDA organizations. The limitation is clearly negative on its face. It clearly shows retrenchment, the reduction in spending, and, therefore, is entirely within the Holman Rule, and I believe it is completely in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

As the gentleman from Illinois declares, the point of order and the arguments supporting it have been offered on previous occasions, and on occasion by the gentleman from Mississippi, as recently as the 26th of May last year.

This point was made last year with respect to an amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE), which, while not identical, is, in the opinion of the Chair, sufficiently similar to the presently offered amendment, as to govern.

On that occasion the gentleman from Massachusetts offered an amendment which would have provided:

That no part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to formulate or carry out any price support program (other than for sugar) under which payments aggregating more than \$20,000 under all such programs are made to any producer or any crops planted in the fiscal year 1970.

On the basis of previous rulings of the Chair, it is the opinion of the present occupant of the chair, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois is a limitation on an appropriation bill and is therefore in order.

The point of order is overruled.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who just preceded me mentioned me. He said that he had hoped I would walk up the aisle with him and that I had told him I was going to offer an amendment for \$10,000.

Of course I plan to offer an amendment for \$10,000. I intend to offer it when the legislative bill comes here.

When we were debating the foreign aid bill here on Thursday, he spoke to me. He came up to the desk and said, "Are you going to offer an amendment?" I said, "Paul, I think this is the wrong way to do it."

Twice, I have won this battle. I won after battles here on the floor and then the Senate did not go along with us.

Mr. Chairman, in all seriousness I met with the gentleman at a meeting with this ad hoc committee from the legislative agricultural committee and we tried to come out with compromise proposals. I think we are going to make some real headway, as I said earlier on the floor of the House today. Secretary Hardin is the first Secretary of Agriculture to come out and say that we will have to have some kind of payment limitation. He is the very first.

I do disagree with his \$110,000 per crop proposal which is way too high and ridiculous.

But I had breakfast with him, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) was there and others—the gentleman



from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) was with me. Several weeks ago I told him it was too high and I thought we got some results out of that meeting. He did not commit himself to any figure, but our discussion would indicate that the Agriculture Department would settle for less.

With the ad hoc committee, I thought we made progress and they were going to bring that recommendation back to Mr. POAGE's committee. But, unfortunately, our agreement with the committee blew up and nothing happened.

Some may try to scare us and say that there may not be an Ag bill this year. But to folks like myself who are opposed to these scandalous high payments this is the best thing that could happen, since there would then be no farm subsidy payments except for sugar. If the present act expires, these subsidy payments cease, and the law reverts back to the old loan program. So we have nothing to lose. We can wait this thing out.

With any sound limitation payment we must have strong language to prevent them from subdividing these large tracts of land. This is the way the big farmers can get around the amendment. They will set up all these dummy corporate entities and they will collect \$20,000 each. Instead of one big farm being reduced to \$20,000, there may be 50 getting \$20,000.

This is what I want to prevent. When Mr. POAGE's committee gets ready to bring out a bill, I want to make sure the limitation is low and that we have strong language against subdividing to get around a payment limitation.

This is what I want to do when Mr. POAGE's committee gets ready to bring out a bill, to put on a good tight amendment. If they do not come out with an agreeable one, we will get a bonafide limitation, I warn you right now, with tight language so they cannot get around a limitation.

I am sorry I have to be put in this embarrassing position after carrying this battle for years on the floor of the House, but it is the only right and sensible thing to do. If no amendment goes on, I have the agreement I will offer the amendment to strike out section 508, and my friend from Mississippi said he would go along with me and recommend to the committee that it be stricken out. So I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I think I am in about the most neutral position of any Member of the House. I do not get even a dollar in my district for any kind of farm payments, not \$20,000, not \$4 million.

Apparently the two champions of this cutting of payments have fallen out with each other. The gentleman from Illinois gets \$49 million in his district. I do not get any. It is all right for his district to get \$49 million if you just spread it around far enough. You do not spread anything around in my district at all.

You might say, "Well, then, why would you oppose a limitation of payments when you do not have any payments in your district, little or big?"

I will tell you why I do that. In the

first place, the limitation of payments is going to eventually, and maybe in not too long a time, completely destroy farm programs. You gentlemen over there who represent consumers will say, "So what? The quicker we get rid of them the more money we will save for the taxpayers."

Maybe you will. You will save maybe \$3 or \$4 billion. But if you bring on a farm depression in this country, which happened in the 1930's, when wheat sold for 26 cents a bushel and corn sold for 11 cents, your people back home are not going to have jobs any more than they did during the 1930's, because when you destroy the largest industry in the country, you will destroy the entire economy of the entire country.

I represent a metropolitan city that has a lot of manufacturing. A lot of the products that are sold out of that city eventually go to the farm trade, and if we do not have any farm trade, I am going to be hurt and my district is going to be hurt just as much as the rest of you.

So when you think that it does not concern me because nobody in my district gets anything, I point out that what you do with a farm bill is that you buy the reduction of production, and when you buy \$4 million of reduction in production, you help every little farmer in the country, and when you drive the big boys out—and they will have to go out with any kind of proposed figures—when you drive them out, they will produce enough stuff that there will be no little farmers left, and then you fellows in the cities will have to support those people with your aid programs.

So everybody in this House is interested in a farm bill, because without that you are going to ruin the economy of the country, and the quickest way to ruin the farm bill is to put on a limitation of payments.

I know it is a great publicity stunt. Anybody in the world can make the most horrible statements about why our men should get \$3 million to not do anything. Well, that is fine, but what about all the other subsidies in this country? Ever since the beginning of the country we have had subsidies of all kinds.

The reason for those subsidies was to help the economy of the whole country. We have not had any more subsidies for farmers than we have had for businessmen and laborers and others. So to those people who feel they are just not concerned in this battle between Massachusetts and Illinois and who gets the credit for running the farm program, I say they are concerned.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, mention was made of section 508, which I talked about earlier, which reads as follows:

SEC. 508. No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used to change any price support program payment or payments, or commodity loan or loans in any manner, the effect of which is to modify substantive law.

My purpose there was to permit the legislative committee and the Congress to pass an agricultural act. I thought it ill became us to interfere with that, and not only because of that, but also because

it was thoroughly unsound to try to write in this appropriation bill restrictions and limitations, and in a sense to try to write a bill that properly belongs to another committee and belongs to the Congress.

But in the event this amendment is defeated, there will be no further need for that section, so I will recommend to the subcommittee, and I believe it will go along with me, that this section will be no longer needed, and we will thereby be leaving it in the Subcommittee on Agriculture where it should be, so that committee can work its will and so this Congress can work its will.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### RURAL WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL GRANTS

For grants pursuant to sections 306(a) (2) and 306(a) (6) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1926), \$56,000,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Iowa: On page 32, lines 24 and 25, delete "\$56,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$100,000,000".

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would increase from \$56 million up to \$100 million the amount of money available for the rural water and sewer program.

The so-called rural water and sewer program applies to communities of 5,500 and under. Last year the Department returned \$276 million of these applications for lack of money. This is one important place where money is really needed in this country if we are going to fight pollution.

We hear a lot about the urban crisis. Indeed there is an urban crisis. But when we look at the statistics we find that there are more people below the poverty level in this country who are in the non-metropolitan areas than in metropolitan areas even though there are less than half as many people in the non-metropolitan areas.

Indeed, there is an urban crisis that is being fed from the nonmetropolitan areas.

These people have been unable to provide water and sewer systems that they need. We find also that an astounding 30 percent of the homes in these areas have no plumbing. These are the areas where we really need to put the effort on anti-pollution.

Also last year we increased, under another program for urban areas, the amount of money from \$214 million up to \$800 million, and under another program this year from \$150 million to \$500 million. This rural program last year had \$46 million and \$276 million of applications were returned for lack of money.

I want to commend the committee for what it has done in this bill. I believe it is a good bill. They are really making an effort in this regard. But I believe this is one place where we really ought

to put extra emphasis and provide the amount of money authorized.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. I join the gentleman, and I would add this further dimension to his reasoning. The Federal Government and its officials have for a number of years promised approval of projects to these smaller communities, many of which, incidentally, are on the perimeters of larger cities and help to relieve the pressures on the larger cities, but because of the funding level the Federal Government has actually broken faith with a number of these small towns. They were told they would get the projects. They have had project applications in for 3 or 4 or 5 years. Always they are told, "You will get the project." But each year we find them delayed again and again.

The gentleman is correct. These are worthwhile projects in this environmental battle, trying to solve the problems of the cities as well as the problems of the small towns.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The gentleman brings up another good point. Some of these applicants are right on the perimeter of the cities. If they are not organized as a public corporation, they are not eligible under the other law and there is no way to secure the needed funds under the other law. This amendment is needed and this is a way to help the city problem at the same time.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. I want to congratulate the gentleman on this amendment. I believe it is a much needed increase in the funding for this essential project and would benefit all rural areas.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Again I commend the subcommittee for this bill and for what they have done. They have done a great deal, but I just do not believe they have done enough on this program. I hope they will not fight this amendment vigorously.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman in the well, because I believe, also, this is a very important part of the environmental program, and certainly will go a long way toward helping not only in the rural areas but also in the cities and towns.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I use those words intentionally. I strongly support this program, too. In addition may I say I know of no Member of Congress for whom I have a higher regard than the gentleman from Iowa, NEAL SMITH who offered this amendment.

I will tell the Members, it is pretty hard sometimes to hold the position I do having here to present what the committee felt we could get through. Hav-

ing grown up in the rural community where as I have frequently said we needed to strike water worse than we did oil, I know what we are all talking about here.

May I say to you that it sounds mighty good to provide a whole lot of money, and we have done it a lot of times when it did no good. Last year your subcommittee recommended and the Congress approved an increase from \$24 million to \$46 million. Eighteen million was frozen, and finally we did get this sum released about 60 days ago.

This is not the only money in this bill. We provide \$74 million available for loans.

I always believe in progress in this area and I know that the Nation needs it. It was the belief that we could get more progress if we follow a consistent basis and get the money released than to have a higher figure and have the funds frozen. In this bill we have gone from \$24 million to \$56 million. I have not figured it out, but that is about a 135-percent increase. This \$56 million is in grant money. We thought we could really make better progress that way, for our trouble this year was not because we did not appropriate but because we could not get the funds released. Our subcommittee has done the best that it could do. We are dealing with a subject here that is very complicated, and we want you to know that we are just as vitally interested in it as anyone else. Perhaps attitudes have changed. The need is certainly there.

If the \$100 million figure is substituted, it certainly will not upset me so far as my sympathy personally is concerned and my belief in the program. As chairman of this subcommittee for some 16 or 18 years, I believe we carried this about as fast as we could get by with, and I personally do not care to antagonize the Bureau of the Budget and have half of what we have in this bill frozen.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I appreciate the gentleman's words. I know he is sincere and he has done a lot for this program. In reference to how much the administration will distribute, I remember that last year the administration asked for \$214 million for an urban pollution program and later after we appropriated \$800 million they told us that they could use \$800 million. So I think they are capable of changing their mind if we show that we intend to do something about it, too.

Mr. WHITTEN. You could be right. I certainly hope so.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. KYL. There is another factor involved, I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi. There have been very few or relatively few applications for this program in the last couple years. In other words, this is not a progressive proposition. The applications which are pending and could use the amount of money that the gentleman from Iowa

suggests are applications which have been in and which are approved and simply need a signature for approval if the funds are available.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman will allow me to say this, let me mention some of the things involved that we went through in this subcommittee with the REA program. As the gentleman knows, I believe in area coverage and I want to cover the country like a blanket. But if you do not mind, in your haste you will have some small pipes at your well and inside of 18 months you will have to dig them all up because the people who move—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WHITTEN was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I am trying to say that you need proper planning too. I do not say that you could not use \$100 million. I am talking about whether you can do it in the next 12 months. I will go along with you with the fact that it takes a lot of investment, but we have to make studies in order to find out how to do it and it also takes proper planning. We have already a number of places throughout the United States where we are trying to get on as fast as we can with the amount of money that we have. I am in accord with my friend from Iowa. I am for all of the money being spent, but you do not always get more progress in trying to spend it too fast without proper planning. I am sympathetic with the gentleman in his procedure. I say, though, that the subcommittee has raised this 135 percent above the budget, and that is a pretty substantial increase, in my opinion.

Mr. KYL. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. I would not want the gentleman to think that these applications have not been appropriately engineered and approved.

Mr. WHITTEN. A whole lot of them have not, if I may say so, looking to the future growth.

Mr. KYL. I would hope that future growth does occur, but I say again to the gentleman from Mississippi that unless we get sewer and water systems that growth will not occur.

Mr. WHITTEN. Again may I say it is the rate of speed that we can progress, because we are surely headed the same way with the same desires.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased that the able gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH) has offered this amendment, which means so much to the small towns and rural areas of this Nation. In West Virginia, for example, there are hundreds of small towns under 5,500 in population which will benefit from this provision of the bill. The Farmers Home Administration has indeed brought joy and happiness, as well as the good life and economic development to many areas in West Virginia and the Nation.

I would like to point out that when the President's budget recommended a meager \$24 million for water and waste



disposal systems in the small towns, the unfulfilled need was huge and serious. Fortunately, the committee has increased this amount, but even the committee action fell far short of the \$100 million authorization.

Therefore, the proposal to expend the full \$100 million is a bold step to provide clean water and fight water pollution in the rural areas. Many of these towns simply do not have the local tax funds or bonding capacity to undertake these projects. As a result, the water surrounding the communities becomes polluted, and this adversely affects other areas downstream and spreads disease in a wide region.

In addition, there are many unincorporated areas which have failed to come under the umbrella of any organized program. This bill, with the addition proposed in the amendment by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH) will provide a godsend to these communities, both incorporated and unincorporated, in their valiant efforts to fight for clean water and eliminate pollution.

Many pending applications from smaller communities under 5,500 in West Virginia and the Nation can be funded once this appropriation is finally approved. I commend the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH) for his leadership, skill, and persistence in shepherding this amendment to a successful conclusion. I know that thousands of people throughout the Nation will be grateful to him for his effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAHON) there were—ayes 64, noes 45.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 508. No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used to change any price support program payment or payments, or commodity loan or loans in any manner, the effect of which is to modify substantive law.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONTE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONTE: On page 39, lines 8 through 11, strike all of section 508.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. CONTE. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman that I have discussed this matter with the members of the subcommittee that I could contact at this time, and there are no objections on the part of those members, and unless some individual member does have an objection—and if so, I will be glad to hear from that member at this time—otherwise, on behalf of the subcommittee we will accept the amendment.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, there is no objection to the amendment from this side.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WRIGHT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 17923) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand the committee is not asking for con-

sideration of or preparing to file a rule with respect to postal reform legislation?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. The gentleman from Iowa is correct in his understanding.

Mr. GROSS. That is not a part of your request?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. It is not a part of my request.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA)?

There was no objection.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF WEEK

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the rest of the week and if there are any changes from the announced program as contained in the whip notice.

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

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

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader and pursuant to the reservation made in connection with the announcement of this week's program, we are making some changes in the program, which are due to the fact that a rule has not been granted on the postal reform bill which was scheduled for tomorrow. In lieu of postal reform bill we are programming for tomorrow, H.R. 17255, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act.

If that bill is quickly disposed of, that is in time for the consideration of another antipollution bill, we will call up H.R. 11833, a bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act.

On Thursday of this week, if the postal reform bill is not ready for consideration, we will program the bill, H.R. 17970, which is the military construction appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971.

This is tentative. The postal reform bill still has the right of way, but we are giving the Members as much notice as possible that the military construction bill might be up on Thursday.

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

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

Mr. HALL. Is the possible consideration on Thursday of the military construction appropriation bill referred to by the distinguished majority leader the one for which the request to file a report by midnight tonight was just granted by unanimous consent?

Mr. ALBERT. It is my understanding that the request was granted with respect to the other two bills.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I should like to complete my question. My question is this: Could the distinguished majority leader give us any idea about what will be the content of the rulemaking in order consideration of the military construction appropriation bill before the authorization bill is voted into law?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, as I understand, the Committee on Rules has agreed to give a rule on the military construction bill, the rule being required because while the authorization has passed the House, it has not cleared the other body, and, therefore, a rule will be necessary in view of the lack of authorization having been enacted into law. If the bill were brought up tomorrow, as had been contemplated at one time, then a rule would have been necessary, because the 3-day period would not have expired, the bill having been reported on Monday; but now that it is not contemplated that the military construction bill will be brought up tomorrow, the 3-day requirement will be met and a different type of rule will be required. We will not have to waive in that rule the 3-day requirement.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. ALBERT. The request, as I understand it—and I hope I am correct—includes both the bill from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Appropriations bill. That is my understanding of the request, and that makes in the order the three bills I have announced for the remainder of the week, provided we do not consider the postal reform bill.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding and I appreciate the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, but we leave out the observation that the rule must, under such circumstances, waive points of order in addition to making it in order under the 3-day rule in accordance with the rules of the House. Does the rule as contemplated to be filed by midnight waive points of order on the military construction bill?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. ALBERT. My understanding is that a waiver of the 3-day rule is no longer necessary with respect to the military construction appropriation bill. It was reported in that manner on the possibility that it might be brought up on Wednesday. Instead, we are calling it up on Thursday if we do not call up the postal reform bill, and the waiver of the 3-day rule is no longer needed.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MAHON. But a rule will be required waiving points of order on the military construction bill because we do not have the complete authorization, and that was the main purpose of the rule.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, a rule has already been granted waiving points of order. Permission has already been granted to file that rule, and the two rules from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

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

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to propound an inquiry, if I may, to the majority leader. I have had a number of inquiries as to when the bill H.R. 8298, known as the mixing bill, or the water transportation bill, was going to come up for consideration. Can the able Leader give us any indication of that?

Mr. ALBERT. This matter has become a matter of privilege with members of the Committee on Rules, of which the gentleman is a member. It can be called up as a matter of privilege, as I understand, at any time. Would the gentleman like to suggest a time, in view of the fact that the gentleman is serving notice, as I take it, that he intends to call this bill up as a matter of privilege?

Mr. PEPPER. I had naturally supposed that that was the prerogative of the leadership, and I shall be glad to cooperate on it.

Mr. ALBERT. It is not a matter of cooperation. It is a matter of right.

Mr. PEPPER. Would there be an opportunity to do so this week at any time?

Mr. ALBERT. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would put it over to some day next week. Could the gentleman suggest a day certain next week?

Mr. PEPPER. Maybe Monday or Tuesday of next week?

Mr. ALBERT. Monday would be all right.

Mr. PEPPER. If it would be agreeable, I would like to call it up on Monday.

Mr. ALBERT. In view of the statement of the gentleman from Florida, I will be glad to cooperate and to program that bill on Monday.

Mr. PEPPER. Very good. I thank the able gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished majority leader will await final decision on that and if the gentleman from Florida will withhold, as the distinguished majority leader knows, I have been talking to him, and I understand others have, about the possibility, if the Rules Committee does not act on the postal reform on Thursday, of starting general debate after the Flag-Day ceremonies on Monday on the postal reform legislation.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, of course, this is a matter of high privilege, and I would suggest if the gentleman has no objection, that if we do not dispose of the

postal reform bill, that H.R. 8298 be made the first bill on the program subsequent to disposition of the postal reform bill. Is that agreeable?

Mr. PEPPER. I regret to say I have a hearing scheduled for the Crime Committee beginning out of the city. Monday or Tuesday would be a suitable day, or I could defer it until the following week, but I would hope an opportunity might occur so we could do it on Monday or Tuesday. Of course, we want to cooperate with the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, the gentleman understands the necessity for programming the postal reform bill when it is ready.

Mr. PEPPER. Could we set it for Monday and then if circumstances did require deferment, we would work out an agreeable date?

Mr. ALBERT. That is agreeable with me.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the gentleman.

#### RURAL AREA DEVELOPMENT IN COUNTIES LOCATED IN NATIONAL FOREST LAND

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

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, today I am joined by the Honorable CARL ALBERT and 14 other colleagues in the introduction of legislation designed as a catalyst for rural area development in counties located in national forest land. The bill I am introducing would set aside for the discretionary use of the Secretary of Agriculture 55 percent of all funds derived from national forest land to be used expressly for the construction of beneficial renewal land surface projects and/or additional resource management activities within the national forest of origin of such funds.

At the present time according to provisions of a Forest Service revenue sharing program authorized under 16 U.S.C. 500, 25 percent of the net revenues received during any fiscal year from national forests is paid to the State treasury of each State containing national forests and is stipulated by Federal statute to be expended as the State legislature may prescribe for the benefit of "public schools and public roads" in the county or counties of origin. The receipts vary and are derived from sales of timber, forest products, contracts, land use permits, recreational purposes, power permits, and other contractual agreements.

Ten percent of the net revenue from forest service lands is also reserved for use of the Forest Service to be expended by the Secretary of Agriculture for the construction and maintenance of roads and trails within the national forests of the United States.

The other 65 percent of the net Forest Service receipts is retained in the Federal Treasury. My bill would not interrupt in any way the 25-percent allocation of funds earmarked for public schools and public roads or the 10 percent earmarked for Forest Service roads and trails. It would set aside 55 percent



of the remaining funds for land development programs, resource preservation and other constructive programs, leaving 10 percent in the National Treasury.

The U.S. Forest Service owns and has jurisdiction over nearly 200 million acres of land in the United States, located in 45 of the 50 States. In 1969, total gross receipts from all sources of revenue from National Forest Service land amounted to about \$1,200 million.

In my own State of Missouri, the Forest Service lands are situated in underdeveloped and undeveloped areas of the State where income is low and where the "payment in lieu of taxes" obtained from the Forest Service does not proportionately bear the cost of county governmental programs and administrative expenses, nor help defray the costs of new rural area development projects providing the means for economic development and improvement.

On the basis of 1968 figures, Missouri counties received about \$350,000 distributed by the State legislature among 31 counties for school and road purposes. The lowest county payment was \$169 for 842 acres and the highest county payment was \$19,327 for 95,754 acres.

The new fund established by my bill is comparable to the reclamation fund administered by the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior.

The Bureau of Land Management has exclusive jurisdiction over about 453 million acres of public land on which mineral leases and permit receipts totaled \$1,089,821,884 in fiscal year 1968. The disposition of the mineral leasing receipts is as follows: 37.5 percent is returned to the State and counties of origin; 10 percent is retained by the Federal Treasury; and 52.5 percent is deposited to the credit of the reclamation fund.

The reclamation fund is designated and used solely for reclaiming and restoring mined-out areas for useful purposes, including recreational benefits and conservation practices. My bill would establish a similar program for National Forest Service lands.

#### MILITARY SERVICE IS FORCING SERVICEMEN INTO DEBT

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, one of the great shames of our Nation is the treatment given servicemen, particularly when they are in need of a loan or have to purchase a large-cost item, such as an automobile, mobile home, or household furnishings. The Banking and Currency Committee has conducted numerous investigations in this area and the practices that we have uncovered have been shocking.

In one instance, we found a company that was charging servicemen 60 and 70 percent interest rates on loans. The company was also padding the serviceman's finance contract with hundreds of dollars of unnecessary and, in many cases, phony charges. He was billed for automobile insurance that was never written and when he fell behind in his payments,

his car was immediately repossessed, many times in a fraudulent manner, and quickly resold to another serviceman. The original borrower, however, was still required to pay off the so-called "deficiency balance" on the car and was told that unless he made these payments, his commanding officer would be notified and the company would see that the serviceman was dealt with severely.

These actions were, of course, shocking, but the story became a horror tale when we learned that eight members of the 12-member board of directors of the company were retired admirals or generals.

The committee also uncovered numerous automobile agencies that pulled every fast trick in the book to swindle servicemen, including disappearing with hundreds of thousands of dollars of servicemen's funds.

One of the solutions to these problems put forth by the committee was the establishment of credit unions at our major bases overseas and the upgrading of the treatment received by stateside credit unions as far as their relationship with the military was concerned. A great deal of progress has been made in the area of protecting the serviceman from "fast buck" operators and from those who charge high interest rates for the extension of credit.

However, Mr. Speaker, I have recently found out that some military bases in the United States are actually participating in high interest rate schemes designed to take money out of servicemen's pockets.

These schemes are being carried out at various officers' clubs on military installations throughout the country and the military is working in connection with a credit card company, Bank Americard. One of the clubs is a naval officers' club in San Diego, Calif. If an officer makes a purchase on credit it is charged on his Bank Americard. The serviceman then has 25 days to pay the bill without an interest charge. However, if the complete bill is not paid, an interest charge of 18 percent is added. While there are advantages to a charge system as far as the clubs are concerned, there can be no justifications for allowing an 18-percent profit to accrue to a bank. Actually the profits are much greater since the Bank of America or its local representative discounts the bills submitted by the club so that the bank gets a piece of the action from both the serviceman and his club.

I am also informed that a similar operation is being conducted at an officers' club at a large Air Force base in Oklahoma. I am further informed that other clubs throughout the country are also operating with Bank Americard and saddling their members with 18 percent service charges.

Information has been supplied to me indicating that Bank Americard representatives or representatives of the local bank handling Bank Americard call on the installation commander to collect the debts of anyone who cannot meet the 18 percent payments.

When I called this situation to the attention of military authorities, they explained that the charges made on Bank

Americard to the servicemen were no higher than any other credit card systems which were operating in military clubs.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is not the case. There are credit card systems operating at clubs which do not charge the serviceman any interest so that in effect, the serviceman is not saddled with an extra burden of debt when he makes a purchase in his own club.

Mr. Speaker, in coming weeks I will have a great deal to say about the extension of credit in our military club system throughout the world, and I sincerely hope that the Department of Defense will take action in this area so that we can avoid another series of scandals such as those that rocked the military club system last year. I would also strongly urge the military to reexamine its policy of allowing some credit card firms to gouge our servicemen with an 18 percent interest charge while other companies provide the same service without any charge to the serviceman. It would appear that the military is not doing business with the lowest bidder, but rather with the highest gouger.

#### THE SLUMP GROWS WORSE

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the national economy continues to deteriorate in alarming fashion and it is clear that this trend cannot be permitted to continue indefinitely.

Not only do we have increased unemployment and decreased economic activity but these are accompanied by sharp increases in the cost of all commodities. Thus with the slowing of the rise in our gross national product we are confronted with a recession on the one hand and rising prices on the other. At the same time, people are being released from jobs, some of them held over long periods of years, and we are finding that the record-high interest rates and the allocation of available funds are virtually halting whole industries such as that of homebuilding.

It is certainly cause for deep concern that the rising unemployment rate in the Waterbury, Conn., area has reached 7.2 percent. It is this figure dealing with human lives and too often affecting blacks and youth that has vital importance.

The precipitous decline of the stock market is in itself an indication of the concern which the public feels in the baffling and sobering performance of our economy.

It is not easy to determine exactly what steps should be taken in the current crisis. I have always shrunk from the application of controls because I have lived through the period of such controls and I know how difficult they are to remove. One can also see the deadening effect of too many controls in the Socialist countries today and we wish to avoid this sort of stagnation.

I do believe, however, that the decline has reached the point where the executive must consider some sort of govern-

mental action. For one possibility, it would appear desirable for the administration to proclaim certain guidelines and to exercise moral suasion to persuade the various sectors of our economy to comply with them. I believe there is much value also in the suggestion that a board of experts be constituted to follow developments in the economy and report as to the potential results of actual or proposed increases in the productive sector.

We have, of course, given the President the power to exercise certain limited controls should he deem it necessary and this provides a third emergency authority which could be exercised if the circumstances warranted.

In the first session of this Congress, the House, with my support, passed legislation which provided the President with machinery to control credit transactions and interest rates. On December 23, 1969, the bill was signed into law. Now, almost 6 months later, the President has yet to take any action under that law in the direction of lowering interest rates and stabilizing the economy. And this despite the fact that the country is experiencing the worst inflation in 20 years, the sharpest increase in unemployment in 10 years, and the highest interest rates since the Civil War.

Representatives of the administration have been promising a change in the direction of the economy but so far this change has not come and while it may not be appropriate or desirable now to impose far-reaching war-time controls, it is important that firm steps be taken to bring the economy under control and to limit the economic injury which it is causing daily to organizations and particularly to individuals in all segments of the economy.

#### LETTER FROM DR. WILLARD T. JONES IN SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S DECISION TO ATTACK COMMUNIST SANCTUARIES IN CAMBODIA

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

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, one of my most valued constituents and a close personal friend for many, many years, Dr. Willard T. Jones, has forwarded to me a copy of his letter to President Nixon in support of the President's decision to attack Communist sanctuaries in Cambodia.

Dr. Jones is the former superintendent of schools of Saratoga Springs, N.Y. He shares all our concern over the most effective means to achieve peace in Vietnam. He recognizes that a major threat to the success of the Vietnamization has been the unrestricted use of Cambodian territory by the enemy as a sanctuary. While Dr. Jones realizes that our military effort in Cambodia is a controversial one here at home, he is strongly opposed to any proposal that would inhibit the President's ability to follow prudent courses of action which we all hope and pray will achieve an honorable peace in the safest and quickest way possible.

Dr. Jones has also given the President his views with respect to dissent within our Nation. Protection of the right of dissent is one of the many basic reasons we are opposing Communism but like many of us, he breaks with dissenters who insist on using violence to further their own aims.

I am pleased to call Dr. Jones' thought-provoking letter to the attention of my colleagues:

SUN CITY CENTER, FLA.,  
May 8, 1970.

HON. RICHARD NIXON,  
President of the United States, White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I seldom write letters to my governmental representatives, but I want to let you know that I wholeheartedly support your move into the sanctuaries in Cambodia. And I hope that you will continue to have the necessary support of the large majority of the members of Congress and of the American people.

I cannot understand how any knowledgeable American can disagree with your conclusions and decision. None of the comments by government representatives or leaders of "organization for peace" who criticize your decisions relative to southeast Asia ever acknowledge publicly, that I have heard, that North Vietnam is the aggressor; they never admit that North Vietnam soldiers have occupied portions of Cambodia for years and have attacked South Vietnam from Cambodia. They never criticize North Vietnam's refusal to negotiate for peace sincerely. They never criticize deliberate bombardments of civilian populations in South Vietnam cities, nor the murder of thousands of unarmed civilians in areas where the Viet Cong and North Vietnam gain control as they did in Hue. Some of the "peace" protesters even carry North Vietnam flags and chant "Ho! Ho! Ho Chi Minh is sure to win!"

Are such protesters Americans? Or are they communists and communist sympathizers? Do they believe in American democracy or in communism? Why aren't their acts treasonable acts, since they give aid and comfort to the enemy?

A people should have the right to live under the form of government they prefer; but communist leaders want to force communism on as many countries as they can. Communism wouldn't stop in southeast Asia; its doctrine is expansion by whatever means. But many of our leaders fail to acknowledge this.

Senators Fulbright and Goodell always seem so critical of America but never critical of North Vietnam. I believe that during times such as we are experiencing, all Americans should stand together. Let our leaders voice their opinions of dissent, but let them do it in a statesmanlike manner, recognizing and considering all the facts, all the options, and all the consequences to America of any action or inaction. But once a course is embarked upon, let us all be Americans and support America. Let our leaders have courage to decide on the basis of what will be best for America and for humanity—never on the basis of how many votes for reelection their actions will win or lose.

And why should a minority of a student body force a University to close? For that matter, why should any portion of a student body be permitted to accomplish that? The Universities do not belong to the current student bodies. They belong to society—to all the people. In most cases, the majority of students want to continue their education, and their right to do so should not be infringed by any kind of activist. We are witnessing a persecution of the majority by a minority—the reverse of the very thing Civil Rights is all about!

Mr. President, you recognize all these unfair and unjust conditions in our society

today, and I believe you have acted with courage in your actions to meet and try to solve many of our problems. I commend you for it; and I entreat you to continue your stand against anti-America cliques, against minority militancy, and against unlawful and unjust actions.

I realize that mine is only a small voice among two hundred million; but perhaps my writing to witness my support will add a little to the encouragement I am sure you have received from many, many thousands who believe as you do.

Most sincerely,

WILLARD T. JONES.

#### VALEDICTORY TO THE 1969-70 ACADEMIC YEAR

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, in these troubled days the rhetoric has been hot and loud on the reasonable statements few and far between. Last Sunday the Washington Post printed a valedictory to the 1969-70 academic year, written by Charles Palmer, president of the National Student Association.

Mr. Palmer's address is one of the best I have seen by anyone in the last few months. It is firm, yet conciliatory. He speaks of the bridges which must be built between the working men and students. He goes on to state:

I don't believe they get built by throwing all the stones at those on the other side. They don't get built by trite rhetoric or self-righteous condemnations. They get built by our understanding the pressure on workingmen and relating to them in a language they understand.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to include a copy of Mr. Palmer's entire statement in the RECORD. I urge all of my colleagues to take the time to read it:

"WE'VE USED EACH OTHER TOO LONG"

(By Charles Palmer)

I have been asked to give a valedictory address; to wrap up the year in a smooth package of rhetoric; to unfold what might be the scenario next month or next fall.

There are several alternatives open to any student speaker at any commencement exercise this year.

He can lead a walkout, condemning the university for complicity with the ever-growing war machine. If he wants to stay, he can recap the growth and change and trouble and education of his school year; he can talk about classes that never happened because the strike against the war and repression intervened; he can explain what happened in what some schools call "reconstituted" classes, where people discuss subjects as they relate to our society and our generation and our war.

He can eulogize Fred Hampton, the latest martyr in the continual purge of Black Panthers and other militant groups, and demand an end to the repression of black people.

The speaker can be moral, haranguing his audience about the senseless killing and destruction—of Vietnamese, of Americans; both those killed on the battlefield and those languishing in jails because they were courageous enough to say no.

The average valedictorian can talk about polarization and nonparticipation and partisan politics—and how all segments of our society are the victims of those vicious and continuing forces.

And whichever of these alternatives he does



take, it's valid and true. All these things happened this year; these feelings of injustice and frustration and anger will be shared by the vast majority of his classmates.

After all, his student audience helped to make those large peace demonstrations last fall that President Nixon was too busy watching football to notice. They are the students who fought against racism in athletics in Colorado and challenged the exclusion of black people from the building trades in New York.

And we are the very same students who found ourselves—as so many who worked for social justice do—resisted, gassed, clubbed, and jailed. Our publications have been shut down. Our teachers have been fired and denied tenure for standing with us. There is a lot to remember and recall at commencement this year.

#### THE "SILENT MINORITY"

But maybe the most important speeches are those of the guys who didn't make it to graduation. Not because they were tossed out of school; not because they chose, as a protest, not to attend, but because they were just never given the chance to even think about that choice.

There's the kid in L.A.'s East Side who's been out of the service for two weeks and is spending today reading the paper—the want ads—because there is no demand for a chicano who can shoot to kill.

There's the 42-year-old Teamster whose oldest son is going away to the state university this fall . . . and he's scared because he wants all the things for his kid that he didn't have and he's afraid that the Communists and radicals will pervert his dream. And money's tight and there's not the overtime he was counting on to pay the extra bills.

There's the mother of seven, on welfare, bitter about the possibility of her son ever surviving his inferior high school, and concerned that the President expects her children to live on 19 cents a meal.

We can't even talk about the participation of people as a valid solution to these problems, since we've now become embroiled in a game of seeing which side can build the biggest rally.

And we see the hard-hats, marching and waving what they call "their" flag, and we know that they do not represent the American labor movement. There are reasonable and humane men put there; Walter Reuther wasn't alone in fighting for social justice.

There are working men in this country, the kind whose children go not to Harvard and Yale but to Kent State and Jackson State, who didn't want war and conflict, but a better world.

And between these men and students, bridges must be built. I don't believe they get built by throwing all the stones at those on the other side. They don't get built by trite rhetoric or self-righteous condemnations. They get built by our understanding the pressure on workingmen and relating to them in a language they understand.

Another lesson we must learn is that we've used each other for too long. Politicians, running for office, first speaking out on civil rights, now on the war—speaking out every election year and doing little else.

Nixon, soaking his silent majority, crassly interpreting students as ridiculing the men who fought in previous wars, allowing the economy to crumble bit by bit, letting money tighten so quickly that the gains won by labor will soon be negated by the dwindling job market.

#### POSITIVE GAINS

We have accomplished a great deal this year, the last few weeks in particular. When no one else would take on the President and his generals, we did. And we have shaken the establishment to its very roots. But there have been dangers in what we have done.

While our numbers have swelled and we have found ourselves with new and welcome allies our movement remains, basically, white and middle class. We have allowed and, in fact, assisted in the creation of the fraud that Nixon-Agnew-Mitchell speak for the common man, while they, in fact, are helping to rob him of his money, his security and his freedom of choice. While we reacted with a righteous and justified anger at this escalation of the war, we have failed to channel that anger and energy into channels which are meaningful for working people.

At the same time, we have all noticed the absence of black and brown people from our ranks. They seem somewhat hardened at our horror and anger for they are neither surprised nor shocked at the murders of Kent and Jackson. They have seen it all before.

So it is that we must turn our concern to building lines of communication to those other groups and we must come to have some understanding of how it all feels in their shoes. We must build for the long run, for it is far more frightening than what we have seen.

This is a time of commencement, of beginning. Let us begin the work that will bring our people together, in a country that is just and moral. For many of us, this year marks our first substantive involvement in political action. As we begin, in earnest, the struggle to turn this country around on war, racism and poverty, let us not fall into the President's trap. Let us base our success on bringing together the American people, rather than tearing them apart.

#### CUT DEFENSE SPENDING

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, last week, in the House of Representatives, I sponsored an unsuccessful effort to hold the public debt to \$389 billion instead of the \$395 billion debt ceiling requested by the Nixon administration. In this same proposal, I urged a \$66 billion limitation on defense spending in fiscal 1971, \$5.8 billion less than the 1971 budget estimate.

In my argument for a lower debt ceiling, I pointed out that the \$395 billion ceiling provided the administration with a \$6 billion cash balance, \$2 billion greater than that provided the previous administration.

The cost of the Vietnam war and the Cambodian operation do not appear in the President's budget. If the 35,000 troops presently in Cambodia are removed on the President's promise and if 150,000 troops are withdrawn from Vietnam, military costs undertaken in fiscal 1971 should be considerably less—particularly if withdrawal is followed by troop strength reductions.

Last week, Secretary Melvin Laird announced that troop strength would be reduced by a million men. With each man involving a cost upwards of \$20,000 per year, the potential for Defense savings are infinite. A million man troop reduction could save \$20 to \$25 billion every year.

Earlier this week, it was announced that the Pentagon is planning a fiscal 1972 defense budget of somewhat over \$70 billion, about \$1.8 billion less than fiscal 1971. The Pentagonese explanation is that this \$1.8 billion reduction really constitutes a \$6 billion cut when

allowances are made for an impending military pay increase and inflationary pressures. I simply cannot believe that this is enough.

The public debt—like private debt must be related to the net worth—the assets of the debtor. In the past 6 months, hundreds of billions of dollars, perhaps a half-trillion dollars of value have been trimmed from tangible and intangible property in America. In addition, the growth in unemployment has converted millions of Americans from tax contributors to beneficiaries. This does not help our capacity to carry the debt. Under these conditions, the balance sheet, the relationship of our Federal debt to our assets and our capacity to pay it off has become more troublesome, more ominous.

A substantial reduction in our defense spending right now is absolutely necessary if we are to preserve the capacity of our Nation to meet its commitments tomorrow and in the days ahead.

I firmly believe that a \$66 billion limitation for fiscal 1971 expenditures is absolutely necessary to conserve the economic strength of this Nation. On defense expenditures we must undertake at least the same level of restraints we have applied in other areas of expenditures.

Certainly we can reduce troop strength in Western Europe. How can we justify the continued deployment of 300,000 men at \$6 billion per year? The same question can be directed toward the deployment of an almost like number in Japan, Taiwan, and Okinawa.

It is my hope that the Members of the other body will seek to amend the debt ceiling legislation when it is on the floor for consideration by reducing the administration's request from \$395 billion to \$389 billion and reducing the defense appropriation request for fiscal year 1971 accordingly. Every agency of the Government, including the Defense Department, should be subject to the same kind of expenditure limitation.

A Washington Post article follows:

#### SEVENTY BILLION DOLLARS FOR DEFENSE IN 1972 EYED

The Pentagon is planning a Fiscal 1972 defense budget totaling somewhat over \$70 billion, about \$2 billion below the allotment for the fiscal year that starts next month, a spokesman said yesterday.

To do this, he said, it may be necessary to cut proposed spending by about \$6 billion to offset an impending military pay increase and inflationary pressures.

In other words, it appears that the Pentagon will have to cut severely into military man power strength and the base structure in order to keep defense spending in Fiscal 1972 close to the Fiscal 1971 level.

The spokesman indicated that new guidance has been received from the White House, designed to assure that defense spending is kept to that approximate level.

At the White House, press secretary Ronald L. Ziegler said that preliminary discussions of the 1972 military budget are under way but that no target figures have been fixed.

Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird last week spelled out a goal of cutting U.S. uniformed strength by one million men from the Vietnam war peak of 3.5 million.

The administration already has trimmed the number of Americans in service by about 400,000, and the Pentagon spokesman said

it is hoped to reach the 2.5 million level by the end of Fiscal 1972. This would mean a further reduction of 600,000 Americans from the armed services rolls over the next two years.

The spokesman said "we would hope that the continuing Vietnamization program will be of some help in reducing major costs."

He added that it is unlikely that any major further cuts will be made in research and development or in the nation's strategic nuclear forces.

On Capitol Hill, meanwhile, the House Appropriations Committee recommended \$365.8 million in construction money for the next year of the embattled Safeguard antiballistic missile program.

The Safeguard money was included in a \$1.99 billion military construction bill sent to the House floor for consideration later this week. This is \$435.7 million more than was provided for the current year, but \$137.7 million less than was requested.

#### SALE OF AIRCRAFT TO ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the able minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate the gentleman from Florida yielding to me.

I want to reaffirm here what I have said before and what I have done before indicating my strong personal conviction that our Government should at the earliest possible date take action to make sure there is a continuity of the sale of jet aircraft to the State of Israel. It is my feeling that the case has been fully and adequately made for affirmative action by the executive branch.

I have joined with others on both sides of the aisle in signing letters, sponsoring statements of policy which clearly set forth my deep personal conviction that this would be in the best interests not only of the United States but as well of the free world. It is important to the United States and to the free world as well as to Israel that Israel be given the opportunity to make these purchases so that it can maintain an adequate military balance in the Middle East.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able gentleman for his very able words.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the able majority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

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

I desire to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and the remarks of the distinguished minority leader.

It seems to me that nothing is more important to the free world and to the United States of America than retaining a bastion of freedom in the Middle East. I doubt that there is anything more important in the world picture today than making sure that Israel is not gobbled up by its neighbors through the help of the Soviet Union or any other foreign power.

I have consistently advocated the sale of these planes to Israel. It is not only in the interests of a great and vital democracy but it is also in the best interests of the United States of America.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able gentleman from Oklahoma.

I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, some 2 weeks ago I made some remarks on this important matter on the floor of the House, at which time I urged the sale of the types of planes Israel was trying to purchase from the United States. I expressed my views on that occasion. I felt strongly for a long while that the national interests of the United States would be carried out in the sale of these planes and the sale of such planes would also be consistent with the national interests of Israel.

We must appreciate the fact we need friends in the world; the United States, as well as other countries, needs friends, just as individuals do. Brave Israel is a friend of the United States, and in the entire Middle East it is the only country which enjoys real democratic institutions of government. I think the time has arrived for action, and I hope the President of the United States will make the decision very quickly that will bring decisive action into operation and by that decision will also convey a message of firmness to the Soviet Union showing that we do not intend that appeasement will be followed in the Middle East and that we do not intend that the great country of Israel, which is our friend, will be placed in serious danger of its existence.

So I am very glad to join with the gentleman from Florida who has been a leader not only in the establishment of Israel independence but also has taken those steps that will assure the strength, the dignity, and the assured continuance of that great country and the independence and freedom of the brave people of that country.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to hear those remarks from the distinguished Speaker of the House and publicly to attest that no voice in America has for a longer time or more eloquently or more urgently supported the cause of freedom and independence for Israel or been stronger in support of that cause than the distinguished Speaker. All who love that country are deeply indebted to him.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. REID of New York. First I would like to commend the gentleman for taking the time and showing the initiative to call the attention of this House to the critical importance of recent events in the Near East.

In my judgment there has been a shift in the balance of power adverse to Israel resulting in substantial measure from the introduction of SAM sites in the United Arab Republic around Alexandria, Cairo, the Aswan Dam, and reportedly along the west bank of the Suez Canal.

In addition to that, as the distinguished gentleman from Florida well

knows, the Soviet Union has taken an unprecedented step in introducing combat pilots into the United Arab Republic's Air Force. This is unprecedented except for one exception in Yemen that I am aware of.

Accordingly, it is very much my hope that the President will at an early time make an affirmative decision to provide Israel with the Phantoms and Skyhawks that are essential to maintain her deterrent strength.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would add that concurrent with steps looking toward the maintenance of Israel's deterrent strength and its effort to maintain a balance of power in the Near East—a balance of forces that is fair and necessary in Israel which is the only democracy in the Near East—we must also make very sophisticated efforts to secure a cease-fire particularly around the Suez Canal area.

Second, we must reopen talks with the Soviet Union at the highest level relative to their not introducing further armaments into the area, and, as per the resolution introduced in this House, to urge them to recall some, if not all, of their combat personnel in this area.

Clearly arms limitations are essential in the Near East, but they should be imposed in relation to an arms balance and not in terms of an arms imbalance adverse to Israel.

Lastly, I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is essential that we make fresh and determined efforts consistent with the Security Council's resolution of November 1967 to facilitate progress toward direct negotiations on the Rhodes formula initially on the immediate problem and ultimately direct negotiations on the overall problem.

Our concern must be with working toward a joint effort, particularly with the Soviet Union, to avoid the danger of repeating the conditions of 1967 when events led to a confrontation and serious recrimination.

Mr. Speaker, to all those who would like to avoid World War III—and I am sure that includes every Member of this body—the Soviet Union should not be led to believe that the United States will abdicate its responsibilities in the Near East or its clear support of Israel, and we must therefore manifest a responsible position of firmness. We must demonstrate that we are trying to work for an early peace, particularly between the parties to the dispute. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think we need a policy of diplomacy and firmness to avoid hostilities and to secure peace.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for those remarks. All of us are familiar with the highly valuable service which the gentleman rendered to this country while serving as Ambassador to Israel prior to his coming to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we are just now passing the point of commemorating the third anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem.

When one recalls that it was King David who founded the great city of Jerusalem which I like to call the real eternal city of the world one has the suggestion come to mind that there is



a certain parallel between the present situation facing Israel and the situation which faced the young David who came as a shepherd boy out of the mountains to combat Goliath, the champion of the enemy, gleaming in his armor which was considered invincible, so mighty and majestic, so powerful, that he thought none dared to assail him. Yet this young David, with no weapon except his trusted sling shot fearlessly and determinedly engaged the Goliath and slew him. Today Israel, a nation of a little over 2 million people, faces the Goliath of over 100 million Arabs determined to destroy the people of Israel and to drive them into the sea, to eliminate from the face of the earth the country of Israel. They now have not only that Goliath which they have faced since their freedom and statehood, they have another Goliath far more powerful and far more dangerous today in the form of the Soviet Union. For the first time a great power, one of the world's greatest powers—no other nation exceeds her strength save the United States of America—the Soviet Union not being satisfied with replenishing the war materiel which the Arabs lost in the 6-day war in 1967, now has sent its own military personnel into Egypt against Israel. I heard in a public broadcast a statement of the Foreign Minister of Israel, the great Abba Eban, that the Russians were engaged in operational military activities in Egypt. Russian pilots are flying Russian planes in the service of Egypt. Not only that, but there are many more Russian personnel at least in Egypt manning anti-aircraft guns and commanding other weapons of various types, perhaps thousands of them are a part of the military forces of Egypt.

This is a second Goliath that this gallant Israel, the ancient David did, has to face today.

Their Prime Minister has stated only recently that if the Russians violate the territorial integrity of Israel they would shoot down a Russian plane with a Russian pilot just as quickly as they would an Egyptian plane controlled by an Egyptian pilot. The people of Israel have not lost courage, but the fight is one-sided, Mr. Speaker, if Russia is not only to supply all necessary arms but is to participate with its own personnel in this battle against Israel.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is this: Are we proceeding under special orders of the House?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the gentleman is correct. We are proceeding under special orders of the House.

Mr. HALL. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. PEPPER. What is the answer, Mr. Speaker? The answer is that the United States of America which was the first

country, I believe, to recognize the independence of Israel, must let the Russians know that we will not allow them to take over the domination of the strategically valuable Middle East, the domination of the Mediterranean, in which they are already engaged. We will not allow the Russians to achieve their dream of centuries to reach warmwater ports, and to put its fleet in the Mediterranean for the purpose of militarily dominating that whole area. We will not allow that ancient dream to be realized by them without our resistance, and we will not allow Russia to destroy the independence of Israel so long as our might can prevent it. The only way we can do that is to respond to the Russian threat with the only thing the Russians recognize, and that is the threat of force and power. The Russians do not yield to persuasion. They are not moved by ethical or moral appeals. Supplication has no influence upon them. They recognize only bare, naked power—only that.

And so I believe the United States must let the Russians know that we will not allow them in violation of international law, and the principles that we hold dear, to destroy Israel. We must tell them we will not allow you to do that, and we will take whatever steps are necessary to prevent it.

Now, Mr. Speaker I believe that we can prevent such aggression without the necessity of hostilities if we let the Russians know that we are firm in our response. And the first thing to do is to let the people of Israel, gallant and brave as they are, have whatever weapons of war are necessary for their own defense. They will man those weapons. They are not asking for American personnel to fly our Phantom jets or our Skyhawk jets. Just let them have the jets. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, they propose to pay for them, cash, as they have done in the past.

I do not know what sort of deal the Russians have with the Egyptians, I doubt if the Egyptians are paying cash; but Israel is ready, willing and able to pay cash.

Has Israel not a right to be heard in the councils of our country? If we will let the Russians know that we will let Israel have as many planes as it needs I do not think we will ever have to send an American to the Middle East, and Israel can save herself and can save that precious area so strategically important to us, and to the free world.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, let these words, after the example of President Kennedy, go forth from the distinguished Speaker from the majority leader, from the minority leader, from the Members of this House, as they have gone forth from the Members of the Senate that the Congress will stand by Israel and against Russia or any who would attempt to destroy her. We are confident that the President of the United States will utter an authoritative statement that Israel may receive what planes and weapons she needs from us very shortly.

We have confidence that the President will respond to the sentiment of our country, and the expressed and recognized sentiment of the Congress, and let the Russians know that Israel will have our aid and our help to the extent that it

may be necessary to preserve their freedom and independence, which means so much to all mankind.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that in the real international world of today, in some cases lack of ability of a country like Israel to defend adequately can encourage war. It would be nice if we had arrived at the place in world affairs when there can be arms reduction but we do not yet have that situation and the option is not up to us alone. Under the circumstances, providing sufficient arms is a calculated move to reduce the possibility of war when we cooperate to assure that the balance of power is not upset in the Middle East. I commend the gentleman from Florida, with whom I have talked many times about this situation, for his attention to this problem in the Middle East, which I believe is the place where there is the greatest danger of an all-out war erupting.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the able gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF), and yield back the remainder of my time.

#### ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) who has long helped to lead this fight for the defense of Israel.

I should like to read into the RECORD a statement from Hon. THOMAS E. MORGAN, who is the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. MORGAN today gave me this statement to put into the RECORD:

REMARKS OF HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN,  
DEMOCRAT, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge an end to the unwise delay in making a favorable decision to sell jet planes to Israel. High administration sources have indicated that a decision will soon be reached and at the same time have implied that only partly favorable action will be taken in this important matter.

The security of Israel is important to the United States for many reasons and it is very much in the interest of peace to help her obtain the equipment she needs for defense. The deployment of Soviet missiles in the United Arab Republic and the presence of Soviet pilots flying military aircraft in the area can only be a matter of the gravest concern to Israel and to those nations who seek genuine peace in the Middle East.

Our Secretary of State has recently emphasized that "It is in our best interest to be sure that Israel survives as a nation," and he went on to say "That's been our policy, and that will continue to be our policy." I am glad that he made such a statement and I support him in it one hundred per cent. However, statements are not enough. Words will not offset the hard realities of the situation. It is plain that the Soviet is changing the balance of power against Israel and if we continue to fail to implement our policy all our fine words will have been for nothing. I hope the right decision will soon be made and that it will not be equivocal. We should sell Israel all the jets needed for her defense without further quibbling and dangerous delays.

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

Mr. WOLFF. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the administration has still not indicated whether F-4 Phantom jets and Skyhawks will be sold to Israel to counter the increased Soviet military presence in the United Arab Republic.

In light of reports that the Egyptians are attempting to build SAM missile bases along the Suez Canal, the United States can no longer afford to vacillate on its Mideast policy. According to military observers, these bases would most probably be manned by Russian personnel, thereby greatly increasing the chances of a direct Israeli-Soviet confrontation.

The suggestion that the United States will sell Israel only a sufficient number of jets to cover losses from battle attrition is disquieting. If such a plan were to become our policy, it could lead to a fatal erosion of Israel's security. After all, the Russians are not just replacing Egyptian equipment destroyed in battle. They are expanding the United Arab Republic's capacity to mount a military offensive against Israel.

An arms race in the Middle East is not a desirous thing, but neither is the destruction of the area's only democracy. Therefore, we must sue for peace by promoting negotiations between the Arabs and Israelis, while not ignoring the realities of an incendiary situation that dictates against compromising Tel-Aviv's security.

The U.S. foot dragging in assistance to Israel has encouraged the Soviets to establish a more aggressive military program in the United Arab Republic.

Strategically, Israel's request for the Phantoms must be fulfilled to assure the continuation of a military balance that will prevent the eruption of full-scale hostilities and reduce the possibility of the major powers being dragged into a direct confrontation.

Morally, the planes must be supplied if the United States does not want to risk having the destruction of Israel on its conscience.

I am aware of Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser's May Day threat that the United States would "rupture forever" its relationship with the Arab world if Phantoms were sold to Israel. But this kind of rhetoric emanates daily from the Arab world, which is too divided to implement the words, even if it were serious about doing so.

Critics of Israel are demanding that the United States put pressure on the tiny nation to make concessions to the Arab world without receiving anything in return. Thus, these individuals insist that the Israelis should proclaim they will limit their air activity to the Suez Canal area and should also express a willingness to evacuate from the occupied territories without prior Arab assurances that Israel's territorial integrity will be respected.

Israel has repeatedly declared that outside of East Jerusalem, all territories seized in the 1967 war are negotiable. It remains for the Arabs to respond officially that they will recognize the existence of Israel and are ready to negotiate a peaceful settlement.

There is also reportedly some concern

within the administration that adding to Israel's air arsenal would escalate the arms race with the Soviets in the Middle East.

On the contrary, failure to supply Israel with the planes would be an open invitation for the Russians to accelerate their military role and multiply the dangers of a major East-West confrontation. We must not encourage any Soviet view that regards the United States as either too preoccupied in Southeast Asia or too indifferent to Israel's fate to stand up to a Russian challenge in the Middle East.

Arguments that Soviet intervention in Egypt has been relatively mild are dangerously myopic.

Another thing that disturbs me, Mr. Speaker, are the fallacious attempts to label as inconsistent those who advocate both withdrawal from Vietnam and military assistance to Israel.

Let me outline, once again, the differences:

In Israel, we are supporting a democratic government; in South Vietnam, an unpopular and repressive regime.

American soldiers are being killed daily in Indochina. The Israelis ask us for nothing more than material support. They are willing to pay for what they receive, and our Government will not have to make the financial sacrifices which Vietnam demands.

If Israel loses its fight, it faces annihilation. If the Saigon regime is defeated or removed, it will most likely improve the chances of the feuding factions' assimilation—through a political settlement.

From the point of view of America's self-interest, Israel is clearly a democratic bulwark against Soviet domination in the Middle East. It is not apparent that the ouster of the Thieu government will place Hanoi in control of South Vietnam or that Red China will engulf all of Southeast Asia.

Mr. Speaker, the United States must continue to work for negotiations between hostile parties in the Middle East. It must resist the pressures of certain American business interests that would betray Israel to preserve holdings in Arab lands. A solution must be found which guarantees Israel's right to exist as well as permanent settlement of the Palestinian refugees.

Some dangerous misconceptions in certain levels of the administration jeopardize Israel's position in the Middle East and the stability of the region in general.

A number of American diplomats have succumbed to the Arabs' flimsy rhetoric which insists the Israelis would be able to bully the Arabs every step of the way in negotiations.

Other Western diplomats have accepted the Arab line that if the Palestinian refugees were given a choice of returning to Israel or receiving reparations, 95 percent would pick the latter alternative. The diplomats overlook the distinct possibility that the Arab governments might coerce the refugees to return to Israel and act as a fifth column.

Mr. Speaker, Arab propaganda has

portrayed the United States as champion of Israel since its inception in 1948. Yet the U.S. Government embargoed military aid to Israel when the Arabs sought to destroy the fledgling state in its first year of existence.

Since that time, the United States has provided arms to both Arabs and Israelis, but only the Israelis have regularly paid for them.

Israel asks no more, and the United States can do no less than supply weapons with which Israel can defend itself.

Hopefully, a military stalemate will buy the time for tensions to unwind in the troubled Middle East.

To avoid a full-scale conflict between Israelis and Arabs and restrain the Russians from escalating toward a major power confrontation, I urge the administration to sell Israel the planes for which it has asked.

Mr. WOLFF. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. WOLFF. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman in the well for taking this time and I want to associate myself with the remarks made by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida, who preceded the gentleman, and I associate myself with his views regarding this very important matter in the Middle East because it is obvious that the situation there is reaching alarming proportions.

Mr. Speaker, I have recently once again joined in signing a letter to the President urging that he proceed immediately with the sale of additional jet planes to Israel. I have also requested the President to vigorously protest the presence of Soviet military personnel in Egypt.

United States' interests are closely tied with the continued existence of the State of Israel, and these interests appear to be in serious jeopardy.

The incursion of Soviet military personnel in Egypt constitutes a dangerous escalation of the hostilities in the Middle East and poses a grave upset in the balance of power there. It is imperative that our Government protest vigorously this presence to the Soviet Union, making it clear that this country will not stand for the physical intrusion of a foreign power in the Middle East.

At the same time, we must provide Israel with the planes she so desperately needs to conduct her own defense. This is particularly vital now, with the Soviet Union flying military missions in Egypt.

Mr. WOLFF. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. WOLFF. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER), and to my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF), because this is exactly the time when every voice should be raised to make clear to the President how deeply the great majority of the Members of this body feel about permitting Israel to buy the jets she needs so urgently. If ever there was a



stitch in time that could save nine, that stitch is selling Israel these jets, and the time is now. Israeli security is jeopardized by the escalation of Soviet support for Egypt. So is the frail hope that the Arab states will discover that further recourse to force is not in their interest. If Israel loses her deterrent capabilities, Arab aggression becomes inevitable, and that means preemptive strikes. We cannot expect Israel to sit by, waiting patiently to be eradicated at the convenience of her enemies.

There is much to do to encourage peaceful and just resolution of the Middle East crisis, but if the arms race tilts to the side of those who continue to reject the possibility of negotiating differences, war must come again. In that event, nothing further can be done to encourage a peaceful and just solution, and the war that results could imperil the survival of the whole planet. At the very best, such a war must bring enormous misery to millions of people in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, I wish there were an arms freeze in the Middle East. I wish the Arab States were willing to negotiate. If wishes were horses, then beggars would ride. Meanwhile, there must be no unilateral arms freeze against Israel, which is willing to negotiate, while those who are not willing to negotiate arm past their teeth until they feel strong enough to strike. Each day of delay adds to the possibility of this kind of tragedy. That is why we must speak out today and tomorrow, and the next day, and the next, demanding every day that the President sell these jets to Israel until they are in fact sold.

Mr. WOLFF. I thank my colleague.

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

Mr. WOLFF. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make just this one observation.

I am so pleased that the distinguished Speaker of the House, the distinguished majority leader, the distinguished minority leader, the distinguished dean of this House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER), and a number of our other leading colleagues have issued a letter—and have urged all of our colleagues to sign it—which asks the President to provide Israel with the jets it requires. It is a letter similar to that sent to the President by 76 Members of the Senate.

The reason it is very important that we advise the President of our position, is that the President and the State Department are under great pressure by people like David Rockefeller, John McCloy, and Robert Anderson, representing the oil interests, who have been urging a policy which is unfavorable to Israel.

Because these people have great power, I am so pleased that the leaders of the Congress on both sides of the Capitol and on both sides of the aisle are standing up and saying to the President: Let us do what is in our national interest and that which is just, and do it by helping Israel to safeguard its borders by providing it with the Phantom jets necessary to do so.

I am, Mr. Speaker, setting forth a recent column by C. L. Sulzberger which appeared in the New York Times on June

5, 1970. The article sets forth the facts on the involvement of the U.S.S.R. in the Mideast. Time is short and delay is unpardonable. The President should announce the sale of jets to Israel immediately.

The article follows:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: SUEZ AND THE SOVIETS  
(By C. L. Sulzberger)

Moscow.—Three years after the Six Day War began, Moscow's Middle East strategy is perhaps no longer based only on rearming the Arabs so they can overcome Israel while the Soviet Union and the United States warn each other to stay away. Indeed, Russia may be preparing deliberately to participate in a limited conflict, reckoning it can get away with this at little risk.

In 1967 the Kremlin avoided intervention to protect its massive Arab investment. The consequence was a swift Israeli victory. The Soviet leaders were then convinced Washington would not permit Israel's destruction and would forcibly prevent it. Now, however, there have been changes in the situation.

Russia considers it in its primordial interest to reopen the Suez Canal. This is no longer a major concern of other big powers because petroleum is more cheaply and efficiently carried in huge supertankers which could never squeeze through the canal.

Moreover, with the British and French empires gone and the U.S.A. in Asia essentially dependent on trans-Pacific maritime support, Suez has lost strategic meaning for the West. But it shortens the route between European Russia's Baltic and Black Sea ports and the East—to India and North Vietnam. It also allows access by the U.S.S.R.'s growing Mediterranean fleet to the Indian Ocean and the Red Sea where Soviet penetration is significant.

So long as Israeli occupation of the canal's east bank continues, these major projects are frustrated. It is worth a considerable gamble to change this and the easiest way for Moscow—while insuring the consequent war doesn't get out of hand—is by supervising the operation under its own commanders in Egypt.

WHAT RUSSIA MIGHT DO

The Kremlin might conceivably use as an excuse almost any of the daily incidents occurring between Israel and Egypt. It could proclaim it was acting merely to enforce the U.N. Middle East resolution and that once Israel's 1967 Sinai borders were reached, fighting would halt. Moscow could insist this was a quick, one-shot operation designed to correct injustice and to open Suez for the good of world commerce.

This hypothesis was first conceived early in 1968 by Sir Harold Beeley, then British Ambassador in Cairo. Even then it would have been difficult for the United States to intervene promptly on Israel's behalf and counter by superpower confrontation an operation proclaimed by Moscow as limited. Instant decisions on enormously vital matters would first have to be taken in Washington. And today the American people are far less in a mood to accept such decisions than they might previously have been.

Bitterly divided on Vietnam and Cambodia, confused by a sagging economy and torn by racial dissension, America may well be deemed by the Kremlin as today so weak that the gamble is acceptable for Russia. Every development of the past few months seems to fit into this analysis.

Moscow has been circumspect about Cambodia, where America is embroiled, but has been unyieldingly tough on the Middle East. It has sent SAM-2 and SAM-3 missiles to Egypt and protects them with a Soviet air division. The defense system was first established along the Nile Valley, preventing Israel from attacking Egypt's heart in the war of attrition.

Now a second stage has been reached. The infrastructure for SAM-3 missile sites has been laid down along the west bank of the canal. If Egypt's own air force cannot defend these emplacements when the actual missiles are inserted, Russia may simply extend its protection to the front lines.

FORCING THE ISSUE

Then either the Israelis will have to withdraw from their existing positions as they become untenable or the Russians could decide to force the issue—perhaps when Israeli pilots have knocked down Soviet planes. Nowadays Russia not only has some armed cadres in Egypt but commando units and helicopter carriers in the Mediterranean.

Moscow's actions increasingly indicate the Kremlin might decide to force the reopening of Suez and strengthen its position in the Arab world, the Red Sea and Indian Ocean. The argument about whether Israel should be allowed to purchase more U.S. Phantoms is no longer even relevant to the possible new form of crisis.

Major U.S. Government contingency plans must be made now and perhaps aired in advance if deterrence is intended—before, not after the fact.

Mr. WOLFF. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join with the leadership of the House and with my colleagues, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF), in expressing my strong support for Israel's pending request for the purchase of jet aircraft from the United States.

On many occasions I have urged the present administration to take a more forthright attitude on the problems of the Middle East in support of the entirely legitimate positions of the Government of Israel.

Not only must the United States make available the planes and other military equipment needed by Israel for her defense, but the United States must make absolutely clear to the Arabs and the Soviet Union that we have no intention of letting Israel be driven into the sea. As I have suggested in the past, I believe consideration should be given to incorporating this commitment into a formal treaty, either a bilateral treaty or possibly a multilateral treaty.

The State Department's proposals of last fall with regard to the terms of possible settlements between Israel and the United Arab Republic and Jordan were a serious blunder, as I stated at the time. They undercut Israel's bargaining position in the event that discussions do get underway with the Arab states, and they should now be withdrawn, since they were firmly rejected by both sides.

The State Department was clearly overoptimistic last year in its hope that the Soviet Union really wanted to promote a peaceful settlement in the Middle East. That forlorn hope has now been exploded.

I understand that the State Department has expressed to the Soviet Union our great concern at the Soviet's recent irresponsible moves in the Middle East, including the introduction of pilots flying Mig aircraft. I must say that our posture

in demanding the withdrawal of Soviet personnel would be far stronger if we were not ourselves engaged in a massive military misadventure in Southeast Asia.

While the Congress is divided on the proper course to take in Southeast Asia, it is to a remarkable degree agreed on the issues in the Middle East. The executive branch would do well to pay heed to the statements made here today and on many other occasions by Members of this body.

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

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

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I want to join with the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Florida in the remarks that they have made in respect to the sale of jets to Israel at the present time. There is only one point that I wish to make following the statements made that, in the opinion of the last speaker, the bankers and the oil companies, for some reason or other, do not want jets sold to Israel. Let me suggest that in my opinion it is in the interest of the oil companies and the banks that are interested in the oil companies to see that jets are sold to Israel, because the only way that the moderate Arab countries can survive is to unhinge the tie with Soviet Russia, because once the Soviets gain domination of that area, that will be the end of the moderate governments that have oil to sell to Europe.

So I ask them to look to their own best interests.

It is imperative that the sale of jets to Israel no longer be delayed. The need for these jets by the Israelis is quite evident. The Arabs outnumber the Israelis 4 to 1 in modern aircraft. This in itself is cause for concern. But with the intrusion of massive Soviet aid to the Arab States, the situation becomes alarming.

The installation of the SAM III missile sites by the Soviets and the fact Soviet pilots are flying operational missions is cause for the deepest concern not only to Israel but to this Government as well. With the Soviets assuming the defense of the United Arab Republic, Nasser's best pilots are thereby released for the purpose of attacking Israel.

Soviet intrusion and influence in the Middle East has now reached a level that is intolerable to the United States. But the implications of Soviet influence in the Arab States far transcends the interest of our own Nation. The consequences for the moderate Arab States and even the United Arab Republic in the end might very well be the end of their national sovereignty. For as we have seen in countries such as Czechoslovakia when the "Russian Bear" hugs it never lets go. Those moderate Arab countries in the final analysis have indeed more to fear from the Soviet Union than from Israel.

Failure to sell jets to Israel would encourage deeper Soviet involvement in the Middle East conflict. The administration's hesitation in selling the aircraft to Israel has already encouraged the Soviets

to install their SAM III missiles and to even provide pilots against Israel.

The administration must now in the best interest of the United States immediately sell Israel all the aircraft she has requested.

Mr. WOLFF. In line with the gentleman's remarks I should like to point out that if the Soviets get the oil, surely our American oil companies cannot have it.

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

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

Mr. HALPERN. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, we have heard repeatedly that the United States stands firmly behind Israel. And there is no question of the American people standing almost solidly behind Israel in its struggle for existence and freedom. Yet despite this great support there remains a residue of fear about how flexible is our policy.

So that our friends may be reassured and that our enemies not miscalculate, a new forthright declaration on Middle East policy is essential. And it must do more than voice phrases. Actions must occur.

We should announce without further delay the provision of additional Phantom and Skyhawk jets and other weapons required by Israel.

To enable Israel to pit its meager finances against the combined economies of the Soviet Union, France, and the Arab world, the United States must assist Israel in giving extended credit to help finance the cost of the necessary arms.

The United States must re-affirm unequivocally the principle of a just settlement involving direct, face-to-face negotiations in which the Arabs acknowledge their responsibility to make and keep a real and lasting peace, and sign such a treaty.

There is not time to spare, Arab terrorists are viciously continuing their attacks. Egyptian troops are in Libya and Libyan forces are entering Egypt. Russian pilots are flying Egyptian fighter jets.

Humanity rebels against the rising level of violence that endangers not only Israel but also the national security of the United States.

Moscow is today operating through the radical Arab State to penetrate the Middle East and the Mediterranean. Israel is the target because Israel is an outpost of freedom. A defeat for Israel would be a devastating blow for the United States. It would undermine the American position and that of all free nations in the Mediterranean.

No American troops are sought by Israel. But we must nevertheless deter direct Soviet military intervention. When Secretary of State Rogers said last March when he announced the administration's decision on the sale of Phantom jets to Israel he did reaffirm our stated intention to maintain careful watch on the balance of military forces and to provide jets and arms to Israel as the need arises.

Israel's need is immediate. Further delay is dangerous. If we delay, the danger of aggression will only grow; the

strength of the Arabs will increase while Israeli deterrent power deteriorates; violations of the cease-fire will escalate, the Soviet Union might very well miscalculate our position and wrongly assess American intentions in a grave error that could bring about a horrendous confrontation threatening the entire world.

It is no longer a question of whether we can afford to provide Israel with the necessary jets and to extend new lines of credit to cover their financing. It is now a matter of whether we can afford not to take action on Israel's urgent needs.

This is the way to avoid confrontation. This is the way to peace through strength. And this is the way to redeem our moral and ethical commitments toward Israel.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his statement. I commend him as the coauthor with me of the original sale of jets to Israel. It is very heartening to see his continuing support and leadership in this very worthwhile effort.

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

Mr. WOLFF. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON).

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from New York and associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER).

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague from New York (Mr. WOLFF) and my colleague from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) for taking special order to call attention to the increasing crisis in the Middle East.

In 22 short years Israel has progressed further economically and technologically than any nation in history in a similar period of time. She has extended the hand of friendship and citizenship to people from around the globe, and despite hostile surroundings, has made remarkable efforts to extend all human and political rights to the Arab peoples living within her borders.

Without repeating in detail what most of you know to be the highlights of Israel's history, let me briefly mention some of the reasons that I believe Israel is important to the people of America.

First, Israel is the only true democracy, the only open society in the Near East. While some of her Arab neighbors have potential for freedom, Israel is the only country in the area that has put the welfare of her people above all other national goals.

Second, Israel, despite her serious military and financial situation, and her need to spend great sums of money on settling and training refugees, has been able to devote major energies to providing assistance to many emerging countries of Africa. She is literally sowing the seeds of literacy, technology and freedom in a continent which many westerners feared would fall easy prey to Communist initiatives.

It is fair to say that Israel has more credibility and has done more good in these nations than has our own aid program. Because our aid carries with it the connotations of great power and cold war involvement.

Third, and not to be minimized is the



fact that Israel is our only dependable ally in the Near East—counting all of those nations now involved in the immediate conflict with Israel.

While Jordan and Lebanon have been friendly to us for many years, the growing Palestinian influence in these nations makes their future status extremely questionable. While I hope that potential revolution in presently constituted Arab governments will not create another Syria, we should not discount this serious possibility.

Considering the strategic importance of the Mediterranean area, and considering the proven fact that democracy in Israel—in a new and developing nation—is serving as a vital example to other developing nations, all Americans, whether their names are Bernstein, or Wilson, or Horton or Colombo, must recognize the importance of our friendship with Israel.

Now what responsibilities does this friendship impose upon the United States?

First, from the standpoint of diplomacy, the United States must lead the world in calling attention to the very difficult propaganda dilemma which Israel faces. When Israel is attacked by guerrilla forces from across Arab boundaries, she has little choice but to act against guerrilla sanctuary areas in these nations. The problem is that much of the world recognizes that at least some of these attacks against Israel are launched without either the direct consent or control of the governments that are supposedly in power in these nations.

In some cases, either the Arab regimes we recognize lack the military power to control Palestinian guerrillas, or, more often, they are prevented politically from making any move that would give the appearance of opposing the powerful guerrillas, or opposing the continuation of the holy war against Israel.

Thus when Israel moves against these sanctuaries, as she has done recently in Lebanon, the world, and the United Nations react in opposition to Israeli aggression—since Israel's military actions are controlled by her government, and are thus subject to the rules and sanctions of international law and diplomacy.

The guerrillas, on the other hand, answer to no lawfully constituted or recognized authority, and are thus immune from diplomatic and propaganda sanctions. To this extent, Israel has suffered from her victory in the June 1967 war, and has been the butt of countless resolutions condemning her so-called aggression against guerrilla and Arab military placements across the truce lines, despite Israel's immediate willingness to honor the cease-fire which was broken when Nasser declared this war of attrition against Israel last year.

I have deplored United States votes for some of these resolutions. Instead, we should be pointing out that some way, some procedure must be found to apply condemnation and sanctions against those groups responsible for sabotage, aircraft piracy and attacks against Israeli villages.

Many people have sought to draw analogy between Israel's attacks against

Palestinian sanctuaries in Arab countries and the action against Communist sanctuaries in Cambodia. My position on the latter is well known. I believe the South Vietnamese Government has the right to challenge Vietcong and North Vietnamese units in these areas from which attacks are launched against South Vietnam. But I do not believe Americans should be sent across international boundaries to do this job unless our constitutional requirements that Congress be consulted are closely followed.

I believe direct American involvement in any widening of the Southeast Asian war into Cambodia is as dangerous an escalation as is the use of Soviet fighter pilots on combat duty in Egypt.

I purposely raise this point because I think both situations are highly charged with the danger of great power confrontation. I think recent events have shown that our diplomacy in the Middle East has not properly reacted to this danger, however. Our policy seems to have been one of backing away step by step from the support of Israel in the hopes of appeasing the Arabs, and in the hopes of showing Moscow how peaceful our intentions are in that area of the world.

What has been the result? With each American step backward, the Russians have taken a decided step forward in their involvement.

When Secretary Rogers made his very conciliatory speech December 9, offering detailed terms of a peace settlement along the Jordanian and Egyptian frontiers, the Soviet response was as follows:

First. Russia rejected the offer outright.

Second. Russia hurriedly influenced Arab officials in Cairo, who were tempted by the U.S. offer, to reject it out of hand, probably in return for promises of more military aid.

Third. Russia backed away from her previous promise to support peace talks between Arab and Israeli diplomats under the Rhodes formula, with a neutral middle-man shuttling back and forth between the two sides. This was a decided step away from peace in response to the U.S. peace overture.

Then, in the face of massive French plane sales to Algeria, and the installation of Soviet SAM III missiles, President Nixon chose to try a further conciliatory step. He rejected the Israeli request to purchase U.S. Phantom and Skyhawk aircraft. Despite the fact that I and other Congressmen and Senators had urged that he grant at least a portion of the request.

What was the Russian response? We know it all too well. Did they interpret the U.S. move as final evidence of our desire for peace? Did they take prompt steps toward setting the atmosphere in Cairo for a settlement? Indeed not.

They instead felt the cost was clear for the direct involvement of Soviet pilots in Egyptian combat air defense, freeing Egyptian pilots for offensive missions, and forcing Israel to forgo missions beyond the Suez zone if they want to avoid deepening the crisis by shooting down a Soviet pilot. Israel has, in fact, stopped

all air missions beyond this zone, because it desperately wants to avoid giving the Russians a propaganda excuse for widening Soviet direct participation in the Arab military ranks.

My question is, if we fail to grant a significant portion of Israel's request at this juncture—after the introduction of Soviet pilots—what will be their next step forward in response to our step backward?

I was one of the first Members of Congress to announce my support for the Nixon doctrine, which the President enunciated last summer in Guam.

Simply stated, the doctrine says that America should stand ready to help free nations defend themselves by offering economic and appropriate military equipment aid. It states that U.S. ground combat troops should not be committed where other free world nations in the threatened region are not committed.

The Nixon doctrine is a master plan for extracting America from the role of world policeman. It does not do this by abandoning free nations, but puts them on notice that the commitment will not normally extend to U.S. combat troops.

I have urged that this doctrine be applied in Laos and in Cambodia—that our ground troops not be committed there. I now urge that it be applied to Israel. We should not commit ground units there. To be sure, no one has asked us to. But neither should we hesitate to grant Israel's request to buy U.S. aircraft so that she can defend herself. We are her last remaining supplier of aircraft.

I think a decision to supply these planes would be in keeping with the Nixon doctrine, and would be in keeping with the President's desire to negotiate with the Soviets from a position of strength. In all matters, I think our commitment to the state of Israel is at least that great.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is well established that I have a consistent record of advocacy of the belief that the state of Israel is our only real friend in the Middle East.

It is equally well established that I have a consistent record of advocacy of the belief that the sooner Moscow, Nasser, and company recognize that Israel is there to stay the sooner we shall have peace in the historically critical geopolitical theater.

Even as I have a consistent record of advocacy of the belief that we must assure that the people of Indochina must not be left defenseless against aggression, so, too, is my record consistent with regard to the application of that same concept in behalf of the freedom of the people of Israel.

It has been in active support of these advocacies that I have joined, frequently, with those distinguished colleagues who, so long, have urged the President of the United States to assure Israeli freedom and Middle Eastern peace by correcting any Soviet or French imposed imbalance of arms or planes which might threaten that peace and that freedom.

When, early this year, President Nixon made clear, publicly, that he would do precisely that, I hastened to make clear, also publicly, my gratification and support.

In the months that have passed since that moment, it has become a most ominous fact of history that the men in the Moscow Kremlin have decided to test our resolution and determination on this very point. Certainly, I need not recite here the myriad well-documented items of intelligence which have been permitted to arrive in the public domain with regard to the manner in which the Kremlin leaders have moved to aggravate the now obvious imbalance against Israel which they created in the first place.

I have joined in this essential effort in realization that now is the time for us to face up to our responsibilities and see that Israel receives jet aircraft and other arms and armament to enable her to deter aggression against her.

Suffice it to say that the consequence of this carefully calculated Kremlin action has delivered us to a situation so urgent that the move to correct this imbalance can no longer be delayed, not alone in the interest of Israeli freedom, nor mid-Eastern peace, but in the American self-interest.

It is for this critical reason that I have joined the leadership of this House on both sides of the aisle in dispatching a new letter to the President to express vital congressional concern "with the threat of Soviet presence in the Middle East," and to emphasize that "it is clear to us that the moment has arrived for the United States to take firm action to meet the present danger" thereby imposed.

In signing this letter setting forth "that it is urgent that our Government provide Israel with additional supersonic jet planes," I was perfectly willing to rest my case with the brutal fact that, as stated in that letter:

It is public knowledge that the Soviet-Arab aircraft strength is now four times the strength of that of Israel and that the presence of Soviet filers and technicians may adversely affect Israel's heretofore qualitative advantage.

Mr. Speaker, what more need be said? Thank you.

Mr. WOLFF. I thank the gentleman. I must underline the fact that he has always spoken out loud and clear when it comes to the inroads being made by communism, no matter where it exists in the world.

Mr. Speaker, each day the extreme urgency of the Middle East crisis grows more intense. In effect, it becomes more and more obvious that we must act if the delicate balance of power in this area of the world is to be restored and the foundations of future world peace are to be established.

For sometime now the Soviets have been the arsenal of the Arab world fueling the flames of war in the Mideast. The recent decision of the Soviet Union to undertake a direct military role in the Arab-Israeli conflict by flying combat missions over Egypt and manning SAM sites comes as a direct confrontation with

free world interests in the Mideast and a blow to world peace efforts.

This infiltration not only badly disrupts the balance of power in the Middle East, but it also permits the Egyptians to mount strong offensive actions, while Soviet military personnel take over their defense against counter blows by the Israelis, giving immunity to the United Arab Republic to continue its dangerous war.

Thus, it becomes imperative that we heed Israel's call for sales of needed Phantom and Skyhawk jets to restore the balance of power and prevent the outbreak of full-scale war.

The brazen actions of the Soviet Union in the Middle East, are not the result of a sudden thought on the Kremlin's part. Indeed, it is part of Russia's attempts to control the Middle East area which dates back to 1853, a time at which a London correspondent for the New York Tribune announced Russian plans to control the Middle East.

More than a hundred years later, Khrushchev told the 23d Congress of the Soviet Communist Party that Nasser "is now the instrument of Soviet policy in the Middle East."

In effect, the actions of the Soviet Union, by arming and funding the perpetual Arab attacks upon Israel is consistent with the historical Russian policy of attempts to dominate the Middle East and gain access to the Mediterranean, the subcontinent and Africa.

The Middle East crisis by no means rests solely with the USSR's support of the Arab nations. It is exacerbated through the blatant actions of France and her sale of planes to Libya. Moreover, just yesterday in the Washington Post it was reported that a Cairo paper has announced French intentions to deliver surface-to-air rockets to Arab nations at the beginning of next year.

Hence, although I would prefer as the most desirable course of action a total arms embargo in this extremely sensitive part of the world, it is very obvious that Russia and France are unwilling to agree to such an embargo.

It therefore becomes essential that we sell Israel the additional Phantom and Skyhawk jets which are vital to her security, bearing in mind that our security is, as the distinguished minority leader has noted directly tied to Israel's security. And Secretary of State Rogers at a briefing this morning confirmed this.

Unfortunately, the President's March decision to defer sale of additional jets to Israel has failed to induce the Soviet Union to exercise reciprocal restraint with respect to arming the United Arab Republic and other Arab nations.

I can recall moreover that when this decision was announced, Secretary of State Rogers promised that "the President will not hesitate to reconsider this matter—if steps are taken which might upset the current balance."

Those steps have been taken. And now we must act. As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East, I am firmly convinced that the United States can postpone its decision no longer if there is to be any hope

for ever achieving peace in the Middle East.

Only by strengthening Israel's military capability can we insure that the sparks of precipitous unwise acts by the Arab nations will not produce a conflagration which could consume the world.

This immediate need for action has gained the support of a very significant number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in both Houses of Congress.

On May 31, a bipartisan committee of 73 Senators sent a letter to Secretary of State Rogers requesting a meeting to discuss the Middle East crisis and to urge the United States to provide aircraft for Israel's defense.

In addition, a letter asking for the sale, which had been circulated by House Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK, House Majority Leader CARL ALBERT, the dean of the House EMANUEL CELLER, and House Minority Leader GERALD FORD, to name but a few signatories, will be sent to the President.

Earlier this session I introduced a resolution which was cosponsored by a number of my colleagues calling for the President to begin negotiations for the sale of jets.

Undeniably, the voice of Congress echoes the need for action, a voice in which citizen groups and individuals have spoken loudly and clearly.

Just last month, for example, the past national commanders of the six leading veterans organizations sent telegrams to the President urging him to take action immediately to sell Israel the aircraft.

The anxiety generated by this situation is widespread. And the depth and breadth of those who have voiced their deep concern as to Israel's fate and the fate of world peace efforts, makes it imperative that we take action today, not next week or next year.

We cannot sit back to monitor this situation any longer. For while we continue to ponder our policies toward the Middle East, we are continuing to train airmen for six Arab nations at our expense under the military assistance program.

To add to this, we have given, not sold planes to Jordan, which can only make me wonder why we are not at least selling planes to Israel.

Israel's viability is essential to the fate of NATO. For she not only stands as the only democracy in that part of the world, but she is also the southeastern flank of Western democracy.

Although she is not a member of NATO, she stands as one of the protectorates of our NATO countries in this heavily Soviet dominated area of the world.

We should consider moreover the fact that Soviet domination of the entire region including fleet expansion in the Mediterranean Sea and Indian Ocean has grown more pronounced because we have failed to heed Israel's request.

Our monitoring of this has been a futile attempt to defuse the crisis in the Middle East. It is very clear that our failure to stand up to Soviet intimidation and belligerent actions has only intensified the situation.

Only by making an early and affirmative decision to provide Israel with addi-



tional planes can we make it clear to the Soviets the seriousness with which we view their action. This is the best guarantee against the outbreak of major hostilities.

Concomitant to such action, the United States must also exert its influence to reestablish a cease fire as a preliminary step to eventual peace negotiations.

And there must be prompt consultations with our NATO allies because of the dangers posed to our own security by the Soviet build-up in the Middle East.

The truth screams out at us. If we are to resist the totalitarian advancement which destroys the fabric of democracy we must provide Israel with an adequate deterrent to guarantee her integrity and viability.

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

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

Mr. TUNNEY. I should like to compliment the gentleman from New York for having brought this matter to the attention of the House at this time. I agree with him that it is absolutely essential, if we are going to maintain the balance of power in the Middle East, for us to promptly give jets to Israel that she requires for her self-defense.

The gentleman from New York has done a great service to this country and to our foreign policy by bringing this point to the Nation at this time when it appears that there is a reevaluation of our Government's policy with respect to the sale of jets to Israel.

It seems to me that there never should have been a question regarding the sale. It seems to me that this issue should not have had to be brought to the floor of the House by the gentleman from New York. But unfortunately it is necessary to bring the issue up and I subscribe in every particular to what Mr. WOLFF has said.

The administration, through its inaction and intransigence, has tipped the balance of power in the Middle East in favor of the Arab block and their principal supporters, the Soviet Union.

Russian advisers are now based in Egypt. The Arabs have the benefit of both Russian missiles and Russian jets.

The Arabs have sworn to defeat Israel—to destroy her as a nation. Mr. Speaker, the question that I ask today is, How long can the administration allow our one true ally in the Middle East, Israel, to stand alone?

Unlike South Vietnam and Cambodia, Israel seeks none of our troops. They seek no handouts, but, rather, they want only the chance to defend themselves. They want only the opportunity to buy jets from us in order to maintain their defensive capabilities. We have refused them.

Under our previously outlined policy of "evenhandedness" we have turned our back on a people who are struggling to maintain a democracy that they have lived and died for, for over two decades. Our policy of "evenhandedness" is now one of "underhandedness."

The United States must provide the necessary military aid to Israel that she needs in order to allow her to defend

herself against the onslaught of the Arab nations. We should sell the amount of jet aircraft that are needed to assist Israel in restoring the tenuous balance of power in the Middle East. We should insist that there be direct negotiations between the Arabs and the Israelis with no big power interference. Only when Israel and the Arab States negotiate their differences directly will there be a lasting peace.

We must act to assure that there be no imbalance in Middle Eastern power relationships. Our Government's previous decisions not to sell jet fighters to Israel amounts to nothing less than direct assistance to the Arabs' one clear objective—the bloody annihilation of the State of Israel. Our policies have been a slap in the face to the people of Israel: a tiny nation which seeks no aggression, no conquest, only a fighting chance to remain free.

Nowhere are our misbalanced priorities more obvious than when one measures the relative merits of our roles in Southeast Asia and in the Middle East. Into the one, we have poured billions of dollars in guns, bombs, and jets and have wasted thousands of American lives in a war that is wrong—morally and politically—while, in the Middle East, we have turned our backs on a true ally, a country that seeks only to buy our armaments in order to maintain the balance of power and prevent the holocaust and bloodshed that would surely follow if Israel were overrun. We have done nothing to prevent the continuation and enlargement of a conflict that, each day, claims the lives of innocent people; people interested only in peace.

Mr. Speaker, it should be within us all, as a matter of duty and, more, as a matter of conscience, to make every effort to change our Government's Middle East policies. Nothing less than the survival of a free people and of a free nation are at stake. Israel needs these planes. I urge the Nixon administration to act—now.

Mr. WOLFF. I thank the gentleman from California, who serves with me on the Committee on Foreign Affairs and has long taken a great position of leadership with regard to questions of peace throughout the world and particularly in the Middle East.

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

Mr. WOLFF. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, because I believe, too, that Israel is a keystone to peace in the Middle East, I would like to associate myself with the remarks by my colleague from Florida.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLFF. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Is the gentleman fully satisfied that all possible efforts and international pressure has been applied to persuade and induce the Soviet Union to withdraw some of its pilots from that critical area?

Mr. WOLFF. I might say in response to the gentleman from West Virginia that according to advices we have received from the Secretary of State only this morning in the Committee on For-

eign Affairs and also the briefings we had with Mr. Sisco, this Nation was aware Soviet pilots and planes were in the Middle East before the President made his decision not to send the aircraft requested by Israel. However, in an effort to try to reduce tensions and to have the Soviets remove their pilots and SAM crews, we held back on the decision to sell the jets. As a result of holding back on the decision to sell the jets, the Soviets increased their efforts in the Middle East and are now flying combat missions.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I thank the gentleman for his information.

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

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fine statement that the gentleman has made. I think all of us understand the crisis arising in the Middle East. The State of Israel is the symbol of civilization throughout that area. It has been my pleasure to visit there on several occasions. I congratulate the gentleman and those who have associated themselves with him.

I include an article as follows:

EGYPT'S GROWING CONFIDENCE IS A DANGER  
SIGNAL

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

When serious people in Egypt talk about a forthcoming "decisive battle" with Israel, it is time for some serious stock-taking in this country.

They are talking about such a battle in Egypt today. What they mean, apparently, is something a good deal more critical than the relatively small-scale "war of attrition" that is currently being waged.

The prediction of a new outbreak of full-scale warfare is not generally accepted in the United States—or, for that matter, in Israel.

The general assessment is that the present military standoff between Egypt and Israel is likely to go on for a long time. Although the possibility of a major explosion is not altogether ruled out, it is held to be unlikely in the near future. There is an impression in the State Department—which actually may be based largely on wishful thinking—that the Russians are exerting a moderating influence on their Egyptian clients.

At the same time, the Israelis have not failed to notice the new note in Egyptian official declarations. They are warning that the present stepped-up war of attrition along the cease-fire line could be "the conditioning process for a subsequent frontal assault across the Suez Canal."

There is, nevertheless, one strong, underlying assumption to all assessments made in Israel and the West. It is that if the Egyptians were so foolish as to launch a frontal assault on Israeli defenses along the canal, the inevitable result would be yet another disaster for the Egyptian armed forces.

Faith in the virtual invincibility of the Israelis has been unshakable since the 1967 war. It was greatly strengthened by Israel's deep-penetration air raids into Egypt starting last August, in which the Israelis demonstrated virtually undisputed mastery of the skies.

It is sometimes argued that this basic balance of power—heavily weighted in Israel's favor—has not been fundamentally changed by the arrival of Russian technicians and pilots this spring. The Soviet presence, it is said, is purely defensive in nature. And if Israel's deep-penetration raids have halted as a result, there are many American experts

who would contend that this was no bad thing.

Yet, in fact, it is hard to sustain the contention that the Soviet presence in Egypt is purely defensive. Since the arrival of the Russians, the pace of President Nasser's "war of attrition" has picked up dramatically.

Egyptian forays across the canal have mounted steadily in frequency and effectiveness. Guerrilla activity along Israel's other frontiers also is on the upswing. And Israeli retaliation along the canal and elsewhere has become a matter of daily routine. Casualties on both sides are mounting.

More important, however, something very fundamental is taking place in Egypt. A new spirit of confidence and determination is reflected in dozens of reports from the Egyptian capital that represents a startling contrast to the mood six months ago.

This change of mood is, of course, impossible to judge in terms of possible future military action. It is said to be, however, very different from the giddy self-intoxication that prevailed in the period leading up to the 1967 war. No one is talking about quick and easy victories and about "driving Israel into the sea." Egyptians today are being told to prepare themselves for a hard and punishing struggle, involving major destruction and heavy casualties.

Western analysts who foresee only one possible outcome to a renewal of heavy fighting on the Egyptian front may have failed to grasp one very important aspect of the Russian presence in Egypt. As the Egyptians see it, quite certainly, this presence virtually precludes another Egyptian defeat on the scale that occurred in 1967.

That defeat, very substantially, was the result of overwhelming Israeli superiority in the air, including the destruction of most of the Egyptian air force on the ground. In all probability, this could not be done today. And the fact that it could not be done would make the outcome of any new round in the war far more problematical than is generally supposed.

In short, it is by no means inconceivable that the Egyptians—and their Russian advisers—might be contemplating at least one major battle in the Sinai peninsula. The aim, presumably, would not be total victory over the Israeli army. Even a limited success for Egypt's armed forces would radically change the political equations in the Middle East and force an urgent reassessment of the long-range prospects in Washington and Jerusalem.

Mr. WOLFF. I thank the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, the continued crisis in the Middle East, where two parallel but conflicting national movements have existed since 1917—and surely since 1947—seems as far removed from solution today as it has at any time of the modern history of the area.

In past weeks, we have seen tragedy strike children in schoolyards and on buses while our State Department still weighs the possibility of selling Phantom jets to the Israel Government.

It is difficult to conceive the rationale which surrounds our hesitancy in this particular instance, even though a final resolution of the unrest still eludes us. The history of the conflict in this area has only one lesson, I believe, and that lesson is that the only deterrent to a further escalation of the hot war is a recognition on the part of the United States of the validity of superior Israel military strength.

Israel asks only for her right to survive; she has earned her right to defend herself with her own blood. She asks no

gifts of men or arms from our Government; after all, she only asks for the right to buy planes.

The way to evaluate friendship between governments is through actions. While we are assured by Secretary Rogers that it is in the best interest of our Government that "Israel survives as a nation," it is naive to think that peace can be achieved in the Middle East without the parties to the conflict being part of the negotiations.

The military fact is that peace in the Middle East will only be secure if Israel is strong enough to keep that peace. As long as the Arab nations feel that Israel stands alone, they will take advantage and pursue the war of attrition. As long as it suits the Soviet Union, they will continue to pursue a course of harassment in the situation.

Our position must be to encourage Israel to come up with some new proposal for the area while she is absolutely assured of our complete support and back-up strength. Under these circumstances, perhaps, forces within the Israel Government could be in a stronger position, for instance, to at least consider the possibility of suggesting that the Palestinian organizations also be invited to negotiate directly with Israel with the possibility of an independent Palestinian state formed in the west bank area of Jordan which has been occupied by Israel since the 7-day war, as suggested by Schlomo Avineri, of Hebrew University.

The Palestinians would have everything to gain from this kind of arrangement. It would begin to solve the refugee problem. It would give the Palestinians a legal base with which to negotiate with other Arab countries. It would indicate a willingness on the part of Israel to accept the fact of Arab nationalist interests.

It would also begin to cool the concern of the Soviet Union as to the intent of our Government in that area, since it would emphasize the right of self-determination of the Arab and the Israelis.

I also believe that a solution to the boundary problems in the Middle East will best be served if somehow the Arab nations were contiguous to each other, which perhaps could be accomplished—as Prof. Nadav Safran of Harvard suggests—by trading of territory between the Israelis and the Egyptians.

I strongly urge our Government, as peacemaker in the area, to encourage Israel to make creative proposals, assured that her security will be protected by the United States. The Arab States and the Soviet Union are not natural allies in this part of the world. The United States and Soviet Union have been on the same side of the problems besetting this area more times than they have been in opposition.

If we can somehow show evidence of accepting the nationalist aspirations of the Egyptians as well as of the Palestinians, we will have done much to cool the feelings of the Arabs toward us, while we continue through actions and words to support the justified military needs to Israel and encourage her to take the initiative in showing recognition of those nationalist aspirations.

Most of the raid activity in the area is being conducted by Palestinian guerrillas, protected by the fact that no Arab

government feels responsible for their actions. The guerrillas have nothing to lose—no government, no land—so they also have everything to gain by some recognition of their national aspirations, even though they seem to show the most hostile attitude toward Israel at the present time. I offer this as a step toward thinking constructively in this direction. It can only be done, however, if Israel is assured of our absolute commitment to her.

We must back up that commitment by immediate sale and delivery of the jets she so desperately needs to be able to negotiate from strength. She must be able to measure her own strength by at least being assured of the support of her friends.

It is important to state, in summary, that as a nation we have a rare opportunity in this area to truly support a government conceived in liberty and dedicated to democratic principles while we need to encourage an acceptance of two nationalist movements. It is irrelevant to discuss the issue in terms of Zionism. We must begin to encourage negotiation on existential terms, both among the Arab nations and the Israelis.

Peace in the Middle East is to the advantage of the Soviets as well as ourselves. If we could adopt a position of benevolent neutrality, this would also suit the Soviet Union, because its fundamental interest is to deny us major influence in the area through neutralization and demilitarization.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, recent developments in the Middle East must be viewed with the utmost gravity. The assignment of Russian pilots to active flight status in the United Arab Republic, following the supplying of increased Soviet missiles and other arms to the Arab Nations, has created a dangerous imbalance and escalated the threat of a full-scale Arab-Israel war once again. Should Israeli and Russian pilots engage in combat, we are faced with the very distinct possibility of a wider war with grave consequences for us all.

On June 4, I joined more than 90 of my colleagues in a bipartisan appeal to the President to negotiate the sale of additional jets to Israel in order to counterbalance the new Soviet arms buildup. It is imperative that we act quickly, because of the long leadtime required to contract for, produce, and deliver jet aircraft. To delay much longer is to allow a deteriorating situation to become irretrievable, and it is simply unthinkable for us to abandon our friends and allies, the only democratic nation in the Middle East. Our letter to the President also contained a plea for urgent consultation with our NATO allies and new initiatives on our part to establish a cease-fire as a precondition to negotiations for peace. I join with my concerned colleagues here in the House today in a fervent plea for the honoring of our commitment to beleaguered Israel.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I plead for urgent and immediate help to beleaguered Israel. I have addressed myself to this cause before. I have written to the President to urge that the administration act quickly and decisively to supply Israel



with the jet aircraft necessary for her survival, and I have joined my colleagues—including the distinguished leadership on both sides of the aisle—in such pleas for immediate assistance. I have grown increasingly impatient at the delays.

We deceive ourselves, I think, if we deny that this is a matter of extreme urgency. The fact of massive Soviet intervention in Egypt and other Arab countries, within the last few months, is plainly to be seen. The balance of power is clearly weighed against Israel now.

To leave Israel unprepared should a full-scale war begin is to require that the United States respond massively at that time. I think we can envision the Soviet response. I believe that partial measures and continued excessive restraint pose the greater threat in the Middle East—which is that of encouraging a premature and unnecessary explosion based on the presumption that Israel is weak.

Only last November we heard Egypt's President Nasser declare:

There is no alternative to the battle . . . There no longer is any way out except to use force to open our own road toward what we want—over a sea of blood and under a horizon of fire.

I do not believe this was boastful posturing. President Nasser is far stronger now than he was 6 months ago.

His cities and his military supplies are protected by an umbrella of Soviet pilots. His troops are relieved for combat by thousands of Soviet technicians behind the lines. Most of Egypt is now off limits to Israeli counteraction because it dare not risk a face-to-face engagement with the Soviets. Meanwhile, the war has gradually intensified as Arab forces, grown bolder and more confident, pursue their sworn objective of driving Israel into the sea.

I believe we must take a risk, Mr. Speaker, that of insuring Israel's deterrent strength, because we cannot countenance the greater risk of letting hostile Arabs believe that the time is ripe to conquer Israel.

I believe we must insure that there is a deterrent to further dangerous actions while we are exploring the paths to a permanent peaceful settlement. I believe we must urgently respond to Israel's request to remain capable of deterring aggression by supplying her fully with the jet aircraft she wants. I see no alternative. To serve effectively as a deterrent, Israel's air strength must match that of her hostile foes.

I see hesitation as a genuine threat to the survival of Israel. She is a great democracy, a nation imploring us to let her live. We must not let her go down in the brief hours of another Mideast war.

I am warmly encouraged by the overwhelming response of the Congress to our demands for immediate aircraft for Israel. We must insist on this.

Let there be no "sea of blood" or "horizon of fire." The United States cannot be responsible for such a tragic possibility.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I join my distinguished colleagues today in calling

for the immediate sale of U.S. jets to Israel.

Just 3 years ago this month the four Arab countries of Egypt, Syria, Iraq, and Jordan had a combined total of just slightly over 300 jet planes. Israel had slightly less than that number—about 280. Today, just 3 years later to the month, those same four Arab nations have a combined total of 1,230 jets, while Israel is now at 300. In other words there is today a 4 to 1 air superiority favoring the Arab countries. Yet our Government holds back on providing the planes necessary to create the balance needed for that small island of democracy and its brave and courageous people.

It is no wonder, that under the circumstances, these same Arab nations are now openly talking about a forthcoming "decisive battle" with Israel.

Tragically, I think, our State Department does not either understand this or they do not believe it. It seems perfectly evident to me that unless we sell immediately, the jet aircraft in question, the aforementioned possibility could become reality. It is perfectly clear, too, that air superiority will have a great deal to do with the outcome of the next major confrontation between those nations. It would be sad indeed to continue fighting a useless, wasteful, and meaningless war in Vietnam and Cambodia where at best, a democracy is little if at all understood, and let a nation like Israel go down the road to defeat. I call again upon the administration to immediately release to Israel the jets that may save her life as a nation.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the rapidly deteriorating situation in the Middle East requires decisive action by our Government. Israel has tried valiantly to bring about face-to-face negotiations with the Arab leaders without success to date. The Soviet Union has committed vast resources to the government of President Nasser in an effort to shore up Egypt's ability to maintain an offensive war footing. Israel is under increasing military pressures and continues to have to fight for her survival on a day-by-day basis.

It is obvious that the vast Soviet influence which has developed during these past several months poses an enormous threat to the balance of power in the Middle East. In this connection, Israel long ago requested that she be allowed to purchase Phantom and Skyhawk jets at full cost from our Government at an enormous cost to her beleaguered and limited budget. As I have said in the past, Israel must survive. To do so, she will need as much assistance from friendly nations as possible. Israel has demonstrated her clear-cut desire to assume the total responsibility of her self-defense. This nation does not ask for the commitment of American troops or advisers. Israel needs access to the highly sophisticated weapons of modern defense.

Israel remains steadfast in her adherence to democratic rule and stands out clearly as the showcase of democracy in the entire Middle East. Other nations would do well to follow Israel's example in this regard. Our Nation should clearly stand behind Israel in her time of trou-

ble to demonstrate to the Soviet Union and to the world that we stand firmly behind genuinely democratic governments and will not tolerate destruction of or interference with the sovereign rights of such governments. If we do not demonstrate such willingness, Israel's survival will be placed in jeopardy because of new boldness on the part of the Soviet Union and the Arab nations. We must act decisively now. There is no time to wait.

On June 4 I joined with others in this body in sending the following letter to the President. I would like to include the text of that letter in the RECORD at this point since it so well emphasizes the crisis facing Israel and the Free World. The letter is as follows:

Mr. PRESIDENT: We are writing you to express our extreme sense of urgency respecting the deteriorating situation in the Middle East.

It is our deep conviction that our vital national interests are involved in preserving the balance of power in the Middle East pending a final settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute. The decision by the Soviet Union to undertake a direct military role in the Arab-Israeli conflict by flying combat planes over Egypt represents, in our judgment, a significant change and a challenge to American strategic interests, as well as a growing threat to world peace. Recent Soviet moves have clearly encouraged Arab belligerence and are creating a growing military imbalance in favor of the Arab states.

Your decision in March to defer the sale of additional jet combat aircraft to Israel has failed to induce the Soviet Union to exercise reciprocal restraint with respect to the arming of the UAR and the other Arab states. On the contrary, the Soviet Union has taken the unprecedented step of overtly involving an increasing number of its own military personnel in a state far from its own borders.

We believe, Mr. President, that the United States should now announce its intention to provide Israel with the aircraft so urgently needed for its defense. This action would serve as a credible response to the reckless Soviet escalation of the Mideast conflict. We feel that the strengthening of Israel's military posture at this time is the best guarantee against the outbreak of major hostilities.

We also suggest prompt consultations with our NATO allies because of the dangers posed to their own security by the Soviet build-up in the Middle East. We urge that you exert your influence to re-establish the cease-fire as a preliminary step to eventual peace negotiations. These steps would demonstrate to the Soviet Union that we do not intend to abdicate our responsibilities in the Middle East, as well as our earnest desire for peace.

Sincerely,

CHARLES VANIK.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the growing tension in the Middle East. Russian SAM-3 anti-aircraft missiles stand poised along the Suez Canal. Russian pilots man Mig-21's over the skies of central Egypt. This infusion of arms into the Middle East raises the threat of an East-West conflict. This conflict must be avoided at all cost.

Israel has come to us as one of her oldest friends, and has asked to purchase jet aircraft. She wants these aircraft to defend her territory. I strongly urge that we sell her these aircraft.

In a period in which we find fewer and fewer countries which we can truly

call allies there is one nation which now asks for planes in order to survive. We should not abandon Israel in her time of need.

If we abandon Israel, we would be sanctioning the obliteration of a race which has contributed much to civilization.

If we abandon Israel, Russia would control the strategically important Middle East without any opposition from the West.

If we abandon Israel, other nations whom we are bound to support in times of national survival would begin to question the credibility of America's commitments. They would say that the United States deserted a country which had supported America and which was willing to fight for her own survival without demanding that American blood should also be shed.

There are those who say that by supplying Israel with planes we are fanning the fires of aggression in the Middle East. I disagree with this judgment because it assumes that Israel is an aggressive state. If we examine the history of the Arab-Israel struggle, we find that Israel has only acted militarily when her survival was at stake. History reveals that aggression only occurs when one country believes that it has the military capacity to destroy its foe. Thus, by not providing the Israelis with the requested Phantom and Skyhawk jet fighters this country will be encouraging the very aggression which it claims that it wishes to prevent. I do not believe that the Arab leaders are foolish enough to initiate a war which, if Israel has the proper protection, will lead to their own destruction.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, during the past months I have made several statements on the floor of the House concerning my position on the sale of jet aircraft to Israel and the need for a restatement of this Nation's support for Israel.

The recent statements of the Secretary of State indicate that a decision on Israel's request for aid will be made shortly but there have been reports that the decision will be in the nature of a compromise. This decision will have a major effect on the situation in the Middle East, including the future actions of the Soviet Union. For these reasons, I urge the President once again to act firmly and without equivocation.

In order to convince the Russians that their intervention in the Middle East will not be tolerated, the President should immediately grant Israel's request. It is my hope that the President will announce the sale of 125 Phantom and Skyhawk jets to Israel together with a commitment to sell additional jets to replace those lost or destroyed in the future. I also urge the President to make this announcement as soon as possible and not to wait 2 more weeks as the Secretary of State has indicated he may.

This action would go a long way toward restoring the confidence of Israel and the free world in our Nation's policies. In addition, to the sale of jet aircraft to Israel, I would hope that the President and the Secretary of State will issue a clarification of our policy in the

Middle East to make it quite clear to all parties involved in that area of the world that the United States stands as a friend of Israel and that there will be no deterioration of that stance.

The overwhelming support of the Members of this body as well as the Members of the other body has been publicly declared in support of Israel and in favor of the sale of jet aircraft to Israel. To waiver now in making the necessary decisions will only serve to give hope to the Arab terrorists who are determined to destroy an independent nation and to the Soviet Union which will undoubtedly provide as much assistance—both personnel and equipment—to the Arab Nations as will be tolerated by the allies of Israel.

We must not let either of these courses of action come about for further escalation of the Middle East crisis can only lead to tragic consequences. We must renew our efforts to bring about direct negotiations between the combatants while maintaining the balance of military power in the Middle East through additional military aid to Israel.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the beginning of this month marked the third anniversary of the 6-day war in the Middle East. It has been a particularly distressing anniversary for it marks also the heightening of tensions, mounting guerrilla attacks, and increasing civilian casualties which tragically include the deaths of innocent children.

Foreign Minister Abba Eban of Israel, in referring to these attacks, said recently:

One of the factors which has encouraged the activities of murder organizations such as Fatah is international apathy and indulgence.

Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I have been bitterly disappointed over the inaction and delay of our own Government in trying to preserve the Mideast balance which has been substantially altered by Moscow's assumption of a direct combat partnership in Egypt.

American intelligence has indicated that the Soviets have begun a new air defense over Egypt which includes at least 50 Soviet combat pilots actively flying missions in the area. Additionally, it has been confirmed that Soviet SAM-III ground-to-air missile sites are run by Russians around Cairo and the Aswan Dam.

Without additional planes, Israel cannot be expected to keep up the air war indefinitely. The 50 Phantom jets pledged to Israel by the Johnson administration will all be delivered by September, and the planes that are lost in the mounting air attacks must be replaced if the military balance in the Mideast is to be preserved.

Over 2 years ago, I joined in sponsoring legislation which authorized the sale of 50 Phantom jets to Israel. I felt at that time, as I do today, that a balance of military power in the Middle East is essential if we are to prevent full-scale war and maintain peace and security in that critical area of the world.

I am pleased, therefore, to join the outstanding Speaker of the House, JOHN

McCORMACK; the majority leader, CARL ALBERT; the majority whip, HALE BOGGS; the minority leader, GERALD FORD; the minority whip, LES ARENDS; and all of my distinguished colleagues in urging the President and the State Department to provide Israel as soon as possible with additional supersonic jet planes in order to enable her to deter aggression. Our Government can no longer afford inaction and delay in the face of an altered Mideast military balance of power.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the isolated citadel of democracy in the Middle East, Israel, recently celebrated its 22d year of independence. This little nation was established in 1948 by action of the United Nations—to the acclaim of most of the world. It is a sad commentary that since that time, during its entire 22 years of statehood, it has not enjoyed a moments peace. I do not believe that it is necessary for me to recount the continuous efforts of its Arab neighbors, who unfortunately and most unwisely are bent on its destruction.

For 20 years, the continued existence of Israel was a matter of vital concern to the people of America and to our Government. We took pride in the fact that the United States, under the Presidency of Harry S. Truman, was the first country to formally recognize Israel as a nation in 1948. Over the years we supplied many forms of assistance for its development and to secure its continued existence. Today, as never before, we must re-emphasize and reaffirm our policy of concern for the existence and safety of Israel.

Many months ago, Israel requested our Government's approval for the purchase of American aircraft. The continued delay by our Government has not resulted in similar restraint on the part of the Soviet Union. Quite to the contrary, the Russians have increased their support to the Arab nations. The restraint by our Government has played into Russian and Arab hands.

There is no longer a balance of power in the Near East. It has been shifted decidedly in favor of the Arab nations by Russian arms deliveries to Egypt and Syria from the end of the 6-day war to 1969. The introduction of Russian pilots flying Egyptian planes, first detected in April of this year, removes the argument that the Kremlin's activities were limited to the defense posture of its Arab clients. Israel is subject to almost continuous attack on every border. The Soviets have clearly established their presence and influence in the Middle East. The long range implications of the present situation are ominous.

Mr. Speaker, there are indications that a decision on the Israeli request is shortly forthcoming. At the same time, there are indications that the Arab nations are exerting every influence against the approval of that request.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge that the President immediately approve the request. Such action is necessary for the continuation of longstanding U.S. policy in the Middle East and will best serve the interest of the United States. Further, such action will not deter from our efforts to bring peace to that part of the



world, but, to the contrary, will assist those efforts.

I am most pleased to join with my many colleagues today in urging the President to approve the sale of aircraft to Israel.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to participate in this special order of the House on a subject which is of great importance to all Americans. As I said recently, the world spotlight can swing too far in any one direction while the Nation struggles with domestic outcry and dissent over what I believe was the mistaken policy decision to go into Cambodia. We have seemed to neglect the ominous developments that have occurred recently in the Middle East.

The valiant nation of Israel fights on almost all of her borders. Soviet pilots and technicians have joined the Air Force of the United Arab Republic. While we are concentrating our major effort against communism in Southeast Asia, Russia entrenches itself in the Middle East.

As all the Members of this House know, this is not the first time I have voiced my concern for Israel in its heroic struggle for survival over the years. In the last 18 years that I have had the privilege to be in the Congress, I have repeatedly acted to bring about an easing of the crisis faced by Israel. A further step in this continuing effort will be the joint letter to President Nixon, signed by over 175 Members of the House urging that the administration immediately authorize the sale of Phantom and Skyhawk jets to Israel.

Mr. Speaker, the views expressed in our letter represent the concern of millions of Americans and I include the letter to President Nixon at the conclusion of my remarks.

Current intelligence from our State Department regarding the situation in the Middle East indicates that Israel's position has grown even more ominous with each passing week. Our policy of restraint has failed. The Soviet intrusion of pilots and other military personnel into the Mideast has decidedly tipped the defensive scales in favor of the Arab nations. We must hasten to redress the balance. Clearly the Nixon administration must act immediately. The priorities of our commitments in the Mideast are very clear, as contrasted with the cloudy and dismal state of our affairs in Southeast Asia.

Mr. Speaker, from recent rumblings within the administration, I believe that at last the word has finally been passed up and I do expect that this week we will hear some favorable news from the White House regarding the sale of aircraft to Israel.

I, however, as one Member of the House of Representatives, want the record to be very clear on this matter. There must be a real commitment on our part not just the token sale of a few aircraft. Our action with regard to the defense of Israel, our only true ally in this part of the world, must be a real act of substance. Tokenism or a partial sale of equipment needed by the Israelis will not suffice. This matter is indeed too serious to be dealt with in an expedient or politi-

cal fashion. Again, I welcome the opportunity to participate and congratulate all my colleagues for making this important special order possible.

The letter referred to follows:

The President,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is clear to us that the moment has arrived for the United States to take firm action to meet the present danger posed by the involvement of the Soviet Union military forces in the Middle East. In the face of this threat, we believe that it is urgent that our government provide Israel with additional supersonic jet planes to enable her to deter aggression against her.

It is public knowledge that the Soviet-Arab aircraft strength is now four times the strength of that of Israel and that the presence of Soviet fliers and technicians may adversely affect Israel's heretofore qualitative advantage.

The Congress is vitally concerned with the threat of Soviet presence in the Middle East, as evidenced by the number of signatories hereto, and by the letter sent to the Secretary of State which was signed by over seventy Senators, urging the immediate sale of these planes so vital to the preservation of the balance and peace in the Middle East.

Respectfully yours,

SAMUEL F. FRIEDEL.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week marked the third anniversary of Israel's victory over the Arabs in the 6-day war. It was a victory that came swiftly but left the Israelis confident of their strength in the Middle East. Now, a short 3 years later that strength is in jeopardy.

Russian intervention has increased beyond all previous limits. The U.S.S.R., no longer content with supplying arms and bombers to the Arabs, has attempted to tip the balance of power with the installation of missile sites throughout Egypt's Nile delta. But even more critical than that is Egypt's use of Soviet pilots in service to the Egyptian Air Force.

With their own brave determination and our continued assistance, the Israelis have been able to maintain their security while nurturing a culture deserving of our highest praise and respect. The step-up of Soviet military aid, however, threatens not only the survival of Israel but the security of the United States as well.

Repeatedly the Israel Government has turned to the United States in search of the additional air strength it needs to deter further aggression by the Arabs and the Soviets. But President Nixon, apparently fearing the Soviet's reaction to increased American involvement, has refused to make any decision on Israel's request to purchase 25 Phantom and 100 Skyhawk jets from the United States.

I have on several occasions joined with my colleagues in expressing to the President our support for such a purchase and am pleased to unite with them again today in supporting this vital cause.

The President cannot delay making his decision any longer. Recent military victories and mounting casualties resulting from Soviet intervention have had a demoralizing effect on the people of Israel who have fought courageously to preserve the democracy which they hold so dear. During his recent visit to the

United States, Israel's Foreign Minister Abba Eban warned that additional aircraft are physically essential to preserve the security of his people. I had the opportunity to meet with Mr. Eban when in Israel earlier this year and respect his assessment of their needs.

I strongly urge the President to act affirmatively in Israel's behalf and arrange for the delivery of all 125 jets. To provide a supply less than requested would only be a token gesture by the President and would not provide the strength necessary to prevent further Soviet aggression. Israel is not an aggressive country and depends upon the strength of its Air Force to deter the Arabs and the Soviets from resuming full-scale hostilities. We must not give the Arabs an advantage by allowing Israel's defensive capabilities to be weakened. To preserve her territorial integrity, we must be willing to make every effort to maintain Israel's defense and to aid her in arranging peace negotiations with representatives of the Arab States.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, exactly 3 years ago war raged in the Middle East. It still rages there today. And the prospects for a lasting and meaningful peace, raised so high in the days following the 6-day war, seem today more remote than ever.

The Arab States which closed the Straits of Tiran to Israel in the days preceding the June 1967 war, and which swore eternal enmity to their neighbor, are committed still to her destruction.

And now, to Arab intransigence has been added Soviet belligerence. The Soviet Union, bent on fomenting turmoil and committed to animosity against Israel, has poured billions of dollars worth of armaments into Egypt. Even more perilous, Soviet pilots are flying combat jets in the Egyptian air. SAM-3 missile sites mark the Egyptian landscape.

The time for this administration to reject the ambivalence and equivocation which have marked its posture towards Israel is long past due. In fact, the only appropriate policy the administration should have maintained—as did its predecessors—is that of the clearest and firmest support for Israel.

Instead, we have seen a foreign policy of passivity. In large part, the State Department has neither acted nor reacted, but merely contemplated. The one venture it has undertaken—the proposal of guidelines for a peace settlement—was itself misguided, since it served to deter the possibility of direct negotiations between the parties to the conflict.

Certainly, the administration bears considerable responsibility for the present state of peril to Israel. For while the Soviet Union has taken bolder and bolder steps, each time testing the water, so to speak, to see how much it might venture, the administration has stood aside, wringing its hands in concern, while doing nothing. And each successive instance of inaction by the administration has in its turn encouraged further action by the Soviets.

Yet, our interests, Israel's interests, and the interests of world peace require the survival and prosperity of that valiant

nation, seeking only to live in peace, free from the aggression of her neighbors.

Traditional U.S. policy—as articulated by the actions as well as the words of four successive Presidents—Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson—has been one of firm support for Israel. To forsake her now is to forswear our word.

Our interests compel support for Israel because we support the principles of democracy which she embodies in her finest expression.

Our interests coincide with a secure Israel because she, in her turn, has offered us firm and steadfast friendship.

Our interests require support of Israel because she is the great example of the benefits which modern technology, idealism, and dedication can bring to the poverty stricken peoples of the third world.

Once again, as I have done continuously, I call upon the administration to allow Israel to purchase the jet planes which she seeks. Israel's air force is her very protection against destruction, and we simply cannot continue to deny her the means by which to insure her survival.

What is more, this sale must be clearly labeled as the United States signal that we support Israel, that we will not tolerate her destruction, that we deplore the attacks of the Arab States and guerrillas, and that we oppose the Soviet moves which have escalated this crisis to fever pitch.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues to express our continued support for the security of Israel and the safety of the Israeli people.

I have written a letter to the President on May 23, 1970, which I am glad to insert in the RECORD to emphasize the urgent necessity of prompt authorization by the U.S. Government of arms assistance, jets, and economic, educational and health assistance for the people of Israel.

The letter referred to, and a reply, follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., May 23, 1970.

President RICHARD M. NIXON,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing further to emphasize the changed situation in the Middle East, and particularly to emphasize my concern for the security of Israel and the safety of the Israeli people.

Israel is facing the possibility of having to fight Russia, since Soviet pilots are flying MIG jets for Egypt, and manning SAM-3 sites on the Suez front. Israel must confront the Soviet Union in a Cuba-type confrontation. Israel can not do it alone. It needs the help of the United States.

I am therefore writing to you to ask your careful consideration and authorization for the United States Government for sale of United States jets to Israel.

During the past year I have visited Israel and having seen the wonderful progress of the Israeli people, I have learned at first hand the willingness of the officials of Israel and the Israeli people to work for peace and security, as well as the progress of the peoples of the Middle East.

In my considered opinion, under the threat that faces the people of Israel today, I would recommend not only the sale, but

in addition the grant of jets to Israel, as well as the grant of military supplies and economic, health and education assistance. We citizens and officials of the United States can not afford to let as fine a people and as good a democracy as Israel go down without our firm United States support and assistance.

I do hope and pray that a favorable decision will soon be made, so that the world will know that the United States means what it says, when it emphasizes the concern of the people of the United States for the security of Israel.

Sincerely,

JIM FULTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, June 2, 1970.

HON. JAMES G. FULTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FULTON: This will acknowledge and thank you for your letter to the President requesting that the United States supply the State of Israel with military jet aircraft. Your letter requesting that a determination be made in the affirmative on this matter will be brought to the President's early attention.

With cordial regard,  
Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. TIMMONS,  
Assistant to the President.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, while I welcome this opportunity to speak out on the urgent need for favorable action by the United States on Israel's request to purchase additional aircraft, I deeply regret the critical situation in the Middle East at this time creating this urgency. Indeed regret is more than an understatement of the deep concern and alarm felt by so many of us over the massive buildup of arms shipments to Egypt by the Soviet Union. With the takeover of Egypt's air defense by the Russians, with Russian flyers, Russian technicians, and Russian ground troops, the implications and stakes in the Middle East war go far beyond this region of the world. With recent reports of Russian pilots flying Soviet Mig-21s to "crowd" Israeli air force pilots in the so-called free zone along the Suez Canal, furthermore, the Soviet actions in this part of the world can no longer be described as purely in defense of their allies.

Aside from our Nation's historic commitment to the right of self-determination—a right for which thousands of Americans have died in Vietnam and a right which Arab extremists would deny the citizens of Israel—the shift in the Middle East balance of power brought about by Russian intervention and the terrible potential for an escalation of this conflict, in my judgment, brought about the involvement of our Nation's own national interests.

The overwhelming concern about the current imbalance in the Middle East and the widespread support among Members of the House and Senate for the sale of jet aircraft requested by Israel has been amply demonstrated. In January of this year 228 Members of the House of Representatives signed a declaration in support of peace in the Middle East reiterating our support for the democratic State of Israel and stating that—

It is not in the interest of the United States or in the service of world peace to create the impression that Israel will be left defenseless in face of the continuing

flow of sophisticated offensive armaments to the Arab nations supplied by the Soviet Union and other sources.

This declaration, which I joined in signing, went on to state that—

We thus adhere to the principle that the deterrent strength of Israel must not be impaired.

During recent weeks a letter signed by over 70 Senators was sent to the Secretary of State urging the immediate sale of the additional supersonic jet planes to Israel necessary to enable her to deter aggression against her. I have joined similar appeals with a number of my House colleagues and the following letter to the President was sent by 96 of us on June 4:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing to express our deep concern over the shift in the balance of power in the Near East adverse to Israel which has occurred recently as a result of the introduction of Soviet pilots and SAM sites in the United Arab Republic.

The United States has long viewed an arms imbalance in that area as being a prescription for widespread hostilities. In addition, these new developments represent a challenge to NATO's southeastern flank. As you noted in your report to the Congress, "The U.S. would view any effort by the Soviet Union to seek predominance in the Middle East as a matter of grave concern."

It would appear that your action in holding in abeyance the sale of the additional Phantoms and Skyhawks requested by Prime Minister Golda Meir has not been met by similar restraint on the part of the Soviet Union. Indeed, the introduction of Soviet combat pilots is unprecedented in the Near East with the brief exception of Yemen.

Accordingly, we hope that you will now, following the Administration's review of this question, make an early and affirmative decision to provide Israel with the additional Skyhawks and Phantoms essential to her deterrent strength. We believe that this would serve to make clear to the Soviets the seriousness with which we view their action and would be the best guarantee against the outbreak of major hostilities.

Concomitant with this action, we hope that you will continue to pursue serious arms limitation talks with the Soviets on the Near East which could be effective only when there is a relative arms balance, not an arms imbalance. We believe these steps could facilitate progress toward direct negotiations on the Rhodes formula, consistent with the Security Council resolution of October 1967.

We also suggest prompt consultations with our NATO allies because of the dangers posed to their own security by the Soviet build-up in the Middle East. We urge that you exert your influence to re-establish the cease-fire as a preliminary step to eventual peace negotiations. These steps would demonstrate to the Soviet Union that we do not intend to abdicate our responsibilities in the Middle East, as well as our earnest desire for peace.

I have also joined a number of my colleagues in another letter on this same subject, which has not yet been mailed.

It is my profound hope that the Nixon administration, which does recognize the changed situation in the Middle East and which does have this matter under review, will make an early and favorable decision on Israel's request to purchase additional supersonic jets from the United States.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues urging the United States now to maintain the vital balance



in military strength between Israel and her hostile neighbors.

Very few days have passed without word of new Soviet shipments to Egypt. Long ago all Egypt's losses during the ill-famed 6-day war were made up by the Soviet Union. Last year the Egyptian Army surpassed its best condition prior to the war both in quality and quantity of its equipment and in levels of training provided by Soviet advisers. While news of reequipping and retraining of the Egyptian Army by the Soviet Union has been alarming, the news in recent weeks of installation of Soviet-made and manned surface-to-air missiles and of Soviet pilots flying missions in Egyptian marked aircraft totally alters the complexion of the dilemma of achieving a stable peace in the Middle East. It is no longer enough for the United States to leisurely contemplate provision of some form of additional support for Israel at some unspecified future date.

Twenty-two SAM-3 sites are already in place around Alexandria. Another 23 sites are under construction along the Suez Canal which would give Egypt a total of 62 sites with approximately 480 missiles manned by more than 5,000 Russian technicians and military advisers. These missiles combined with more sophisticated 100 mm. radar-guided anti-aircraft artillery have produced an order of magnitude increase in Egyptian military capability. The time has come for the United States to do more than "review the situation." It is time to do more than replace Israeli aircraft losses which, to date, have been slight. The time has come to permit needed Israeli purchases of weapons in any quantity necessary to meet the threat which is now observable and that which is already easily predictable. This is not an open-ended commitment to furnish unlimited arms to meet all distantly conceivable future threats, but it is an advocacy of assistance to achieve a balance at the very least.

Beyond the provision of arms, it is incumbent upon the United States to make every effort to restrain further escalation of the Middle Eastern arms race by the Soviet Union. If another American arms shipment to Israel does no more than spur the Soviet Union to additional shipment, nothing of lasting consequence has been gained. If a balance of arms can be achieved and maintained through Soviet and American restraint, then hopes for negotiations brighten. And that is the second major duty of the United States; to support every effort by any nation and all international bodies to develop initial grounds on which negotiations can begin. The present increasing rigidity of both sides observable to all cannot possibly be productive of talks. Without some form of negotiation, there can be no settlement of any duration. All parties must meet face to face and the United States, the Soviet Union and other powers share an obligation to undertake the necessary steps to facilitate the beginning of talks. No one expects that this will be soon. No one expects that once begun, such talks would be immediately productive. But with the commencement of negotiations there is the first real hope that the 3 years of running warfare just past will not be

the prelude to an equally bloody 3 or more years to come.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

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

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

There was no objection.

#### HORTON LEGISLATION BANS SALE OF MAILING LISTS BY FEDERAL AGENCIES FOR COMMERCIAL AND OTHER SOLICITATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON), is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, a serious gap in our Federal laws encourages the invasion of an individual's right to privacy, and in some cases, threatens his safety. Over the past 2 months, I have been studying the question of mailing list sales by the Federal Government.

After making a survey of 50 departments and agencies, I was astounded to find the wide difference in policy. In fact, there is no established Government policy on the sale of mailing lists. Some agencies provide such lists routinely, others do not. Interestingly enough, all cite the Freedom of Information Act as the basis for their decisions.

The Federal Freedom of Information Act was enacted in 1967 to provide the public with as complete access as possible to public records.

The purpose of the act is to prevent Government agencies from unjustifiably withholding information that should be reasonably available to the public. Certain information can be withheld if it involves national security, proprietary business information, investigatory files, or personnel or medical files. Other statutes protect the confidentiality of income tax and census data.

An area overlooked in the act is mailing lists compiled by Federal agencies in carrying out their proper roles. I do not believe that the Freedom of Information Act was passed as a license for commercial organizations to invade an individual's privacy or to aid those with illegal intent.

Last February, Dr. Wendell Ames, director of the Monroe County Health Department, called the mailing list problem to my attention. Dr. Ames, a gun collector, was required to register with the Internal Revenue Service under the 1968 Gun Control Act. He soon found he was receiving solicitations from a sports supply shop in Ohio. These solicitations used the identical address label used by IRS for its own mailings to licensees. When I first looked into this, IRS claimed it was forced to sell this list, containing the names and addresses of 143,000 gun collectors and dealers, under the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act. IRS said it had to sell the list to anyone who wanted it and who

paid the \$140 charge set by the agency. This amounts to less than a tenth of a cent per name and address.

Dr. Ames' complaint was that his home had been placed in jeopardy, without his knowledge, by the sale of this list. The list would have made it easy for anyone to instantly locate and steal supplies of weapons kept unprotected in private homes across the country.

As a result of my inquiry, IRS Commissioner Randolph W. Thrower reviewed this practice and stopped the distribution of the names of gun collectors. However, IRS continues to sell the mailing list of gun dealers.

There are other examples of how Federal agencies aid the invasion of privacy of our citizens. The Federal Communications Commission sells at cost the names of all licensed ham radio operators. The Federal Aviation Administration sells the names of licensed pilots. The Coast Guard sells the names of registered boat owners.

The Federal Communication Commission sells mailing lists with the names of 265,000 amateur operators. The Federal Aviation Administration sells lists of licensed pilots with 680,000 names. These lists are sold at about a tenth of a cent a name, about the same as the list of 143,000 names of gun dealers and collectors sold by IRS.

To correct this serious breach of privacy, I have drafted legislation amending the Freedom of Information Act to prohibit the Government from selling mailing lists for commercial purposes or other solicitations, or for any illegal purpose. Over 75 of my colleagues are joining me in sponsoring this legislation today.

I also plan to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of replies I had received from over 50 agencies regarding their practices of selling mailing lists, which clearly illustrate the inconsistency in their policies regarding mailing list sales and distribution.

My bill will prohibit the sale or distribution of any list of names of Federal employees, past or present members of the Armed Forces or persons who are licensed or required to register with any Federal agency unless there is a certification that such a list will not be used for commercial or other solicitation or for any unlawful purpose.

This is legislation that I feel will protect the individual's right to privacy and safety. It does not prevent legitimate access to agency information but states clearly the intent of Congress that mailing lists will not be used for purposes affecting individual safety or privacy.

The need for a Government-wide policy on the question of mailing lists is obvious to me, and to many of my colleagues. This legislation I have proposed will provide the missing policy direction. I feel it is a positive balance between the public's right to know and the individual's right to privacy.

As a member of the House Subcommittee on Government Information which originated the Freedom of Information Act, I hope early hearings will be held on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the language of the bill at this point:

H.R. 17990

A bill to limit the sale or distribution of mailing lists by Federal agencies

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That section 552 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) (1) Notwithstanding subsection (a), no agency may distribute, sell, or otherwise make available to any person any list of names and addresses of—

"(A) employees, or former employees, of any agency,

"(B) persons licensed by any agency,

"(C) persons registered or required to file information with any agency, or

"(D) members, or former members, of the Armed Forces, except in accordance with paragraph (2) or (3).

"(2) An agency may make available a list of names and addresses of persons referred to in paragraph (1)—

"(A) if the person to whom such list is made available certifies (in such manner as the agency shall by regulations prescribe) that—

"(i) such list will not be used for purposes of commercial or other solicitation, and

"(ii) such list will not be used for any purpose which is unlawful under any State or Federal law, or

"(B) if the list is made available by the agency as a necessary part of its statutory functions or requirements (other than requirements imposed by this section).

"(3) Any agency may make available a list of names and addresses if specifically authorized to do so by statute (other than this section).

"(4) No person who has received a list under paragraph (2) or (3) may make such list, or any copy thereof, available to any other person. No person who receives a list in violation of the preceding sentence may use such list for purposes of commercial or other solicitations or for any purpose which is unlawful under State or Federal law.

"(5) Any person whose name and address is on any list made available under paragraph (2) (A) and who is solicited in a communication mailed to him the address of which is obtained from such list may request the person who addressed such communication to remove his name from such list. Upon receipt of such request, the person addressing the communication shall remove such name from such list.

"(6) Any person—

"(A) who uses a list for a purpose for which he has certified under paragraph (2) (A) that he will not use such list,

"(B) who makes a list available to any person or uses a list, in violation of paragraph (4), or

"(C) who fails to remove a name from a list in accordance with paragraph (5), shall be imprisoned for not more than one year, or fined not more than \$10,000, or both."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply only to lists made available by an agency after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. Subsection (c) of section 552 is redesignated as subsection (d).

Mr. Speaker, I also include a list of the cosponsors of the bill:

#### COSPONSORS

Joseph P. Addabbo, Democrat, of New York.  
William R. Anderson, Democrat, of Tennessee.  
Mario Blaggi, Democrat, of New York.  
Edward G. Blester, Jr., Republican, of Pennsylvania.

Ray Blanton, Democrat, of Tennessee.  
Edward P. Boland, Democrat, of Massachusetts.

Garry Brown, Republican, of Michigan.  
James T. Broyhill, Republican, of North Carolina.

Daniel E. Button, Republican, of New York.  
Bob Casey, Democrat, of Texas.

Shirley Chisholm, Democrat, of New York.  
Don H. Clausen, Republican, of California.

William (Bill) Clay, Democrat, of Missouri.  
James C. Cleveland, Republican, of New Hampshire.

Barber B. Conable, Jr., Republican, of New York.  
R. Lawrence Coughlin, Republican, of Pennsylvania.

Florence P. Dwyer, Republican, of New Jersey.  
John N. Erlenborn, Republican, of Illinois.

Marvin L. Esch, Republican, of Michigan.  
Hamilton Fish, Jr., Republican, of New York.

Walter Flowers, Democrat, of Alabama.  
William D. Ford, Democrat, of Michigan.

James G. Fulton, Republican, of Pennsylvania.  
Cornelius E. Gallagher, Democrat, of New Jersey.

Barry M. Goldwater, Jr., Republican, of California.  
Kenneth J. Gray, Democrat, of Illinois.

James R. Grover, Jr., Republican, of New York.  
Gilbert Gude, Republican, of Maryland.

Seymour Halpern, Republican, of New York.  
Orval Hansen, Republican, of Idaho.

Michael Harrington, Democrat, of Massachusetts.  
James F. Hastings, Republican, of New York.

Ken Hechler, Democrat, of West Virginia.  
Henry Helstoski, Democrat, of New Jersey.

Chet Holifield, Democrat, of California.  
Craig Hosmer, Republican, of California.

William L. Hungate, Democrat, of Missouri.  
John E. Hunt, Republican, of New Jersey.

Carleton J. King, Republican, of New York.  
Thomas S. Kleppe, Republican, of North Dakota.

Clarence D. Long, Democrat, of Maryland.  
Allard K. Lowenstein, Democrat, of New York.

Donald E. Lukens, Republican, of Ohio.  
Joseph M. McDade, Republican, of Pennsylvania.

Martin B. McKneally, Republican, of New York.  
Robert B. Mathias, Republican, of California.

Spark M. Matsunaga, Democrat, of Hawaii.  
F. Bradford Morse, Republican, of Massachusetts.

Charles A. Mosher, Republican, of Ohio.  
Richard L. Ottinger, Democrat, of New York.

Edward J. Patten, Democrat, of New Jersey.  
Thomas M. Pelly, Republican, of Washington.

J. J. Pickle, Democrat, of Texas.  
Otis G. Pike, Democrat, of New York.

Bertram L. Podell, Democrat, of New York.  
Albert H. Quie, Republican, of Minnesota.

Tom Railsback, Republican, of Illinois.  
Ogden R. Reid, Republican, of New York.

John J. Rhodes, Republican, of Arizona.  
Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey.

Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Democrat, of New York.  
Fernand J. St Germain, Democrat, of Rhode Island.

John P. Saylor, Republican, of Pennsylvania.  
Henry C. Schadeberg, Republican, of Wisconsin.

Garner F. Shriver, Republican, of Kansas.  
Robert L. F. Sikes, Democrat, of Florida.

B. F. Sisk, Democrat, of California.

Robert T. Stafford, Republican, of Vermont.

Robert Taft, Jr., Republican, of Ohio.  
Guy Vander Jagt, Republican, of Michigan.

Charles A. Vanik, Democrat, of Ohio.  
Joseph P. Vigorito, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.

Lowell P. Weicker, Jr., Republican, of Connecticut.  
G. William Whitehurst, Republican, of Virginia.

Larry Winn, Jr., Republican, of Kansas.  
Clement J. Zablocki, Democrat, of Wisconsin.

John M. Zwach, Republican, of Minnesota.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, in making my survey of Federal agencies, I found a wide variety of policies and interpretations of the Freedom of Information Act. I would like to share with you the text of my letter to the 50 agencies and the responses:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, D.C., March 5, 1970.

Hon. L. QUINCY MUMFORD,  
Librarian,  
Library of Congress.

DEAR MR. MUMFORD: It has been brought to my attention that some government departments and agencies are selling or making available mailing lists including the names and addresses of individuals or firms which fall under their jurisdiction or regulation.

I am conducting a government-wide study of all mailing lists that agencies have prepared and made available to the public. My purpose is to weigh the balancing interests between freedom of information and the individual's right to privacy.

I would appreciate your providing me with information about any mailing lists your agency or its components have developed, to whom you have sold them or allowed distribution, the charge to purchaser, a detailed breakdown of how your cost is determined and the specific legislative authority under which you sell each list.

So there is no delay in my study, I hope you can provide this information as soon as possible, preferably within the next two weeks.

Thank you in advance for your assistance and cooperation.

With kindest personal regards, I am,  
Sincerely,

FRANK HORTON.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,  
March 9, 1970.

Hon. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: The Secretary has referred your March 5 letter concerning government mailing lists to the appropriate office.

A reply will be forwarded to you as soon as possible.

Sincerely,  
JERRY W. POOLE,  
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Congressional Liaison.

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,  
Washington, D.C., April 22, 1970.

Hon. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: This refers to your letter of March 5, 1970, in which you requested information regarding the sale or furnishing of HEW mailing lists to the public.

Because of the decentralization of distribution activities throughout the Department, details regarding individual transactions are not immediately available. Accordingly, the data you have requested will be



obtained and the results will be furnished to you without delay.

With kindest personal regards, I am  
Sincerely,

ROBERT H. FINCH,  
Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,  
Washington, D.C., April 30, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: As Secretary Finch advised you in his letter of April 22, we have had to survey the agencies of the Department to obtain the information you requested on the sale or furnishing of mailing lists to the public.

As a result, certain agencies of the Department have made mailing lists available to both nonprofit and private interests on a nonreimbursable basis as follows:

A. National Institutes of Health.—On two occasions mailing lists were furnished without charge to non-Government requestors. The first instance was in response to a request by a surgical instrument firm in Boston which asked for a copy of the mailing list for either the Journal of the National Cancer Institute or one of the other periodicals published by the National Cancer Institute, it is not recalled which. The other instance was in response to a request by the Upjohn Company which asked for the mailing list of the Journal of the National Cancer Institute in connection with distributing an announcement of a NCI-sponsored meeting on Upjohn's new drug, "Cytosar."

B. Health Services and Mental Health Administration.—Requests from private interests to use HSMHA lists are very infrequently received. Because of this, no special criteria has been developed to determine who shall be furnished such lists, and no special restrictions are imposed upon the recipient to their use. HSMHA mail list sponsors are free to exercise their own judgment in making their lists available for use by private interests. The sponsors normally inquire as to the use to which the mail list printout will be put and what type of information or literature will be distributed, prior to authorizing release of the list.

Mailing lists are made available to printing contractors producing Government publications for use in making direct shipment by the printer. Address information is normally furnished on gummed labels and precautions are taken to protect the confidentiality of this information. Additionally, mailing lists are, on occasion, made available to grantees and contractors as part of the terms of the grant or contract.

We know of no instance in which mailing lists have been sold by the Department. However, one list is presently being prepared for which a fee is to be charged. Since the list is extensive and its compilation will require a considerable expenditure of time, a fee will be charged to cover the costs. This list is being compiled by the Environmental Health Service for the Law Publishing Company, Blue Island, Illinois, and consist of the name, title, and business address of technically oriented personnel in the Environmental Health Service. The list will be prepared in an estimated 200 hours for which the Law Publishing Company will pay the \$3.00 rate required under the regulations of the Department. It is to be used to distribute, free of charge, a controlled publication functionally related to the Environmental Health Service.

Fees are authorized in PL 90-23 and in the Public Information Regulations of the Department as stated in Subpart E, Section 5.60.

"It is the policy of the Department to pro-

vide routine information to the general public without charge. Special information services involving a benefit that does not accrue to the general public shall be subject to the payment of fees, which shall be fixed in such amounts as to recover the cost to the Government providing such services. Fees will be charged for the following special services:

(a) Reproduction, duplicating, or copying records.  
(b) Certification or authentication of records.  
(c) Searches of or for records.

In the interests of protecting the privacy of individuals, an additional criterion has been applied in cases of requests for lists of Government employees. The policy of the Department is to supply the official but not the home addresses on mailing lists of employees of the Department. This is not, however, always possible for mailing lists containing names of private individuals.

For your information, the only specific reference to mailing lists is contained in Appendix A, Item 16, of the Department's Public Information Regulation which lists examples of records which are exempt from mandatory disclosure. Item 16 reads:

"Official personnel folders and related files including grievance and disciplinary files, confidential statements of employment and financial interest; performance evaluations and test scores; internal mailing keys."

We hope the above will be of assistance to you.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

STUART H. CLARKE,  
Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for  
Administration.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, D.C., April 24, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: This is in reply to your recent letter concerning your mailing lists study.

The General Services Administration does not routinely make mailing lists available. However, certain lists are made available to specific interest groups. For example, contractors on our Federal Supply Schedule are provided with lists of Government offices which have expressed a desire to receive descriptions of and pricing information on specific commodities. Contractors are provided these lists at no cost since the lists are used to distribute their descriptive catalogs to Federal agencies, and, thus, are of benefit to those Federal agencies concerned. These lists contain the addresses of Federal offices and not individual names.

There are relatively few requests for copies of any mailing list maintained by the General Services Administration. In each request, however, consideration is given to the danger of invasion of individual privacy. In most instances, the few lists which are maintained by the General Services Administration are released upon request. For example, a recent request from a contractor who wanted to subcontract work under a Federal Supply Service contract resulted in this contractor being furnished with a list of firms which had indicated a desire to sell metal shelving to the Government.

Other requests for lists are generally of a related nature, and the request is for lists of firms or individuals who have indicated interest in doing business with the Federal Government or with a private entrepreneur. Except where the release of a mailing list may result in savings to the Government, the recipient of the list is charged with the cost of preparation. This includes costs of labor, materials, and addressing equipment usage.

I hope this information is helpful to you.

If I may be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. KUNZIG,  
Administrator.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORP.,  
Washington, D.C., April 8, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: This is in somewhat tardy response to your letter of March 5, 1970, regarding mailing lists the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation may be making available to the public. The Corporation has been in a period of transition awaiting the arrival of its new recently-designated Chairman, Mr. Frank Wille, and this has delayed some of our correspondence. I had occasion last week, however, to discuss your inquiry with Mr. Monahan.

As of January 1 each year, the Corporation publishes a computer print-out of the insured operating banking offices in the United States and Territories. A copy is enclosed. This information is published in limited quantity primarily for internal and bank regulatory use. It includes the names of banks, and the cities and States or Territories in which they are located. Additionally, it uses symbols designating the kind of bank, i.e., N-National banks, SM-State member banks (members of the Federal Reserve System), NM-insured State commercial banks (not members of the Federal Reserve System).

This publication does not include the names of officers, street addresses, or zip codes. For this reason, and also because this book is expensive to publish and distribute, we have tried to discourage the people requesting this information presumably so that they could compile mailing lists. However, more recently, because of provisions in the Freedom of Information Act, we have reluctantly adopted a somewhat more relaxed position in this matter. We have replied to requests with a letter pointing out the inadequacies of the information and suggesting the use of a bank directory. Thereafter, if the inquirer persisted, the name of his firm has been added to our mailing list.

The mailing list for Operating Banking Offices now approaches 1200 copies. This includes internal distribution, other bank regulatory agencies, banks, financial trade associations, research organizations, advertising agencies, and some others undoubtedly interested in marketing their products or services.

In the past, however, we have not charged for this book. Last Fall, to discourage inquiries, several requests were answered with a letter indicating there would be a charge of \$5.00 a copy. Later, we concluded that this form of discouragement was not worth the effort, inasmuch as it would probably cost the Corporation more than \$5.00 a copy to collect and process that amount.

In essence, therefore, we are holding outside distribution of this list to the minimum but, when confronted with the issue, we have not been able to conclude that a citizen should be denied access to a bare-bones listing of the banks which are insured by the Corporation.

Sincerely,

EDWARD F. PHELPS, Jr.,  
Controller.

PEACE CORPS,  
Washington, D.C., April 7, 1970.  
HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HORTON: Thank you for your letter of March 5, 1970. The Peace Corps maintains address lists for staff and Volunteer personnel, Volunteer next of kin,

Returned Volunteers, Staff and Volunteer applicants, and other organizations and individuals wishing to receive information about the Peace Corps. All lists are for the use of this Agency only and no lists are sold or distributed outside the Peace Corps.

If any further information is needed please advise us.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH H. BLATCHFORD.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, D.C., April 6, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: I am pleased that you are making a government-wide study of mailing lists in order to weigh the balancing interest between freedom of information and the individual's right to privacy.

This is an area in which the Department is greatly concerned because it must keep lists of several million farmers participating in farm programs, because of its regulatory and cooperative work such as meat and poultry inspection, and its reliance upon 700,000 unpaid crop reporters and about 150,000 unpaid members of the agribusiness community for accurate statistical information.

In addition, the Department must maintain mailing lists of its own personnel.

It is not U.S. Department of Agriculture policy to maintain mailing lists for sale to the public.

Several directories are compiled and reproduced by the Department of Agriculture in the course of carrying out its responsibilities. Principal distribution of these directories is internal and to cooperating institutions, individuals, and firms. In some instances, these also are available on request to the public without cost and are for sale from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office. Some are available only on request to the Department, and no charge is made for these.

A survey of such directories and mailing lists available to the public was made in response to your request, and a summary of this survey is enclosed.

The Freedom of Information Act requires us, upon request, to provide records, if they exist, unless disclosure is prohibited or unless it is determined that the request should be denied under one of the exemptions made possible by the Freedom of Information Act. One of these exemptions is to avoid disclosure which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy. This exemption, however, is not mandatory; its use for denying a request must be by administrative determination.

Department policy is to withhold lists of names and addresses of farmers, businessmen, persons, firms, or organizations used in the Department to obtain information or to mail information requested if those lists are to be used directly or indirectly for solicitation purposes.

A new policy is being put into effect by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service in connection with requests for lists of farmers.

This is discussed in the enclosure under the heading, "Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service."

Thank you for this opportunity to provide information on sale or disclosure of mailing lists.

Sincerely,

E. F. BEHRENS,  
Executive Assistant to the Secretary.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION,  
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: The Smithsonian maintains fairly extensive mailing lists for vari-

ous purposes. These are used for distribution of a wide range of informational materials, including a monthly calendar of events and schedules of academic activities in the Washington area. We also mail, on a regular basis, programs or invitations for a continuing series of museum activities. Because of the great many specialized areas represented by our art, science, and history departments, there are also a number of specialized lists that provide for distribution of materials as well as communication with individuals within various communities of interest.

Among these listings, I should probably mention in particular the growing list of members of our Smithsonian Associates group, which now includes some 10,000 addresses here in the Washington area. With the development this spring of a nationwide Associates program and a magazine for members, this list can be expected to grow significantly.

The Smithsonian Institution does not sell mailing lists. We have occasionally made them available, on a case by case basis, to organizations closely related to the Smithsonian or its components when there has been a specific purpose. For example, should a local university be holding a conference in a specific scientific field, our people in this area would certainly consider providing a list of their own correspondents so that they could be invited to participate. Likewise, if the American Numismatic Society were holding an annual meeting in Washington, our numismatists would undoubtedly be glad to provide a list of their regular contacts in this vicinity.

When such assistance has been provided, we have done it without charge. However, if a situation should develop where substantial staff time or other services became involved, we would naturally consider appropriate compensation.

I should point out in passing that, as you know, the Smithsonian has a private as well as governmental character growing out of the circumstances of its establishment in the early 19th century and the private endowments that help finance some of the components. I feel it appropriate to bring this to your attention because your study appears most particularly related to government agency mailing lists.

We are, of course, happy to provide this information, and will be of any further assistance you may request in this connection. Please let us know when we can help in any further way.

Sincerely yours,

S. DILLON RIPLEY,  
Secretary.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, D.C., April 3, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: This is in further reference to your letter to the President concerning the sale of lists of licensed firearms dealers and collectors by the Internal Revenue Service.

I understand that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has recently informed you that he has directed that in the future the names and addresses of those persons licensed as collectors under the Gun Control Act will not be disclosed, but that the Freedom of Information Act contemplates disclosure of the list of those engaged in business as dealers.

I believe the Commissioner's decision provides a proper balance between the protection of an individual's right of privacy and the public's right to information regarding persons engaged in business. I hope you will agree that this approach is an equitable solution to the problem which you called to the attention of the President.

With warm regard,

Sincerely,

RICHARD K. COOK,  
Special Assistant to the President.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, D.C., March 10, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: Secretary Stans has asked me to acknowledge your letter of March 5 requesting information for a government-wide study of all mailing lists that agencies have prepared and made available to the public.

We will give you a further reply in this regard as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

SOL MOSHER,  
Special Assistant to the Secretary.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, D.C., April 3, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: This replies to your letter to me of March 5, 1970 regarding mailing lists.

Mailing lists are developed by many of the bureaus of the Department. They enable the bureaus to send publications and other materials requested by persons and firms and they enable the bureaus to communicate with people and organizations who are interested in the work performed by the bureaus.

With the exceptions stated below, we do not make mailing lists available to members of the public under any circumstances. Attached are copies of two letters which delineate clearly the responses we have made to insistent requests for the release of mailing lists.

In the case of the Census Bureau, we do not release any information of a personal or corporate nature, not even to other Federal agencies.

The Bureau of International Commerce Trade Lists available to present and potential U.S. exporters who are seeking foreign business connections. The lists are sold at cost to U.S. business firms. Lists are currently being sold for \$1.00 per country for each Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) number. Approximately 50,000 lists per year are sold. Also, the entire Trade List is available on magnetic tape for \$2,500.

The Patent Office prepares for sale by the Superintendent of Documents the following publications: "Directory of Registered Patent Attorneys and Agents" at \$1.50 per copy and "Roster of Attorneys and Agents Registered to Practice Before the U.S. Patent Office" at \$1.00 per copy.

In addition, the Patent Office prepares and sells a special listing of Patent Attorneys and Agents to Dr. Irving Kayton, Director of the Computers-in-Law Program, George Washington University, 720 20th St., NW., Washington, D.C. 20006. Dr. Kayton performs work for the Patent, Trademark and Copyright Foundation of the George Washington University and requests this list approximately twice each year. Charges are made on the basis of actual computer time used. Preparation of this information is authorized by 35 U.S.C. 11 which authorizes the Commissioner to print laws and rules relating to trademarks, and circulars or other publications relating to the business of the Patent Office.

I hope this gives you the information you are seeking. Please call upon us if you would like more details.

Sincerely,

MAURICE H. STANS,  
Secretary of Commerce.



SEPTEMBER 22, 1967.

Re Request for Consideration.

Mr. ALBERT J. DIAZ,  
Microfilm Editions, Inc.,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DIAZ: I have carefully considered your request for reconsideration dated September 8, 1967, for the Bureau's mailing list of subscribers to the microfilmed Government reports and patents which you specified. I have concluded that these records fall within the scope of the exemptions from public disclosure contained in subsections (b) (4) and (6) of 5 U.S.C. 552 and are not to be made available. I am, therefore, denying your request for such records.

Each of the persons on the Bureau's mailing lists voluntarily submitted his name and address to the Bureau for the limited and explicit purpose of purchasing and obtaining specific Government publications or other materials, and for no other purpose. They did not act under compulsion or any law, and these subscription lists have not in the past and are not now considered to be public records available to inspection upon demand.

When these persons furnished this agency their names for this limited purpose, they relied upon the Bureau's discretion to utilize their identities for the intended purpose. I deem that such identities were submitted in confidence and are confidential, and that their disclosure would be an impairment of such confidence and of their personal privacy, particularly if disclosure would be the basis for commercial or other solicitations by outside parties.

It is in the Department of Commerce's interest and part of its program to encourage businessmen and others to obtain trade and technical information useful to them which is published, collated, or made available by Government agencies. It also is in the interest of these subscribers to receive such Government materials. If persons who subscribed to Government publications or materials knew that by so doing they were to open themselves to all sorts of commercial or other solicitations by persons who obtained the subscription lists from Government agencies, they might well decide not to subscribe, to their own and the Government's detriment.

As I understand, your business is to sell microfilm equipment and related materials and data, and I assume that you wish to obtain those mailing lists for your business purposes. Although this is a legitimate purpose, the subscribers have their own means of ascertaining available microfilm equipment and supplies. Persons who wish to obtain Government subscription or mailing lists for commercial or similar solicitations would be using the Government agencies as sources of customers or other solicitees free or at a nominal charge, and thereby avoid obtaining customers at their own proper expense. Although this Department does attempt to aid businessmen, it would be an abuse of its discretion and confidence to utilize captive subscribers to Government publications to aid business solicitors in this manner.

A mailing list is in itself something of commercial value. Companies are in the business of preparing and selling lists for solicitation purposes. Mailing lists held by Government agencies are items of valuable property, and are significant as such rather than as Government records. The Congress recognized in its consideration of the new law that where property or information in private hands could be held in confidence, Government agencies should also treat in confidence under 5 U.S.C. 552(b) (4). Customer lists were specifically mentioned in this regard. I conclude that when the Bureau itself compiles and holds similar mailing lists, it likewise is covered by the confidentiality provision of subsection (b) (4). Nor is there any indication that Congress

intended by this law for a Government agency to give away such property to any person willing to pay the price of making a copy.

It was also recognized in connection with exemption (b) (6) of 5 U.S.C. 552 that a possible area of invasion of privacy would be the furnishing of detailed information about Government employees or lists of other persons. Information about Government employees, such as their home addresses, is not to be disclosed for commercial or other solicitations. I conclude that it would likewise be an impairment of the privacy of subscribers to Government materials to make their names and addresses known for commercial or other solicitations within the scope of 5 U.S.C. 552(b) (6).

Lastly, the essential purpose and intent of the Public Information law is to have Federal agencies inform the public about their organizations, operations, decisions, and rules, and to make their records publicly available, so that interested persons when adequately informed would know what the agencies were doing and how to deal with them more effectively. At the same time, the Congress recognized that records which, if disclosed, would impair important Government operations or rights of privacy should be protected from disclosure. A balancing of these opposing interests is to be made in determining record availability under the law.

Requests, such as yours, for records of subscribers to Government information made for the commercial advantage or gains of the requesting parties, have nothing to do with the avowed purposes and policies of the law. This is not the type of information which the Congress had in mind would require disclosure to assist the public in its dealings with the executive branch, even by the utmost emphasis on the fullest disclosure possible.

It is the type of record which should be found to be protected from disclosure under exemptions (b) (4) and (6), and on balance I have determined from the aforesaid compelling considerations that it is exempt from disclosure and that it is not in the public interest to grant your request. Your request is accordingly denied.

Pursuant to the provisions of Subsections 4.01 and .02 of Department Order 64 (32 Federal Register 9734, 9735, July 4, 1967), and Section 4.10 of Title 15, Code of Federal Regulations, Subtitle A, Part 4 (32 Federal Register 9643, 9645, July 4, 1967), this decision is the final decision of the Department of Commerce on your request.

Sincerely yours,

A. V. ASTIN,  
Director.

JUNE 26, 1968.

Mr. HOWARD E. DEUTCH,  
Attorney at Law,  
Rockville, Md.

DEAR MR. DEUTCH: Your letter of June 18 requested our subscriber lists for U.S. Government Research and Development Reports (USGRDR) and the Government-Wide Index to Federal Research and Development Reports (GWI). The Government-Wide Index to Federal Research and Development Reports has been renamed U.S. Government Research and Development Reports Index (USGRDRI).

It is the policy of this agency to maintain such mailing lists in confidence, and, therefore, we cannot provide you with the above subscriber lists. We believe that customers, when entering into a purchasing arrangement with the Clearinghouse, rely upon our discretion to use their names and addresses for the intended purpose only.

Under the Freedom of Information Act you may, of course, protest this decision. The Department of Commerce has prescribed the rules for obtaining information under the Freedom of Information Act which appeared

in the Federal Register, Volume 32, No. 128, page 9643, on July 4, 1967.

If you decide to protest this decision, it will be necessary for you to make application concerning the information you have requested directly to the Department of Commerce, Central Reference and Records Inspection Facility, Washington, D.C. 20030. This can be done by completing the enclosed form, CD-244, and submitting it with the required fee. I should, however, inform you that a similar denial was previously upheld.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT E. SAUTER,  
Director.

THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION,  
Washington, D.C., March 13, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: Thank you for your letter of March 5 (received March 9), relative to whether this Department is selling or providing mailing lists containing names and addresses of individuals or firms under its jurisdiction or regulation.

I am not aware of anything along these lines, but I will certainly check into it and give you an early answer.

Sincerely,

JOHN.

THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION,  
Washington, D.C., April 1, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: This is a further reply to your letter of March 5 pertaining to selling or making available mailing lists containing names and addresses of individuals or firms which fall under the jurisdiction or regulation of this Department.

The Department of Transportation does not sell or make available mailing list per se; however, the Freedom of Information Act (Public Law 90-23) requires government agencies to make records, except under certain exemptions, available to the public upon request.

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) maintains records of airman certifications and aircraft registrations. The U.S. Coast Guard maintains boat registration lists for the States of New Hampshire, Washington, Alaska, the District of Columbia and Guam. Any individual or organization requesting copies of these records is provided the record, upon payment of a search and copying fee.

It is entirely possible for a person or firm to prepare mailing lists on the basis of information derived from lists maintained by the FAA or Coast Guard. The Department has no control over the use of information which is released to the public under the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act. In fact under the Act, we are not permitted to release information selectively, based on judgment as to the propriety of the use which will be made of the information requested.

There is a search and copying fee charged for records provided to members of the public. This charge, in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, is assessed to offset costs entailed in the furnishing of government records. The specific fees to be charged by all administrations of DOT are set forth in Subpart H of Part 7 of the Department regulations. Under this fee schedule a charge of \$40 is made for each reel of duplicate data tape or fraction thereof; if an applicant does not supply the tape, there is an additional charge of \$40 per reel for government tape. In the case of aircraft or boat registration records, a charge of \$5 per each 1,000 lines of data processed print out is made.

Enclosed is a listing of individuals and organizations to whom copies of FAA airman

certification and aircraft registration records, and Coast Guard boat registration records have recently been provided. No other records have been provided by any of the other components of the Department from which mailing lists could be developed.

If I may be of any further service to you please let me know.

Sincerely,

JOHN WOLF.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,  
Washington, D.C., March 11, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HORTON: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter dated March 5 regarding a study of all mailing lists that agencies have prepared and made available to the public.

Your letter will receive our prompt attention and a reply will be forwarded as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

OSCAR \_\_\_\_\_,

(For Robert D. O'Neill, Director Congressional Relations).

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,  
Washington, D.C., April 1, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HORTON: This will reply to your inquiry of March 6, 1970. A few of the various mailing lists in use throughout the Commission have been sold or made available free of charge to the public, as described below.

We have a nuclear science abstracts mailing list, consisting of scientific and technical organizations and individuals in the nuclear field, which occasionally has been provided at no charge to organizations such as the American Nuclear Society and the National Science Teachers' Association upon their request.

We have lists of licensees which have been made available through the U.S. Government Printing Office on a cost recovery basis:

A. Special nuclear material licensees.....	\$2.30
B. Facility licensees.....	4.60
C. Source material licensees.....	4.60
D. Byproduct material licensees.....	18.40

These lists are now being computerized and probably will be made available in the future directly from the Atomic Energy Commission, again on a cost recovery basis. The statutory authority for the recovery of costs for furnishing these lists is found in 31 USC 483a. The Public Information Act of 1966 (Public Law 90-23) also provides that each agency, on request for identifiable records made in accordance with published rules stating the time, place, fees to the extent authorized by statute, and procedure to be followed, shall make records promptly available to any person. The Atomic Energy Commission's rules in this regard may be found in 10 CFR Part 9, a copy of which is enclosed.

We will be glad to provide any additional information you may need.

Cordially,

W. E. JOHNSON,  
Acting Chairman.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION,  
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: This is in response to your letter of March 5, 1970, to Dr. McElroy, Director of the Foundation, concerning mailing lists and our practices with respect to selling or making such information available to others.

While the National Science Foundation maintains thirty-seven mailing lists containing an aggregate of approximately 17,700 names, they are not in great demand. In

fact, only four requests have been made: one by Associates International of New York City, two by Washington Science Trends of Washington, D.C., and the other request by Russell Sage Foundation of New York City. In the first two cases, the requesters were undertaking to continue publication of science news which had been included in a periodical which the Foundation was discontinuing. The mailing list for that publication was furnished to the requesters as a service both to those on the mailing list and the requesters themselves. The only charge made was \$6.00 to cover the cost of actual reproduction of the list. A further request (a second from Washington Science Trends) has been received recently and is under consideration now.

In the other case, it was agreed with the Russell Sage Foundation, that its purpose could adequately be served by a list from which the names of private citizens had been deleted, leaving only names of government officials. The list of government officials was provided to the Russell Sage Foundation.

If you have any further questions, we will be glad to try to answer them.

Sincerely yours,

C. C. OHEKE,

Head, Congressional and Public Affairs.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,

Washington, D.C., March 11, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 5, requesting detailed information about any mailing lists the Department has developed and made available to the public.

Your correspondence will receive prompt attention, and a report on this matter will be sent to you at the earliest possible date.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

WINTON M. BLOUNT.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,

Washington, D.C., March 25, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HORTON: The Postmaster General has asked me to reply to your letter of March 5, 1970, concerning the Post Office Department's policy on making mailing lists available to the public.

The Post Office Department does not compile and sell mailing lists of any type whatsoever for the public.

To give effect to the Public Information Act, 5 U.S.C. 552, this Department promulgated its implementing regulations which are published in 39 Code of Federal Regulations 113. Pursuant to these regulations, on diverse occasions some members of the public have asked for certain information. If such information was contained in official records of the Department and was not exempt pursuant to the exemption provisions in the Law, the information would be made available. Normally, a user fee would be charged. The fees are also set forth in the above regulations.

We trust this information will be of assistance.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. POWELL,

Congressional Liaison Officer.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,

Washington, D.C., March 24, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House Office Building,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: This replies to your letter of March 5, requesting information concerning mailing lists.

Neither the Department nor its constituent

bureaus develop mailing lists for sale to the public.

Interior agencies do receive varied requests from the public to inspect or copy information contained in our records. These requests occasionally involve mailing lists, names of bidders or other information which may be used for solicitation of business.

Public requests for information of any type are handled by this Department in accordance with congressionally declared policy, as expressed in the Public Information section of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946, codified as section 552 of Title 5, United States Code.

The published rules of the Department relating to the availability of records are found in Part 2 of Title 43—Subtitle A of the Code of Federal Regulations. A copy of these rules is attached for your ready reference.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE H. DUNN,

Assistant Secretary for Administration.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1970.

Congressman FRANK HORTON,  
House Office Building,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HORTON: Secretary Hickel has asked me to respond to your letter of March 5 requesting information concerning mailing lists.

We shall be pleased to provide this information as soon as possible, hopefully within the next two weeks.

Sincerely yours,

(sgd) GEORGE E. ROBINSON,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Administration.

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,  
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: This is in reply to your letter of March 5, 1970.

The Civil Service Commission does not sell or make available to the public any mailing lists of individuals or firms.

We fully share and appreciate your concern about striking a balance between freedom of information and an individual's right to privacy. The Civil Service Commission, in keeping with the intent of the Freedom of Information Act, has adopted the policy of making information in its possession, or under its control, available to the public except when that disclosure would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, is prohibited under law or Executive Order, or relates to internal memoranda and other communications the disclosure of which would interfere with the performance of the Commission's functions.

For example, the Commission will not make available to the public home addresses and home telephone numbers of employees, or the names of applicants for civil service positions or eligibles on civil service registers.

We are enclosing for your information a copy of Chapter 294 of the Federal Personnel Manual, Availability of Official Information. The provisions of this chapter apply to other Federal agencies as well as the Commission.

Please do not hesitate to call on us, if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. HAMPTON,  
Chairman.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,  
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HORTON: This is in reply to your inquiry of March 5, 1970, as to



the possible sale or release of Commission mailing lists.

The Commission maintains mailing lists of carriers under its jurisdiction according to mode, accounting class, type, etc. The bulk of these mailing lists are computer maintained since address information is a part of the program for processing and accumulating data respecting regulated carriers. Such lists are made available to other Government agencies who establish a valid official need for such information, or addressing from the list may be done on a reimbursable basis for other agencies. For example, the Commission recently addressed a "Wanted" circular to all regulated motor carriers for the FBI on a reimbursable basis.

Requests from the public or non-Government sources for duplicate copies of these mailing lists have generally been denied on the basis that the Commission does not have available the resources necessary to provide such information. Inquirers are advised that mailing lists are available for inspection in the Commission's Washington Office. Thus far, no special problems have been encountered.

The Secretary's Office also maintains other lists which relate to the Commission's formal proceedings. Essentially these lists comprise the names of parties to and/or persons interested in a specifically docketed proceeding. These lists are, of course, by law, available for inspection by anyone requesting them. The Commission, however, does not make copies of such service lists, primarily because of limitations on personnel available to perform this service. Persons desiring copies of the service lists have coin operated xerox equipment available to permit them to make their own copies if they so desire. In addition, there is available in the Office of the Secretary, lists of statutory agents designated by carriers to receive service of the Commission's Notices and Orders as provided in Sections 16(5), 221, 315(a), and 416(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. §§ 16(4), 321, 915 and 1006) and Section 6 of the Mann-Elkins Act (49 U.S.C. § 50). Here again, as with the service lists, persons requesting such lists must make their own copies at their own expense.

Sincerely,

GEORGE M. STAFFORD,  
Chairman.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND  
SPACE ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, D.C., March 23, 1970.

HON. FRANK J. HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: This is in response to your letter to the Administrator, concerning your government-wide study of all mailing lists that agencies have prepared and made available to the public.

The policies and procedures prescribed by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the release of information and other identifiable agency records are set forth in the Federal Register, Volume 32, No. 127, Part 1206 (14 CFR 1206). They are reproduced as Attachment A to NASA Policy Directive NPD 1382.2, revised April 24, 1968, a copy of which is enclosed.

With regard to the public availability of lists of names and addresses of individuals, it has long been NASA policy to withhold lists of employees' names that include their home addresses and/or home telephone numbers in order to preclude an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy. Lists of names, position titles, grades, salaries, and duty stations of Federal employees may be furnished to members of the public upon request, subject to certain restrictions in Chapter 294, Federal Personnel Manual, as cited below. In both of these respects, NASA policy is consistent with the related U.S. Civil Service Commission's regulations currently published in Chapter 294, "Availability of Official Information,"

Federal Personnel Manual, Inst. 123, January 15, 1969. In particular, Appendices B and C thereof are pertinent. For your convenience, there are enclosed copies of Appendix B, "Guides for Furnishing Lists of Employees and Identifying Information to the General Public," and Appendix C, "Guides for Responding to Employee Organization Requests for Names of Employees and Identifying Information."

In this connection, NASA Headquarters and installation telephone directories that are available on request to members of the public, do not include the employees' home addresses and/or home telephone numbers. (The Headquarters directory is offered for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office for 60 cents per single copy and for a subscription price of \$2 per year. Requests for NASA installation telephone directories not containing employees' home addresses and home telephone numbers may be filled only at the installation they serve.)

It should also be noted that the position titles, names and home addresses of key officials at NASA Headquarters and field installations, as well as officials of other government agencies, appear in that part of the Congressional Directory that relates to each of the respective agencies. Through this reference, and possibly others, home addresses of certain government officials can become known to the public.

With regard to names and addresses of firms, NASA does prepare lists of contractors for use within NASA to meet various management and operating needs. For example, the Headquarters Procurement Office maintains a mailing list of NASA principal prime contractors and first-tier subcontractors on an up-to-date basis for use by Headquarters offices. The responsibilities and procedures for use of such a list are set forth in NASA Issuance HQMI 5150.3, October 17, 1968, a copy of which is also enclosed.

While contractor mailing lists, such as mentioned above, are designed for use within NASA, they are themselves identifiable NASA records which would, under NASA's policies and regulations, be subject to release upon request by a member of the public.

We trust that the above information and the enclosures concerning NASA will assist you in your study. Please let us know if you require any additional information.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT F. ALLNUTT,  
Assistant Administrator for Legislative  
Affairs.

MARCH 16, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: Your letter of March 5, 1970 to the Administrator of Veterans Affairs concerning a government-wide study of mailing lists has been referred to me.

We are gathering the necessary information and the Administrator will reply to you as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

BLAKE E. TURNER,  
Assistant Administrator for Management Engineering and Evaluation.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, D.C., March 23, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: In response to your letter of March 5, 1970, I assure you that the Veterans Administration desires to balance the interests between freedom of information and the individual's right to privacy.

The furnishing of lists of VA claimants is specifically prohibited by VA Regulation 519 (38 CFR 1.519)—except as directed by the Administrator or Deputy Administrator—

whereas VA Regulation 501 (38 CFR 1.501) authorizes the same officials to release information to individuals or organizations when in their judgment this would serve a useful purpose.

In consonance with these principles we have adopted a policy of furnishing data tapes containing the names and addresses of recently discharged veterans to five large organizations which are staffed and qualified to assist servicemen returning to civilian life. These are the American Red Cross and certain Congressionally chartered veterans organizations, i.e., the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the American Veterans of World War II. These five organizations have been recognized under the provisions of 38 USC 3402 in the preparation, presentation and prosecution of claims under laws administered by the Veterans Administration.

No charge is made for the information which we give these organizations. They provide us with magnetic tapes periodically and we add the data at our Austin, Texas Data Processing Center and return them with the names and addresses of recently discharged veterans. These organizations all understand that the VA's purpose in making the tapes available is to assist in informing recently separated veterans about their potential entitlement to various benefits, and under no circumstances are the tapes or any print-outs to be released by the organization to outside interests.

Also, on request and with my approval, we have furnished one time lists of veteran's names and addresses to organizations, Congressional committees, and departments such as the Department of Labor, the Committee on Veterans Affairs and several colleges and universities. The purpose of releasing this information in each case was to render assistance or guidance to veterans in obtaining employment or to advance their education. No charge was made for this information.

A set of our Release of Information Regulations is enclosed. I hope this information will serve your purposes.

Sincerely,

DONALD E. JOHNSON,  
Administrator.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
OF THE TREASURY,  
Washington, D.C., March 9, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: For the Secretary, I am acknowledging your letter of March 5, in which you request information about any mailing lists of individuals or firms that this Department may provide to the public. You will have a further response as promptly as possible.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. SMITH,  
Special Assistant to the Secretary, Congressional Relations.

BUREAU OF CUSTOMS,  
March 18, 1970.

To: Mr. Ernest C. Betts, Jr.  
From: For Glenn R. Dickerson (K. Knight).  
Subject: Request from Congressman Horton.

In response to your memorandum of March 11, 1970, we have had only one (1) situation of selling or making available Customs mailing lists.

The information requested by the Congressman regarding this sale is as follows:

- 1—Items sold—master file of U.S. importers registered with the Bureau of Customs.
- 2—Sold to—World Trade Computer Exchange Inc., 422 East 53rd Street, N.Y., New York.
- 3—Charge to purchaser—\$300.
- 4—How cost determined—computer, plus handling, plus supplies.
- 5—Legislative authority—5 USC-552.

REQUEST FROM CONGRESSMAN HORTON  
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Administration,  
Department of the Treasury  
Deputy Commissioner, Internal Revenue  
Service

Attached is our response to your March 11 transmittal of Rep. Horton's request for information on mailing lists sold or made available to the public. We have not included a report on information provided to or exchanged with other Federal agencies or the States.

Incidentally, Mr. Horton also wrote directly to the Commissioner and asked for the same information as contained in his request to the Secretary. We are notifying the Congressman that the data will be provided through the Department as part of the Treasury response.

WILLIAM H. SMITH.

MARCH 24, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: This is in further reference to your letter of March 2, 1970, with respect to other mailing lists which the Internal Revenue Service makes available to the public.

Information on the other mailing lists will be incorporated in the Treasury Department's response to your March 5, 1970, letter to the Secretary.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,  
RANDOLPH W. THROWER,  
Commissioner.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, D.C., March 20, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: This is in further response to your letter of March 5, 1970, to Secretary Kennedy, in which you requested information about mailing lists that the Department of the Treasury has developed, sold, and distributed to individuals or firms.

Attached are mailing lists of the Bureau of Customs and the Internal Revenue Service which show cost and legislative authority under which each list was sold. Other bureaus of Treasury do not sell any mailing lists.

I shall be pleased to provide any additional information if needed.

Sincerely yours,  
A. E. WEATHERBEE,  
Assistant Secretary for Administration.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, D.C., March 20, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: I appreciate your concern with the balance between freedom of information and the right of an individual to privacy as they relate to the sale or use of mailing lists developed by Federal agencies.

We do maintain a number of mailing lists on addressograph plates. The bulk of these, however, involve a public information function. Specifically, they include the names and addresses of newspapers, periodicals, radio stations and television stations which reach farmers. Other of our lists include libraries, agricultural extension workers, colleges and secondary schools involved in agricultural education, farm organizations and cooperatives.

We also maintain lists of selected Government officials, our own field personnel and officers and directors of the banks under our supervision.

We have available, but not on addresso-

graph plates, the addresses of the 1,000 local credit associations under our supervision.

We have never, under any circumstances, sold any of these lists to any individual or firm. On rare occasions we do get requests for the addresses of the local credit associations we supervise, but these are generally limited to associations in one state or region. Such requests are promptly filled by Farm Credit Administration. Request for extensive lists, however, may be referred by us to the particular Farm Credit district or districts involved. Please allow me to emphasize that these requests are rare and usually involve only a small number of addresses. If we provided large lists for any reason we would have to recover the cost of preparing them.

Our lists would not violate anyone's rights to privacy and they are not of a nature that would involve them in questions regarding freedom of information.

Sincerely,

E. A. JAEKE,  
Governor.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, D.C., March 20, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HORTON: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of March 5, 1970, inquiring if the Department of State makes mailing lists available to the public.

The Department maintains a number of mailing lists of individuals and institutions who have expressed interest in receiving our publications. These lists are maintained strictly for the Department's use and are not sold or otherwise made available to the public.

I hope that this information will be helpful to you in the preparation of your study.

Sincerely,  
H. G. TORBERT, JR.,  
Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

March 20, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives, Committee on  
Government Operations, Rayburn House  
Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 5, 1970, regarding selling or making available mailing lists of the names and addresses of individuals or firms who transact business with the Government Printing Office.

We do not provide any mailing lists either by sale or gratis distribution of any individuals, firms, or other business entities doing business with the United States Government Printing Office.

If I can be of further assistance please let me know.

Sincerely yours,  
JAMES L. HARRISON,  
Public Printer.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS  
COMMISSION,  
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1970.

Congressman FRANK HORTON,  
Committee on Government Operations,  
House of Representatives, Rayburn House  
Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: In accordance with the Federal Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and the Freedom of Information Act, 5 USC 552, the Federal Communications Commission makes available to the public a variety of information from its files, some of which includes the names and mailing addresses of its licensees. For example, applications for broadcast and nonbroadcast authorizations and related files are routinely made available for public inspection. Moreover, the Commission provides in its public reference rooms coin-operated duplicating

machines for those who personally appear at the Commission's offices to inspect the records and may desire copies.

In addition, however, requests are received for copies of one or more of those records which are available for public inspection from members of the public not able to visit the Commission's offices. To accommodate the needs of the public in this respect, the Commission for some time has had a contract with an outside firm which duplicates such records at a fixed charge for members of the public requesting them. The current contractor for this service is the Cooper-Trent Division of the Keuffel and Esser Company.

The comparatively recent use of a computer by the Commission has made possible the establishment of a large data bank. Among the data contained in the computer are those pertaining to our radio licensees along with their names and mailing addresses. The licensee data is periodically printed out by the computer for Commission use. These printouts are also routinely available for public inspection. Requests have been received for copies of our computer tapes. Again, to accommodate the public, the Commission has entered into an arrangement with the Department of Commerce's Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information whereby copies of our computer tapes are reproduced and sold to members of the public requesting them.

The Commission does not keep any records as to who requests copies of our records to be duplicated by Cooper-Trent, or copies of our computer tapes to be duplicated by the Clearinghouse since such requests are made directly to these organizations. Hence, we are unable to provide you with information as to who may have purchased Commission records either in the form of hard copy or computer tape. The charges made by Cooper-Trent for providing duplicating services are competitively arrived at through the process of requesting bids on the open market to provide these services. The service charges by the Department of Commerce's Clearinghouse are established by the Clearinghouse. The current charge is \$55.00 per reel of tape.

In our judgment, the names and addresses of licensees fall under none of the exemptions of the Public Information Act, 5 U.S.C. 552, and thus must be furnished to members of the public for inspection or copying upon request.

As indicated by the foregoing, the Commission does not prepare, furnish or sell mailing lists as such. However, information compiled by the Commission for its own use may be useable as a mailing list, and such information is made available to the public for inspection and copying upon request as described above.

I hope that this information will be helpful to you in your study. If you have any questions concerning this matter, please advise me.

Sincerely yours,  
DEAN BURCH, Chairman.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,  
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HORTON: This is in reply to your letter dated March 5, 1970, concerning the selling or making of mailing lists including the names and addresses of individuals who come under the jurisdiction of the Selective Service System.

This System maintains an address for every male citizen and most male residents who were born after August 30, 1922. These addresses are confidential, and not disclosed to anyone other than in accordance with the Selective Service Regulations. This policy of the System has been upheld by the United States District Court in the case of *Schmidt and Sternback et al. v. Patti Hall, Local Board 13, et al.*, W.D. Wis., Civil No. 69-C-3(M).



About fifteen years ago, a Congressional investigation was made because certain local boards had been furnishing the names and addresses of recently returned veterans to local insurance companies. This action became the subject of extensive hearings before the Subcommittee for Special Investigations of the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, 84th Congress, Second Session. These hearings were held on March 23 and June 11, 1956, and published in a pamphlet titled "Commercial Use of Selective Service Forms." Since that time, the Selective Service System has not released addresses of registrants to anyone other than those persons authorized under 32 C.F.R. 1606.32, and has not used the addresses to forward mail other than official mail to registrants, except as prescribed under 32 C.F.R. 1606.41. Copies of these regulations are enclosed for your information.

In the past six months, an incident of such sale of names was brought to the attention of one of our State Directors. After a complete investigation, and F.B.I. report, the employee who had sold the names was terminated. To my knowledge, there has been no willful violation of this trust which the Congress has placed on the Selective Service System.

Of greater concern to me, and to the System, is the requirement that we release the home addresses of our local board and appeal board members. When civil actions are brought under the Freedom of Information Act, seeking these home addresses, the United States District Courts have followed the ruling of the Seventh Circuit in the case of *Tuchinsky v. Selective Service System*, 418 F.2d 155 (1969), that the public is not entitled to the home addresses of board members. However, when a registrant is charged with refusing or failing to report for induction, defense attorneys are being more and more successful in securing discovery orders from the same United States District Courts. Included in these discovery orders will be a requirement that home addresses be produced in open court. The purpose of the defense is to establish the legality of the local board. However, since the System has always been willing to furnish a certified statement that the records have again been examined and the board member resides within the required area, or has agreed to an in camera inspection of the records in the Judge's chambers, it is my concern that this unwarranted invasion of privacy may cause many board members to resign their positions rather than subject their families to the type of harassment which is being more and more directed at the Selective Service System and anyone affiliated with it.

Sincerely yours,

DEE INGOLD,  
Acting Director.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE  
UNITED STATES,

Washington, D.C., March 18, 1970.

Hon. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR FRANK: Reference is made to your letter of March 5, 1970, requesting information concerning the preparation and sale or distribution of mailing lists to the public.

The General Accounting Office has in no instance sold or allowed distribution of mailing lists to the public. The only lists of this nature maintained by this Office are those essential for its work, such as lists of names and addresses of common carriers doing business with the Federal Government for use in connection with the audit of transportation charges. These lists are made available only to other Government agencies which have a need for them in their work.

The policy of this Office concerning the furnishing of information about its employees is contained in a letter, dated April 26, 1966, to heads of divisions and offices,

a copy of which is enclosed. This policy is based on guidelines prescribed by the United States Civil Service Commission.

Should you require any additional information on this matter, please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER B. STAATS,  
Comptroller General  
of the United States.

GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE  
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,  
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1970.

Hon. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: This is in further reply to your letter of March 5, 1970, in which you asked for information concerning the availability to those outside the Government of mailing lists of the names and addresses of individuals or firms associated with the Department of Defense.

Soon after the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) went into effect the question arose as to whether the Department was obliged to make available to requesters lists of the names and addresses of military personnel or former military personnel. We concluded that to make such names and addresses available would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy and advised the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) that his policy of denying such lists for commercial solicitation purposes could be continued (see the attached DoD Directive 1344.7, paragraph III. B. 2. e.). This restriction is consistent with the policy established by the Civil Service Commission (5 CFR 294.702). The decision to continuing denying such lists of names and addresses has been conveyed to all components of the Department of Defense.

The question regarding the names of firms is more difficult to answer. Firms fall under our "jurisdiction or regulation," in a sense, only through contractual provisions. There exists no overall list of firms doing business with the Department of Defense. However, bidders' lists are maintained by each separate procuring activity, and these are made available upon request at the cost of reproducing the list. Similarly, there may be other lists of firms which do a particular kind of business with the Department of Defense or have been qualified or disqualified from doing business. These lists would also be made available upon request unless for some particular reason they come within one of the exceptions to the Freedom of Information Act.

The method of determining costs of reproducing lists is set forth in DoD Instruction 7230.7 (copy attached).

Should you require further details, we will be happy to assist, but if the detailed information must be obtained from the components of the Department of Defense, it normally requires up to a month's time for compilation.

Sincerely yours,

L. NIEDERLEHNER,  
Acting General Counsel.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION,  
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1970.

Hon. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: This is in response to your letter of March 5, 1970, regarding mailing lists which the Commission prepares and makes available to the public.

The only publication of the Commission which possibly might fall in the category of mailing list is the booklet, *Approved Conference Rate, and Interconference Agreements of Steamship Lines in the Foreign Commerce of the United States*. Section 8

of this booklet lists the names and addresses of agreement representatives. The booklet is prepared by the Commission but sold by the Government Printing Office which determines its cost. This publication is not required by an statutory authority; it is designed merely to provide information to the industry and the public. I am enclosing a copy for your information.

I trust this will be of assistance to you in the conduct of your survey.

Sincerely,

HELEN DELICH BENTLEY,  
Chairman.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY  
COMMISSION,  
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1970.

Hon. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HORTON: This is to acknowledge with thanks your letter of March 5 regarding agency mailing lists.

Yes, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission does maintain a mailing list for the distribution of press releases to interested persons and organizations. We have not, however, made public or sold this list to anyone. It is solely for the use of this Commission.

I hope this sufficiently answers your question. If you have further queries in connection with this matter, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Best regards,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM H. BROWN III,  
Chairman.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,  
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1970.

Hon. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: This is in response to your letter of March 5, 1970, in which you requested information concerning any mailing lists which this Agency may have prepared and made available to the public.

We do not prepare or maintain or sell or distribute any listings of the names and addresses of individuals, unions or firms which are involved in our proceedings or subject to our jurisdiction. We do have indices in the published volumes of our decisions, which set forth the names of parties involved therein but not their addresses. The only mailing list we maintain is a very limited one used by our Division of Information for distribution of Agency decisions and releases. It has never been provided to the public, nor has a request for a copy of it been received.

There are two situations in which the Board receives lists of names and addresses capable of utilization as mailing lists. In election proceedings, the employer is required to provide lists of the names and addresses of employees eligible to vote, and these lists are then made available to the other parties to the proceeding, but only to them. This requirement was established to assist the Board in securing a timely check on voter eligibility and to facilitate communication with the voters by all the parties on the election issues, thereby enhancing the probabilities of an informed electorate. This requirement was considered and approved by the Supreme Court.

The second type of situation where such lists are required to be furnished is where an employer's interference with Section 7 rights of employees has been so widespread, flagrant, and repeated that the Board deems this remedy essential to assure accurate, effective communication by methods or means which can be demonstrably free from employer retaliation. The remedy has been involved in only a few exceptional cases. It too has been approved by reviewing Courts.

In both situations we view these lists as

being submitted to the Board for a limited use and purpose, and have not made them available to persons not parties to the proceeding.

If we can be of any further assistance to you, please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK W. McCULLOCH,  
Chairman.

—  
TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,  
Knoxville, Tenn.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
The House of Representatives,  
Committee on Government Operations,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: This is in response to your letter of March 5 concerning mailing lists of individuals and firms which are made available to the public.

TVA has never sold any mailing lists to the general public nor has it ever developed any such lists for the purpose of distributing them to the general public. TVA has a member of lists of various kinds to serve its own program purposes under the TVA Act. Presumably, most if not all of these would be available to individual members of the public upon request under the Freedom of Information Act. We have been able to identify only three cases, however, in which such lists have been provided to members of the public.

1. The TVA Office of Power maintains a directory of municipal and cooperative distributors of TVA power. The list includes, in the case of municipal distribution systems, the mayors of the cities, and in all cases the chairman of the local utility board and the operating manager or supervisor of the distribution system. The list was compiled for internal convenience in the operation of the TVA power system and copies are provided to the distributors themselves for their operating purposes. There have been occasions, however, when it has been given out on request for a variety of purposes ranging from merchandisers to scholars studying the TVA power system.

2. TVA's Division of Forestry, Fisheries, and Wildlife Development has compiled "a partial list of forest products industries in the Tennessee Valley counties." This list contains the names and addresses of wood products industries and identifies the specific products they may manufacture. When TVA receives a request for information as to potential sources of, say, chips, shavings, or other products, this list is provided. The authority for doing so is in the provisions of the TVA Act directing TVA to encourage industrial development in the region.

3. The TVA Retirement System sends a list of the names and addresses of all of its retirees to each retiree once a year. This is done as a means of enabling retired TVA employees to keep in touch with each other and is authorized under the provisions of the TVA Act relating to TVA's maintenance of an effective personnel system. Upon request, this list has been made available to the American Association of Retired Persons and the National Association of Retired Civil Employees under the Freedom of Information Act. A partial list was provided to the Peace Corps as an aid in the recruiting of retired persons.

If you wish any additional information, we will be glad to provide it.

Sincerely,

AUBREY J. WAGNER,  
Chairman.

MARCH 18, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HORTON: Your letter of March 5, 1970 to the Attorney General has been referred to this office for reply.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice is its only component which makes a mailing list avail-

able to the public. This monthly list consists of the names and addresses of naturalized persons and is distributed without cost as follows:

1. Interested Congressmen with respect to those naturalized who are residents within their districts.
2. Some few State officials, such as Governors.
3. Interested newspapers, as news releases, for publication.
4. The Republican and Democratic National Committees.

(Numbers 1 and 2 above are furnished for the sole purpose of having the new citizens welcomed by those officials.)

I trust the above information will be of help to you.

Sincerely,

L. M. PELLERZI,  
Assistant Attorney General for Administration.

—  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,  
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: In response to your question of March 5, the Labor Department neither gives away nor sells mailing lists or names and addresses of individuals or firms with whom we deal.

I hope this will be of use to you in your study.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely,

GEORGE P. SHULTZ,  
Secretary of Labor.

—  
THE SECRETARY OF HOUSING  
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,  
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: This is in response to your March 5, 1970 letter on the use made of Department mailing lists.

In the Department of Housing and Urban Development, including all its elements, we have consolidated our official mailing lists in the Printing and Distribution Division. These lists of names and addresses of individuals or firms are not available for sale or made available to anyone outside of the Department.

I think it is fine that you are undertaking this study on a government-wide basis.

Sincerely,

GEORGE ROMNEY.

—  
THE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS,  
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Committee on Government Operations,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: In response to your letter, March 5, 1970, the Library of Congress does not make its mailing lists available to any outside sources, individuals or organizations. The responsibility for the maintenance of mailing lists for publications is vested in the Central Services Division. These lists constitute the majority of the Library's official mailings. However, certain specialized units of the Library do maintain additional lists, but neither are these made available to the public.

Sincerely yours,

L. QUINCY MUMFORD,  
Librarian of Congress.

—  
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,  
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives, Committee on  
Government Operations, Rayburn House  
Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: Thank you for your

letter of March 5, 1970, in which you indicated that you are conducting a Government-wide study of all mailing lists that agencies have prepared and made available to the public.

Of the 11 mailing lists maintained by the Federal Trade Commission none have been sold or made available to the public.

I hope the above information will be helpful, and if I may be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to let me know.

With kind personal regards,

Sincerely,

CASPAR W. WEINBERGER,  
Chairman.

—  
FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,  
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
Committee on Government Operations,  
House of Representatives, Rayburn  
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: Thank you for your letter of March 5, 1970, concerning a government-wide survey you are making of agency mailing lists which are available to the public. You request information as to the lists which have been prepared by this Commission, specifically, the persons to whom they are distributed, charges therefor, details as to the manner in which our costs are determined; and authority under which such sales are made.

The names and addresses of all public utilities, licensees, pipelines and producers who file reports with or are otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission are matters of public record and available without charge by inspection of those records or by reproduction of relevant pages of such reports at a rate of 7 cents per 9" x 12" page under government contract by Xerox Systems Center. Alternatively, copies of pages of the Commission's National Electric Rate Book containing electric companies serving communities of 2,500 or more can be obtained from the Government Printing Office at 25 cents per State and a list of jurisdictional pipeline companies is available without charge by Commission release published semiannually.

No compilations of the above persons are maintained in list form. However, the Commission maintains several mailing lists. Apart from limited distribution of matters related to particular pending cases, we maintain mailing lists for newspapers and other communication media (involving about 100 persons) which daily receive news releases and for other interested persons (about 3,750) who have requested distribution of the weekly *FPC News*, which reprints the aforesaid releases, or opinions of the Commission (which go to about 650 distributees). Rulemaking orders are distributed by our Office of Public Information to about 450 interested persons and, in addition, rule-making notices are sent to persons who may be affected thereby. We also have approximately 800 paid subscribers to our publication, *News Digest*, containing excerpts from news sources of general information relating to gas and electric matters of interest to our staff and other concerned persons.

None of these compiled lists has so far as I can ascertain been made available to the public; nor am I aware that request for any has been made. The Commission, of course, would have to comply with such request, if made, under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. 552.

To the extent that the release of information referred may be deemed "sales," the Commission's authority stems from Sections 309 and 312 of the Federal Power Act and Sections 10 and 16 of the Natural Gas Act.

I will be pleased to furnish any further information you desire in this matter.

Sincerely,

JOHN N. NASSIKAS,  
Chairman.



CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,  
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HORTON: Chairman Browne has asked me to reply to your letter of March 5, 1970, requesting information as to your inquiry concerning agencies selling or making available mailing lists including the names and addresses of individuals or firms which fall under their jurisdiction or regulation.

The Civil Aeronautics Board does not sell mailing lists of persons subject to its jurisdiction to anyone. Among our various publications which are generally available to the public is a "List of U.S. Air Carriers" which is issued semiannually. No charge is made for this document.

Various economic reports prepared by the Board are also available to the public, some at nominal charges. I have enclosed a copy of the Board's "List of Publications" for your information.

Sincerely,

TROY B. CONNER,  
Executive Director.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, D.C., March 16, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: Dr. Hannah has asked me to reply to your letter of March 3, 1970 concerning the selling or making available of mailing lists to the public.

Agency mailing lists for directives, notices and publications of recurring nature are maintained centrally and are circularized periodically. In two instances lists or tabulations have been made available to the public.

The Office of Engineering prepared for its own use and the use of individuals, architect-engineering firms and construction firms that requested it, a tabulation of engineering and construction firms that are doing business in A.I.D. recipient countries using A.I.D. funds.

The tabulations are not put on mailing lists and are not sold, but instead, are given out as specifically requested or mailed as enclosures in response to inquiries.

We have felt that such a tabulation is public information and its availability is in the interest of A.I.D. in better performing our functions. This opinion is shared by the Agency's legal counsel.

The Office of Health in the Bureau of Technical Assistance has published a technical series entitled, "Water Supply and Sanitation in Developing Countries." The publications and mailing list were developed by the University of North Carolina under an A.I.D. contract.

The publication was terminated in 1969 for budgetary reasons; and at that time, the University recommended that the list be made available to others for the distribution of worthwhile technical material. A.I.D. concurred in this recommendation. To date, a list has been provided without charge to Intercontinental Publications, Inc. for distribution of their publication "Modern Government" without charge to those on the list.

If I can provide you with further information, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

MATTHEW J. HARVEY,  
Director, Congressional Liaison Staff.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, D.C., March 16, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: This will acknowledge and thank you for your letter to the President concerning the sale of lists of licensed fire-

arms dealers and collectors by the Internal Revenue Service. We will be pleased to bring your letter and accompanying press release on this matter to the President's attention at the earliest opportunity. We will be in further touch with you.

With warm regard,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. TIMMONS,  
Assistant to the President.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD,  
Washington, D.C., March 16, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HORTON: This will acknowledge your March 5, 1970 letter to Chairman Martin concerning the practice of some government departments and agencies selling or making available mailing lists of individuals or firms falling under their jurisdiction or regulations.

This Agency maintains a mailing list of institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. The list is used for official purposes only and there is no sale or distribution made.

If we can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to let us know.

Sincerely,

CARL O. KAMP, Jr.,  
Acting Chairman.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD,  
Washington, D.C., March 16, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HORTON: This will acknowledge your letter of March 5, 1970, received March 11, 1970, pertaining to the availability or distribution of mailing lists showing the names and addresses of individuals or firms which may fall within the jurisdiction of the National Mediation Board.

This Board does not provide its mailing list to any individual or carrier who may or may not be subject to the provisions of the Railway Labor Act and thereby under the jurisdiction of the Board.

I trust this information is responsive to your inquiry.

If I can be of any further assistance to you, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS A. O'NEILL, Jr.,  
Chairman.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD,  
Chicago, Ill., March 13, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: This is in response to your letter of March 5, 1970, asking about mailing lists developed by this agency.

The Board has never had any mailing lists prepared and made available to the public generally. The few lists which have been prepared and furnished are indicated below, and were released because the Board found that disclosure of the information was in the employees' interest.

The Boston and Maine Corporation in 1966 was given a current mailing list of its retired employees which was requested so that the company could apprise such employees of Medicare and other matters beneficial to them. The REA Express in 1966 was given a current mailing list of its retired employees in order to be of help to the company in informing such employees of Medicare and other matters of benefit to them. The Grand Trunk Western Railway Company in 1966 was furnished the names and addresses of their retired employees for the purpose of mailing to them copies of the railway's new monthly publication. Also in 1966, the Board furnished the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen the names and addresses of retired

members of that organization which were requested for the purpose of advising the retired members of benefits they may not have been aware of. There was no charge for these lists.

Beginning in 1965, the Board has furnished The Travelers Insurance Company on a reimbursable basis certain detailed data, including the address, for each employee who retires.

The information is required in the administration of Travelers' group life insurance contracts for railroad employees. The charge to Travelers average about \$850 per month, or around \$10,000 a year. Authority for such a charge is contained in Section 10(b)4 of the Railroad Retirement Act (45 U.S.C. § 228) (b)4.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD W. HABERMAYER,  
Chairman.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE  
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,  
Washington, D.C., March 13, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
Committee on Government Operations,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: I am writing in response to your letter of March 5, 1970, in which you requested information about any mailing lists which the Federal Reserve might make available to the public.

With the exception of the names and locations of the commercial banks that are members of the Federal Reserve System—which have always been on the public record—the System does not make any lists available to the public for a fee or otherwise. I might note, however, that the names and business affiliations of the 262 directors of the Federal Reserve Banks and branches are also matters of public record and are published each year in the February issue of the Federal Reserve Bulletin.

If you require any further information about this matter, we will be happy to assist you.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR F. BURNS.

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY,  
Washington, D.C., March 13, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: Mr. Shakespeare has asked me to reply to your letter of March 5, 1970, concerning your study of mailing lists that agencies have prepared and made available to the public. In the various legislative enactments relating to this Agency, as well as in comments relating thereto by members, the Congress has clearly expressed its wish that the U.S. Information Agency should not actively engage in the dissemination of its products in this country. Consequently, we have not prepared any general public mailing lists for our materials in the United States.

If I can be of further assistance in this regard, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

CHARLES D. ABLARD,  
General Counsel and Congressional  
Liaison.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, D.C., March 13, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: In reply to your inquiry of March 5, 1970, concerning Small Business Administration mailing lists, we are pleased to report that although this Agency maintains several mailing lists, they are not available for dissemination to the public.

It is always a pleasure to assist you. Please let us know if you need any additional information.

Sincerely,

HILARY SANDOVAL, JR.,  
Administrator.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL  
AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY,  
Washington, D.C. March 12, 1970.

Hon. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HORTON: Thank you for your letter of March 5 requesting information about any mailing lists this Agency has developed and distributed.

Periodically, the Agency issues a locator list of Agency employees which includes home addresses and phone numbers. This list is primarily for internal Agency use, but it has occasionally been given to people outside the Agency at their request. The only instances of distribution outside the Agency that I am aware of, however, involved other Government agencies or Congressional committees with which this Agency regularly deals. No charge is made for this list. Enclosed is a copy of the latest locator list.

Also enclosed for your information is a copy of the latest Annual Report of this Agency to Congress. Beginning on page 84 of the report is a list of depository libraries to which Agency documents are sent. The reason this list is included in our annual report is so that readers of the report who are interested in further study of arms control matters can determine where the nearest source of further information is.

I hope this information will be useful to you. Please do not hesitate to let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM W. HANCOCK,  
General Counsel.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD,  
Washington, D.C., March 11, 1970.

Hon. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: This is in response to your letter of March 5 concerning the selling or distribution of mailing lists by government agencies.

At no time since its formation has the Subversive Activities Control Board sold or made available to the public a mailing list of any kind.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. MAHAN,  
Chairman.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,  
Washington, D.C., March 10, 1970.

Hon. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: Secretary Laird has asked that I acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 5 in which you requested information concerning the availability of mailing lists to the public.

This matter is receiving attention and you will be advised further as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

J. F. LAWRENCE,  
Brigadier General, USMC,  
Deputy Assistant to the Secretary for  
Legislative Affairs.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF  
THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, D.C., March 10, 1970.

Hon. FRANK HORTON,  
Committee on Government Operations,  
House of Representatives,  
Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: We have received your letter of March 5, 1970, in reference to mailing lists.

The Export-Import Bank of the United States does not make available to the public, by sale or otherwise, any mailing lists. The only mailing lists which we maintain are for internal use by the Bank in distributing press releases and other informational material on Eximbank programs and activities.

If we can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to call on us.

Yours truly,

J. E. CORETTE III,  
General Counsel.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,  
Washington, D.C., March 10, 1970.

Hon. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: In your letter of March 5 you request information concerning the Commission's mailing lists, particularly as to whether they have been sold or otherwise made available to persons outside the agency.

The Commission maintains several mailing lists. They consist of the names of individuals, firms and corporations (a) who are registered with the Commission under one or another of the laws it administers; (b) who wish to receive notice of new rules and rule proposals and other announcements of the Commission in its administration of those laws and (c) who wish to receive copies of the Commission's statistical studies.

With one exception, these lists have never been sold or otherwise made available to members of the public. That exception occurred some eight years ago when the Bureau of National Affairs in cooperation with the Federal Bar Association conducted a seminar in Washington on the Federal securities laws and their administration. Members of the Commission and several staff officers participated in these discussions, attended by several hundred lawyers and other professionals. In order to reach the widest possible group of practitioners who might be interested in benefit from the seminar discussions, the Bureau asked the Commission for the list of practitioners who regularly receive the Commission's new rules and rule proposals. Rather than provide the list to the Bureau, the Commission agreed to run the Bureau's envelopes through its addressograph machine. This was done.

To our knowledge, there have been no other exceptions to the Commission's policy of maintaining its mailing lists strictly confidential.

Sincerely,

HAMER H. BUDGE,  
Chairman.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE  
ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES,  
Washington, D.C., March 10, 1970.

Hon. FRANK HORTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Committee on Government Operations,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HORTON: In response to your letter of March 5, may I state that no mailing lists developed by this agency have ever been sold, distributed, or otherwise made available to the public. Moreover, no action of this nature is contemplated in the future. Thank you for your interest.

Sincerely,

P. P. BERMAN,  
Director of Administration.

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND  
CONCILIATION SERVICE,  
Washington, D.C., March 9, 1970.

Hon. FRANK HORTON,  
Committee on Government Operations,  
Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HORTON: This Agency maintains separate mailing lists for (1) Press Releases, (2) Newsletter (for employees only), and (3) Annual Report. None of these

lists have been made available to outsiders, either by sale or otherwise.

I trust this responds to your inquiry.

Sincerely,

J. CURTIS COUNTS,  
Director.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my able colleague, Representative FRANK HORTON, in the bill to prohibit the sale or distribution by Federal agencies of names and addresses to be used for commercial purposes.

There is enough junk mail circulating already without Uncle Sam adding to and encouraging more junk mail.

In the case of Daniel Rowan, American Book Service et al. against U.S. Post Office Department, the U.S. Supreme Court in a unanimous decision handed down on May 4, 1970, Chief Justice Burger eloquently stated:

Today's merchandising methods, the plethora or mass mailings subsidized by low postal rates, and the growth of the sale of large mailing lists as an industry on itself have changed the mailman from a carrier of primarily private communications, as he was in a more leisurely day, and has made him an adjunct of the mass mailer who sends unsolicited and often unwanted mail, into every home.

The able Chief Justice added:

In today's complex society we are inescapably captive audiences for many purposes, but a sufficient measure of individual autonomy must survive to permit every householder to exercise control over unwanted mail. It places no strain on the doctrine of judicial notice to observe that whether measured by pieces or pounds, everyman's mail today is made up overwhelmingly of material he did not seek from persons he did not know. And all too often it is a matter he finds offensive. . . . The ancient concept that "a man's home is his castle" into which "not even the king may enter" has lost none of its vitality, and none of the recognized exceptions includes any right to communicate offensively with another.

Personally, I feel that the postal laws should be further amended to enable every person to stop the delivery of unwanted third-class mail. Under the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967, a person must sign a statement that unwanted material is erotically arousing or sexually provocative. The statute should be broadened to make it clear that a person may refuse any type of mail which he finds offensive. The procedure now is that when such a form is filed the Postmaster General will take legal steps to keep a person's name off a mailing list from that particular firm. Perhaps a simpler device could be developed which would enable those who objected to junk mail to place a blue eagle or some other symbol on their mail box to indicate they did not want to receive third-class mail.

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a primary source of agitation for many citizens, is to find a wad of fabulous offers and once-in-a-lifetime opportunities jammed into the mailbox everyday. A man's home is a very personal place.

I feel that the selling of mailing lists by the Federal Government is an invasion of personal privacy. Various forms are presented to citizens who, under threat of law, are forced to fill them out and return them to some Federal office.



These names and addresses, and other information thus gained, are often sold to direct mail advertising firms. I, too, have introduced legislation which would prevent such sales. And I heartily support Mr. HORTON in his efforts.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join more than 60 of my colleagues in the House today in introducing legislation to prohibit the sale of mailing lists by the Federal Government for commercial or solicitation purposes.

Unfortunately, it is widespread practice by many Government agencies such as the Internal Revenue Service, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Aviation Administration, and the Coast Guard, all of which maintain lists of individuals who have received Federal licenses, to sell these lists upon request. The availability of this information stems from the Freedom of Information Act, which was adopted to protect the public's right to know the activities of its Government. However, I do not believe that it was the intent of Congress in passing this law to give a license to invade the privacy of individual citizens.

I believe this is clearly a misuse of governmental authority which is causing some Americans to suffer both frustration and inconvenience. Many people are also disturbed by the large amount of so-called junk mail which they receive, which is, in a sense, subsidized by the Federal Government through low postal rates. When an individual applies for a pilot's license, when he satisfies the Federal requirements for operating a ham radio station, he hardly expects that lists containing his name can be purchased and used in any way a commercial operator may wish. Neither does he expect to be bombarded with unsolicited mail as a byproduct of complying with a Federal regulation governing an activity in which he is involved.

This bill would not prevent access to information but states clearly the intent of Congress that mailing lists will not be used for commercial or other solicitations or for any illegal purpose.

It is my sincere hope that hearings can be scheduled on this measure soon and that it can be considered by the House at an early date.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

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

There was no objection.

#### VOTING RIGHTS ACT

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon be con-

sidering legislation dealing with the right which has been called the "preservative of all rights," namely the right to vote. There is no greater privilege or duty for an American citizen than to participate in the electoral process. Throughout our Nation's history we have enlarged the number of citizens eligible to vote.

Economic factors no longer determine who may vote. The old qualification that an individual must own some minimum amount of land or property in order to vote has long ceased to be a consideration. The 24th amendment eliminated the last economic barrier to enfranchisement by making it illegal for a State to keep an individual from voting "by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax."

The 15th amendment extended voting privileges to ex-slaves by prohibiting abridgement of the franchise "on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude," and the 19th extended it to women by prohibiting abridgement on "account of sex." The 17th amendment made everyone's right to vote more meaningful by requiring the direct election of U.S. Senators. There is presently under consideration another constitutional amendment which would apply the principle of direct election to the selection of the President and Vice President. I hope this amendment will be passed by the Senate soon and will be ratified by the States before our next presidential election in 1972.

The Supreme Court has also done its share in making the franchise more meaningful by assuring that each person's vote is equally weighted against all other individual views.

Five years ago Congress took an important step to insure that every American who wished to vote would have the opportunity to do so. Many of our fellow countrymen participated in 1968 in a presidential election for the very first time as a direct result of the enforcement of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. This was a most worthwhile piece of legislation and deserves to be renewed. I am prepared to vote, therefore, for the 1970 voting rights bill as passed by the Senate.

A feature of the Senate's version, nonetheless, causes me to stop and speak out in opposition. The floor amendment that lowers the voting age to 18 nationwide in all elections does not belong in the bill, for two reasons: First, the voting rights bill and the voting age rider should each be considered independently on its own merits, and second, there is doubt about the constitutionality of any congressional attempt to change the voting age by statute.

I believe that the voting age should be lowered to 18, and I have already expressed my desire that the 1965 Voting Rights Act be renewed. Both of these measures are important for the same reason: Passage of each proposal will insure the franchise to those qualified and deserving of it. Last year I joined with other Republican Congressmen in a tour of American campuses. I spoke with many young people and was impressed over and over again with the fact that these people can intelligently participate

as voters at the age of 18. These individuals are considered adults in our courts in most States. They are held accountable for their actions. Most may sue and be sued. Many of those in the age group 18 to 21 are not enrolled in institutions of higher education but are working, raising families, paying taxes, and leading productive lives. Most are keenly aware and interested in the world around them and quite anxious to participate in the formulation of governmental policy through the traditional tool of the ballot box. They should not be denied this opportunity any larger.

I have outlined my support for the voting rights bill and the concept of a lower voting age. I want to see favorable action on both during this session. But there has been only one significant reason expressed why the two must be considered in a single package: As a Member of this House, I am told that I must accede to the Senate amendment to lower the voting age in order to get the voting rights bill passed and sent to the President. With such a threat hanging over me, I am not at liberty to vote my belief on either separate issue without this vote being prejudiced by factors concerning unrelated issues. I do not believe we can properly discharge our responsibilities as legislators under such conditions, and we should not be asked to do so.

I want to see the Congress take a stand purely on the important substantive issues. This is impossible if the two are tied together in a single bill. It is an old legislative strategy to argue that one part of a bill is of such importance that another section should be allowed to stand in order to achieve that which is important or good. This may always be the dilemma in which we find ourselves but I believe that in this situation—because of the real constitutional question involved—each part should stand or fall on its own merits.

Thus I intend to vote against the previous question on the rule in order to open the rule to amendment so that a separate vote can be obtained on the question of lowering the voting age by statute.

One important reason why I wish to see the two proposals considered separately is that many of us have reached different conclusions on them. As I have said, I am prepared to vote for the extension of the Voting Rights Act as passed by the other body. And I want to vote against any attempt to lower the voting age by statute. As strongly as I believe 18-year-olds should be allowed to vote, I believe foremost in the constitutional integrity of the actions of this and other branches of the Federal Government. I have reached the conclusion only after careful consideration that Congress does not have the authority to lower the voting age and that the Supreme Court would rule any such statute to that effect unconstitutional. It may well be, in fact, that our action in adopting a statutory voting age may well disenfranchise those who would otherwise be eligible if an amendment were adopted and ratified. Some may say that it is not the job of a Congressman to

make such a judgment, that constitutional questions should be entirely left to the Court. I disagree. Gerald Gunther, a professor of law at Stanford University and the author of a textbook on constitutional law, states in a letter to the President:

Under our system, Congress and the President have an obligation to exercise a conscientious, independent judgment on constitutional questions, especially on questions such as this that are not foreclosed by repeated and firm Supreme Court rulings.

Those who argue that Congress has the power to lower voting age cite section 1 of the 14th amendment which contains the equal protection clause and section 5 which gives Congress the "power to enforce, by appropriate legislation the provision of this article." As Prof. Ernest J. Brown of the University of Pennsylvania Law School points out in a letter to President Nixon, Congressman Bingham—the author of section 1 of article 14—stated in 1867 that—

The amendment does not give, as the second section shows, the power to Congress of regulating suffrage in the several states . . . the exercise of the elective franchise, though it is one of the privileges of a citizen of the Republic, is exclusively under the control of the states.

In the past, Congress and the States, by passing constitutional amendments, have prohibited certain qualifications—such as sex or race—from being considered by the States in determining who may vote. But the question of age in respect to the right to vote is fundamentally different. In a letter to the President, Prof. Paul G. Kauper of the University of Michigan Law School writes:

In fixing a federal age requirement at age eighteen, Congress recognizes that an age requirement is in itself a proper qualification for voting. The real question then is whether Congress while recognizing that an age requirement is valid may choose to say that any voting age requirement above the age of eighteen years constitutes an invidious discrimination against the class of persons between the age of 18 and a higher age which may be fixed by a state's law.

Kauper goes on to say:

The purpose of an age limit is to assure sufficient maturity in exercising the voting right. May Congress say that a state has no rational basis for fixing a 21 year age limit as the standard for voting maturity? Obviously, there is room for choice in this matter. Most states continue to adhere to the twenty-one year limit. A few have reduced the limit to a lower age. It may be assumed that fixing the age limit anywhere from 18 to 21 is reasonable so far as any judicial interpretation of the equal protection clause is concerned. Since the basic power to fix voting qualifications is in the states and not in Congress the question raised by the proposed Congressional legislation is not whether it is reasonable and appropriate for Congress to fix the voting age limit at 18 but whether it is appropriate for Congress to declare that any age limit higher than 18 is an invidious discrimination, i.e., whether it results in an arbitrary classification.

It is argued by some, Mr. Speaker, that the provisions of the Senate passed bill, supported by the administration, relating to the residency requirements for voting in Federal elections is also an invasion of State responsibilities similar to the 18-year-old vote statute. I

disagree. In the Morgan case cited by the proponents of lowering the voting age by statute the Court was refining the equal protection concept based on the discriminatory effect of a State law. This same analogy holds, it seems to me, to the Congress enacting a law that is aimed at State residency laws, which, while not in purpose, but effect, are discriminatory because they deprive citizens in our highly mobile society of the right to vote.

This is not the same as a statute to lower the voting age since the age—at whatever level—is necessarily arbitrary. Thus, there are substantial differences both as to the purpose and effect of voting age requirements contrasted to residency requirements.

There is a further point that I believe needs to be made regarding the 14th amendment. Prof. Paul Kauper states it well:

It is fantastic to suggest that when the States ratified the Fourteenth Amendment in 1868, they thereby understood that they were thereby giving Congress the authority, in the name of equal protection enforcement, to displace their own power to fix voting age requirements or to declare that any voting age limit above 18 constituted an unconstitutional discrimination.

It is important also to assess the effect of our action on the young people of this Nation. This is, of course, a matter for personal judgment, but if the Congress votes to lower the voting age by statute and the Court strikes down such legislation, I can conceive of deep feelings being expressed by many young people. It is vital that the Congress not only vote the proposed statute down, but immediately follow that action by passing a constitutional amendment and submitting it to the States for ratification this year. The amendment which granted the right to vote for women was ratified in 15 months. It is not impossible for an amendment to lower the voting age to become effective in time for the 1972 elections. However, if a statute is declared unconstitutional by the Court, and concurrent action has not begun on an amendment to the Constitution, there will not be enough time to get an amendment ratified before 1972.

I have joined with several other Congressmen in sponsoring a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age to 18—House Joint Resolution 865. Presently there are over 60 such amendments which have been introduced in the House of Representatives alone. There are three ways to get the Congress to consider such an amendment. The first would be to pass a statute and take the chance the Court will strike it down. This could bring to bear on the Court an immense amount of political pressure to rule one way or another. No matter how it ruled, the decision is bound to leave scars harmful to the Court and our whole federal system. The New Republic editorial on May 2 said it well:

The issue of the 18 year old vote, as now presented, exerts what Justice Holmes once referred to as "hydraulic pressure." Should the Supreme Court uphold the constitutionality of the Senate rider under this pressure, it would launch a doctrine whose radiations are unpredictable, and in many applications quite possibly disadvantageous to the interests that sponsors of the rider

care most about. The Court will have worked an historically significant shift in balance of functions between the state and federal government. It has done so before; it may do so again. But the outcome is in doubt, and the wisdom at this time of requiring the Court to decide is questionable.

On the other hand, should the Court withstand the 'hydraulic pressure' and declare the Senate rider unconstitutional, it would expose itself to the wrath of all those whose expectations it would defeat, and in the bargain cause confusion about the results of elections that may already have been held under the provisions of the rider.

The second way would be to defeat the statute in Congress. Following this, an amendment to lower the voting age would surely have to be passed by both Houses. The third way is to pass the statute and move immediately to act on the constitutional amendment. Regardless of our personal views on lowering the voting age by statute or amendment, action is essential on the amendment. Whatever pressure would have been directed at the Court could now be directed where it should be: Upon a political body; namely the State legislatures which would have to vote for or against ratification.

There are, Mr. Speaker, some who will counsel favorable action on the statute because those opposed will "lose political advantage." Some of my Republican colleagues suggest that if we do not support this voting age rider the Democrats are apt to gain support from those under 21. That argument does an injustice to our young people and their understanding of the political process.

I well understand the desire of the youth franchise coalition to move on this by the quickest means possible. Not only is speed, on the surface, advantageous, but the results in Oregon suggest that lowering the voting age might not be all that popular and therefore the sledding will be rough in State legislatures.

Our system was not designed to move precipitously. An amendment to the Constitution requires a tedious process of congressional approval and ratification by the States.

But a provision to extend the franchise to those between 18 and 21 is a significant step. In each case in the past when the franchise has been considered we have guaranteed the right to vote by a constitutional amendment. Why are we now to so dramatically change our method? Because of politics? Or because it is easier? I think not. The goal is worthwhile but the means to achieve it are also important.

Alexander Hamilton said over 200 years ago:

Nothing is more common in time of crisis than to gratify momentary passions by letting into government principles and precedents which afterwards prove fatal.

The wisdom of these words remains today.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the statutory means of lowering the voting age. I hope others do likewise so that we can move ahead to the prompt consideration of a constitutional amendment and do the right thing in the right way.

If the rule is adopted that prevents our voting separately on the voting age issue,



I shall then have to vote up or down on the package. In that situation, I shall vote "aye" because the voting rights bill needs to be passed and I can but hope that prompt court action will be taken to judge the constitutionality of Congress acting to lower the voting age by statute. If this is found unconstitutional, any delay in the Court's decision can have profoundly disturbing results.

#### PEOPLE AND PRICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, all of us are concerned about the state of our economy, and well we should be.

If there is unhappiness in the land, at least part of the malaise can be traced to economic conditions. I am certainly not an economic determinist, but no one can ignore the relationship between economic pain and personal frustration.

In these past weeks we have witnessed a slide in the stock market that equals anything up to and including the disaster in 1929. The market went through its greatest decline in decades, despite the effort to prop things by lowering margin requirements. Then the market took great leaps upward, bigger leaps than have ever been recorded. The last time I looked, the stock market was quivering with sheer exhaustion.

This extraordinary action on the stock market indicates to me that the market, like everyone else, wonders what is happening to the national economy. The market reflects the unease that the ordinary citizen feels—uncertainty about the war, about young people, about the quality of life, and genuine puzzlement over how it is possible to have record high interest rates, an economic downturn, and record-breaking inflation all at the same time.

I think that even the council of economic advisers wonder why the indicators that ought to be up are down, and those that ought to be down are up.

The man in the street, the ordinary manufacturing worker, sees prices going out of sight. At the same time his working week is growing shorter. His paycheck is bigger, but it buys less than it would in 1968. Jobs are harder to find, but interest rates are so high that most workers, even with good jobs, could hardly think of buying a new house. And the litany could go on.

To put it simply, a lot of people are having a hard time just surviving this economic turbulence. They are not in a state of panic, but they feel uneasy, and I think that many workers wonder who in Government really cares about the economic pinch, and the mysterious behavior of the system.

This feeling of restlessness is not based on sheer emotion, but stems from solid economic reality.

For the plain fact of the matter is that so far at least, the performance of the economy under the present administration is far worse than it was in the previous administration. It is worse on the average, and it is worse than during any given year from 1960 to 1968.

This is not a partisan statement; I do not mean it as such, and I hope that it will not be taken as such. It is a plain statement of fact, and I will furnish you data to support my statements. It is not data that anyone can take much pleasure in reading.

Consider the Consumer Price Index, which is a good indicator of how things are going.

It is a fact that people today are paying 34 percent more for goods and services than they were in 1957-59. People today are generally better off than they were then—there have been real gains in wages. But the fact is that in the last couple of years wage gains have been outstripped by increases in the cost of living. Those "outrageous" wage settlements that you have been hearing about have not helped the average manufacturing worker. And in fact they have not even kept him abreast of the tide of inflation. Average weekly manufacturing wages have increased by \$7 since 1968—but those same weekly paychecks in 1957-59 dollars are worth \$1.68 less than they were at the end of 1968, when it comes to buying the groceries, seeing the doctor, paying the mortgage and buying the car. The increases are not enough just to be even with the higher cost of living.

From 1960 to 1968, consumer prices increased by 21.2 percent above the 1957-59 base period. But since 1968, consumer prices have jumped to an index figure of a flat 134.

The net results of all this to the average manufacturing worker are plain to see. Whereas his real wages rose by \$14.06 a week during the Kennedy-Johnson years, real wages have declined by \$1.68 a week since the end of 1968.

The rate of inflation from 1960-1968 averaged 2.65 percent.

To be fair about it, the Democrats incurred a far higher rate during 1965-68, when prices rose by an average of 3.7 percent a year.

But under this administration, prices rose by 5.7 percent, and this year, at the last reporting period, consumers paid the inflation tax at an annual rate of 7.2 percent. The worst year the Democrats had was 1968—a relatively mild 4.9 percent.

If you translate this into more provincial terms, you can begin to see the impact of inflation of the past year and a half on family incomes.

I do not know how many of you go to the grocery store with any regularity. But if you have been through many checkout lines, you will notice that food prices have gone up—and by a substantial amount.

You would have noticed under the Democrats an annual increase of 2.41 percent in your weekly grocery bill. One year, 1966, things got really bad and we had women picketing the stores.

But since the end of 1968, grocery prices have increased by 9.9 percent—and if things get no worse, that will be an annual rate of twice what it was in the years 1960-68. But it looks from the charts as if grocery prices will in fact go considerably higher this year—and the index figure is already nearly 7 points

over its position in January, worse again than anything in the Johnson years.

If you have been to the doctor lately, or had to pay a hospital bill, you know that the cost of services is up. As a matter of fact, services today cost 19.1 percent more today than they did in January 1969. The rate of increase in the cost of services today is twice what it was in the first 8 years of the sixties.

Have you bought a refrigerator lately, or maybe an air conditioner? Durable goods are up 9.3 percent in the last year and a half.

My point is that inflation was real from 1960 to 1965, and bad from 1965 to 1968, but it has been terrible since 1968, far worse than anything experienced under the leadership of the "spendthrift" Democrats.

What is worse than the experience of the past year and a half is the fact that as far as consumer prices are concerned, things may get worse before they get better. There is simply no sign that under current policies inflation is coming under control.

Moreover, all of this is happening in the face of an economic decline. Our gross national product has been virtually standing still since 1969—yet price increases in that period have been little short of breathtaking. One can only wonder what will happen to prices when the promised upturn takes hold this year, whenever the right corner is found. For this unprecedented inflation of 7.2 percent a year is taking place in the presence of a GNP decline at a 3-percent annual rate.

As far as I can tell, the fact is that our present economic policies are not working. Certainly there is no reason to panic, but neither is there any reason to rejoice. There is plenty of reason to feel uneasy, and plenty of reason to ask hard questions about our policy. It may, in fact, be time to take up some new economic tools to deal with this frustrating and debilitating situation.

A great many economists, including the chief economist at the Treasury Department, Mr. Murray Weidenbaum, are saying that we had better start thinking about new policies, including putting in some controls to curb excessive wage and price increases.

It surprises me, especially when Arthur Burns—on whom the President has relied for years for economic advice—starts calling for some kind of intervention to halt the inflationary spiral, and to even this man the President seems not to be listening.

The reason may be that Mr. Nixon was once a lawyer in the Office of Price Administration, and in that capacity he saw the problems with trying to govern wages and prices by artificial means. He saw the black marketing, the gouging, and all the struggle that went on as the market tried to respond to great demands for short supplies of goods. But while Mr. Nixon saw this and was impressed by the problems of intervention, of governing wages and prices, he seems to have been unimpressed with the fact that it worked pretty well. With all the problems, the OPA did keep the economic lid on.

What has to be considered now is

whether the President might not be justified despite his doubts to interfere with the wage and price market. We might not need to pass a law governing wages and prices, but it seems to me that we cannot afford to sit back and just watch the inflationary spiral as it gets longer and far stronger as it is now.

I think that we are at the point where serious consideration has to be given to setting up a national incomes policy—in other words, to control wages and prices. This could take the form of "jawboning," and it could take the form of full dress controls, or any point in between.

That is why I join my colleagues on the House Banking and Currency Committee this week in sponsoring a bill that would give the President standby powers to impose controls on wages and prices. This would be a very limited control; the President would only have this power for 6 months, and he could only control wages to the extent that restraints would not create inequity.

The intent of this bill is simply to say that myself and the other sponsors, and a great many others in Congress, believe that the economic situation is serious enough to warrant a new look at our policies at the very least. To continue the present course, unless there is some drastic change, would bring about continued hardship on the vast majority of Americans, and create economic pressures that may well be intolerable.

If the stock market is uneasy, so am I. So are many economists.

And so are ordinary citizens. We should all be concerned, because we are all in the same boat. We stand in the same checkout line and pay the same inflated prices, and the earnings of workers diminish in value just as surely as your own.

That is why I have joined my colleagues in sponsoring a bill to give the President standby powers to impose economic controls. He thinks he does not need them, and I hope he does not. But I think that he might, and if he does, they ought to be ready.

It is not a question of greed that we are talking about; workers are asking for more money, and the fact is that they need more money, just to stay even. Manufacturers need more money, because their profits are down and their costs are up. Somewhere, somehow, the inflationary spiral has to be brought back within reasonable and tolerable limits, and this may require far more action from the Government than we have seen to date, and far more than the President seems willing to take.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the Record, the following tables:

Average weekly earnings—1957-59 prices*	
Manufacturing Industries:	
1960	\$87.02
1961	88.62
1962	91.61
1963	93.37
1964	95.25
1965	97.84
1966	99.33
1967	98.80
1968	101.08
1969	101.42
1970 (March)	99.40

\*Earnings in current prices divided by consumer price index. From Council of Economic Advisers, *Economic Indicators*, May 1970.

Gross national product—1958 prices	
Billions of dollars:	
1959	483.7
1960	487.7
1961	497.2
1962	529.8
1963	551.0
1964	581.1
1965	617.8
1966	658.1
1967	674.6
1968	707.6
1969	727.5
1969 I*	723.1
II	726.7
III	730.6
IV	729.8
1970 I	724.3

\*Annual rate, seasonally adjusted. From Council of Economic Advisers, *Economic Indicators*, May 1970.

CONSUMER PRICE INDEX—1957-59=100	
(In percent)	
1968—121.2—average annual rise, 1960-68,	2.65.
April 1970, 134.0—Increase, 1969, 5.7.	
Rate of increase 1970, 7.2.	
Worst increase, 1960-68 (1968), 4.9.	

Commodity prices	
1968, 115.3—average annual rise, 1960-68,	1.875.
April 1970, 125.2—Increase, 1969, 5.2.	
Increase to date, 1970, 4.7.	

Food prices	
1968, 119.3—average annual rise, 1960-68,	2.41.
April 1970, 132.0—Increase, 1969, 6.2.	
Increase to date, 1970, 6.5.	

Durable goods prices	
1968, 107.5—average annual rise, 1960-68,	9.935.
April 1970, 114.8—Increase, 1969, 4.1.	
Increase to date, 1970, 3.2.	

Nondurable goods prices	
1968, 117.7—average annual rise, 1960-68,	2.21.
April 1970, 127.0—Increase, 1969, 5.3.	
Increase to date, 1970, 4.0.	

Service prices	
1968, 134.3—average annual rise, 1960-68,	4.28.
April 1970, 153.4—Increase, 1969, 9.4.	
Increase to date, 1970, 9.7.	

## CAMBODIA: THE ARROGANCE OF IGNORANCE—II

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, in the Record for Tuesday, June 2, I commented on remarks by C. L. Sulzberger. Because he was apparently doing a series, I include in the Record his second offering which appeared in the New York Times on June 3. In my opinion, Mr. Sulzberger is performing a valuable service. Based on my discussions with more than 400 visitors and reading 1,623 letters, I agree with him. The dialog is often more heart than brain—more passion

\* Current rate (0.6 per month)  $\times$  12. From Council of Economic Advisers, *Economic Indicators*, May 1970.

than reason. I do not agree with his characterization of the Vice President, but it is a good example of how people who deplore polarization fall victim of the precise practice they deplore.

But as I read Mr. C. L. Sulzberger, he is calling for a cool and rational discussion. His second commentary like his first is a significant contribution to such a discussion. The arrogance of ignorance is a fault which most of us share in varying degrees. By putting the current situation into better perspective, Mr. Sulzberger's remarks may hopefully bring back a little commonsense and wisdom to the national dialog.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, June 3, 1970]

## FOREIGN AFFAIRS: THE ARROGANCE OF IGNORANCE—II

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

Moscow.—President Nixon correctly estimated the advance military and diplomatic implications of his decision to order U.S. troops into Cambodia to clean out Vietnamese Communist sanctuaries and, as discussed in a previous column, enormous booty was seized while Russia and China displayed prudence in their initial reactions. However, where Nixon made a grievous miscalculation was in judging repercussions at home.

His staff system—a modified version of President Eisenhower's—is based on preparation by the Kissinger office of option papers on given problems. This office shrewdly cased the situation in terms of battlefield significance and the fundamental effect abroad but there were apparently deep misjudgments in analyzing American opinion.

It is not sufficient to underscore erroneous ideas often held by U.S. public and opposition leaders although these do indeed produce a powerful effect. Nixon's adversaries illogically denounce the dispatch of forty thousand U.S. and South Vietnamese troops into Cambodia as a violation of neutrality while contending that the prior presence of forty thousand Vietcong and North Vietnamese troops was not a similar and earlier violation.

Indeed, Prince Sihanouk himself had been increasingly complaining of the latter just before he was ousted by a coup. That the Lon Nol Government is inefficient and ill-prepared does not make it automatically illegal or wicked. One may recall that the shrewd and acrobatic Sihanouk, who now seems to have become an outright tool of Peking, had locked up quite a few of his own enemies.

The Cambodian campaign is but one depressing aspect of a depressing war that is roundly condemned as "immoral" by large segments of U.S. opinion. Nevertheless, with the exception of the American Revolution, the Civil War and World War II, none of our military engagements could clearly be proven as "moral," and killing, whenever and wherever it occurs, is horrid. The horror is of course compounded because Vietnam is the first televised war with blood spread through parlors and kitchens.

## FAILURE OF REASON

The American tragedy is that everyone discussing Vietnam argues more with his heart than his brain, with more passion than reason, regardless of which side he endorses, hawk or dove. Moreover, Nixon has clearly failed in the vital task of explaining to public opinion a sufficiently cogent case to gain the requisite support. No conflict can be fought by a democracy if it is not accepted by those called upon to do the fighting.

Vice President Agnew's undignified character assassinations are not conducive to uniting a public whose divisions are so ob-



viously profound and broad. Many thoughtful Americans—as distinguished from emoters—conclude (like Clark Clifford or Cyrus Vance) that no war is worth what this one is doing to the United States.

It is difficult to weigh such theoretical arguments but surely they must be coolly considered and not obscured by tragic incidents of violence, attacks on academics, dismissal of protesting students with epithets or, on the other hand, by corrosive tirades launched against anyone endorsing Nixon who is, after all, President of the United States.

It is disturbing to see today a sentimental hankering for America to retreat into the womb of its past, abandoning the nasty outer world, dodging present and future problems imposed by U.S. wealth and power. The nation cannot re-create the nostalgic agrarian society of that idealistic little state for which George Washington prescribed isolation.

Nevertheless, Nixon must see that even accurate predictions of what U.S. troops would find in Cambodia and how our adversaries would react are meaningless if the United States dissolves in a frenzy of madness. For this reason he must make it convincingly clear that in no way will Cambodia be allowed to turn into another protracted Vietnam.

#### UNBALANCED MOOD

The national mood is unbalanced if not deranged. The spin-off from Cambodia depressed Wall Street, enhanced inflation and discouraged business. This is the fact even if the reasons may be illogical.

Too many opinion-molders and political figures have shown themselves depressingly ignorant and inexcusably arrogant in arguing that Nixon's policy is criminal—which I do not by any means concede. Nevertheless, the President's staff and possibly the President himself displayed a similar arrogance founded upon ignorance when assessing the nation's reaction to the Cambodian venture. One cannot succeed abroad while failing at home.

#### CONGRESSIONAL NEWSLETTER

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, this week I am sending to my constituents my fifth newsletter of the 91st Congress. In the report, which is going to approximately 170,000 persons, I discuss some of my efforts in Washington and New York City. It also includes the tabulated results of my April questionnaire from which I received some 25,000 responses.

With the thought that it might interest our colleagues, I include its full text in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CONGRESSMAN EDWARD I. KOCH REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

DEAR CONSTITUENT AND FELLOW NEW YORKER—

"And while each of us pursues his selfish interest and comforts himself by blaming others, the nation disintegrates." John Gardner, Chairman, National Urban Coalition.

The gathering storm of race, war, and dissent broke over all of us this sad and violent spring. I need not recount to you the events that lend credence to John Gardner's grim appraisal. But let me tell you what I have been doing and what constituents have been doing to make our democratic system work.

At the center of the storm is the Vietnam War and it's hitting all of us hard—hawk and dove, parent and child, white collar and blue collar. Since the President's invasion of Cambodia, over 20,000 constituents have written to me expressing their resolve to do some-

thing about ending the war. The hideous price of 42,000 American lives, \$140 billion, a stumbling economy and civil disorder has made it clear that we had better stop worrying about saving Vietnam and get on with saving our own country.

On April 30, I stated on the Floor of the House that President Nixon had neither the moral nor legal right to commit American military forces in Cambodia without the consent of Congress; and I have supported all measures in the House, none of which have yet been successful, to enforce that judgment. Since coming to Congress I have voted against every bill which contained money for the further prosecution of the Indochina War and I will continue to do so. I support and am working actively for the passage of those amendments which will cut off all further funds for Southeast Asia except for the purposes of withdrawing all our troops safely, obtaining the return of American prisoners of war, and granting asylum for Vietnamese who may feel threatened by our total withdrawal.

During the past six weeks, thousands of students, teachers, housewives, clergymen, and lawyers have come to Washington to plead with Congress to end our military involvement in Indochina. By actual count, I have met with more than 1,000 constituents and I am heartened by their commitment in opposition to the war and the manner in which they have presented their reasoned arguments to the Members of Congress. And I will continue to give whatever assistance I can to those students seeking peaceful change within the democratic process. They are exceptional and I am proud to work with them.

Finally, may I say that I share the alarm of many constituents who fear that the President and Vice-President are polarizing our country for their own political gain. This is a terrible abuse of the awesome power of their high offices and, like the continuing war, threatens the future liberty and order of society. If the Administration persists in ignoring the legitimate grievances of the poor, the blacks and the young, then we must make a greater effort to listen and respond. If the Administration cares only about political strategy, then we must care more about social and economic justice. If the Administration appeals only to the worst that's in us, then we must resist and respond with the best that's in us. In the absence of Executive leadership, the question is whether the Congress and the people will make the necessary commitment to end the war and change our national priorities. Together, in the months to come, we must do just that.

#### PRISONS

Earlier this year, I decided to personally survey the prison conditions in New York City. I visited the Federal Detention Center, the Tombs, and Rikers Island. The Federal Detention Center is very small, having approximately 300 inmates. The Tombs has approximately 2,000 prisoners and Rikers Island has approximately 5,800. Aside from seeing the physical conditions, with the cooperation of Federal Warden Fitzpatrick and City Corrections Commissioner McGrath more than 1,000 prisoners filled out confidential questionnaires for me. I'm told this is the first time that such a polling of prisoners has ever been made.

My own inspection and the results of the questionnaire made clear the need for federal legislation to provide minimum standards for all correctional institutions—city, state, and federal, as well as federal funds to help localities meet those standards. I have cosponsored such a bill, H.R. 16794, to stimulate the reforms needed to create a more humane and effective penal system.

At the Tombs, I saw prisoners required to sleep three in a cell built for one, with some men not even having a mattress during the first week of their incarceration. Most of

these men have not yet been convicted of any crime but are awaiting trial. As a result of my visit and protests over this condition, Commissioner McGrath has now provided a mattress for every prisoner.

I was appalled to learn that drug addicts (38% of the inmates) are subjected to "cold turkey" withdrawal from their habit, instead of receiving the accepted medical treatment of methadone withdrawal to reduce their physical distress. One prisoner described the experience to me. He said when going through withdrawal and sleeping on the top bunk, he vomited on the third prisoner sleeping on the bare floor and that he felt "like an animal". Since my visit to the Tombs I have been working with Corrections Commissioner McGrath to install a methadone withdrawal facility at the Tombs and there is now pending before New York City's Budget Director an application to provide the minimum nursing staff for such a facility.

On May 23, at the Dalton School, I held a conference in the form of a district hearing to take testimony on my corrections bill and to discuss prison conditions. Several hundred community organizations and individuals participated as co-sponsors. The most moving statement was that of an ex-con who criticized prison treatment by saying, "It doesn't cost a dime to be a human being". But it does cost money to provide physical facilities as well as vocational, medical and psychiatric services to rehabilitate prisoners. When we do that, we are assisting not only them but protecting ourselves. For we ultimately pay the human and economic price of an inadequate corrections system.

#### DRUG ADDICTION

We all know that the City and State drug addiction programs are making little headway against the spreading drug epidemic. Such programs are reaching less than 10% of the City's addicts.

There are no quick or easy answers but I am doing what I can on several fronts to arrest this frightening and tragic epidemic.

In early March I urged the City to institute a detection program in our junior high and high schools through urine analysis examination. The Department of Health is now proposing that there be selective screening of students on suspicion of drug use.

Federal assistance for treatment and rehabilitation services has been grossly inadequate. At present I am a cosponsor of drug legislation, pending before the House Commerce Committee and already the subject of extensive hearings in the Senate, which would provide more funds to local communities for the operation of drug prevention and treatment centers. The bill, H.R. 12882, establishes a comprehensive federal program through the creation of a Drug Abuse Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The private agencies in our City providing effective treatment and rehabilitation services are not being given sufficient governmental support. A prime example is the Odyssey House operating five treatment centers in the City. At present their adolescent facilities receive no federal help and legislation has been introduced to remedy this. This month I am sponsoring a Congressional delegation tour of Odyssey House centers to mobilize support for the legislation.

On the law enforcement front, corruption has apparently invaded every level of narcotics enforcement—federal, state and local. Thirty-eight federal narcotics agents have been forced to resign, four state troopers have been removed from duty and the *New York Times* recently alleged that some local police are actually abetting the drug traffic. There is an urgent need for a thorough investigation of narcotics enforcement by a commission that commands the public's respect. I have repeatedly called upon Governor

Rockefeller to establish a Moreland Act Commission with full powers of subpoena and grand jury action to root out official corruption particularly among narcotics enforcement personnel.

I hope you will add your voice and write to Governor Rockefeller, Albany, N.Y., urging him to establish a Moreland Act Commission.

#### ORGANIZED CRIME

I have been critical of the performance of the New York-New Jersey Waterfront Commission in effectively fighting the infiltration of organized crime in the port of New York. In addition Attorney General Mitchell has charged that Kennedy Airport, the largest air cargo center in the world, is virtually controlled by organized crime.

Though state and local authorities must continue to attack this problem, I think federal help is needed. I have introduced legislation now being seriously considered by the Nixon Administration which would create a Cargo Protection Division in the Bureau of Customs for two primary purposes:

First, the prevention of infiltration by organized crime of legitimate waterfront and airport businesses by the use of licensing powers; and

Second, the creation of Federal standards of cargo protection and the creation of freight security areas in both airports and seaports.

The ultimate victims of the multimillion-dollar thievery and corruption at our ports of entry are the small businessmen and the consumer public. The increased cost resulting from business monopoly fraudulent practices and cargo theft are passed on to them. My bill, the Airport and Seaport Crime Control Act, H.R. 17387, provides the authority for the federal government to save legitimate businesses and the American consumer from the increasing menace of organized crime at our airports and seaports.

#### DRAFT COUNSELING

In the fall, the City's Board of Education will commence a program of draft counseling for its high school students.

Because of the complexities of the draft law and the inaccessibility of information on the draft, many draft age men are not aware of the rights and deferments available to them. While I have introduced legislation to abolish the draft, it would appear that it will be with us for several more years. Therefore, in February I contacted the New York Selective Service Board and suggested that a draft information program be conducted in the high schools. The Board responded that they would provide speakers for any interested group where there is a "dearth of information concerning the draft." Early this spring I advised all secondary schools in the 17th C.D. of this service, and a number of them have requested speakers from the Selective Service Headquarters.

Now the Board of Education has announced it will provide draft counseling in the city's 92 high schools to inform students of the wide range of options open to them. I have urged the Board of Education to make this counseling service also available to the private and parochial high schools.

#### EAST SIDE URBAN COALITION

On May 29 the first success of the "East Side Urban Coalition" occurred when a sitting park at 34th Street and the East River was officially opened. The "Coalition" is a group of East Side community organizations, institutions and industries that I helped bring together. The new park is only the first of what I hope will continue to be many cooperative efforts. Joining me in the creation of this first project were: Nine Churches for a Better East Side, Con Edison, the New York Telephone Company, Coca-Cola Bottling Company, Equitable Federal Savings and Loan Association, New York University Medical School, Turtle Bay As-

sociation, and the New York City Parks Department. The purpose of the "Coalition" is to do for the middle class what the Urban Coalition does for ghetto areas—organizing people to help themselves.

#### QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

The response to my April questionnaire was enormous. I was gratified that approximately 25,000 people took the time to answer the questions and to include some very thoughtful and helpful comments at the end. 53% of the respondents were women and 47% were men.

The following are the results in percentages:

	[In percent]	
	Yes	No
1. Do you favor the establishment of an independent public postal corporation?	75	24
2. Do you think that each class of mail should pay its own way?	87	13
3. Do you favor a Federal voting rights law establishing 18 as the minimum voting age?	64	36
4. Do you favor the Government's continued subsidy for the supersonic transport's (SST) development?	29	71
5. Do you think tax rates for single persons should be lowered so they are the same as those used by married persons?	76	24
6. Would you favor a 6-month extension of the existing 5-percent surtax (now scheduled to expire in July) if requested by the President as an anti-inflationary measure?	44	56
7. Do you favor the U.S. Public Health Service's providing family planning information and birth control devices to those who want them?	96	4
8. Would you favor banning private aircraft from heavily congested airports such as Kennedy, La Guardia, and Newark, limiting the use of these airports to only commercial airlines?	90	10
9. Would you favor a mandatory in-school testing of all junior and high school students for heroin use through urine analysis?	60	40
10. Do you favor the Senate passed "no-knock" drug bill allowing police to break into homes without notice if there is "probable cause" that if the police announced themselves, the marijuana or hard drugs being sought would be destroyed?	32	68
11. Would you favor a system of national health insurance for all citizens, regardless of age, including free choice of medical practitioner?	76	24
12. Do you believe the President should approve the pending request for the sale of 25 Phantom jets and 100 Skyhawks to Israel?	62	38
13. Would you favor requiring private pension funds to invest a percentage of their assets in mortgage financing for the construction of housing?	53	47
Vietnam: Do you think the United States should—	Percent	
(a) Proceed with immediate troop withdrawal while providing for the safety of U.S. troops, securing the release of American prisoners of war, and assisting any Vietnamese desiring asylum.	65	
(b) Withdraw our troops to enclaves and have the South Vietnamese assume offensive combat responsibilities.	14	
(c) Continue as we are now under President Nixon's schedule of withdrawals and program of Vietnamization and pacification.	16	
(d) Escalate fighting with the objective of a military victory.	5	

#### PLEASE INDICATE HOW YOU FEEL FEDERAL SPENDING SHOULD BE ADJUSTED IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS [In percent]

	More	Less	Same
Air and water pollution control	94	1	5
Crime prevention and control	76	5	19
Defense	9	74	17
Education	72	8	20
Foreign aid (economic)	21	47	32
Foreign aid (military)	3	86	11
Health	75	5	20
Highways	16	49	35
Housing	76	7	17
Mass transit	86	3	11
Open space and wildlife	71	5	24
Prisons	71	6	23
Rehabilitation of narcotic addicts	79	6	15
Space	9	64	25

Your comments on this newsletter and any proposals you might have on any subject are of interest to me. Please write to me c/o House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515.

If you need assistance, call my New York City office at 264-1066 between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on weekdays.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY AND OUR VETERANS

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, over the years, the Federal Government has established numerous programs providing for pensions, retirement benefits, and social insurance. These efforts have met with varying success. We find that loopholes and inequities are too common in these programs for the Congress to rest content with its labors.

I believe that it is time to act to close these loopholes and abolish the inequities. I have introduced a bill that I feel will mark the important beginning of such a campaign.

In this time of spiraling inflation, it is our senior citizens who are the hardest hit. They must watch while their fixed and limited incomes are eaten up as prices continue to rise. Given the inadequate level of benefits, they can ill afford this added burden.

There is one group that I would like to single out in order to demonstrate the inequities of the present system. These are the men who did not make careers out of military service but who served so well when their country called.

There is the well recognized need to better compensate those Americans who have served in the military. The difference between a man's earnings while in the military and his potential civilian earnings are great in absolute terms. A less obvious inequity becomes apparent when veterans begin to collect social security benefits.

Under present law, the man who served for a short period in the Armed Forces is penalized when he begins to draw benefits from social security. Presently, social security benefits are computed for all individuals on the basis of their average monthly wage as earned during their "benefit computation years." In computing one's benefit years, the 5 lowest years are deleted. This gives the individual a somewhat higher benefit rate, and is to be commended for providing our retired citizens with larger benefits.

There remains, however, a hidden penalty that is placed against all those who have been called upon to perform military service. Currently, a veteran's military income is included in the "benefit computation years." Given the fact that these are unusually low-income years, the individual who has served in the armed services is penalized by having lower benefits upon retirement.

While many individuals are able to delete the 5 lowest years of their civilian income in computing their benefits, the veteran is permitted to delete at most 2 of 3 years of his civilian employment.

The bill that I have recently introduced shall serve to end this inequity.



It will permit veterans to delete up to 4 years, military income in addition to the standard 5-year provision. The passage of this bill will result in greater benefits for millions of our citizens and establish a generally more equitable social security system.

Social security has too long discriminated against the veteran in this area. Let us now recognize their need in this inflationary time and give them our support.

**PFC. RICHARD "JUG" CLOUGH LEAVES FOR VIETNAM—PROUD PARENTS AND A MOVING COMMENTARY**

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, these are trying times, and for none so trying as the families and loved ones of our brave men who are serving America in Vietnam. Men in all wars have had to live with the risks of battle, and have done so. But in this present war they have an added burden, of politicians and news media who appear at times to undermine their efforts, and even make scapegoats of them if it will further their cause of opposition to the war.

The weight this bears on the families of our servicemen was brought vividly to my mind through a letter I recently received from some constituents. These people are proud of their son, who has recently gone to Vietnam. They know in their hearts that they have done a good job of raising him, and that he truly is one of America's heroes in this difficult time.

These parents are proud of having a son who volunteered to defend America, and has not shirked the responsibilities of citizenship. They know that he has a difficult and seemingly thankless job to do in Vietnam, and that he will do it to the best of his ability. In return they ask that we as Congressmen accept the responsibility of supporting our Nation's sons who are in Vietnam.

I commend the letter from Mr. and Mrs. Edward Clough, of Nashua, N.H., to the attention of my colleagues. America is a good country, and we have produced many good people. We are fortunate indeed that many people proudly accept the responsibilities of citizenship.

The Cloughs have sent their country a good boy. I join them in their hopes and prayers for their son and our beloved country.

NASHUA, N.H., April 7, 1970.

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CLEVELAND: This morning we took our only son, Pfc. Richard "Jug" Clough to Logan Airport where he started the first leg of his journey to Viet Nam. As our just turned 18 year old squared his shoulders and walked confidently toward his destiny, many thoughts cascaded through our minds . . . some pleasant and some not so pleasant.

We are proud to have fostered an offspring that has accepted the responsibility of citizenship and volunteered to serve his

country when so many of his generation have been seeking ways to avoid it. We are proud of the way he has adjusted to military life and the effort he has put into his training. We walk a little taller, as does he, when he speaks in glowing terms of his branch of the military, the United States Army Aviation and of the Fort Rucker slogan, where he trained . . . "Above The Best." We know he has learned his lessons well . . . it is a great country, one to be proud of and an honor to serve it.

When he gets to Viet Nam he will be assigned to a "Huey" helicopter, first as a door gunner and perhaps later as a crew chief . . . that is what he has been trained for. As he flies over the jungle, his "Huey" will draw enemy fire and his aircraft commander will direct him . . . "to pick up that fire and return it." This, of course, he will do because he is a military man and believes in the system. As he blasts away at the jungle with his M-60, possibly unbeknownst to him . . . a child will die or a woman will be wounded . . . because that is the kind of war it is . . . there being no clearly defined battleground.

This is where we become concerned. Possibly one of our news media representatives trying to make a name for himself, or even a G.I. looking for personal exposure, will decide this is an overt act . . . and another proud name will be tarnished, a proud man destroyed and a proud nation's image again blackened in the eyes of the world . . . all this before a shred of evidence is presented . . . or a word of testimony given . . . Freedom of the press . . . or is it judgment by the press.

If this should happen, I hope that you, your staff and/or your colleagues will remember this parent's plea. We have entrusted in your care our only son, born in the shadow of the state capitol, raised in the tradition of thousands of sons of the Granite State, reminded through his youth that the "Great Stone Face" up in the Franconia Notch signifies that "New Hampshire builds men". Jug learned early in life the beauty and tranquility of Mount Moosilauke, knows the joy of fishing the Olverian stream and has observed the deer at play on Benton Flats. He has tramped and camped his native state from Mount Washington to the sea.

He learned to appreciate the beauty of nature, respect for all living things and love and compassion for his fellow man. These lessons he will not forget, but his job now is . . . to defend . . . to protect . . . to survive.

To defend the principles of freedom that he so cherishes but for a Congress that finds many of its members doing so much to discredit the military.

To protect an administration that has a "plan to end the war" but forces the military to engage in a defensive war that furnishes little protection for the men who are fighting it.

To survive in an alien environment where a child or woman may be your enemy but with a threat of a murder charge governing your every action.

We are sending you a good boy . . . and we hope and pray you will return to us a better man. May your every action and that of your colleagues be aimed in the direction of preserving as many as possible of the lives of "America's best" that they may return to the business of curing our domestic ills.

May God bless you in your efforts.

Sincerely,

ROSALIE AND ED CLOUGH.

**THE PENN-CENTRAL CRISIS IS A RESULT OF HIGH INTEREST RATES**

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

point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have now reached a stage in our economic problems where actions and events are speaking louder than words and warnings.

For many months, some of us in the Congress have been attempting to alert the Nixon administration to the growing crisis being created by month after month of the highest interest rates in 100 years. Unfortunately, these warnings and pleas for action have fallen on deaf ears.

Today, we are in the crisis and we are no longer talking about the potential, the possibility, of economic troubles. This morning, the American public picked up its newspapers to find that one of the Nation's wealthiest and largest corporations—the Penn-Central Transportation Co.—was in a severe crisis—a crisis created by a heavy interest charge on its debt.

Penn-Central Transportation Co. is at this moment in a crisis for cash and it cannot sell debentures in the market at a 10½ percent interest rate. I repeat, one of the Nation's wealthiest corporations—with \$7 billion in assets—cannot sell debentures at 10½ percent interest.

If a huge corporation like Penn-Central cannot raise funds at 10½ percent interest, then think what is happening to all of the smaller concerns around the Nation. We see front page stories in the major newspapers when a big corporation is in trouble because of high interest rates. We see immediate movement in Government circles when a huge corporation is pinned to the wall. But what about all of the small businesses already bankrupt by high interest rates, and the thousands of others who are in a cash crisis, unable to borrow money at anything like a reasonable interest rate?

Mr. Speaker, surely what is happening to Penn-Central Transportation Co. is enough to awaken the most complacent member of this administration. Surely it is enough to get some movement in the Congress for lower interest rates.

I sympathize with the troubles of the Penn-Central. I do not want to see this giant corporation fail. And I am willing to cooperate in efforts to help keep it afloat. But this is simply an emergency effort and it cannot be regarded as the overall solution.

We must have an overall solution—a rollback of high interest rates—or we are going to see dozens of other cases like Penn-Central.

There is talk of bailing out Penn-Central through utilization of the Defense Production Act. The Defense Production Act of course allows the Federal Government to guarantee through the Federal Reserve System loans in such a situation.

The triggering of this mechanism would be an allocation of the Nation's credit to take care of an emergency situation to save a segment of our transportation industry. I shall place no roadblocks in the way of such a loan but I want to make it clear that such an allocation of credit cannot and should not be limited just to Penn-Central.

Penn-Central is not the only corpora-

tion and the transportation industry is not the only industry that is in trouble. All of us in this Congress know that there is no industry in greater distress than the homebuilding industry. Its depression has long preceded any difficulties of Penn-Central or any other transportation outfit.

So I say that if the Federal Reserve System allocates funds to the Penn-Central Transportation Co., then it must follow up with a massive infusion of credit for the Nation's depressed housing industry.

In participating in the loan to Penn-Central—one of the Nation's wealthiest corporations—the Federal Reserve would admit that it has the power to allocate credit. If this is done, I insist that the Federal Reserve move immediately to put money into housing. If allocation of credit is good enough for giant railroad corporations, than I am sure that it is all right for homebuilding.

The Federal Reserve currently has the power to purchase housing paper in the open market. Such open market purchases would create more credit for housing.

The Federal Reserve should start making the purchases immediately and continue until the Nation reaches its housing goal of 2.6 million new housing units each year.

It is unfortunate that it takes the difficulties of a major corporation before the Federal Reserve can see the light and agree to allocate credit. It is too bad that the human misery of people without adequate homes does not move the administration as much as the difficulties of a \$7-billion corporation.

The difficulties of the Penn-Central corporation will bring home to the administration and the American public the deep crisis created by high interest rates.

When a giant \$7-billion corporation cannot sell paper bearing a 10½-percent interest rate, then something is drastically wrong with the economy. We will be facing distress sales—sheriff's sales—throughout the Nation unless something is done now to roll back interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a copy of a New York Times article on the crisis of Penn-Central. I hope that all my colleagues will read this carefully and recognize the import it holds for the entire economy. The article follows:

[From the New York Times, June 9, 1970]

TOP OFFICER QUILTS AT PENN CENTRAL IN CASH SQUEEZE—COMPANY HARD PRESSED FOR WORKING FUNDS DESPITE HOLDING OF RICH ASSETS

(By Robert E. Bedingfield)

Stuart T. Saunders resigned yesterday as chairman of the board and chief executive officer of the Penn Central Transportation Company, the nation's largest railroad.

He was succeeded by Paul A. Gorman, who was brought in as president last Dec. 1 to succeed Alfred E. Perlman, who at that time became vice chairman.

The announcement of Mr. Saunders' resignation comes amid reports that the railroad is trapped in a financial crisis that has left it short of working funds. Ironically, the railroad and its parent corporation, the Penn Central Company, have combined assets of more than \$7-billion and are among the wealthiest companies in the country.

#### SOME COMPLAINTS

The railroad's assets include some of the most valuable real estate in the world—much of the land underlying office buildings and hotels spreading north from Grand Central Terminal along Park Avenue. The parent holding company's assets include ownership of huge realty companies, pipelines and amusement parks.

The Penn Central, which provides railroad service into Manhattan for more than 65,000 residents of Westchester County, Connecticut, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, has been under fire from commuter groups for the quality of service. The New York Public Service Commission has also been critical of the commuter operations.

The parent company, like the railroad, will also name Mr. Gorman as its chairman, president and chief executive officer to succeed Mr. Saunders. In making this announcement, the Penn Central Company did not say when its directors, who are also directors of the subsidiary, would meet.

The entire top echelon of the troubled organization appears to be on the way out. In addition to Mr. Saunders' departure, it was announced that David C. Bevan also "has retired as an officer" (he was vice chairman) and was resigning as a director of the parent company, the railroad and "all other" affiliates.

#### CONTRACT TO EXPIRE

The announcement continued that Mr. Perlman, who has an employment contract, had been "relieved" of his duties as vice chairman and would resign from the board when his contract expires next November.

Neither Mr. Saunders nor Mr. Bevan, according to a company spokesman, had an employment contract.

Mr. Saunders' resignation had been predicted for months. When he was interviewed about these predictions last fall, Mr. Saunders acknowledged that he had heard them. He said then that a majority of the directors had pleaded with him not to resign or retire notwithstanding the criticism, which he indicated came from some board members.

#### ASSISTANCE SOUGHT

Immediately after the news of the railroad's management shift was announced yesterday, there were Wall Street reports that the Department of Transportation had called for it. Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe in Washington could not be reached for comment.

It has been reported that the general counsel for the Department of Transportation has been asked to determine whether existing legislation would enable the Government to extend some kind of financial assistance or guarantee to the railroad.

The Penn Central still owes some \$20 million on a loan guaranteed by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The amendment to the law under which the regulatory agency guaranteed the borrowing, made by the old New York Central Railroad, expired in 1963.

The Penn Central has been plagued with a cash shortage since Feb. 1, 1968, when the Pennsylvania Railroad acquired the New York Central in a giant merger.

#### SALE ABANDONED

Through the Pennsylvania Company, an investment concern in which it holds large blocks of marketable securities, the railroad a week ago had hoped to sell \$100 million of 25-year debentures and thus relieve its cash problems.

But the sale had to be abandoned when prospective underwriters reportedly could not find buyers for even \$50-million of debentures carrying an interest coupon of 10½ per cent. While there were reports that a still higher interest rate was considered—as much as 11½ per cent—observers of the situation suggested that so high a rate would only scare buyers away. "They would have

thought something really was wrong," one railway analyst said.

When the \$100-million debenture sale was called off, the company said it would try to make other arrangements for the funds. The most recent credit obtained by the company was a \$59-million borrowing in Swiss franc, carrying an interest rate of 10.1 per cent. This loan, obtained after the end of last year, matures next Dec. 31.

The Penn Central needs cash not only for current requirements but also to help it handle more than \$100-million of long-term debt that matures this year. The prospectus issued for the planned debenture offering disclosed that the Penn Central had \$75-million in commercial paper maturing at the end of June.

#### CASH STRINGENCY

The prospectus also noted that since April 21 maturities and payments of Penn Central commercial paper (short-term notes) exceeded sales of such paper by \$41.3-million.

The company's unusually severe cash stringency reflects the inability of the railroad to achieve earnings since the February, 1968, consolidation.

In this year's first quarter the parent company operated at a net loss of \$17.2-million despite an extraordinary credit of \$51-million. The railroad subsidiary had a first-quarter loss of \$62.7-million.

The parent company's loss in calendar 1969 was \$121.6-million, after a \$126-million charge-off of some of the railroad's investment in passenger train facilities. In the last 11 months of 1968, when the parent company had a reserve of \$275-million to cover unusual charges associated with the merger, it had a net income of \$90.3-million although the railroad in that period operated at a loss of \$127-million.

Mr. Saunders, who will be 61 years old on July 16, is a lawyer turned railroad man.

#### JOINED N. & W. RAILWAY

He practiced law in Washington, D.C., until April, 1939, when he joined the legal department of the Norfolk & Western Railway, in which the Pennsylvania Railroad was one-third owner.

Mr. Saunders rose to the presidency of the N. & W., which he left in 1963 to become chairman and chief executive officer of the Pennsylvania Railroad. He pushed to complete the merger of the Pennsy with the New York Central. Such a merger had been proposed several years earlier, by his predecessor at the Pennsy, James M. Symes, and the Central's chairman, Robert R. Young.

In addition to getting labor to switch from opposition to support of the merger, Mr. Saunders succeeded in overcoming the Justice Department's objections to the consolidation by agreeing to have the combined company absorb the bankrupt New Haven Railroad.

Alfred Perlman never exhibited the enthusiasm for the merger that was shown not only by Mr. Perlman but also by Mr. Perlman's old boss, Mr. Young.

#### RECOGNITION EARNED

Mr. Perlman, who will be 68 on Nov. 2 when his contract expires, has earned recognition in the industry as one of the most effective operating railroad executives of the century.

He is credited with having saved the New York Central from bankruptcy, which it apparently faced in 1954, after Mr. Young won control of the carrier from the Vanderbilt family in a bitter proxy fight. Before heading the Central, Mr. Perlman was executive vice president of the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad.

Last October, when directors named Mr. Gorman president of the Penn Central, Mr. Saunders in a statement emphasized the "many new viewpoints and concepts, particularly in the areas of cost control, budgeting, computer technology, personnel and public relations" that he said Mr. Gorman would provide.



## FORMERLY AT BELL

Until he joined the Penn Central last December, Mr. Gorman had spent his entire business life with units of the Bell telephone system. At Western Electric he was known as a keen cost-cutter and as a "tough operator" who sometimes barked commands to his subordinates.

At the Penn Central annual meeting last month, Mr. Gorman's \$250,000-a-year salary came under sharp attack from several stockholders.

Mr. Bevan, 63, was with the New York Life Insurance Company and the Provident National Bank of Philadelphia before 1951, when he joined the Pennsylvania Railroad as financial vice president.

He is credited with having spurred the aggressive diversification program in nonrailroad fields followed by the Penn Central since the merger and by the Pennsy in the years prior to consolidation.

# EIGHTY PERCENT OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE THINK PRESIDENT DOING POOR JOB ON THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, for many weeks, I have been placing in the RECORD various editorials and letters in an attempt to show the public's deep concern over the failure of the Nixon administration to bring down interest rates and stabilize the economy.

Today, the Washington Post published the latest edition of the Lou Harris poll and this sampling of public opinion gives President Nixon his lowest marks on economic issues.

Eighty percent of the people give a negative response on questions relating to President Nixon's ability to keep down the cost of living. Mr. Speaker, this is a true reflection of the toll that high interest rates have taken on the economy. High interest rates have raised the cost of every consumer item and have contributed greatly to the continued price rise record month after month.

Mr. Speaker, only 17 percent of the people answering the Harris poll felt that the President was doing a good job on keeping down the cost of living.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, 60 percent of the people queried by the Harris poll responded in a negative fashion to questions about the President's efforts to keep the economy healthy. Only 34 percent gave a positive answer in this area. Once again, Mr. Speaker, this response reflects a concern over the tight monetary policies and high interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Members of Congress will look at the Lou Harris poll closely. When 80 percent of the people are opposed to a President's policies, I think it is time for the Congress to do what is necessary to correct them.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a copy of a Washington Post story detailing the latest Harris survey:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 8, 1970]

**JOB DONE BY NIXON GIVEN 51 PERCENT RATING**  
(By Louis Harris)

President Nixon's overall rating on the job he is doing is 51 per cent positive, 45 per cent negative with 4 per cent not sure. This

slightly favorable rating is close to that just before his announcement of the Cambodian move.

Here is the trend of the public's job rating for Mr. Nixon over the past six months:

"How would you rate the job Richard Nixon is doing as President—excellent, pretty good, only fair, or poor?"

	[In percent]		
	Positive	Negative	Not sure
May 1970.....	51	45	2
April.....	52	46	2
March.....	52	45	3
February.....	58	38	4
December, 1969.....	62	36	2
November.....	60	36	

Although the positive marks the President receives are 11 points off the high point recorded for him after his Nov. 3 speech announcing troop withdrawals from Vietnam, his job rating parallels the 50 to 43 per cent division in the country backing the decision to send U.S. troops into Cambodia.

The latest Harris Survey shows that he is still regarded favorably on his speeches and press conferences and on foreign policy matters outside Southeast Asia.

FOREIGN POLICY [In percent]			
	Positive	Negative	Not sure
Working for peace in world... TV speeches, press conferences.....	53	43	4
Relations with Russia.....	51	39	10
Handling Vietnam war.....	43	39	18
Handling Cambodian war.....	40	54	6
Handling war in Laos.....	38	51	11
	35	50	15

But he receives negative ratings on seven key domestic issues:

DOMESTIC RATINGS [In percent]			
	Positive	Negative	Not sure
Approach to law, order.....	37	56	7
Handling race problems.....	35	58	7
Keeping economy healthy.....	34	60	6
Handling strikes, labor relations.....	33	57	10
Appointments to Supreme Court.....	32	50	18
Handling taxes and spending.....	29	64	7
Keeping down cost of living.....	17	80	3

# FROM THE HEARTLAND—REASSURING VOICES ARE STILL HEARD

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have long been deeply concerned by the effect that some of our domestic dissent may be having on Hanoi's war leaders. I am concerned that it may be stiffening North Vietnam's will to continue its aggression. I am almost certain it has had a demoralizing effect on American men fighting in Vietnam. I commented generally on this concern in my remarks accompanying Mr. C. L. Sulzberger's articles entitled "Cambodia: the Arrogance of Ignorance," which I have inserted in the RECORD.

In the flood of mail I have received in the past 5 weeks have come some thoughtful, touching letters. Often these have been written by parents and friends of men fighting for America in far-off Vietnam. They express concern for their loved ones who are now serving their country.

An unspoken theme of such letters is the immorality of some Americans not supporting their countrymen while they are doing their country's bidding. One such letter was written by my good friends and constituents Joe and Betty Oslin of Hillsboro, N.H. To me, it is a short, eloquent statement of parents who love America, and are proud that their two sons do, too. They need and deserve our support. They also need and deserve the prayers and respect of patriots and they have mine as well as those of most Americans.

The other letter that I here commend to my colleagues is of a slightly different nature. Through the words of her brother written in 1942, while he was fighting in another war, my friend and constituent Mrs. Aria Cutting Roberts, of Plymouth, N.H., adds perspective to this call for our support for our fighting men. The words written 28 years ago are still eloquent, and are particularly timely. These letters speak for themselves.

They are in heartening contrast to other letters—fearful and doubting, and clearly without faith in our time-tested methods of making the hard decisions which have permitted us to survive and move forward in freedom under God.

The two letters follow:

HILLSBORO, N.H., May 15, 1970.

Congressman J. C. CLEVELAND,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: I have just completed notes to Senators Cotton and McIntyre expressing my family's support of President Nixon's decision concerning Cambodia.

Our only two boys are in uniform and consider it a privilege. Young Joe just left for Vietnam yesterday. It is in his behalf and in behalf of our son Bob, who will start his second tour of duty there in the fall, and all the other boys who elected to serve their country rather than hide on the campus or flee to Canada that I ask that no limiting action be taken in the Congress. In my judgement, any vote to appease the chronic vocalizer will be construed as lack of national will in Hanoi and will prolong the conflict rather than resolve it.

Best regards,

JOE AND BETTY OSLIN.

PLYMOUTH, N.H., May 18, 1970.

Congressman JAMES CLEVELAND,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM CLEVELAND: It seems that this is the time to say that I feel all of us should show united support for President Nixon and America's fighting men in the Cambodian crisis. I know that many of our fighting men feel this way—that many of them wish they had more than one life to give for their country—

I would like to quote from a letter:

"The present situation will, in the end, turn out satisfactorily for us. How can it be otherwise? Those very same principles that our ancestors fought and bled to establish, we are now ready to sacrifice likewise to preserve. Principles don't die—they live, provided those who support and in turn are supported by those principles are a red-blooded, fighting race that we are supposed to be, and which, to all those who are opposing us we are proving to be—"

Sounds just like a letter from a soldier in Vietnam, doesn't it? And the man who wrote this just 28 years ago in the far-away South Pacific during World War II, would say the same today. I am so glad that he doesn't know about the unrest all over this country right now—he would feel so hurt about it. The man who wrote the letter was my brother Arnold D. Cutting of Clermont who saw

several years of military service and came out a major in 1945. He died just five years ago from a battle with cancer.

All best wishes,

Most sincerely,

Mrs. ARIA CUTTING ROBERTS.

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL

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

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I commend the House Appropriations Committee for reporting early the \$7.4 billion Department of Agriculture and related agencies appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971. Confronted with an extremely tight budget situation, the committee has come forward with a bill which provides for some increases in farm-related programs which are urgently needed and has made offsetting reductions in some other activities which carry a lower priority.

I think it should be noted that in many respects this is also a bill for consumers. Even the price assistance programs for agriculture are consumer related in that they help to insure an abundance of food for the American people at a cost of only 16½ cents out of each dollar the consumer spends—lowest percentage in the world. By far the largest increase—nearly \$700 million—is proposed in food assistance programs where expenditures would rise from \$2.324 million in fiscal 1970 to \$2.433 million in fiscal 1971. By comparison, the recommended appropriation under title I for general USDA activities is \$2.955 million. The largest reduction is in title III—\$480 million—for corporations, including Public Law 480 and other assistance programs.

Although there are numerous important items which received considerate treatment from the committee, I would like to single out a few. I am especially pleased that funds for the Great Plains conservation program, which is so vital to the future of North Dakota and the other Great Plains States, were increased by \$355,000 to a total of \$15,355,000. Total new obligational authority recommended in the bill for the Soil Conservation Service was increased by \$22,614,000 to \$268,844,000.

For the rural electric and telephone programs, the full budget estimate is recommended—\$322 million in new authorization for electric loans and \$123,800,000 for telephone loans. Carryover funds will enable the Administrator to make new loans of \$345 million and \$125 million respectively.

The bill provides for substantial expansion of many loan programs under Farmers Home Administration. The agency's insured loans will reach the \$2.2 billion level during fiscal 1971.

#### CASH AWARDS FOR SOLUTIONS TO NATIONAL PROBLEMS

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his re-

marks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am today proposing a program of \$25,000 cash awards from the Federal Government as an incentive to individual Americans to develop solutions to critical national problems.

I have long felt that someone should create an atmosphere of incentive for Americans at the grass roots level to come up with answers to some of our most pressing problems—like maybe a fellow in his home garage devising an effective but inexpensive device for controlling air pollution. I would like to enlist all of our citizens in a campaign to lick our national problems. And so I have introduced a bill which I think will provide the incentive.

My bill would have the Federal Government offer as many as four prizes of \$25,000 each to be awarded, possibly annually, to Americans who make outstanding contributions toward solving any of our national problems. No prize would be awarded in years when no such contribution had been made.

My point is that it is in the national interest to create this atmosphere of promoting individual solutions to our national problems by recognizing and rewarding citizens who deserve such awards.

I call my bill the Distinguished Citizen Awards Act. It is patterned after the annual awarding of Nobel Prizes except that it would be presented only to U.S. citizens and only for contributions to the solution of the problems of this country.

While the individual who wins one of these awards would truly be a distinguished citizen, he would also be representative of Middle America. What I want to do is bring the man on the street—the farmer, the factory worker, the small businessman—into the solution of our national problems.

My proposal does not overlap the cash awards offered to employees by various U.S. Government departments because the scope of it goes far beyond such programs.

I believe a program of the kind I am proposing would accelerate our progress in solving national problems and would enhance the well-being and happiness of our people. I therefore feel we should establish a system of Distinguished Citizen Awards as a matter of national policy.

My bill would create a Presidential Commission of five members who would meet annually to consider whether any American citizen had so contributed to the solution of a national problem as to be deserving of a \$25,000 Distinguished Citizen Award. The commission could decide to award no prizes or as many as four. The group would meet in April of each year in Washington, D.C., or at some other location of the Commission's choosing. A three-man majority would have to agree on the awards.

To be chosen for the award a citizen would have to have achieved an established working solution to a national problem. The "solution" could not simply be an idea or a suggestion.

#### LABOR UNIONISTS AGAINST THE WAR: "WE'VE HAD IT"

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

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks we have seen a number of demonstrations by "hard hat" construction workers in support of the Southeast Asian war. These men have every right to their opinions and every right to demonstrate—although I must say their bully boy conduct during the first demonstration in New York, and the one this past weekend in St. Louis, does them no credit. Nor has the President brought credit on himself by embracing their representatives without commenting on their tactics. If I were to meet with peace demonstrators who had behaved in a similarly disgraceful manner, I would certainly criticize their conduct to their faces and in the most unequivocal terms. But to reiterate: The hardhats have every right to hold and express their views.

However, we should not assume that they, or George Meany, speak for the entire union movement. There are unionists whose conception of foreign policy goes beyond "My country right or wrong, we must continue on the same course regardless." There are unionists who appreciate the difference between Vietnam and World War II. And there are unionists who understand that their sons are the first to go and the first to die when we make a mistake such as we have been making in Southeast Asia.

Recently, a number of trade union officers, executive board members, and shop stewards in the San Francisco Bay Area took out a full-page advertisement in both San Francisco newspapers to say, "We want out of Cambodia—Now! We want out of Vietnam—Now! We've had it!"

Under unanimous-consent agreement, I include this advertisement from the May 18, 1970, San Francisco Chronicle in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I also include the news articles, "Peace Ad by Bay Union Officials," from the San Francisco Chronicle of May 19, 1970, and "Coast Unionists Score War Move," from the New York Times of May 20, 1970, in the RECORD following the advertisement.

Following these articles, I include the articles entitled, "Meany Stand on War Challenged by Union," from the Washington Post of May 19, 1970, and "Potofsky, in Labor Split, Denounces War Policy," from the New York Times of May 23, 1970, in the RECORD.

The material follows:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, May 18, 1970]

#### WE'VE HAD IT!

We the undersigned Bay Area trade union officers, executive board members and shop stewards have sent the following message to President Richard M. Nixon with a copy to Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman J. William Fulbright:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: American working people and their families are deeply disturbed at your expansion of the war into Cambodia. Those men being killed are our sons—new



casualty lists to add to the 40,000 already dead and 300,000 wounded in Vietnam.

On April 20 you announced that 150,000 men would be removed within the course of a year. Although we felt that even that pace was too slow, we hoped this was a turn toward peace, an end to the killing.

Now you have further divided this country by a number of blatant reversals in the course of a few days. First there were arms to Cambodia. Then there were American "advisors." Now an invasion in force!

This took place without even the pretext of a request from Cambodia, which international law considers a neutral nation.

This is a direct break with the U.S. Constitution. Only Congress can declare war. Furthermore, you did not even consult with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—the committee mainly responsible to advise and consent. Your own Secretary of State William P. Rogers testified he told Congress that the United States would not escalate the war into Cambodia. Little wonder there are members of your own party who have said you have "broken faith with Congress."

You have created a credibility gap of incredible proportions.

You have pledged to the American people that we will be out of Cambodia by June 30. In the light of this record, all we can say is—we don't believe you!

The economy of our country is steadily being eroded; your promises to stabilize the economy and control inflation have become meaningless. Our paychecks buy less for our families; our standard of living has been assaulted. We are suffering increased inflation and unemployment.

Now Cambodia! What next?

There must be an end to these military adventures.

We want a cease-fire—Now!

We want out of Cambodia—Now!

We want out of Vietnam—Now!

We've had it!

Most important, this nation of ours must turn from war to peace. Any other course leads to disaster.

(This ad was sponsored by a group of Bay Area trade unionists, and paid for by the contributions of the signers. Because of the time element some of the signers have not had the opportunity to take up the text with their respective trade union bodies.)

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, May 19, 1970]

#### PEACE AD BY BAY UNION OFFICIALS

A cross-section of Bay Area union leaders, including some of the most conservative, spoke out strongly yesterday against American military involvement in Southeast Asia.

"We want out of Cambodia—now! We want out of Vietnam—now! We've had it!" they declared in a fullpage newspaper advertisement signed by 336 leaders.

The signers ranked in political outlook from President Harry Bridges of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, which long has opposed the Vietnam war, to such men as Secretary Dan Del Carlo of the local building trades council of the AFL-CIO, which has been one of the staunchest supporters nationally of the war.

Other signers included leaders from the International Typographical Union, Newspaper Guild, Auto Workers, Electrical Workers, Social Workers, Carpenters, Teamsters, Teachers, Painters, Watchmakers, Communication Workers, Iron Workers, Laborers, Lithographers, Office Employees, Bartenders, Hospital Workers, Boilermakers, Laundry Workers, Clothing Workers, City Employees, Machinists, Broadcasters, Cemetery Workers, Bottle Blowers, Oil Workers, Cooks, Retail Clerks, Service Employees, Culinary Workers, Barbers, hodcarriers and pile-drivers.

Among the most prominent AFL-CIO signers were Harry Bigarani, secretary of the

Painters District Council here; Thomas Rottell, head of the Metal Trades Council here; Secretary Art Carter of the Contra Costa County Labor Council; Secretary Richard Groulx of the Alameda county Council and Secretary Charles Weir of the Marin County Council.

Among the Teamsters leaders were Joseph Diviny, the union's first vice president nationally and head of its joint council in the Bay Area, and Director Einar Mohn of the union's Western Conference.

The signers accused President Nixon of violating the Constitution by expanding the war into Cambodia, said the American troops being killed there "are our sons," and charged there is no reason to believe Mr. Nixon's promise to withdraw U.S. men from Cambodia by June 30.

[From the New York Times, May 20, 1970]

COAST UNIONISTS SCORE WAR MOVE—"WE'VE HAD IT" SAYS AN AD BY 451 LABOR OFFICERS

(By Wallace Turner)

SAN FRANCISCO, May 19.—The shattering of labor union support in this area for President Nixon's Indochina policies was signaled yesterday in full-page advertisements in both The San Francisco Chronicle and The Examiner.

The names of 451 labor union officers were signed to the advertisement. It was captioned: "We've had it!"

The text said that "working people and their families, are deeply disturbed at your expansion of the war into Cambodia," adding that Mr. Nixon had "further divided this country" by his move.

Addressing itself to the President, the ad said:

"You have created a credibility gap of incredible proportions. The economy of our country is steadily being eroded, your promises to stabilize the economy and control inflation have become meaningless."

#### A SHIFT IN POLICY

While the sentiments expressed in the advertisement are not new, the signatures to such a document of the names of many leaders of conservative unions constitutes a departure from national labor policy. Behind President George Meany, most of the old-line unions in the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations have consistently supported Mr. Nixon's war policies.

But the signature to the anti-war advertisement include those of officials of the iron workers, carpenters, boilermakers, painters, communications workers, lithographers and butchers unions.

More predictably, there are also signatures of officers of the more liberal unions, such as the auto workers, longshoremen, led by Harry Bridges; the American Federation of Teachers, and the farm workers.

Some of the signatures that stand out are of Einar O. Hohn, head of the Western Conference of Teamsters; Joseph Diviny, first vice president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters; Richard Groulx, executive secretary of the Alameda County Labor Council in Oakland; and Larry Vall, secretary of the State Retail Clerks Union.

#### WAR I CRITIC SIGNS

One note from the long past was the signature of Warren K. Billings, listed as a member of the executive board of Watchmakers Local Union 101.

Mr. Billings was convicted with Tom Mooney of bombing the Preparedness Day parade here in 1917. He learned watchmaking during the long years he spent in Folsom Prison.

The advertisement was prepared by liberal union members whose previous antiwar attitudes were intensified after four students were killed by National Guardsmen at Kent State University in Ohio.

[From the Washington Post, May 19, 1970]

MEANY STAND ON WAR CHALLENGED BY UNION

"Is everybody out of step except the AFL-CIO?" one of the federation's constituent unions has asked in challenging President George Meany's support of American operations in Cambodia.

"The AFL-CIO is not infallible and many of us feel strongly that it is out of step with the thinking of the 13 million members it represents," an editorial in the official publication of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen states.

"We do not believe that the leader of our great American trade union family speaks for that family in supporting the President in the present war dilemma of our nation," said the June-July issue of the Butcher Workman.

Meany pledged his support and that of the AFL-CIO the day after President Nixon announced that U.S. troops were entering Cambodia to deactivate North Vietnamese sanctuaries.

The 35-man AFL-CIO executive council endorsed Meany's position last week with three members dissenting and one abstaining from the vote.

Meany and the council have consistently backed Presidents Johnson and Nixon on the conduct of the war in Southeast Asia. It was on this issue that Meany and the late Walter P. Reuther had a falling-out that led to the ultimate withdrawal of the United Auto Workers from the AFL-CIO. Reuther also backed the administration but advocated a more moderate stand accused the council of passing a "jingoistic" resolution on the war.

Patrick E. Gorman, secretary-treasurer of the Meat Cutters, unsuccessfully ran for the executive council four years ago.

The editorial contended that "no rational segment in the make-up of America puts the stamp of approval on our war involvements."

"We wonder how long the 13 million trade unionist in the United States will sustain this opinion," it said.

[From the New York Times, May 23, 1970]

POTOFKY, IN LABOR SPLIT, DENOUNCES WAR POLICY

(By Emanuel Perlmutter)

ATLANTIC CITY, May 24.—The head of one of the nation's largest trade unions broke today with the leadership of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations and condemned the Vietnam and Cambodian war policies of the Nixon Administration.

Jacob S. Potofsky, president of the 417,000-member Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, praised the United States Senators who have been seeking to cut off funds for further military operations in Cambodia.

"Let us pray that success may crown their efforts," he said in an interview on the eve of the union's 27th biennial convention, which opens here.

"Congress must exercise its constitutional responsibility of not leaving the war-making decisions to the President alone," he added.

The American presence in Cambodia has been supported by George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, who said two weeks ago that he spoke for nine-tenths of the federation's 35-man Executive Council. Mr. Potofsky is a member of the council.

In opposing the federation's stand, Mr. Potofsky joined a number of labor leaders who are critical of the Cambodian decision. On the West Coast, 451 union officers last week signed newspaper advertisements opposing the move.

Criticism of the Administration's war policies is also contained in the text of Mr. Potofsky's keynote address tomorrow before 1,500 delegates.

"Our members, like all working people and like the majority of all Americans, want peace," he says in his prepared speech. "Our

members, like all working people and like the majority of all Americans, want peace. And they want peace now, without delay, without further military adventures, without more killing.

"I talk of peace now. If we do not end our involvement in Southeast Asia, which is tearing us apart, our nation and the democratic processes are in danger of dying."

Mr. Potofsky says in the speech that the Cambodian invasion is hurting chances to bring peace in the Middle East.

"A damaging consequence of the Cambodian maneuver is the definite weakening of American power to influence the situation in the Middle East," he says.

"Direct Soviet intervention in the Middle East has already stimulated Egyptian offensive action along the Suez Canal. Does anyone believe that America would have sat idly by in the face of Soviet intervention in the Middle East if America were not so deeply sunk in the Vietnam quagmire?"

Mr. Potofsky says in the speech that the war in Southeast Asia has done "great damage to the spirit of America."

"A climate of fear has descended upon our land," he says. "The war has set men against each other. It has caused division between the people and their Government. It has aroused suspicions and false accusations. It has brought back some of the McCarthyism era—an evil which we all hoped would never reappear."

#### TRUST FUND THEFT—A NATIONAL SCANDAL

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

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I am not one of those who feels the economic system of the United States can be run as if it were the budget of a corner grocery store. I fully appreciate the "pump-priming" value of a small planned deficit and of a small degree of inflation.

But what we have today is not a small deficit, and it is not a small inflation. We are being asked to increase the public debt limit by \$18 billion: roughly 9 percent of the total annual Government budget. And to match this 9-percent deficit, the national economy is currently inflating at an annual rate of about 7.2 percent. Contrast this with 2.9 percent inflation in 1969, 2.8 percent in 1968, and about 1.3 percent for each of the preceding 5 years.

Of course inflation and the national debt are only the beginning of our economic problems. Unemployment is 5 percent, up 1.7 percent from January 1968. The gross national product, which averaged 5.4 percent annual increase during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, has decreased slightly during the past two quarters, thus meeting the textbook definition of a recession. The stock market, exuberantly bullish during the previous two administrations, is in a swandive whose grandeur has not been seen since 1929.

We can try to paper over our difficulties by borrowing from the trust funds—the social security funds, the highway funds, and so forth—but this will get us nowhere; sooner or later, we are going to have to pay it back.

There is no question that, in dollars-and-cents terms, we have the worst of all possible worlds.

Perhaps all this would be acceptable—

at least it would be more tolerable—if some worthwhile purpose were being served. If the President were to say to the American public, "I know we are putting tremendous stresses on the economy but there are urgent needs that simply have to be met. We have to educate our children, expand health research and delivery programs, and make our environment fit to live in. We have to eliminate the national disgraces of poverty and hunger."

But this is not the case. Expansion of food and environment programs is tokenistic. Health and education are being cut back.

Where is the money going? We all know where it is going. It is going to the senseless and discredited war in Vietnam. It is buying the Saigon generals' fancy villas and Swiss bank accounts, and it is buying the American people nothing but division and dead young men.

Let us forget about our overgrown Military Establishment in general. Let us forget about the biggest make-work project in history: the antiballistic missile.

Closing down the war in Vietnam would by itself more than balance the budget and eliminate the need to raise the debt limit.

So I will not be a party to stealing from the trust funds. I will not be a party to this inflationary proposal. I will not be a party to furthering the economic degradation of the Nation. The war in Vietnam is not worth it.

#### PRESIDENT AND POLICY ARE THE SERVANTS OF THE UNITED STATES, NOT ITS MASTER

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

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, a most provocative and timely sermon on our country's current domestic and international disaster was recently delivered by Robert E. Senghas, minister of the Unitarian Church of Davis, Calif., in my district. This sermon was so perceptive and so well put that I find literally nothing I can say that would add to it but my endorsement—and when a Congressman finds himself with nothing to say, that is indeed an occasion.

Under unanimous consent agreement, I insert the sermon entitled "The Crisis Around Us," given by Robert E. Senghas on May 17, 1970, at this point in the Record:

##### THE CRISIS AROUND US

1. From the Declaration of Independence.—We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to

effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate, that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security.

2. "Shine, Perishing Republic" by Robinson Jeffers:

While this America settles in the mold of its vulgarity, heavily thickening to empire,

And protest, only a bubble in the molten mass, pops and sighs out, and the mass hardens,

I sadly smiling remember that the flower fades to make fruit, the fruit rots to make earth.

Out of the mother; and through the spring, exultances, ripeness and decadence; and home to the mother.

You make haste on decay: not blameworthy; life is good, be it stubbornly long or suddenly

A mortal splendor: meteors are not needed less than mountains: shine, perishing republic.

But for my children, I would have them keep their distance from the thickening center; corruption

Never has been compulsory, when the cities lie at the monster's feet there are left the mountains.

And boys, be in nothing so moderate as in love of man, a clever servant, insufferable master.

There is the trap that catches noblest spirits, that caught—they say—God, when he walked on earth.

The Crisis around Us:—There is a certain type of story which clergymen love to use in their sermons as the source of consolation. Recently I read a good example of this kind of story, one used by the well-known Protestant minister Ralph Sockman. Here is the story:

"A traveler in the Swiss Alps spent the night in a chalet well up in the mountains. In the early hours of the morning he was awakened by terrific crashings and rumblings. Frightened, he aroused his guide and asked 'What is happenings? Is the world coming to an end?' Calmly the guide answered: 'No, you see when the sun starts coming up the other side of the mountains, its rays play upon the surface of the glacier and cause the ice to crack with loud reports. This is what you hear. It is not the end of the world; it is only the dawn of a new day.'"

This is the kind of story with which the minister likes to end his sermons. And in the crisis around us, the crisis of extremist violence by both protesters and National Guard, the crisis of irresponsible Presidential leadership, the threat to the balance of powers between the President and Congress, it would be comforting to have a guide who could tell us that the terrific crashings and rumblings we hear are really the dawn of a new day and not the end of the world.

I cannot presume to be such a guide of reassurance today. It will be some time before we know whether we are witnessing the harmless breakup of a past ice jam, of whether we are in the path of a potential avalanche. I have heard many around us crying, "Doom, doom." Perhaps they are right. Yet I must tell you that today I am encouraged in a way I have not felt for many years. I am not naive enough to believe that



we have passed through the time of our greatest troubles. But something is happening in our country which gives me hope. I will come back to this in a few minutes.

Earlier this morning I read from the Declaration of Independence. For almost two hundred years the Declaration of Independence has been a revered relic in the civil religion of America. The original of the Declaration is kept in its glass shrine, like the reliquary with the tooth or hair of a saint. The importance of a saint is in the quality of his life, and when the relic becomes the focus of attention, the significance of the saint's life is perverted. His remains are perverted into objects of idolatry, in place of a life of inspirational source, an example which makes demands upon the believer's own life.

In like fashion, the Declaration of Independence has been encased in a frame and glass, reproduced and hung as a relic, while the life of the Declaration and its discomfiting message has been overlooked.

The message of the Declaration is that there has been from the founding of our country the deep conviction that there are values by which we judge any government of ours. This includes any government which may trace its history back to the time of the Declaration. Our country is not our government; our country is more than any government or political system, and any government of ours must justify itself by the standards referred to in the Declaration. The issue for us as Americans, then, is whether our present government has become (in the words of the Declaration) destructive of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Our loyalty as Americans is not primarily to our government, but to our country.

The distinction between loyalty to our country and loyalty to our government, and the deeper allegiance to country over government, was novel at the time of our American Revolution, and it contradicted the Protestant tradition of Europe based upon Lutheranism and Calvinism, which refused such a distinction. But it has been rare in American history when Americans have felt any conflict between loyalty to country and loyalty to government. Until the present time, only the Civil War raised this issue clearly, and then only for the South, who interpreted "country" to mean the local or Southern country, or "Southern way of life," which of course meant the way of life for the white.

Until the recent crisis over the Vietnamese war and its extension into Cambodia, there has been only a slight erosion of this belief in lack of conflict of loyalties between country and government. This has been for those liberals, radicals, and blacks who have begun to identify themselves with larger, international mankind, or at least oppressed peoples in all lands. The great bulk of Americans, however, have continued at least until this current crisis to identify loyalty to country with loyalty to government, even when their own political parties have not been in office.

Now many more of us, and especially the students, are re-experiencing the conflict known to the founders of our country. We are asking whether our government has forfeited its right to govern. President Nixon has refused to listen to our representatives in the Congress and within his own political party. He has acted without a true consent of those who are governed by him. He has instituted a policy which is destructive to the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

And so after two hundred years we are again faced with the revolutionary question: has our government forfeited its rights to our allegiance?

There are many Americans who refuse to ask this terrible question. They refuse to admit that it is ever conceivable that we can be confronted with a conflict between loyalty to our government and loyalty to

something deeper than that government. When the Cambodian expedition and the massacre of the students at Kent State took place, my neighbor flew an American flag prominently in his front yard. I do not know what his intentions were, but the message of that flag under those conditions was that loyalty to the flag and loyalty to Mr. Nixon were synonymous. And to the students and to me that message is that those who oppose the Cambodian expedition and who oppose the immorality of our Administration are necessarily disloyal to our country and to the values our country should live by. My neighbor is apparently not ready to ask the revolutionary question.

But I am ready to ask the revolutionary question, "Has our government forfeited its right to our allegiance?" And I am also ready to answer that question. My answer is, "Not yet." I am still ready to give general allegiance to my government. The Declaration of Independence notes that "prudence . . . will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for . . . transient causes." And I am living in the hope that the cause which Mr. Nixon has endorsed is a transient cause.

And when I say that I am still ready to give general allegiance to the government, I do not say how I may respond to a specific order. I do not know what my response would be to an order for induction. It would be presumptuous of me to imagine how I might respond to a situation which will not occur. I do not know that I am far less certain I would obey any such order now than I would have been three weeks ago.

I am still prepared to support the government because the government is not, fortunately, simply the Administration. Mr. Nixon has set forces in motion which he, in his limited understanding of government, never foresaw. Like George III, he has made the error of identifying his person with his office. But he has set in motion countervailing forces within government itself—within the Congress and within his own party and his own Administration—which give us hope that his cause will be indeed transient.

I said earlier that I am encouraged. I am encouraged by the appearance of these countervailing forces within the government and within both political parties. I am also encouraged by the appearance of a strong reaction within the great "silent majority" whose mind Mr. Nixon thought he was able to read. And I am especially encouraged by the new legitimization of dissent.

Until last week the only dissent which attained the air of legitimacy with the American public was in the campaign of Senator Eugene McCarthy. When Senator McCarthy abdicated from leadership, the dissenters lost their focus, and dissent again became illegitimate. Until last week I had supposed that it would require the appearance of another leader of national political stature in order for dissent to our policy in Southeast Asia to be legitimized again. Such a leader has not emerged yet. But now it appears that we did not need a new leader to legitimize dissent—dissent has been legitimized by the excesses of Richard Nixon himself and by the excesses of the Ohio National Guard.

In France before their revolution the decrees of the king were ended with the words "le Roi le veut"—the King wills it. In an absolute monarchy that is all that is needed to justify and to legitimate the decrees of the government. Mr. Nixon does not understand that the American process is different. His Executive Orders are not legitimized simply by the words, "The President wills it," although his press conferences show that that is what he believes. Rather, Mr. Nixon's authority is legitimized by the support of the people, or in the words of the Declaration of Independence, his just powers derive from the consent of the governed. And we, the governed, have not consented to what he has done. My neighbor with his flag has appar-

ently not yet made the distinction between Presidential will and public consent, but more and more Americans are making that historic distinction.

What has happened in our country since last week is the realization by many that opposition to our war in Indochina and to its extension is no longer dissent. What has happened is the realization by many that Americans have withdrawn their collective consent to the war. We have withdrawn our consent to the legitimacy of any Administration which acts to extend that war against our will. What has been dissent has become an awareness of a lack of consent in the public will. The issue is not whether the dissent can be legitimized, but whether the Administration can again be legitimized. We are saying that we now know in a deep way that you, Mr. Nixon, are not our country; you are not our flag. Our cause is the country's cause, and that flag is our flag.

And so I am encouraged by a new experience that I am finding my country again. It is not the country Mr. Nixon sees; it is not the country many of those see who would wrap themselves and their insecurities in the flag. But in a way I feel to my very soul, I know that the principles we stand for derive from the very roots of our country.

I am especially encouraged by what is happening to the students at our colleges and universities. Until the last few weeks the student movement was defined negatively. It was a student protest against the Establishment, and the Establishment was thought to include the universities themselves. This has now changed. As *Newsweek* magazine noted, Cambodia and Kent State have converted student antiwar protest into university antiwar protest. Faculty and even some administrations are standing with the students on this issue. With the politicizing of many students who have been inactive, and with the growing mood on campuses that our national Administration no longer has the consent of a large proportion of the governed, the students are coming to see the university as their university: not some outside Establishment's university, but a university that represents their values. There is a sense of common cause among faculty, staff, and students. The number of those who wish to use the university as a battlefield, where violence is directed against the supposed representatives of our corrupt society, that is, the campus administration, seems to be diminishing. It is being replaced by a growing sense that the university is a source of strength, a staging area for moving out into the country, a place where one prepares to encounter the evil in our society. Faculty and administration (where administration is sympathetic) are coming to be looked upon as allies. What seems to be happening on campuses is a change in mood similar to what is happening off the campuses—that opposition to our national Administration is no longer dissent, but that this opposition now represents the legitimate interests of us all. More and more students are coming to feel that they are the Establishment, that they represent the legitimate source of power in our country, and they are now willing to move into the political arena to make that power effective.

I am greatly encouraged by all this. My only concern is for the need among these students for a strong sense of time. Political action requires a willingness to work for the long haul. Mr. Nixon himself is an example of one who knows how to work and wait. Will the students be able to work with the same kind of patience, or will they become discouraged if results are not immediate, especially in this fall's elections? We shall have to see.

Working for political change is like heating up the water under a teakettle. The question is whether the students will become impatient if the water does not boil within

three minutes. Some will probably then propose to throw away the teakettle, warm water and all. What is needed is a continual application of heat.

Although I am encouraged, I am also not completely optimistic either. There are also contrary forces in motion. We are always only a few steps from demagoguery. Besides the awakening part of our population which sees the evil in our Administration, there may also be awakening an element ready to repress any departure from Mr. Nixon's stated will. A straw in the wind is the recent violence of the construction workers during their lunch hour against the students in Wall Street, New York, while the police looked on amiably. These construction workers and these police represent the same class which formed the principal support of Hitler in Germany. We shall see if demagogues emerge who are willing to pandering for support of this movement.

But at this moment I am still largely encouraged. I am encouraged by the willingness of many students to lose their innocence. They are increasingly willing to avoid the supposedly pure life of apathy or of radical courses of conduct that solve only personal, not public, needs. The students are more willing to be tainted, as anyone who joins the fight must be tainted.

A week ago on campus I heard a black student speak about the antiwar issue. His principal point was that in all this talk about writing the Congress, we must remember that Senator Fulbright from Arkansas is a racist. That is the voice of someone who wants to be pure. He is saying that we cannot remain pure and involve ourselves with Senator Fulbright and the rest of the government. And of course he is right. But more students seem to be realizing that the important thing is not to be pure, but to stop the killing of Americans and Asians, black, white, and Oriental.

The republic of Robinson Jeffers is indeed perishing, but there was much about that old republic that deserved to die. In this hour I become hopeful that a new country is emerging closer to the spirit of the instrument which declared our independence than we have been for many, many years.

#### HOMO SAPISAURUS

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

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, there are those who seem to believe that, just because we have never rendered our environment incapable of supporting human life, it cannot be done and will not be done.

A recent column by Arthur Hoppe suggests that there were others who said the same thing several million years ago.

Under unanimous consent agreement, I include the column entitled "Interview With a Dinosaur," from the San Francisco Chronicle of June 2, 1970, in the RECORD at this point:

#### AN INTERVIEW WITH A DINOSAUR (By Arthur Hoppe)

"Dinosaurs dominated the world during the Mesozoic era—from about 200 million years ago to about 60 million years ago . . . Scientists have advanced many reasons to explain why the dinosaurs died out"—*The World Book Encyclopedia*.

"Good morning, sir. You are a dinosaur?"

"Yes, I'm a brontosaurus myself. Come from a long line of brontosauri. We've lived here in this swamp for—oh—140 million years or so. Lovely place, don't you think?"

"Very, I see that you eat these succulent looking reeds that grow in the shallows."

"Yes, they're the only thing I care for really."

"But I see, sir, that as you move about you seem to trample more reeds underfoot than you eat."

"Well, when you weigh in at 50 tons . . ."

"But aren't you concerned, sir, about destroying your food supply?"

"Not at all, young man. There have always been plenty of reeds to eat and there always will be—even though the swamp is a bit shallower."

"Shallower?"

"When I was a lad it came up to my shoulders. Now it's up to my hips. I suppose that's what's got the young ones all stirred up—that and the change in climate."

"The climate's changed, sir?"

"Yes, it's much less humid than when I was a boy. It's not the coolness that bothers you, it's you know, it's the lack of humidity."

"You said, sir, that the young were stirred up?"

"Oh, just a few wild-eyed radicals. They're going around shouting, 'The swamp's drying up! The swamp's drying up!' Sheer nonsense. There's always been a swamp and there always will be a swamp. No swamp! It's impossible for the saurian mind to conceive."

"They have a plan of action?"

"Nothing practical. They want us all to learn to eat those leaves growing on the bank. Leaves, mind you! Can't abide the stuff. Doesn't set well, don't you know?"

"But if, just by chance, the swamp IS drying up . . ."

"I'm not about to change my ways, young man. Reed-eating was good enough for my grandfather a billion times removed and it's certainly good enough for me!"

"But, sir, you agree that the world is changing. And yet you say you will make no attempt to adapt to these new conditions. Aren't you afraid you will become extinct?"

"Extinct! Are you out of your mind, young man? There have always been dinosaurs and there always will be dinosaurs. After you've been ruling the world for 140 million years, there's one thing you know in your bones."

"What's that, sir?"

"The Good Lord created this planet solely for the enjoyment of us dinosaurs."

"The earliest examples of *Homo sapiens* date from about 300,000 B.C."—*The World Book Encyclopedia*.

#### 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. The United States has more compressors than any other nation. In 1966 there were 564,916 compressors in the United States compared to 112,821 in Japan, the second-ranked nation.

#### BEAUTIFUL MOUNT VERNON— INCLUDE THE VIEW

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing and justified citizen chorus to preserve the view from Mount Vernon. Yesterday I brought to your attention and that of our colleagues one part of that chorus. Today, from the Durham, N.C., Morning Herald, I refer you to one

more example of the public's close attention to the plight of preserving our first President's home and its surroundings.

One of my friends recently called me the "lobbyist from Mount Vernon," and rather than take offense at the remark, I readily admit trying to represent countless future citizens who, unless the Congress acts, may never be able to thrill to the panorama of the Mount Vernon setting. The title conferred by my friend was purely honorary so my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee need not feel uneasy about my persistence in this matter.

We can thank one of our distinguished former colleagues, Mrs. Frances Bolton of Ohio, for preserving part of the majestic view along the Potomac. However, we must not assume that the Accokeek Foundation can do the whole job of preservation. The critical part, that still to be done, is the job of the Federal Government and the U.S. Congress.

On behalf of generations of visitors to Mount Vernon yet to come, I urge the appropriation of sufficient funds in the fiscal year 1971 budget to finally and irrevocably protect one of our Nation's greatest landmarks.

The editorial from the Durham Morning Herald follows:

#### SAVING VIEW FROM MOUNT VERNON

Regrettably the battle to save the view of the Maryland shore from Mount Vernon has not yet been won. More than half the land and scenic easements necessary to preserve the natural beauty of the view from the beloved home of the nation's first President has been acquired. Obviously, however, there remains unacquired for the Piscataway National Park enough land in the area to permit developments which would destroy the view George Washington so much enjoyed and which is integral to the character of his home as a national shrine.

Almost a decade has passed since Congress authorized the preservation of the character of the Maryland shore opposite Mount Vernon. But Congress has never implemented that authorization with adequate appropriations, and no administrations (Kennedy's, Johnson's, or Nixon's), for all the professions of concern for conservation, has promoted this eminently significant conservation project, the development of the Piscataway National Park to protect and preserve the view from Mount Vernon. Much of the land already conveyed to the National Park Service for the purpose has been given by individuals and private foundations, and the scenic easements have, of course, been conveyed by the property owners.

It is high time the administration and Congress give priority to completing the Piscataway National Park. Only then will the preservation of the view from Mount Vernon be assured. Two years ago Secretary of the Interior Udall declared the park "substantially complete." Such a declaration was necessary to validate the gifts of land and scenic easements. But more land needs to be acquired, and Congress should make the necessary appropriation now.

The Accokeek Foundation, headed by former Rep. Frances P. Bolton of Ohio, which acquired over 400 acres of land for the projected park, has now become understandably concerned over pollution of the Potomac River and is now undertaking to have the long stretch from Washington to the Chesapeake Bay included in the anti-pollution project for the river. This, too, is needed, not only for Mount Vernon but for that beautiful and historic river and its Maryland and Virginia shores.



## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CORMAN, for Tuesday, June 9, 1970, on account of official business.

Mr. GAYDOS (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for Monday, June 8, and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mr. HORTON, for 30 minutes, today.  
Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. HOGAN, for 1 hour, on June 10.  
Mr. HALPERN, for 10 minutes, today.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.  
Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, for 60 minutes, on June 16.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. FINDLEY, to include extraneous matter with his remarks made today in the Committee of the Whole on H.R. 17923.

Mr. MICHEL, to include extraneous matter with his remarks made today in the Committee of the Whole on H.R. 17923.

Mr. LANGEN, to insert two tables in connection with discussion on H.R. 17923.

Mr. RANDALL, to extend his remarks in connection with the appropriation bill, following amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Iowa and prior to vote on Farmers Home amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN, to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee today and include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. BURKE of Florida.

Mr. ESCH.

Mr. TEAGUE of California.

Mr. HOSMER.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN in three instances.

Mr. HOGAN.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. ESHLEMAN.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. FREY.

Mr. QUIE.

Mr. BLACKBURN in two instances.

Mr. PELLY in two instances.

Mr. BOW in two instances.

Mr. SCHERLE.

Mr. KEITH.

(The following Members (at the re-

quest of Mr. CHAPPELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. ULLMAN in 10 instances.

Mr. MINISH.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. GARMATZ.

Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.

Mr. EILBERG.

Mr. STEED in two instances.

Mr. MIKVA in six instances.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

Mr. WALDIE in three instances.

Mr. HAWKINS.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in eight instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. TUNNEY.

Mr. FRIEDEL in two instances.

Mr. SYMINGTON in two instances.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. HATHAWAY in two instances.

Mr. CABELL.

Mr. CHAPPELL in two instances.

Mr. ALEXANDER in two instances.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 14306. An act to amend the tobacco marketing provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

## ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 10, 1970, 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:

2120. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report of a violation of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, involving the operation fund of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., pursuant to the provisions of 64 Stat. 768; to the Committee on Appropriations.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2121. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on improvements made in building construction inspections to determine compliance with contract specifications, District of Columbia Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 370. A bill to amend chapter 39 of title 38, United States Code, to in-

crease the amount allowed for the purchase of specially equipped automobiles for disabled veterans, and to extend benefits under such chapter to certain persons on active duty; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1164). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 16496. A bill to authorize certain uses to be made with respect to lands previously conveyed to Milwaukee County, Wis., by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 17958. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation, to liberalize certain criteria for determining the eligibility of widows for benefits under such title, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 91-1166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 11102 (Rept. No. 91-1167). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 17352. A bill to designate a Veterans' Administration hospital in Bedford, Mass., as the Edith Nourse Rogers Memorial Veterans' Hospital (Rept. No. 91-1168). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 17613. A bill to provide for the designation of the Veterans' Administration facility at Bonham, Tex. (Rept. No. 91-1169). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1068. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 11833, a bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act in order to provide financial assistance for the construction of solid waste disposal facilities, to improve research programs pursuant to such act, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 91-1170). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1069. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 17255, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to provide for a more effective program to improve the quality of the Nation's air. (Rept. No. 91-1171). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1070. A resolution waiving priority order against consideration of the bill, H.R. 17970, a bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 91-1172). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 17971. A bill to simplify the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by repealing provisions which are obsolete or are unimportant and rarely used; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 17972. A bill to provide for thorough health and sanitation inspection of all livestock products imported into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 17973. A bill to provide for the orderly expansion of trade in manufactured products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 17974. A bill to provide for an equitable sharing of the U.S. market by electronic articles of domestic and of foreign origin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 17975. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation, to liberalize certain criteria for determining the eligibility of widows for benefits under such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 17976. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to establish a procedure by which postal patrons may be relieved of the burden of receiving commercial advertisements transmitted in the mails, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HORTON (for himself, Mr.

ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BROXHILL of North Carolina, Mr. BUTTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FISH, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GROVER, Mr. GUDE, and Mr. HALPERN):

H.R. 17977. A bill to limit the sale or distribution of mailing lists by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HORTON (for himself, Mr.

HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. HUNT, Mr. KING, Mr. KLEPPE, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. McDADE, Mr. McKNEALLY, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PELLY, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PODELL, and Mr. QUIE):

H.R. 17978. A bill to limit the sale or distribution of mailing lists by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HORTON (for himself, Mr.

RAILSBACK, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. RHODES, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. SIKES, Mr. SISK, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. TAFT, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WINN, Mr. ZABLOCKI, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 17979. A bill to limit the sale or distribution of mailing lists by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HORTON (for himself, Mr.

MORSE, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. SCHADEBERG, Mr. GRAY, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. PATTER, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, and Mrs. DWYER):

H.R. 17980. A bill to limit the sale or distribution of mailing lists by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ICHORD (for himself, Mr. AL-

BERT, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. BURLISON of Missouri, Mr. WATTS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. MARSH, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. GRAY, and Mr. PETTIS):

H.R. 17981. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to develop the resources of the national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts

(for himself, Mr. VAN DERLIN, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. BROXHILL of North Carolina, and Mr. BROZEMAN):

H.R. 17982. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for a 1-year extension of financing for the Corporation

for Public Broadcasting; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H.R. 17983. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the provisions which presently prohibit the payment of benefits in certain cases to aliens (otherwise eligible for such benefits) who are outside the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 17984. A bill to amend section 905 of the Tax Reform Act of 1969; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 17985. A bill to provide for an equitable sharing of the U.S. market by electronic articles of domestic and of foreign origin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 17986. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 in order to establish Federal policy concerning the selection of firms and individuals to perform architectural, engineering, and related services for the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H.R. 17987. A bill to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN (for himself and Mr. PETTIS):

H.R. 17988. A bill to amend section 47 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow aircraft to be leased for temporary use outside the United States without a recapture of the investment credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.R. 17989. A bill to create a Presidential Commission on Distinguished Citizen Awards with authority to recognize and reward citizens who have done an outstanding job of helping to solve any of our national problems; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HORTON (for himself, Mr. ERLBORN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. VANIK, and Mr. WEICKER):

H.R. 17990. A bill to limit the sale or distribution of mailing lists by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 17991. A bill to increase the participation of small business concerns in the construction industry by providing for a Federal guarantee of certain construction bonds and authorizing the acceptance of certifications of competency in lieu of bonding in connection with certain Federal projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 17992. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide or to guarantee any bid, payment, or performance bond applied for by or on behalf of a small business concern which is a construction contractor or subcontractor; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 17993. A bill to amend the act of August 24, 1935 (commonly referred to as the "Miller Act"), to exempt construction contracts not exceeding \$20,000 in amount from the bonding requirements of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H.R. 17994. A bill to extend benefits under section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 17995. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 17996. A bill to provide for orderly

trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, to apply a tariff-rate quota with respect to certain skins of mink, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 17997. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that any individual may retire at the age of 60 with full benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 17998. A bill to amend section 401(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide that the Civil Aeronautics Board shall have authority to regulate the type of service performed by an air carrier under the terms of any certificate issued under that act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 17999. A bill to promote public health and welfare by expanding, improving, and better coordinating the family planning services and population research activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 18000. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an income tax credit or deduction for certain contributions to candidates for elective Federal office; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAPPELL (for himself and Mr. FUQUA):

H.J. Res. 1252. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to tenure of office for judges of the Supreme Court and inferior courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H. Res. 1071. Resolution to provide funds for the Select Committee created by House Resolution 976; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WOLD:

H. Res. 1072. A resolution authorizing the printing of a House document of a representative sampling of the public speeches of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower; 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. BROXHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 18001. A bill to provide for the advancement of Capt. Ray Maurer Pitts on the retired list to the rank of rear admiral; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H.R. 18002. A bill for the relief of Dr. Remigio G. Lacsamana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 18003. A bill to proclaim Christopher Columbus an honorary posthumous citizen of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 18004. A bill for the relief of John Borbridge, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 18005. A bill for the relief of Jakov Soce Stojic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

505. THE SPEAKER presented a petition of the Czechoslovak-American Associations, and other organizations, Cleveland, Ohio, relative to the Soviet-Czechoslovak Treaty of May 6, 1970; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.