

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Edmondson). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

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

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 322, nays 53, not voting 58, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

YEAS—322

Abbott	Cunningham	Harvey
Abernethy	Daddario	Hechler, W. Va.
Adair	Daniel, Va.	Henderson
Adams	Daniels, N.J.	Hicks
Addabbo	Davis, Ga.	Hollifield
Albert	Davis, Wis.	Horton
Alexander	de la Garza	Hosmer
Anderson,	Delaney	Hull
Tenn.	Dellenback	Hungate
Andrews, Ala.	Denney	Hunt
Andrews,	Dennis	Hutchinson
N. Dak.	Devine	Ichord
Annumzio	Dickinson	Jacobs
Arends	Diggs	Jarman
Ashbrook	Donohue	Joelson
Aspinall	Dorn	Johnson, Calif.
Ayres	Dowdy	Johnson, Pa.
Beall, Md.	Downing	Jonas
Belcher	Dulski	Jones, Ala.
Bell, Calif.	Duncan	Jones, N.C.
Bennett	Dwyer	Jones, Tenn.
Berry	Eckhardt	Karsh
Betts	Edmondson	Kazen
Bevill	Edwards, Ala.	Kee
Biaggi	Erlenborn	Keith
Blester	Esch	King
Blackburn	Eshleman	Kleppe
Blanton	Evans, Colo.	Kluczynski
Blatnik	Evins, Tenn.	Kuykendall
Boggs	Fallon	Kyl
Boland	Fascell	Kyros
Bow	Feighan	Landgrebe
Brasco	Findley	Landrum
Bray	Fish	Langen
Brinkley	Fisher	Latta
Brock	Flood	Lennon
Brooks	Flowers	Lipscomb
Broomfield	Flynt	Lloyd
Brotzman	Foley	Long, La.
Brown, Mich.	Ford, Gerald R.	Long, Md.
Brown, Ohio	Ford,	Lowenstein
Broyhill, N.C.	William D.	Lukens
Broyhill, Va.	Foreman	McCure
Buchanan	Fountain	McCulloch
Burke, Fla.	Frelinghuysen	McDade
Burke, Mass.	Friedel	McDonald,
Burleson, Tex.	Fulton, Pa.	Mich.
Burlison, Mo.	Fulton, Tenn.	McEwen
Burton, Utah	Fuqua	McFall
Bush	Galifianakis	McKneally
Button	Garmatz	Macdonald,
Byrnes, Wis.	Gettys	Mass.
Cabell	Giatmo	MacGregor
Caffery	Gibbons	Madden
Camp	Goldwater	Mahon
Carter	Gonzalez	Mailliard
Casey	Goodling	Mann
Cederberg	Gray	Marsh
Celler	Green, Oreg.	Martin
Chamberlain	Griffin	Mathias
Chappell	Griffiths	Matsunaga
Clausen,	Grover	May
Don H.	Gude	Mayne
Clawson, Del.	Hagan	Michel
Cleveland	Haley	Miller, Calif.
Cohelan	Halpern	Miller, Ohio
Collins	Hamilton	Mills
Colmer	Hamer-	Mink
Conable	schmidt	Minshall
Conte	Hanley	Mize
Corbett	Hanna	Mizell
Corman	Hansen, Idaho	Mollohan
Coughlin	Hansen, Wash.	Monagan
Cramer	Harsha	Montgomery

Morgan
Morton
Myers
Natcher
Nelsen
O'Konski
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Pettis
Pickle
Pike
Plunie
Poage
Poff
Freyer, N.C.
Price, Tex.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Rhodes
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rostenkowski

Roth
Roudebush
Roybal
Ruppe
Rush
St. Germain
St. Onge
Satterfield
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scott
Sebelius
Shulver
Sikes
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Snider
Spinger
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Symington
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.

Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Wampler
Watkins
Watts
Welcker
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson,
Charles H.
Winn
Wold
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wylder
Wylie
Wyman
Yatron
Young
Zion
Zwack

Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Powell with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Hogan.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL 1969

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 11400) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

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 further consideration of the bill H.R. 11400, with Mr. HOLLIFIELD in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read through line 7 on page 2 of the bill.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the full 5 minutes, but I do feel I want to express, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, my concern regarding the excessive use of supplementals. You know, we have reached a point here where the ink is no more dry on the regular appropriations bills until we get the first supplemental. Then we get the second and the third and finally 30 days before the end of the fiscal year here we are up with another massive supplemental bill.

I recognize that we in Congress do take certain actions that sometimes do require consideration in the area of supplementals, but I just want to tell the House and the members of my committee that I do not like this approach at all. I am very unhappy with it. I think the time has come when we in the Committee on Appropriations should control ourselves better as to the handling of supplementals. Further, what we ought to do is tell the executive agencies not to come up with supplementals as prolifically as they do now.

In my opinion about one or two supplementals a year is enough. I am expressing my opposition to a supplemental bill in these amounts, 30 days before the end of the fiscal year in some instances with agencies trying to get money that was already denied in their regular appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, I object to this approach and I hope, Mr. Chairman, that

NAYS—53

Anderson, Calif.
Barrett
Bingham
Bolling
Brademas
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Chisholm
Clay
Conyers
Derwinski
Edwards, Calif.
Ellberg
Farbstein
Fraser
Gaydos

NOT VOTING—58

Anderson, Ill.
Ashley
Baring
Bates
Cahill
Carey
Clancy
Clark
Collier
Cowger
Culver
Dawson
Dent
Dingell
Edwards, La.
Frey
Gallagher
Green, Pa.
Gubser
Hastings

Gilbert
Gross
Hall
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Kastenmeier
Koch
McCarthy
Meeds
Mikva
Minnish
Moorehead
Mosher
Moss
Nix
O'Byrne
O'Hara

Olsen
Ottinger
Podell
Price, Ill.
Rees
Reuss
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Ryan
Scheuer
Schneebell
Stokes
Thompson, N.J.
Tunney
Van Deerlin
Yates
Zablocki

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

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bates.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Rumsfeld.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Reskill.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Rallsback.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Gubser.

May 21, 1969

H 3907

CONTACT SERVICE AT MILITARY SEPARATION POINTS

Preseparation group orientation on benefits is provided at 288 military separation points each month. During fiscal year 1968 almost 8,000 visits were made to these separation points by VA contact representatives, over 496,000 servicemen were oriented and 70,265 personal interviews were conducted.

LOCATIONS OF VIETNAM CONTACT CENTERS

Air Force: Tan Son Nhut, Bien Hoa, Cam Ranh Bay, and De Nang.
Army: Cam Ranh Bay and Long Binh.
Marine: De Nang.

Itinerant service: Phan Rang, Tuy Hoa, Phu Cat, Chu Lai, U.S. Naval Hospital, De Nang, and 29th Evacuation Hospital, Saigon.

Yet in this today there has been cut \$500,000 off this kind of program, when they have the biggest backlog they have had at any time in the VA program.

I want to say to the chairman that I will appear before your committee when this budget comes along, because I do not believe they are treating the VA right.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. The main problem here, I believe, which the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) has so well presented, is that of personnel limitations which were fixed in section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act last year.

Let me say that in appropriation bills this year for the fiscal year 1970, we will probably propose to recommend some set-aside of that provision of the law as to personnel. We have already included such a set-aside provision in the versions of the bills which have been marked up to date. We expect to report the first one tomorrow. So the personnel problem can, I feel confident, be handled selectively and appropriately.

With respect to the amount of funds needed, that will be a matter for the House to decide. I am sure all of us are going to give our veterans the benefit of the doubt and see to it that they get ample funds for the various veterans programs.

Let me read to the committee the provision on personnel that we would propose to include in the bill making appropriations for the Veterans' Administration. It reads:

Positions in the agencies covered by this Act—

Which would include the Veterans' Administration—

whether financed from funds contained in this Act or from other sources, may be filled during the fiscal year 1970 without regard to the provisions of Section 201 of Public Law 90-364—

That is the tax bill—

and such positions shall not be taken into consideration in determining numbers of employees under subsection (a) of that section or numbers of vacancies under subsection (b) of that section.

In other words, it sets aside the limitation on personnel which is in operation at this time, and which is permanent law.

It is, as I said, prepared to include this provision in the bill for the forthcoming fiscal year. I believe this will meet the situation adequately as to personnel ceiling restrictions on the Veterans' Administration.

(Mr. TEAGUE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

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

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I believe the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, together with the colloquy which has taken place between the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), and the other gentlemen, has ably explained this resolution which is pending before the House.

To some extent my understanding is just a little different, and I will mention that for what it may be worth.

I believe this is an unusual procedure, to handle it in this way today. It is necessary, for otherwise the resolution would have to lie on the desk for 24 hours, in order to have general debate.

I believe the approach of providing the administration with a top ceiling is probably the first time that is has ever been placed into effect by the Congress, as to a ceiling limit for what they could spend. Last year we made them cut certain amounts, but this language, under title IV, will mean that they cannot spend more than \$192.9 billion.

Now, where I differ a little bit, if I understood the colloquy so far as the Veterans' Administration or anything else is concerned, is that this language does not apply to the action taken by the Congress of the United States. In our authorization bill for the veterans, we can exceed the money. In that authorization bill, that is set forth in the budget. If it is appropriated, that money can be spent, and the \$192.9 billion would be increased by whatever action Congress takes in authorizing and appropriating money over the budget top of \$192.9 billion.

I ask the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) is that not correct?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. SMITH of California. In other words, we do not bind the Congress. We can come in next week and change this. We can repeal it. We can add to it. We can do whatever we want with any single authorization or appropriation bill, and the veterans will be taken care of when the independent offices appropriation bill comes in, after the authorizing legislation has been approved.

So other than that, Mr. Speaker, I think it is up to the Congress to cooperate. We have already taken one action in the maritime authorization bill, which increased the money over and above the budget request. That amount, if appropriated, will raise this ceiling by the difference between what the administration asked for and what this House of Representatives asked for last week. Next week we will have the space bill. A rule was granted on it yesterday. There is

an additional amount in the space program, in the authorization bill, over and above the budget request. If that is approved by the House of Representatives and the Senate and if the money is appropriated over and above that figure, in my opinion, that will increase the \$192.9 billion. If I am not correct in that, I would like to have somebody straighten me out.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I think the Committee on Appropriations and its chairman ought to be congratulated for the manner in which they are handling the spending ceiling this year. The chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, and Mr. COLMER, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules (Mr. SMITH) have explained in detail how this ceiling will work.

This ceiling limits the administration and the Bureau of the Budget, but it places no limitation on any action that the Congress might choose to take either to raise or to lower in any instance any agency's budget. We all, to a man, share a sincere concern for our veterans. I know that this Congress is not going to be insensitive to the needs of our veterans or anyone else. We are doing a better job with placing a limitation on expenditures this year in this manner, in my personal opinion, than we did last year, because we placed too much of a burden for reducing expenditures on the executive branch of the Government and did not shoulder the responsibility in the legislative. We can raise or lower the budget any time we want to here in the Congress. It is up to the Congress, and that is where the responsibility ought to be.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Would you agree that by labeling this as a limitation on appropriations it is a misnomer and actually it is solely a limitation on expenditures and not a limitation on appropriations?

Mr. SMITH of California. I do not think it is a limitation on appropriations.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I admit it is not a limitation on appropriations but just on expenditures. You are calling it a limitation on appropriations, and this is a misnomer.

Mr. SMITH of California. I do not think the language says that. I do not think anybody says that. It is a limitation on the amount of money that the administration can spend in fiscal year 1970 unless Congress raises it or lowers it.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. The gentleman evidently agrees with me except that he uses more words than I to say so.

Thank you very much.

Mr. SMITH of California. It is going to be awfully tough for the administration under the present setup to live under this figure. Congress will have to help in every way that it can.

May 21, 1969

H 3909

something can be done to control what I consider to be an abuse of the supplemental appropriations procedure.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of supplementals.

I would say that with respect to the matter of restoration of reductions made last year, less than 1 percent of the funds in this bill represent money for functions which were reduced in appropriations made by Congress last year. The amount so involved is some \$34 million. It is only about one-third of 1 percent of the approximately \$12 billion cut last year from the requests for new funds for fiscal year 1969. That is a pretty good record, I would say.

We always have a supplemental bill for the current fiscal year in the new session. This one, it is true, has been delayed somewhat longer than usual. I agree that we should avoid supplementals wherever and whenever we reasonably can. Most of this pending supplemental is for costs associated with the war in Vietnam, or for pay increases voted and put into effect last year, plus a few other items that are either mandatory under basic law or rest on other requirements that the committee found justifiable.

But I appreciate the views of the gentleman from Michigan. Some supplementals are more or less inevitable for a variety of reasons. The basis for those in this bill are, of course, explained in the committee report accompanying the bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RYAN

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RYAN: Strike out title I, (beginning on page 2, line 1, and ending on page 3, line 5), and redesignate the succeeding provisions of the bill accordingly.

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to strike out title I of the bill entitled "Military Operations in Southeast Asia" which would appropriate in supplemental funds some \$1.2 billion for the war in Vietnam.

This amendment is also sponsored by other concerned Members of the House, including my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN), and the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is appropriate at this point because it offers the only means that the House has to vote on the conduct of the war in Vietnam. The power of the purse is the one power that we in the House of Representatives have to call a halt to the continued infusion of men and money into the conflict in Southeast Asia—and the continued sacrifice of lives. If we do not seize upon this opportunity, then we will once again have abdicated the responsibility which we have to review and control the administration's exercise of foreign policy.

Again this year, as for each of the past 5 years, we have before us a request for supplemental appropriations to prosecute the war in Vietnam. For the fifth

year in a row the costs of the war have been underestimated in the initial budget presentation.

Mr. Chairman, one-third of the funds contained in this bill, \$1.234 billion out of \$3.783 billion is for military operations in Southeast Asia under title I. The increased funds are needed to pay for increased troop strength over that originally estimated and budgeted for fiscal year 1969. Other funds are required because there has been an increase by 50 percent in bombings by B-52's in South Vietnam following the cessation of the bombing in the north.

A greater tonnage of bombs has been used in Vietnam than the United States used in all of World War II.

Despite the President's statement last week that the United States does not seek a military victory, the level of our military involvement in Southeast Asia is no less today than it was 1 year ago. The brutal fact that over 12,000 American servicemen have been killed since the Paris peace talks began is proof that the level of violence and destruction has not subsided. Witness the loss of 43 American lives and the wounding of 290 other American soldiers in the 11 assaults upon Apbin Hill, known as "Hamburger Hill" since about May 10.

Although the American people expressed their opposition to the continuance of the war through the political process last year, there has been no fundamental change in policy which would lead to the disengagement of American forces.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN), for bringing this matter at issue before the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. It is obvious to every single person on this floor that unless we slow down and reduce the level of violence and the level of expenditures in Southeast Asia, we will not be able to cope with the other problems confronting this Nation.

I believe the gentleman from New York is to be highly commended by all of us for having the insight to give us an opportunity to express ourselves at this very important point in time in the war in Vietnam.

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

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman from New York and ask the gentleman for his permission to join in cosponsorship of this amendment.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the support of the gentleman from New York for this amendment. I believe the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON) has pointed out very cogently that, as long as the war continues to drain some \$27 or \$28 billion as it already has done in fiscal year 1969, according to the report of the Committee on Appropriations, the necessary resources will not be de-

voted to solution of the pressing problems which confront us domestically.

This bill before us is inadequate in its treatment of domestic programs. The rent supplement program, for instance, was funded at less than 50 percent of the Johnson administration's budget request. Yet this bill provides no supplemental appropriations for rent supplementals.

The section 246 interest subsidy program for rental and cooperative housing is still \$10 million under the authorization.

Mr. Chairman, it is essential that this war end. By voting against supplemental appropriations for it, we will tell the administration that, with all the urgent domestic problems facing our country, it will have to get along in Vietnam with the paltry amounts of money which have already been appropriated for fiscal year 1969—some \$27 billion or \$28 billion.

The only way to force a change in policy is to refuse to approve the allocation of any additional funds for the war.

As long as Congress continues to acquiesce in appropriations for the war, as long as Congress continues to rubber-stamp administration policy, then Congress must share the responsibility with the administration for the continuation of that war. If Congress wants to bring the war to a close, it has the power to do so.

Mr. Chairman, in 1965, 1966, 1967, and 1968 I voted against supplemental appropriation bills which permitted the war to be expanded and escalated. I shall do so again today. It is time to halt the violence and destruction which have claimed the lives of so many Americans and Vietnamese.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as everyone knows, our Government is seeking to bring the war in Vietnam to a satisfactory conclusion. Peace talks are underway in Paris, and we certainly do not want to weaken the position of our Government at this strategic time. It is hoped that more and more of the fighting will be assumed by the South Vietnamese forces. This bill contains a quarter of a billion dollars for strengthening and modernizing the South Vietnamese Army in order to better equip them for taking over the fighting.

Mr. Chairman, it would be most ill-advised to pull the rug out from under our forces in Vietnam, so to speak, and out from under our negotiators at the Paris talks.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we can vote on this amendment at this time, and vote the amendment down.

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

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

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman how much of the additional appropriations, particularly as they relate to military pay costs for additional personnel, are for the addition of troops beyond those presently in Vietnam?

Mr. MAHON. There are no funds for the addition of troops beyond those presently in Vietnam.

Mr. OTTINGER. There is no money in here for additional troops?

Mr. MAHON. No, that is correct.

Mr. OTTINGER. I thank the gentleman for yield.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I speak today because the confluence of recent events have made the timing of this discussion fateful for the country.

Last March 26, in a speech on the floor of this House I said:

Soon we in the Congress will be asked again for the funds to continue prosecution of the war, and then, as before, Members of Congress will face the most unacceptable of alternatives; for they will be told that to refuse to appropriate money to protect our fighting men is to consign to death yet more of those Americans who are surely among those least deserving to die—those Americans who are carrying out the orders of their Government with a valor and loyalty in the face of the great difficulties and uncertainties of the situation that must rank with the highest such response of our history.

Yet valor and loyalty do not make wrong things right, or senseless policies sensible, or hopeless pursuits hopeful. So there will be those who feel that to vote money for the further prosecution of the war is not to protect lives, but indeed to make more certain that more lives will be pointlessly lost.

It is the imminence of this decision and the existence of stalemate and escalation in Paris and Vietnam that leads me then to urge the President the following steps:

First, the United States should begin at the earliest possible moment to withdraw with all deliberate speed as large a part of our Armed Forces in South Vietnam as would be consistent with the continued safety of those men who remain behind.

Second, the United States should make clear, to those whom we have supported and opposed alike, that it is our intention to continue to withdraw American troops from South Vietnam until none shall remain, providing only that during this continuing withdrawal the Government of North Vietnam and the Vietcong will participate in good faith efforts to resolve by negotiation the negotiable questions mentioned above.

Third, the United States should reiterate its willingness to assist in the relocation of people who do not wish to remain in South Vietnam under new circumstances that must arise in any peace settlement, and to assist through international agencies in the reconstruction of the land devastated by so many years of war.

There has been hesitation to begin the removal of American troops on the theory that to take such a step while negotiations are in progress could weaken the bargaining position of the United States and of the Government of South Vietnam. But I have become convinced that the opposite is in fact the case, unless we are still seeking to negotiate what are not in fact negotiable goals.

For if in fact the early withdrawal of American troops is one of our objectives in the negotiations, to begin that withdrawal could hardly be called a step away from achieving that one of our objectives. It even seems likely that to begin realizing that objective might well make it easier to realize other objectives as well.

The carrot of continuing the American withdrawal should increase the incentive for the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese to negotiate in good faith; while the stick of beginning the American withdrawal could hardly fail to make clear to the South Vietnamese government that we finally mean what we have been saying for so many years—that the war in Vietnam will be de-Americanized. That simple fact should prove a greater inducement to the government of South Vietnam to negotiate in good faith than all the exhortations that words can construct. It would at least remove their greatest incentive not to negotiate: the confidence that as long as there are not successful negotiations there will be an American army on hand to keep them in power.

Therefore, should the President begin the withdrawal of American troops and accompany that withdrawal with public declarations such as those proposed here, he would, I believe, facilitate negotiations rather than hinder them, and thus he would make a major start toward removing the barriers that separate the American people from the most nearly satisfactory resolution of their most difficult dilemma.

In short, it now seems clear that the beginning of the withdrawal of American troops would in fact strengthen our bargaining position if we want to get all the Vietnamese involved to work out the quickest possible way to end the war and the least painful way to begin the reconstruction.

In any event, once these steps were taken and America's purposes were clear, there would be new unity at home in support of those who are negotiating and new hope for a healing of the spirit of this land; and there would be at last an irrefutable rebuttal to those who have denied the efficacy of the democratic process and who would tear it down the pretext that it has collapsed or has never worked.

The money necessary for the "protection" of the lives of those Americans still in the combat area would then be voted without the haunting sense that each dollar proclaimed as protection might in fact increase the likelihood of destruction.

Mr. Chairman, Americans ought today to be feeling great pride because our fighting men gained what is called a great victory in a battle in Vietnam.

Instead, many millions of Americans feel a gnawing and growing wound at their heart, because in fact several hundred more of our finest young men have become casualties in what must be the most irrelevant battle in our history since the Battle of New Orleans. How bitter the taste—and the fruits—of such a "victory" at such a price.

But what is most tragic about this "victory" is that the Battle of Hamburger Hill is simply a concentrated dose of what goes on all the time in less concentrated form, what goes on pointlessly, dangerously, and apparently interminably.

So the moment of "the most unacceptable of alternatives" has now arrived as expected, and once again we are asked for new funds to fight more such battles, to seek more such "victories" on the fevered road to disaster.

And since the withdrawal of American troops has not begun, since the President has not felt he could state the national goals in Vietnam in a fashion that would suggest that the beginning of such withdrawal is imminent since we still seem unwilling to use negotiations to pursue those things that are negotiable—above all, since military commanders still feel

free to spill unmeasured blood to gain transient possession of distant hilltops—in these circumstances, I am convinced that to vote more money is to squander more lives.

I cannot believe that anyone here or anywhere else thinks that it is in the national interest to continue this war, to pile up more bodies on more Hamburger Hills. But that is what we authorize when we vote more money at this bloody moment.

We do not "strengthen our bargaining position" by such a vote, on the contrary, we make it less likely that the President will read correctly the national will to get out of Vietnam. We give the green light, in fact, to the continuation of the policies that have led to all this unredeemable slaughter.

Many of us will not do this. We will vote to save American lives. We will vote to salvage the security and honor of the Nation. The only way to do that under the present circumstances is to vote "no" on this appropriation and on all subsequent appropriations to prosecute the war. We vote no with the prayer that these votes will help persuade the President to reverse the course before the national unraveling becomes irreversible.

If the Congress abdicates its obligation to make this judgment on the national policy, it will do so to the peril of this country that we love next only to liberty and justice themselves.

So it seems to me that this is the place and this is the moment to say "No; not another dollar—not another profligate expenditure of lives. Begin instead today the withdrawing of troops, the de-Americanizing of the war, and begin at home with the pressing national agenda so long and so dangerously deferred and already so difficult to address." Then we can close ranks in support of the President, in support of his negotiators. We can vote the money for the closing-out in Vietnam and for the starting-in at home. We can offer protection for the South Vietnamese Government against massacres during transition if it will seek peace, or we can depart and let it tend to its own future if it prefers to fight. We can, in short, stop imposing a government on the people of South Vietnam and a war on the people of that country and our own.

I concluded my remarks here on March 26 by reading something that had been said by Senator Robert F. Kennedy a year ago. I read it again now haunted by the sense that grows more prophetic with each tragic day:

I am concerned . . . that the course we are following at the present time is deeply wrong . . . I am concerned that, at the end of it all, there will only be more Americans killed, more of our treasure spilled out, and because of the bitterness and hatred on every side of this war, more hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese slaughtered; so that they may say, as Tacitus said of Rome: "They made a desert and called it peace." I don't think that's satisfactory for the United States of America. I do not think that is what this country stands for.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

May 21, 1969

H 3911

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, in March of 1968 the American people made emphatically clear that they no longer would support a government that persisted in the further prosecution of the Vietnam war.

Here we are today—15,000 American lives and \$27 billion later—being asked to approve more money for more killing in Vietnam. May I respectfully submit that the new administration and this Congress have failed the American people.

Earlier this year, I said on the floor of this House that I will oppose any appropriations for the further prosecution of the Vietnam war—that I will not vote a single dollar for more killing. The manner in which this supplemental appropriations bill is presented does not permit a separate vote on title I which is devoted exclusively to military operations in Southeast Asia. There are non-military appropriations in this bill which deserve support but we are told that such items are inseparable from the war appropriation. I resent the intention and effect of such a procedure. I do not think it shows proper respect for those Members who deeply oppose our involvement in Vietnam and I regret to say that it appears to show a contempt for the outrage and agony that the American people feel over the continuation of this unconscionable war.

It is because of this procedure, knowing that any amendment to strike title I from this bill will fail, that I have no alternative but to vote "No" against the entire appropriations bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ECKHARDT TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RYAN

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ECKHARDT to the amendment offered by Mr. RYAN: Strike out lines 1 through 5 on page 3.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, for at least 2 years now I have had deep concern about our involvement in Vietnam. I feel most sincerely that what we have been doing has many mistaken premises and has extended beyond reasonable bounds activity of the U.S. Government which is our benefit. Nevertheless, I have voted for all appropriations which included support of the troops in Vietnam. I have come to the point today, however, where I feel so strongly, along with some of my colleagues who have spoken here before, that I must express my protest against a wrongness of direction and a wrongness of pumping funds into that area.

Yet I am not willing to vote for an amendment that would strike all of title I, which includes military personnel, Army; military personnel, Navy; military personnel, Air Force; and also includes operation and maintenance, Army, Marine Corps, and Air Force, because I feel that many of these items necessarily must be spent or have been spent with respect to the necessary requirements of the personnel in the field.

However, I note that the items involved for military personnel, Army, are at \$110

million; Navy, \$14,500,000; Air Force, \$115 million; and then operations, \$96,310,000.

Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps, \$15,390,000.

Operation and maintenance, Air Force, \$242,700,000.

But the procurement item is far greater than any of these items and is \$640,100,000. The procurement item is largely prospective, and I believe that this is the place at which we should make our point, that continuation of procurement, in order to prosecute an effort on the part of the United States that is harmful, in my opinion, to the Nation, that that amount of procurement in this bill should be cut out as a strong statement against continuation of the war unchanged and unabated. For that reason I have offered the amendment to the amendment which would cut out the prospective portion of title I, the procurement section.

I would appreciate an "aye" vote. I believe this is a proper way to show we want to turn around, but at the same time we would not be withdrawing support of men in the field at this time.

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

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding, and I commend him for the amendment he has offered. It offers a welcome opportunity for those of us who want to register at this time our strong feelings against the Vietnam war, and our belief that scaling down of the violence will help produce peace. I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, as well as the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. There is plenty of money already available to do whatever is necessary to provide the forces now in Vietnam with what they need.

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

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

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record as concurring in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. To my mind it makes good sense.

I do not think we should deny to our soldiers medical care, food, clothing, and housing. I do not think we should deny the needs of our personnel who are in the armed services, deny them the necessities of life.

However, I believe we can pretty well make evident our feeling insofar as the continuing of the Vietnam war; make evident this concern by concurring in this amendment and voting for this amendment. As I said before, it makes good sense and it is about time we turned over the fighting of this war to the Vietnamese.

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

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I congrat-

ulate the gentleman and associate myself with his remarks.

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

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to restate the thrust of the amendments before us. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York would eliminate the possibility of providing additional weapons and equipment for the South Vietnamese forces and thereby limit their effectiveness in battle. Most importantly the amendment would make it more difficult for the Vietnamese to assume a greater part of the role in Vietnam which they now are prepared to do and have shown the ability to do. This is something we have long desired.

The amendment to strike title I offered by the gentleman from New York would simply, in addition to eliminating weapons and equipment for the South Vietnamese and replenishment of our own depleted combat stocks, which is badly needed, would have a further very serious and undesirable effect. It also cut off the pay—listen to this—cut off the pay of the members of the armed services who are on duty in Southeast Asia. Regardless of intent, this would be the effect of the amendment.

Is that what we want to do?

We are being asked to show a vote of no confidence in the men who literally are fighting and dying for this country. This amendment truly would jerk the rug out from under them.

Just a little while ago we were being told that all the Communists wanted was to have us stop the bombing and they would be ready for realistic steps for peace. The bombing was stopped a year ago. What happened? Nothing. The Allied forces have been subjected to offensive after offensive, and the negotiations which have been in progress for months in Paris are still fruitless.

There still are requirements for the war in Vietnam which must be met. There is no way to avoid our own responsibilities.

That is why these amendments should be rejected, and they should be rejected overwhelmingly.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to the debate in favor of the amendment. I felt the arguments made were not even worthy of being debated. It is an extremely serious matter to challenge the provision of the weapons and supplies needed in Vietnam. We must support our troops there to the full extent of our ability and we must strengthen the troops of the Government of South Vietnam so that they can assume the major role in the defense of their country.

This is a supplemental appropriation. We are proposing to give the fighting

May 21, 1969

men the material they need to work with. The \$640 million recommended in Army procurement includes over \$393.7 million for our own men, \$338 million of which is for ammunition. Over \$246 million is to provide for going ahead with phase I and phase II of modernizing and equipping the Vietnamese so they can take over more of the war effort, and we can bring our boys home sooner.

This is what the \$640 million is for.

And we are replenishing the equipment destroyed in the Communist's Tet offensive of last year.

We are replenishing some funds we had to spend because the North Koreans became more aggressive in their actions, and seized the U.S.S. *Pueblo*.

I cannot understand why we should support amendments to abandon the responsibilities that we have supported with our wealth and with the lives of fine Americans. Therefore, I oppose the amendment to the amendment, and I oppose the amendment. I believe we should go ahead and make this appropriation for our military operations in Southeast Asia.

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

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I am informed by the staff of the Appropriations Committee that there are unobligated funds in the Army procurement appropriations of \$3.9 billion. Would that not be adequate to cover the \$600 million sought to be stricken out by this amendment?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. At this point in time, the Army is operating under deficiencies in some appropriations. On May 5 of this year, the Deputy Secretary of Defense sent a letter to Congress notifying us that in military personnel and operations and maintenance they were operating in a deficiency condition. This is not true of the procurement account in which funds remain available until expended, but as the gentleman knows—he is a member of the Appropriations Committee—the funds which are unobligated are committed to specific programs and have been taken into account in arriving at the sum now recommended.

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

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment to the amendment in order that it may be offered at the proper time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I speak not critically either of President Johnson or of President Nixon, and perhaps at the same time critically of both of them. I believe they are using their best judgment in this situation. They are both in a better position, or should be, to know what is needed under the circumstances than are we. For this reason

I think the supplemental appropriations as requested should be supported.

I think it is regrettable that we in the Congress, as the elected Representatives of all the people, have no real control over the expenditures of lives in Vietnam. This is not a declared war; it is a conflict which has gone on for some years; so it cannot be said to be a temporary, emergency, expediency measure.

I am further concerned, Mr. Chairman. It seems to me I recall that a few years ago under the administration of President Johnson an announcement was made that draft calls would be drastically reduced. I think they were cut in half. It seems to me that announcement preceded an election by not very much. I know that my phone rang constantly at the same time, and almost every reservist throughout my district was called up—without the benefit of a press release.

I am concerned at this time, Mr. Chairman, because I hear rumors that 50,000 men may be coming home, and the July draft call may be drastically reduced. I have just been home. I was getting, at one point, three telephone calls an hour from men who might be drafted in June. The size of the May and June draft callups are not the subject of euphoric press releases.

This is a matter that concerns me. I hope we in the Congress can find some way better to control the expenditures of manpower in this country.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

Let us make it clear at the outset that I do not intend in any way to short-change our fighting men in Vietnam. During the many years that I have had the privilege of serving in this House, I have consistently supported the requests of the Department of Defense, but I think the time has come when we in the Congress must exercise our responsibility to see to it that the Department of Defense is brought to task and required to justify its expenditures. For too long a period of time, Defense officials have come before us in a high and mighty fashion saying in effect, "Unless you give us every dollar that we ask for, either in the regular Defense budget or, if we miss the mark, in our supplementals, you are not being loyal to your country and you are not being loyal to the proper defense of your country." I believe this is nonsense. I think the defense of the United States is the absolute first priority of all of us in this Nation, but that does not mean that I have to put a rubber stamp of approval on every appropriation request of the Department of Defense. If we study their actions in recent years, we will see that the mark has been missed many, many times. Again, I say that we in Congress must compel the Defense Department to stop the loose spending and in some instances the squandering of billions of the taxpayers' dollars.

Today we are talking about a request for \$1.2 billion. We are now being told

that if we do not appropriate this money we are jeopardizing our entire effort in Vietnam. Mind you, with a budget in the neighborhood of \$90 billion, the Defense Department is telling us that without this money it cannot afford to conduct operations in Southeast Asia. I believe that it can. I believe the Defense Department can tighten up. Most importantly of all, I think the success of this amendment will serve as notice to the Department of Defense that the Congress intends to exercise its rights and to perform its function by requiring that the taxpayers' money be accounted for properly.

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

Mr. GIAIMO. I am delighted to yield to my chairman.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman well knows that all of the funds requested by the Department of Defense last year were cut by more than \$5 billion. In the request which is before us, in the title we have up now, the Committee on Appropriations recommended, and the amount contained in the bill represents, a cut of \$262.9 million. In the entire bill there is a cut of \$559 million below the budget request for the military. So this is not by any means a rubber stamping of the requests that have been made. I thought in connection with the gentleman's statement that this fuller statement might be made.

Mr. GIAIMO. I understand, Mr. Chairman. While I realize that this is only the first step in the progress of this supplemental appropriation bill, I sincerely believe that the time has come for us to take a stand in the Congress to compel the DOD to be more responsive to the will of the American people and to the will of the Congress. In my opinion, the passage of this amendment is the only way in which this can be accomplished.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment do now close.

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

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SIKES) there were—ayes 25, noes 140.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROCUREMENT
PROCUREMENT OF EQUIPMENT AND MISSILES,
ARMY

For an additional amount for "Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army", \$640,100,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ECKHARDT

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ECKHARDT: On page 3, strike lines 1 through 5.

May 21, 1969

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

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment that was offered a moment ago but, technically, since it was offered to a motion to strike out all of the title, there was no amendment that was appropriate to be offered at that time. So, I withdrew it and I am reoffering it at this time.

Much of the debate and opposition to the first amendment went to the argument that we should support the men overseas, to which I agree, and I, therefore, voted against the first amendment. This is an amendment which in nowise jeopardizes the position of our men overseas. It merely calls a halt to the mad armaments spending in a war halfway around the globe, which constitutes most of title I of this bill.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge that the Members vote in support of the striking of the sum of \$640 million for procurement, which is prospective for the obtaining of further military materiel, to continue a war which we hope will close, and we should be doing everything we can to close it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago in an interchange with the gentleman from California (Mr. LIPSCOMB), I made the point that the staff of the Committee on Appropriations had informed me that there were unexpended funds in this item of \$3.9 billion. That point has been verified. There are unobligated and unexpended funds of that amount in this item.

It is true, I am told, that they have been programed, but the fact remains that they are not expended, nor are they obligated at the present time.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. If the gentleman will yield, there is a further point that the gentleman should make, and that is that they are committed funds.

Mr. ECKHARDT. There is nothing that we commit that we may not uncommit by this amendment.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I suggest that there is a serious incongruity among those who, on the one hand, say that we have got to get out of Vietnam, and that we have got to turn more of this war over to the South Vietnamese and then proceed to support this amendment which would deny equipment to South Vietnam. They are biting off their noses to spite their faces, because this \$640 million when broken down shows \$393 million for U.S. forces in South Vietnam to replace the equipment that is being used up so very rapidly in the toughest war we have ever fought, and the other \$294 million would go to buy military equipment for the South Vietnamese forces. This amount, when broken down, shows \$80 million for ammunition, \$2.6 million for weapons, and other combat vehicles, \$9.7 million for tactical support vehicles, \$17.3 million for communication and electronic equipment, and \$53 million for other support equipment.

How in the world can you say on the one hand that you want the South Vietnamese to take a bigger share of fighting in this war—and I support that position, and so does the President, and so do most of the Members of the Congress—how can you say on the one hand that you want the South Vietnamese to take on a bigger responsibility in the prosecution of this war and then not give them equipment with which to wage the war?

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that this amendment should be rejected by the overwhelming vote.

It would be my hope that the people of South Vietnam, their soldiers, and our own American soldiers who are fighting in South Vietnam in the cause of freedom, would receive renewed confidence and hope from the vote we just cast which rejected by this House overwhelmingly the previous amendment by a 6-to-1 vote, and that it would be an indication to them that we here in Congress support their struggle for freedom as we did when we overwhelmingly adopted the Tonkin Bay resolution, which put us into Vietnam in the first place.

If my memory is correct, I believe there was one dissenting vote in this Chamber, and that there were two or three dissenting votes in the other Chamber on the Tonkin Bay resolution.

Mr. Chairman, we have stood by the people of South Vietnam because we know this: the collapse of South Vietnam would only be the beginning of putting into captive bondage all the nations of Southeast Asia by the Soviet Union, just as the Communists put into Soviet bondage the captive nations of Europe and as the Soviets are now trying to put in Communist bondage and create captive nations out of all the nations in the Middle East.

Mr. Chairman, I am amazed at those who stand here today and say that they want us to get out of South Vietnam when they know that the Communists have 73 other countries on three continents earmarked for the same kind of brutal, barbaric, cruel aggression through subterfuge, and terror that they have tested for 5 years in Vietnam, and are continuing to use to this very date, if the forces of freedom should falter in South Vietnam.

I congratulate the committee for understanding the military needs of the people of South Vietnam and of the forces of South Vietnam, and if we really want the South Vietnamese to take on a bigger share of responsibilities, I suggest that you overwhelmingly reject this amendment.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. From the figures given by the gentleman from Illinois and the figures given by the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Florida, it is perfectly obvious that if this amendment is approved as offered by the gentleman from Texas you will slow down and materially hinder and hamper the effort to give greater responsibility to the South Vietnamese.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Precisely.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Therefore, I hope that for the benefit of the American military forces in South Vietnam that the amendment is defeated.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and on this title do now close.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and on this title close in 5 minutes, and that the 5 minutes be given to the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON).

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, I deeply appreciate the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations suggesting that I be given the 5 minutes, but I am sure we all recall that on the Tonkin Bay matter, we had all of 60 minutes and we spend less than 2 hours annually discussing these matters in Committee of the Whole. My point or inquiry, Mr. Chairman, is if you really think 5 minutes is adequate time to discuss the pending matter?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Texas please repeat his motion.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and on amendments to title I close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has noted the names of Members standing to be recognized under the limitation of time.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, we have heard this old saw every time a supplemental appropriation comes before us, that but for these few billions of added dollars that was not anticipated—but for the approval of these few billions—all the American effort is going down the drain.

We have heard the old saw today that finally we are going to turn over the fighting to the South Vietnamese, if only we approve of this supplemental appropriation.

What absolute nonsense. The fact of the matter remains that we have uncommitted funds right now, if the Department of Defense wanted to use these funds, to arm or to train or to do whatever, with the South Vietnamese Army, and they could spend all the required money even if we do not do a darn thing but reject the pending proposal.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment so that we can reduce our excessive military expenditures on this occasion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN).

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I feel like Alice must have in Wonderland. Or maybe Rip Van Winkle. We talk as if nothing goes on outside this room. We talk as if it were 5 years ago. We talk nonsense in circles—vicious circles.

Outside this room this country spirals into worsening crisis. We are impervious. We debate the longest war in our history, the most disputed adventure of our national experience, for half an hour. Thirty minutes. Then time is up. But if we cannot discuss these matters here, where can we? What is it we are so busy doing here?

Various Members have proclaimed today that we have an obligation to the Americans in Vietnam. That is one point we can all agree about: we have an obligation to the Americans in Vietnam. We have an obligation to the integrity of this Nation. That obligation is not met by abdication of the functions of the supreme legislative body of the greatest democracy on earth. It is not met by quartermaster-like issuing of ever more money to fight this pointless war which cannot be won and which is destroying national unity, poisoning the national purpose, crippling the national interest.

Does anyone still believe that voting supplemental funds to make possible supplemental Hamburger Hills will save American lives? Will increase the national security? Does anyone believe the Duke of Wellington is Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff? Can all us Alices leave Wonderland long enough to face the consequences of acting on this proposal by rote, by slogan, by habit, while all around us men and women in ever-less-quiet desperation and ever-larger numbers despair of the democratic process and despair for the sanity of the Nation. If we cannot stop long enough to debate, can we at least stop long enough to think?

Mr. Chairman, that is what this vote is all about.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER).

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I have participated in the very limited way that has been possible in this debate as it has recurred from time to time on the floor. I think every time I have had a chance to speak on this subject the time has been restricted to 1 or 2 minutes. I have been thoroughly unimpressed with the role of the committee in affording any direction other than to rubberstamp, essentially, the policies of the President. At some point the House of Representatives, if it is going to stand on its own feet and exercise its constitutional responsibilities, ought to face the policy questions involved here much more squarely than has happened in the past.

I do not believe that the Vietnam war has proven to be a wise venture. I take it from the actions and speeches of many of the Members here today that they think it has been a great venture for the American people. They support it. They are prepared to involve us in more Vietnams in neighboring countries in Southeast Asia. I deeply regret that we do not

have more time to discuss these questions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN. An appropriation bill is indeed the only opportunity which we have to vote on the fundamental policy inherent in the Vietnam war. I would like to point out, with respect to the question of military personnel which was raised earlier, that the funds under title I are intended to cover and pay for increased deployment to Southeast Asia of some 17,400 Army personnel. According to the testimony of Gen. L. B. Taylor, director of Army budget, on page 361 of the hearings, and very significantly, in answer to a question posed by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ANDREWS) which was:

Do you have any plans to send any more there in the near future?

General Taylor said:

I think it goes up approximately [deletion] in the next fiscal year.

In other words, troop commitments in Vietnam will go up a certain number in the next fiscal year, according to General Taylor. Yet we do not have the benefit of knowing how many additional servicemen are scheduled for Southeast Asia because that has been deleted or censored by the Pentagon.

Mr. Chairman, I again urge the House to exercise its proper role and make it clear to the President that this war must be brought to a prompt conclusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT).

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

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, the lack of foresight that pervades the whole philosophy of those who would go pell-mell further into a war after they get to the level where the water is reaching their nostrils is illustrated by the argument here that we are going to arm and train the South Vietnamese Army under a supplemental appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL).

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) and associate myself with their remarks. I think it is about time that we in the Congress reclaimed the prerogative of Congress to initiate and to declare war and to stop war when it becomes an insanity as is Vietnam. I think it is time that we issued our protest of the war in Vietnam in forceful terms. I think this is an opportunity for the Members of the House to make this protest heard.

Once again we are asked to acquiesce in approval of more funds for Vietnam. Contained in title I of the supplemental appropriations bill before us, this request is yet another testimonial to muddled political thinking and futile military efforts.

Again we shall hear the same chorus of voices telling us military victory is just around the corner. We know it is

not. Again we shall be assured that just a few more billion and a few more divisions are all that is needed for real power bargaining at the negotiating table. I refuse to believe it.

Once more we shall be told about viable patriotic democrats and heirs of Thomas Jefferson running the government in Saigon. We know they are a patchwork military junta whose jails are crammed with non-Communist opponents.

Still again we shall be told Ky and the Armed Forces of South Vietnam are almost ready to take over a more meaningful role in the war. I have seen too many dead Americans.

Taking all these factors into full consideration, I emerge with one major conclusion—that this war is a civil conflict where we can only continue to waste our substance in vain. Further, that we are only pouring good men and money down a bottomless drain.

I feel we have reached a point where the military of our own country must be curbed and held in tether. Also, their never-ending sources of national funds must be choked off, and there is no better time or place for it to begin than right here and now.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. OTTINGER).

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, our colleague (Mr. PUCINSKI), related the fact of the overwhelming support of Congress for the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. Since that time a great many Americans and a great many Members of this Congress have felt that the policies then approved have proved to be bankrupt.

It is time that we reverse the inexorable increase in the amount we give to the military to prosecute the war and to ever expand it; it is time to stop pouring billions after billions of dollars down the bottomless pit of the military, especially when the military comes to us in this Congress and deliberately falsifies information and seeks to deceive us as it did in the case of the C-54 cargo plane. We simply can no longer take at face value that everything the military describes as "essential" is in fact essential.

We are now spending \$82.5 billion on the military. This constitutes some 60 percent of our free funds, not committed to payment of interest on the national debt. This is the largest and fastest rising item in the budget. Its rise must stop.

Many of us feel that the national security of our country is more threatened by internal explosion than by external invasion. A far greater proportion of our free funds must be devoted to education, job training, housing, and our environment if we are to survive. It is past time that we reverse the trend toward an ever larger war in Vietnam and an ever larger military commitment, all made perversely in the name of "peace."

This increase is a good place to start.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILBERT).

May 21, 1969

H 3915

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I voted for the Ryan amendment to eliminate title I of the supplemental appropriations bill. I felt a vote for tile I is a vote to continue the unpopular war in Vietnam. My support of the Ryan amendment is meant to indicate the dissent in my district and in the country. People are opposed to the Vietnam war, and we in Congress must make every effort to appeal to the President to take steps to end the war. Our best way in Congress to support our troops, is to withdraw them, as I proposed just a few days ago in a resolution introduced in Congress with several of my colleagues. In supporting the Ryan amendment, I have attempted to register my protest, and that of my constituency, over any action to prolong fighting in Vietnam.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM).

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would think Members of this House would have learned something from the events of the past year and a half: That the intensity of the fighting in Vietnam does not bring peace closer, but that restraint does.

We would not even be negotiating as we are today in Paris if President Johnson had not shown restraint by stopping the bombing of North Vietnam. Support of this amendment would indicate support of the idea of restraint in the future by keeping down the violence and would bring peace closer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, we are in Vietnam because of the overwhelming vote in the House and in the Senate in support of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution which put us there. America went there with its eyes open. Congress knew what the consequences would be and that it would be a tough war. Just because it has been a difficult war, they should not be coming in here whimpering to pull out.

The President was right when he said if the needless suffering continues at the hands of the North Vietnamese, we will have to reconsider our alternatives. I think there is a very good chance we may have to resume the bombing of the North. The last year during which we have had the pause in the bombing has only brought more casualties of American boys and no subsequent progress toward peace.

I believe we may very well have to resume the bombing of the North and at the same time withdraw our troops from Vietnam so that North Vietnam will realize it is in for a long bombing siege. Only then may we see some progress in Paris.

This money and equipment is needed to win the war. This war is not going to be won in this Chamber; it will be won by the fighting in Vietnam.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH).

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, it is not because this is a tough war or a hard war that I oppose it but because it is an immoral war, which is to say our involvement is politically, militarily, and economically indefensible. We therefore ought to get out of Vietnam.

The vote on this supplemental war appropriation is symbolic. If we were to vote it down, the President would know that we want a cease-fire now and a start of the withdrawal of American troops now.

This vote transcends the simple question of an appropriation; it is rather an opportunity for those who oppose the war to demonstrate their opposition.

We are told that we must vote for this appropriation in order to support our soldiers in Vietnam. I support our men in Vietnam. I want to bring them home.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN).

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, 5 years ago I remember the then Secretary of Defense and the military saying the war would be over in a couple of months. This is a broken record of constant reiteration and the war still goes on.

I think the only way we can effectively turn this war over to the South Vietnamese is by denying any further funds for procurement of materiel. There is sufficient funds in the pipeline for materiel so the Vietnamese can take over the war.

I believe this additional equipment is unnecessary to provide full protection to our present forces in Vietnam. It could only serve as a means of escalating the American presence in Vietnam and discouraging the South Vietnamese from taking over a greater degree of responsibility for the prosecution of the war.

I believe that the passage of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas to delete this \$640,100,000 would take us a significant step closer to the goal of getting out of Vietnam.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan, the minority leader (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately the amendment as drafted is sloppy and poorly put together. The net result, however, is that we are faced with whether or not we will go along with the desire of the American people to transfer to our allies, the South Vietnamese, a greater and greater share and ultimately the total burden of the fighting in Vietnam.

If we vote for this amendment, we are voting to set back and to roadblock the effort to give the South Vietnamese a greater share of the fighting. Therefore, I truly hope that the amendment, badly drafted as it is, is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LIPSCOMB).

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, the Nixon administration and the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations have examined the requests for funds for military operations in Southeast Asia and has reduced them where not essential. The Subcommittee on Defense went very deeply into the requests and reduced

over \$262 million in the revised request for procurement funds.

The amount requested in the procurement account are the very minimum needed to support not only our own effort in Vietnam, but to equip and modernize the South Vietnamese.

I ask a no vote on the amendment.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must inform the gentlewoman from New York that under the time limitation she is not eligible for recognition.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. May I ask another Member to yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The gentlewoman may ask another Member to yield.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) to close debate on the amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield my time to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CHISHOLM).

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I have just one brief statement to make, because I think most of the statements pertaining to the reasons why we should withdraw from this war in Vietnam have been made.

I speak on behalf of a minority in this country, the women and the mothers, the mothers whose sons have been lost in this war. Unfortunately, here in this body we do not have enough women to speak out on behalf of the women of this country who have been suffering as a result of the loss of their sons in this war.

I think there has to come a time when we have to recognize that we must withdraw, that we cannot continue to lose the cream of the crop of the young men in this country in a war that is unjust, a war that is highly immoral.

The mandate of the people of this country has not been paid any attention. We are supposed to be representing the people of the United States in this Chamber, and the mandate means absolutely nothing in terms of what the women of this country are speaking out about.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BURTON of California) there were—ayes 23, noes 134.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND
CONSERVATION SERVICE
SUGAR ACT PROGRAM

For an additional amount for "Sugar Act program", \$7,500,000.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I rise to ask the chairman whether the amount listed on lines 11 and 12 of page 3—"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', for 'Plant and animal disease and pest control,' includes any amount that involves the spreading of pesticides such as DDT and other non-degradable pesticides, or whether this refers only to the sterile fly program for elimination of the screw-worm referred to in the report."

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman direct his question to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture?

Mr. OTTINGER. I am glad to.

Mr. WHITTEN. This is limited to the sterilization of flies and the effort to stop the screw-worm infestation. Most of it represents money already expended under authority which permits deficit spending where life and property would otherwise be endangered.

None of it has the purpose in mind that the gentleman refers to.

Mr. OTTINGER. In that case I have no objection. Thank you.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER III
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
FEDERAL FUNDS

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For an additional amount for "Federal payment to the District of Columbia", for the general fund of the District of Columbia, \$10,365,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask someone on the Committee on Appropriations whether there are funds in this bill for the restoration of buildings that have been gutted by arson and fire and other acts of property damage at Howard University, including the destruction of a \$30,000 fire truck.

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

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

Mr. NATCHER. I would like for the gentleman to know that in this bill we have no money whatsoever for that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

MORTGAGE CREDIT

HOMEOWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

The limitation on total payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under section 235 of the National Housing Act, as amended (82 Stat. 477), is increased by \$40,000,000 and the limitation on total payments under those entered into under section 236 of such Act (82 Stat. 498) is increased by \$40,000,000.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate my support for the provision in H.R. 11400 which provides \$40 million in new contract authority for the section 235 homeownership program. I would like to have seen the Appropriations Committee approve the administration's full request of \$50 million for section 235 but the money in this bill will at least

enable the program to continue operating. It is essential that we follow up action on this \$40 million supplemental appropriation with approval later in the session of the full 1970 budget of \$100 million for section 235.

The section 235 program has only been in operation in my district since the first of the year but already it is beginning to have a significant impact. In January the Minneapolis FHA office was allocated mortgage subsidy funds for 100 homes. Within 3 months all these funds had been obligated and the office now has a waiting list of over 200 eligible families.

The Minneapolis Housing and Redevelopment Authority has found that section 235 is a particularly useful aid for moderate income families displaced by the urban renewal projects. A MHRA staff member wrote to tell me that three families relocated from a north Minneapolis renewal project had recently obtained FHA mortgages subsidized under 235:

They bought good houses—houses they could not have purchased without the subsidy. Home ownership will not be a burden because payments are related to their ability to pay. But for every home purchased, we had at least 8 inquiries. Many families are continuing to look for homes pending appropriations of more funds.

The following cases from the Housing Authority files provide interesting examples of how section 235 can make a real difference for families in need of good housing:

FAMILY "C"

Mr. and Mrs. "C" have two children, ages 3 and 2. The "Cs" purchased a FHA repossessed home in northeast Minneapolis. The home is a two story frame structure with four bedrooms, bath and kitchen, living room and dining room. It was built about 50 years ago and has been well maintained.

FHA approved a mortgage with a local savings and loan association on February 27, 1969. It was set at 7½% for \$17,300 with a \$200 down payment under Section 235. The "Cs" moved into their new home on April 1. Their share of the monthly payments is \$86.71 with a Section 235 subsidy of \$72.57 for a total of \$159.28 per month.

FAMILY "H"

Mr. and Mrs. "H" have three children, ages 10, 8 and 7. They are expecting their fourth child in August. The "Hs" bought a two-story home built in the early 1900s. A special attraction of this home is its location next to a school, so their daughter with cerebral palsy doesn't have to walk.

The "Hs" purchased their home for \$14,800. The total monthly mortgage payment is \$133.51. The "Hs" will pay \$82.15 and the government will subsidize \$51.36. The payment of \$82.15 is 20% of Mr. "Hs" adjusted monthly income. The reasonable amount of the "Hs" monthly payments should enable them to stay financially secure and build an equity from this purchase.

The human element in this new program is conveyed very effectively by a constituent who recently wrote:

I had been paying \$113.00 per month and I was only earning about \$300.00 per month for almost 10 years. With paying this much per month, I could hardly make any repairs. Things had reached the point where it was raining in every bedroom. When my children needed more and I could not keep up the payments, I was given 30 days to move out. This was the point where 235 came to my rescue.

Now with my small house, easy upkeep and the monthly payments are much less, I feel more confident in the future. I hope this greatly needed program may be expanded. I know from experience how terrible it is not to have a decent place to come home from work. When I see friends and neighbors under the conditions I was in, I feel I should try to let you know how much this can mean to people and how more should be done.

Mr. Chairman, the passage of the 1968 Housing Act held out the hope of homeownership for millions of low-income families. Now, a year later, when the initial excitement over this historic legislation has died down, it is up to us to make sure that the new housing programs really work. Unless we vote adequate funds for section 235 and the other innovative programs, the 1968 act will be nothing more than a token attempt to meet our country's critical housing needs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests, and devises of money, and other property received by each Endowment under the provisions of section 10(a)(2) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, not to exceed a total of \$3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 13, strike out all of lines 13 through 20; and on page 14, strike out all of lines 1 and 2.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, let me emphasize that this is a big bill. This is a \$4 billion supplemental appropriation bill making additions to the regular appropriation bills of last year. And, I want to underscore what the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) said earlier. He said, in effect, that these supplemental appropriation bills are coming too fast. They make meaningless the validity of the regular appropriation bills.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would strike out the \$3 million for the Arts and Humanities Foundation. I would like to ask the proponents for handing over another \$3 million to this Arts and Humanities Foundation if they have read the latest casualty figures for Vietnam war, if they have, whether they do not think it is more than slightly tragic to be spending this money for poetry reading and ballet dancing when we are in the midst of a horribly costly full-scale war in men and money. We have lost 35,000 men killed in action in Vietnam, nearly another 6,000 dead from various other causes in connection with this war and 225,000 wounded. These arts and humanities people seem to be concerned mostly with bailing out bankrupt cultural centers, such as the one in Atlanta, Ga., while the Federal debt climbs and inflation gallops on.

May 21, 1969

I remind you of the testimony of Charles Mark, the planning and analysis director of this organization. He wants this money so they can transport actors from Louisville, Atlanta, Cincinnati, and Minneapolis—among other places—to Broadway at the expense of the taxpayers. When they get there, Mr. Mark said, they will dance dances, present chamber opera, whatever that is, and give poetry readings.

Mr. Mark failed to give any testimony on the subject of where the public's money has already gone at the hands of this Arts and Humanities setup.

It would be interesting to know, too, if they plan any more grants to study Apache Indian history, or to make a computer analysis of style problems in epic poetry; or for research for a book on medieval comic opera.

Are they going to shell out more money for a study of aspects of Wordsworth's reading and writing "which have gone unnoticed or misinterpreted"?

Perhaps they have another grant in mind to study the background of 17th century members of Parliament.

Maybe they plan another grant or two for a study of the leading literary critics of the 19th century Spanish literature.

These people have never, as far as I can determine, financed a study of the flight of our gold to foreign countries, nor has there been a grant to find out what tune Nero was playing when Rome burned. Maybe we could use that tune today as a sort of a second national anthem, when we talk in terms of giving an additional \$3 million to people who engage in spending the taxpayers' money for purposes of this kind. Here is \$3 million we could save, and we had better start saving the millions or we are never going to save the billions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I will not take 5 minutes. It is not necessary, I believe, because my beloved friend from Iowa has not caught up yet with the question that he asked 3 years ago when, of all things, being from an agricultural State, he said that he did not know the difference between a bale of hay and a ballet dancer. That is rather remarkable, being from that area. One might expect that someone from Manhattan or places like that would not know that difference, at least, they would not know a bale of hay.

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that this is really a startlingly small amount of money, even though it is what was requested for matching grants. The gentleman from Iowa and some of the members of the committee might find it perfectly easy to deride such things as interpretation of poetry and 19th-century Spanish literature, or anything else that makes life beautiful.

Mr. Chairman, to equate this amount of money with what happens in Vietnam is, I believe, ridiculous. Probably this

amount of money would not even pump the water out of that submarine at Mare Island.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I will be glad to yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Well, it might help.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. It might help. It would cost, probably, much more than \$3 million to pump it out, that is true.

Mr. GROSS. I did not know in New Jersey that \$3 million could be spent on notice, but perhaps that is true.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That what?

Mr. GROSS. That \$3 million could be spent on notice, that it had any real meaning.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. This has very real meaning, I will say to my friend from Iowa. This covers the entire governmental operation with respect to those grants to the arts and the humanities, to scholarship, and to the beautiful things in life.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey. This appropriation item gives us the opportunity to get private contributions into this very important area. On another point, while the gentleman has called attention to some areas, that might be humerous to some of us, is certainly none of us would, I hope, undertake to hamstring the artists and humanists of this country by trying to circumscribe the areas in which they operate. This program has been well run. I have had an opportunity to examine its scope and operations, and I commend the great men who have administered it.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I quite agree with the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to quote a project that took place just recently in Rhode Island. It was a very healthy and excellent demonstration. As a result of funding from the arts and humanities in Rhode Island, we had a project called Discovery which visited the high schools of the entire State—the theater.

The children who were benefited by this program were very disappointed when they found out that Project Discovery might very well not be continued this year because of lack of funding.

So they put on a demonstration march to the State House hoping that the State would help to fund and that private funds would come in so that they could continue Project Discovery.

I feel that if this type of demonstration can be generated from this funding, certainly it is a healthy thing for the future of our Nation.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman has pointed out something that is very valuable, as has the majority leader.

The fact is that since the passage of this legislation nearly every State in the Union has formed its own State arts council and has turned the attention of the youngsters and of the populace of the States to the beautiful things in life. They may not have much value to some of us, but they do to me and they do to the children and they do to elderly people, such as my friend, Dr. Barnaby Keeney.

This money will generate probably three times as much as the appropriation provided for here. The Endowments on the Arts and the Humanities have done a truly magnificent job with very meager resources.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, if I understood the gentleman correctly, the possibility may be that some of our colleagues cannot distinguish a ballet dancer from a bale of hay, and I believe that this would justify a considerable expenditure for cultural enrichment.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I suppose it would.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my appreciation to the subcommittee and to the committee and my gratitude and the gratitude of our great constituencies who are interested in the arts and humanities for their work and for this very modest contribution.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the \$3 million placed in this bill is to provide for matching grants for every dollar that the Government spends here, another dollar or more of grants will be donated and used to further the program arts and humanities.

After listening to the debate a little earlier on another subject, I am just going to repeat what I said last year.

We have solved many technical problems. We have made magnificent contributions in the sciences and, yet, not yet does this Nation understand the depth of its soul. A better understanding of ourselves can be the contribution of the humanities.

To the gentleman from Iowa, may I ask, what is wrong with knowing the history—the proud history of the Apache Nation?

Mr. Chairman, I want to read a statement by a rather well-known business enterprise. A page advertisement was taken in the newspapers of the West about 3 weeks ago by the Pacific Northwest Bell.

At the top of the page appear the words "The Big Change in Arts and Culture." At the bottom it says:

Like many others in the business world today we recognize that the opportunity to enjoy the arts is an important part of the quality of living we enjoy here in the Pacific Northwest. And like any part of our environment, their growth must be nurtured and stimulated. You might say that's been our theme in this Big Change series. For what we've been saying is that the assets we have

May 21, 1969

in Washington must be matched by the deeds of men if we are all to enjoy the productive life. And that's an unchanging assignment.

I strongly urge you to defeat this amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. How about the history of the Comanches, and the Arapahos and all the rest of them—the Mohawks, the Sioux, the Cherokees, and all other Indian tribes?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. If the gentleman will yield, I think the history of every group who has been part of this country's history is part and parcel of this country's great heritage and should be more widely known. It is part of our culture.

I am personally proud to have worked with the Indian people of this Nation and to understand their role and their relationship in today's world.

Mr. GROSS. The gentlewoman in the very brief hearings that we held on this subject said it was her understanding that the appropriations—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Washington has expired.

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

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to point out to the Members on both sides of the aisle that this is a recommendation that comes from the subcommittee in unanimous fashion. We gave it what we thought was an important and extensive hearing. In our judgment, it is an item in which our Government, our Nation, our people, ought to be interested.

The question is really at what level. I believe all of us will agree that this is a minimal level of Federal funding. I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the position of the subcommittee and defeat the amendment offered by my colleague from Iowa.

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

Mr. McDADE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did not the gentlewoman from Washington, in opening the quick hearing on this \$3 million item, say that, in effect, she was surprised that they would be asking for this funding since she thought supplemental appropriations dealt with emergencies? What kind of emergency is there in this situation?

Mr. McDADE. I would say to my colleague—and the gentlewoman from Washington, of course, is able to speak for herself ably—but I would point out that this is a matching program in which we are making an effort to stimulate non-Federal funding in this area, and in order to do this we are providing funds which can be matched in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. But that scarcely makes an emergency out of this thing.

Mr. McDADE. I think we have to do it in order to stimulate the non-Federal funding. We ought at least to come forward with some Federal funding to keep faith. That is what we are doing.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDADE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. May I say that in our committee questions were asked to develop the fullest amount of information necessary to find out what the funds were designed to do. We were told that for every dollar that would be provided in the Federal funding there is more than a dollar pledged in gifts to the arts and humanities under the matching program. We did not want to appropriate more than would be necessary. We did want to know why, exactly, we needed the money at this time, and the complete answers are in the record of our hearings.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment close.

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

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON).

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

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I think that when the history books of our Nation are written, we are going to be judged not on the number of angry bombs we were able to produce, or the screaming missiles, or the whining bullets, but by what kind of culture or civilization we created.

The gentleman from Iowa mentioned Vietnam. I believe the people of this country want to acknowledge that there are more things to life than wars, and that there are the pursuits of peace, and the advantages and the blessing of peace. We would like to acknowledge that we are a humane, an interested, and an aware people.

I do not think a Congress that today is appropriating \$1.2 billion for killing has the right to turn its back on a token \$3 million for the appreciation of culture and the blessings of democracy and learning. This may seem a very paltry matter, but I think it goes to the heart of what America is and what America would like to be and what America could become if we are willing to invest our wealth in our minds and our spirits. We must not become a nation of Phillistines. We are not barbarians; we are human beings.

As one who would have chosen over Sparta, I urge the rejection of this negative amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE).

(Mr. MAYNE asked and was given

permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I would not want to take the position that \$3 million is a small amount of money, but considering the vast scope of this project, the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, this seems to me to be a very reasonable expenditure in this bill. I, therefore, speak in opposition to the amendment.

Cultural activities of this kind have never in the history of civilization operated at a profit. It has always been necessary to have either some Government subsidization or some other type of contribution from patrons or sponsors to bring great works of art and literature to the peoples of the world. This has been necessary to make progress in raising the cultural and artistic standards of the human race.

We are not talking here about some vague experimental program, but of a program which has already proved its worth operating within the confines of a relatively modest budget.

As the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) said, the arts councils have been very successful throughout the United States. I can certainly assure my colleagues that the Iowa Arts Council, under the direction of Jack E. Olds, has been an outstanding success. This has been a bipartisan effort in the State of Iowa commenced during the administration of a Democratic Governor with an appropriation of \$50,000. This year a Republican Governor has recommended an appropriation of \$61,460 and the full amount has been voted by a Republic legislature. Using State and Federal funds, the Iowa Arts Council has been able to bring great music, great literature, and great drama to every corner of the State. The 1967-68 biennium report of the council shows that 33 projects were undertaken and presented in a great majority of Iowa's 99 counties.

To mention some of these, there were performances by the Des Moines Civic Ballet at Marshalltown and Des Moines and a performance by the Dubuque City Youth Ballet Company in collaboration with the University of Northern Iowa.

An extended tour by the University of Northern Iowa Concert Chorale and Concert Band; a tour of western counties by the Iowa State Symphonic Band; recitals by the internationally known Iowa violinist, Charles Treger, the only American to win the famous Wieniawski competition in Poznan, Poland, and by Pianist David Kaiserman.

A tour of 24 communities by poets from Iowa colleges and universities who read and interpreted their poems to an estimated 5,000 high school students; a drama consultation and technical services project from Iowa State University which brought staff members as consultants to about six communities.

An artist-in-residence program which brought the celebrated painter, Marion J. Kitzman, of Iowa State University, to two communities; a touring exhibition of prints by 12 Iowa printmakers; a traveling program showing and discussing films as an art form was presented in four communities.

May 21, 1969

An Iowa designer-craftsmen touring exhibit assembled by Donn Young, director of the Cedar Rapids Art Center, which has toured 22 communities.

These are some of the extremely worthwhile programs which the Iowa Arts Council has been carrying forward with the aid of grants from the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, and from the Iowa State Legislature. Even more extensive and rewarding programs for the people of Iowa are being planned for next year, if sufficient funds such as those provided for in this bill can be made available through the Arts and Humanities Foundation. The Iowa Legislature has already done its share having appropriated the full amount of \$61,460 recommended by Governor Ray for the 1969-70 biennium. I strongly urge that this House similarly show its confidence in the worthiness of the program, by overwhelmingly rejecting this amendment, the purpose of which is to delete all supplemental funds for the Arts and Humanities Foundation.

Evidently some Members of the House are still unaware of the vigorous cultural and artistic activity which has long thrived in the State of Iowa. There has even been some intimation that one of the most beautiful of the performing arts, the ballet, is completely unknown in Iowa. Nothing could be further from the truth. In addition to fairly frequent appearances by national touring companies, a number of Iowa colleges, universities, and cities sustain their own ballet groups. I can assure the House that many Iowans know what ballet dancers look like. Thanks to the Iowa Arts Council and the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, increasing numbers of Iowans are having an opportunity to decide for themselves whether their lives are indeed enriched by the humanities and the arts. I urge all my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, the author of this amendment has said we should start with a half million dollars or with \$3 million before we can expect to save billions of dollars. The House has just rejected an opportunity to register a protest against the literally billions of dollars in waste which has been exposed in the Defense Department. Therefore, I would suggest a slogan for this amendment: "Billions for defense waste, but not one cent for what we are supposed to be defending."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross).

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross) there were—ayes 21, noes 99.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION,
AND WELFARE

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

HIGHER EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Higher educational activities", including payments authorized by section 108(b) of the District of Columbia Public Education Act, as amended

(Public Law 90-354, approved June 20, 1968), and annual interest grants authorized by section 306 of the Higher Education Facilities Act, as amended (Public Law 90-575, approved October 16, 1968), \$11,161,000, of which \$3,920,000 shall remain available until expended for said annual interest grants: *Provided*, That, in addition, \$160,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHERLE

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHERLE: On page 15, at the end of line 6, strike the period and insert the following: "*Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act for annual interest grants authorized by section 306 of the Higher Education Facilities Act, as amended by P.L. 90-575, shall be used to formulate or carry out any grant to any institution of higher education unless such institution is in full compliance with section 504 of such Act."

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am proposing would prohibit any part of the funds appropriated by H.R. 11400—under chapter VII, higher education activities found on page 14 of this supplemental appropriation bill—for the purpose of such annual interest grants to be granted to any institution which is not in full compliance with the provisions of section 504 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968.

Under chapter VII of the bill before us, Congress is asked to appropriate \$3.9 million for interest subsidy grants for college construction loans. This Federal financial assistance would result in the colleges being able to obtain an estimated \$145 million in loans from non-Federal sources.

The taxpayers have a large stock in the higher educational institutions in this country—billions of their tax dollars aid it each year. There is an urgent need for college administrators to eliminate the radical troublemakers. The clear congressional intent is that the colleges either ought to clean up their campuses or suffer the consequences.

I can think of no more powerful way to impress upon the administrators the seriousness of their failure to impose section 504 than to tell them that such failure would mean that they will not be eligible for this additional type of aid.

Section 504—Public Law 90-575—basically requires that if any student is found, after a hearing by the college or university, to have either been convicted of a crime in a court of record or violated a school regulation which was of a serious nature and contributed to a disruption which prevented his faculty or other students from attending to their duties or engaging in studies, then that student shall not be eligible for certain Federal student loan programs for at least 2 years.

Some colleges are laboring under the false impression given by former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Wilbur Cohen, who felt that enforcement of section 504 was not mandatory. However, the present Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Robert Finch, in testimony before a House Subcommittee on Special Education, of

which I am a member, on April 18, 1969, made it clear that section 504 imposed a mandatory obligation on the college. Secretary Finch said:

As with any provision of law, Section 504 demands compliance in good faith by those to whom it applies. So we expect that colleges and universities will strive in good faith to implement its provisions for aid termination where the facts disclose the "abuses" have taken place.

The amendment only requires the institution of higher education which wishes to qualify for funds under the annual interest grant program to obey the law as far as section 504 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 is concerned. Surely no institution of higher education can make any claim that it should be "beyond the law" in any respect, or that it should not have to comply with the provisions of section 504. It is in fact "bad faith" on the part of an institution of higher education if it applies for one form of Federal assistance while it is guilty of refusal or failure to comply with the requirements of the law in its administration of another Federal assistance program.

The intent of Congress that the colleges must hold hearings is most clear. Not only was it clear from the language used in section 504, but in addition the Congress last year passed substantially similar amendments to three different appropriations bills. They were the Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Act for fiscal 1969, Independent Offices Appropriation Act—Public Law 90-550—and NASA appropriation—Public Law 90-373.

This amendment does not bring the Federal Government into the field of academic discipline. It merely states that none of the funds under this section will be granted to any institution that is unwilling to comply with the present Federal law.

The amendment is important not so much in the program that it amends, but in the principle that it establishes. The relatively new and small annual interest grants program is the only rather general assistance program relating to institutions of higher education in the present bill. My amendment will help the annual interest grant program, by insuring that the limited funds will go to those institutions which are willing to help themselves and to curb the violence and disorders disrupting and in many ways destroying these institutions by using all appropriate means available, including the tools made available to these institutions by section 504 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968. Denial of an annual interest grant will not invoke serious injury upon any institution, but it would show the institutions that Congress is concerned and demands compliance with section 504 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968. The experience gained under this amendment would be of great interest when the Congress considers Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations legislation for fiscal year 1970 later this year, and when it considers other legislation in the field of Federal assistance to higher education.

May 21, 1969

In brief, my amendment simply says that section 504 of the present law must be enforced, not ignored; that the time to stop disorder on the campuses of our Nation is now, not later; and that the American people are fed up with placid college administrators who are unwilling or unable to carry out their responsibilities to their colleges, their communities, or their country.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa, he is drawing attention to section 504 of the Higher Education Act and to sections of the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill, the independent offices appropriation bill, and the Defense appropriation bill of last year which contain certain restrictive language with regard to aid to the colleges. To some extent, the gentleman's amendment merely seems to endorse the present law. I have no authority to speak for the Committee on Appropriations, but personally I do not see anything objectionable about the amendment.

I would ask, Mr. Chairman, unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be closed in 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL).

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, it disquiets me to see an effort afoot in the House to coerce universities and colleges into taking action against student protestors. Offered in the form of an amendment to the supplemental appropriations bill we are considering, it aims at a Federal intrusion onto almost every campus in the Nation, deciding who shall be penalized, and who shall not be.

Such an amendment requiring institutions of higher learning applying for Federal interest subsidies for construction projects to certify that they are complying with a legislative antidisorder measure passed by Congress last year. Here we have those who cry the loudest about Federal intervention, demanding such intervention in the worst possible manner.

Such an overshadowing Federal presence and the threat implied is the very antithesis of what Congress intentions were when Federal aid to colleges and universities was enacted into law. Shall the National Government use its freely offered aid to education to require each school to retain or expel students? Is the Government about to set up standards for scholarship as well?

Enactment of such a coercive measure would be the first step toward abrogation of all the liberties our campuses embody and teach. Academic freedom and the right to dissent will be next. This is intrusion with a vengeance.

I hold no brief for those who bring weapons onto campuses or destroy prop-

erty. I have no sympathy with those who use the right of protest to prevent the vast majority from attending classes and obtaining educations.

Simultaneously, Mr. Chairman, I am vehemently opposed to those who have so little faith in our young people, our ideals and our institutions. At the first sign of trouble, their answer is coercion, abrogation of traditional liberties and the imposition of harsh laws and harsher penalties. Already overreaction is visible in the form of midnight arrests and pounding on the door in the wee hours. This is no solution. It is the very antithesis of our country. We must not allow ourselves to be carried away by the frightened cries of those with little faith and no understanding of democracy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH).

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

Mr. KOCH, Mr. Chairman, the potential effect of this amendment is most abhorrent. It would substitute the judgment of the Secretary of HEW for that of the chancellor of every university with respect to student discipline. And cruelly, if such oversight were exercised so as to find the university chancellor derelict, then under this amendment the Federal funds granted to the university for the construction of academic facilities would be withdrawn affecting all students, good and bad alike, violent and nonviolent.

Those who have always feared the assertion of Federal power in education now seem bent on using it in a punitive manner. Students must be held responsible for their conduct—but the Federal Government has no business using its funds to play schoolmaster.

This amendment establishes an ugly precedent and I oppose it.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA).

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

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. The American people are fed up with the violence, destruction of property, intimidations, and disruptions on the college campuses. They are sick and tired of seeing their tax dollars used for purposes for which they were never intended. They are sick and tired of seeing educational facilities which they funded abused and misused for purposes for which they were never intended.

This amendment merely serves notice on the faculties and administrators that they must enforce the law on their campuses and they must put their own house in order so that academic freedom can be maintained in these institutions, so that the great majority of students who earnestly desire an education may pursue their efforts to improve their knowledge and skills in an atmosphere conducive to that goal.

This amendment is not repressive. It does not impose Federal intervention on the universities, but to the contrary will

help insure academic freedom. It should serve notice, however, to the faculties and administrators that unless they do put their own house in order and bring a halt to this nonsense, that they themselves have encouraged, that the American people will no longer stand for such actions and that this Congress will undoubtedly take far sterner measures in the event that they continue to fail to meet their responsibilities.

This is a most proper amendment and is a proper area in which this Congress can act. Certainly there is a Federal interest involved here because of the great expenditure of Federal funds in the name of higher education, and the Congress has a responsibility to see that these funds are properly used and that the facilities constructed with these funds are not destroyed or damaged.

I have been approached from several sources inquiring whether or not I would offer my bill as an amendment to this legislation, and I was also asked, in the event I did not offer my bill, if someone else offered it, would I support it as an amendment to this supplemental appropriations bill.

I informed those who made such inquiries that I would not offer my bill nor support anyone else who did in that event. While I feel very strongly on this issue, it is my feeling that the Special Subcommittee on Campus Disorders under the chairmanship of the distinguished lady from Oregon has acted very equitably and fairly in this matter.

They are conducting hearings on the issue and have been doing so for several weeks. They have afforded me an opportunity to express my views on behalf of my legislation and afforded others a similar opportunity. It is my feeling that we first should exhaust the usual legislative process before we resort to any other methods to legislate on this issue.

Therefore, I have indicated that I would not offer my legislation at this time.

I think the proper procedure is to let the committee work its will and to inquire into all the ramifications of this issue. I am convinced the committee is doing that and will come up with some suggested legislation to cope with this issue of such concern to the American people. In the event it does not, there will be ample time and opportunity to offer my legislation or other measures to cope with the situation.

I see nothing contradictory with that approach in supporting this amendment as the amendment merely clarifies existing law and tells the faculties and administrators that before they receive any future funds they must certify to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that they will comply with existing law. This is little enough to ask of these faculties and administrators, and I would hope that the committee would accept this amendment.

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

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

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

May 21, 1969

[Mr. MICHEL addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine (Mr. HATHAWAY).

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

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. As I understand, the gentleman proposes that institutions of higher education certify that they are in compliance with section 504 of the Higher Education Act and section 411 of the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Act as a prerequisite to making application for programs which will be funded under the second supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1969. As a practical matter, this will mean that institutions will be required to make this certification with respect to just one program—the program providing Federal payments to reduce interest charges on loans obtained from the private money market for the construction of academic facilities.

Mr. Chairman, the bases for my opposition to this amendment are numerous. First of all, the amendment will be most selective in its application. Under the \$3.9 million supplemental appropriation proposed for the interest subsidy program, it is estimated that less than 250 institutions of higher education, out of a possible 2,000, will be able to participate in the program. Thus, under the amendment only a small percentage of our Nation's colleges and universities will be obligated to meet the requirement mandated by the gentleman's amendment. All other institutions, many of them carrying on extensive student assistance programs, will not be required under the gentleman's amendment to file a certification of compliance.

Mr. Chairman, more objectionable than this, however, is the very dangerous precedent which this amendment would establish. Action taken last year in the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 and on the Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill was directed at disruptive students. These amendments were not directed at institutions of higher education as is the gentleman's amendment. We must not confuse our purposes for it is a much different matter to suggest that we punish colleges and universities than it is to say that we should punish students for illegal actions.

As you know, the Subcommittee on Special Education has conducted extensive hearings on the question of student unrest and, not one witness, and I include Secretary Finch and Attorney General Mitchel, has suggested that we enact legislation directed at institutions of higher education. Quite the contrary is the case. Just yesterday, Attorney General Mitchel advised us that he did not recommend any additional Federal legislation at this time. What he was saying to us is what should be repeated here today—that there is sufficient existing authority to meet the problem.

There is clearly sufficient authority to deal with any institution of higher education which refuses to comply with sec-

tions 411 and 504. There is absolutely no need to add the requirement the gentleman's amendment suggests. It can only be viewed as a totally unnecessary amendment which would be selective in its application and which would establish a most dangerous precedent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. EVANS).

(Mr. EVANS of Colorado asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. If the proponent of the amendment would answer a question, I would like to pose an inquiry. If his amendment passes, how and by whom is it going to be determined as to whether a college or university is in compliance with the laws as passed last year?

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

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHERLE. Under section 504, if they comply with the law as I indicated, there would be no problem whatsoever.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. My question is how and by whom is it determined that they are complying with the laws which have been previously passed?

Mr. SCHERLE. We leave the determination in the hands of the college administrators, exactly where it belongs, and they will have to make the determination as to whether they are in compliance with the statutes.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. When the gentleman mentions "compliance with the statutes," who will judge as to whether or not they are in compliance with such statutes under the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. SCHERLE. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will have final jurisdiction in the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE).

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

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, the statement was made a moment ago that this is punitive with reference to the penalty involved. Certainly there should be a penalty. I think it is very important that the penalty be available for use. This is exactly what it would amount to: It would leave the authorization in the colleges and universities where it belongs and all we say is, "You enforce the law." We take no jurisdiction away from them. The discretion lies in the areas of the college and university and all we are asking is that they enforce the law.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERLE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. If it remains in the hands of the office of education it would be handed over to the commissioner of education?

Mr. SCHERLE. It will rest in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. In other words, he will have jurisdiction over every college and university which receives Federal funds?

Mr. SCHERLE. No, the decision to comply with section 504 would remain with the college and university administrators. If they do not comply with the law then funds would be cut off.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. WYMAN).

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

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. It was my privilege to draft and introduce those portions of section 504 that do not relate to conviction. There is no reason why we should not now require compliance with statutes that were passed by this Congress by a vote of 6 to 1. The only action required on the part of the schools is either that someone should be convicted or that, after notice and hearing, they have been found by the school to have wilfully participated in a serious disruption of the university administration. This amendment would leave the control of the situation in the school administration where it belongs, except in cases of convictions in court, which, incidentally, I hope will be extended to include convictions for contempt of court at some later date.

Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is a worthy one in coping with some aspects of the problems which we are now experiencing at our educational institutions. This is not the complete legislative response, but it helps. In due course hopefully the subcommittee headed by the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) will present additional general legislation firmly imposing sanctions and appropriate penalties for the reprehensible deliberate insurrection we have been witnessing with dismay on too many campuses in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN).

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, section 504 was adopted by this Congress last year by an overwhelming majority. As I understand the amendment this does not cut off funds. It requires each university which wants to apply for funds to file a certificate of compliance—simply a statement to the effect that they will comply with the law.

I do not believe there is anything repressive about this; I do not believe it is punitive, but it serves notice upon the colleges and universities of this country that the Congress of the United States has a legitimate concern about the violence which is now current on our college campuses.

This Congress is concerned when advance amnesty is demanded. This Congress is concerned when it appears that

May 21, 1969

a college faculty capitulates to nonnegotiable demands at the point of gun. This Congress is concerned when the faculty of a liberal arts college of a great university votes to ask that criminal charges be dropped for over 200 students and faculty members who participated in a recent riot. This serves notice that the patience of this Congress of the American people is not unlimited. This is to serve notice to the far left that we are sick and tired of the violence we see in this country, and that this Congress is determined to do whatever it can to see that it is stopped. This is to serve notice to the small minority in the SDS, in the Black Panthers that this country will not tolerate the tyranny of the minority.

My committee, I believe, will have other legislation that we hope will be helpful in this situation. I hope that it will be considered in an atmosphere that is calm—that reason will prevail. I will not support legislation that will fall into the plans of the militants. I hope that this legislation will come to the floor of this House within the next few weeks. But I say that I see nothing repressive about the amendment that has been offered today, and I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania to close the debate.

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 made many important advances in our efforts to provide good housing and good neighborhoods for all of our citizens. There is nothing in the 17 titles of that bill, however, that is more important than the new interest subsidy programs designed to foster homeownership for families which could not otherwise afford it and a greatly expanded rental housing program. We all know the basic role which homeownership plays in our American way of life by giving families a sense of pride and dignity, a sense of responsibility for the community in which they live, and a sense of participation. The benefits of this aid for homeownership will go far beyond the individual families which receive them.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the Committee on Appropriations for the positive approach which they have displayed on most items in the complex supplemental appropriation request. At the same time I deeply regret that they failed to authorize the full \$50 million request for each of the interest subsidy programs. I am hopeful that the other body will grant the full request and hold it in conference. Another reduction which deeply concerns me is the complete elimination of the modest request for funds to enable HUD to carry out its extensive responsibilities under the fair housing legislation. The \$2 million requested in this supplemental is sorely needed for responsible administration of these duties. Again I am hopeful that the other body will include the full amount in its bill. In addition we should all stand behind the budget requests for the

coming fiscal year which contains the full authorization for interest subsidies in the amount of \$100 million for each of the programs. In the case of fair housing funds, I am hopeful that the committee can be persuaded that the original budget proposal of \$14 million is fully justified.

Mr. Chairman, there is an urgent need to move ahead with housing legislation already on the books. My Subcommittee on Housing recently concluded hearings on our national housing goals and the witnesses were unanimous that these goals can be met if our existing authorizations are fully and promptly funded. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill today so that we can get on with the job of providing a good home and a decent environment for every American family.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE).

The amendment was agreed to.

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 14, delete lines 24 and 25 and on page 15, delete lines 1 and 2 and the first four words on line 3 and insert in lieu thereof: "\$7,241,000".

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this amendment eliminates the permission to begin a new program of interest subsidies for college construction in this supplemental bill. The bill carries \$3.9 million for this purpose. The Department has stated that if this permission is approved it will withhold direct loans from appropriations that have already been made for this fiscal year for the purpose of college construction.

Under this new program that they propose to fund, either colleges, junior colleges that are now being built, and universities, will sell bonds, and the Government will pay the interest above 3 percent. They do not propose to sell below face value in order to give an effective yield at the going rate of interest, and the Government pay the difference between the return and the face value, but instead to merely pay 1 year of the subsidy now, and then to go in debt for the rest, and pay it each year over a 35-year period.

So we see that obviously this is a gimmick to avoid the limitation in the Expenditure and Control Act of last year, or a gimmick to avoid the Mahon amendment limitation in this very same bill.

This proposition will cost \$140 million, but only \$3.9 million shows up in the budget, and we go into debt for the rest. This is only part of an overall plan that has been explained to us. In fiscal year 1970, they propose to spend \$7 million under the interest subsidy programs and to substitute that completely for the program of direct loans and grants to 4-year colleges. In other words, there will be no direct grants and no direct loans for

undergraduate and graduate schools if we approve this approach.

Now in the two bills—\$3.9 million plus \$7 million plus a second year payment of \$3.9 million is all that shows up.

The cost of the Government is \$440 million. But all that shows up in the budget is about \$15 million and we will pay the rest over a period of 35 years.

This is deficit financing and backdoor financing and defeats the limitations in the Bow and Mahon amendments and in addition to that it makes the time that we spent on debt limitation bills a waste of time.

To make it more palatable, now they call this, "relying more on the public sector." But a rose by some name is still a rose. No matter what they call it. It is nothing but deficit financing.

I would not mind so much if we did not hurt junior colleges and colleges and universities at the same time.

I was on this subcommittee chaired by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) when we developed the legislation that finally became this Higher Facilities Act. I thought we were trying to help the colleges, but now this is to be turned into a bill for the relief of investment bankers and it is not going to give the aid needed to the colleges.

The colleges face about a 50 percent or more increased enrollment in the next 7 or 8 years. They have already engaged in selling as many bonds as they feel they can market with the full interest rate. In addition to that, they need to get some grants and some direct loans to supplement what they can raise through contributions.

I think it is an involved subject and if we are going to substitute completely an interest subsidy program for the good college grant and direct loan programs, it should not be in a supplemental and it should be fully discussed here.

If we do not carry this amendment, then these debt limit bills, limitations on expenditures and the Expenditure Control Act, and the Nixon budget, which claimed a \$4 billion reduction, all are as phony as a \$3 bill.

If my amendment does not pass, the cost to the Federal Government will be more, most of the cost will be hidden and colleges will be in worse financial condition.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Mr. Chairman, it pains me that I must oppose my colleague on my subcommittee who is generally my strong right arm.

The facts are these. Congress authorized this method of financing in Public Law 90-575, approved just last October 16; so Congress is on record as being for it. The exact number of dollars and appropriation language that is in the bill was requested of the Congress by the Johnson administration; so the Johnson administration was for it. It was approved by the present Nixon administration; so they are for it. Of course, it would not be in the bill if the Committee on Appropriations were not for it.

Thus, under no circumstances will the appropriation circumvent the Mahon

May 21, 1969

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 3923

and Bow expenditure limitation proposal which applies to the 1970 budget.

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

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Is it not true that the force and effect of this amendment would be to return to Treasury borrowing?

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct.

Mr. JONAS. And that it would require the Treasury to go out into the market and borrow \$145 million for a program which we can handle in the way the committee proposes to handle it.

Mr. FLOOD. The only thing wrong with that statement is that I did not think of it. That is absolutely correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Office of the Speaker: From and after March 1, 1969, the basic annual lump-sum ceiling allowance applicable under this appropriation is hereby increased by \$2,230.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NATCHER: On page 16, strike out line 16 through 19, inclusive.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, this line item is no longer necessary. The amendment meets with the approval of the Speaker.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask why this item is being stricken.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. When the committee met, we were requested by the Speaker to increase the basic lump-sum ceiling allowance for his office. Since that time the Speaker has lost his most valuable "right arm," his former administrative assistant, and has now promoted his legislative assistant to that position. The situation has changed and there is now no occasion for the item. I believe the gentleman would agree.

Mr. GROSS. I agree and I appreciate the gentleman's explanation.

Now that we are on the subject of a pay increase, and since there are salary increases on almost every page of this bill, and it is hard to pull together in any one place information with respect to them, let me ask the gentleman this question: Where are the funds for the pay increases for the Members of Congress that went into effect recently?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Page 23, in another section of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Page 23, line 12.

Mr. GROSS. Page 23, line 12; and this is for what period of time for Members of the Congress?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. To the end of the current fiscal year, that is, to midnight of June 30, 1969.

Mr. GROSS. Are there any funds in this bill, is there any forward funding in the bill providing pay increases for the leadership of the House and the other body? Are there any funds in this bill at all for the possible funding of the increase contained in the bill that passed the House and then was shelved in the Senate?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I again refer the gentleman to the figure on line 12, page 23, for the same period of time, for the rest of this fiscal year.

Mr. GROSS. For forward funding of the legislation that was passed by the House and that is now gathering dust over in the Senate? Surely there is no funding for the leaders' pay increase which has not been authorized.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Yes, it is in there.

Mr. GROSS. In the bill we are considering?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. You are putting up the money without an authorization?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. We held these hearings over 2 months ago, and inserted the funds to carry out the bill which had passed the House at the time. I should add, of course, that the funds cannot be paid unless the House bill passes the Senate and becomes law.

Mr. GROSS. How much other money is there in this bill on the basis of forward funding for items that have never been authorized by the Congress?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Referring to the bill in question, one-third of the annual amount involved. The actual amount would be \$19,835.

Mr. GROSS. One-third of the annual amount involved?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. For these particular jobs.

Mr. GROSS. For these particular jobs?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. That is correct.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. The funds cannot be expended unless they are authorized. There is some money here in anticipation of authorization. That money remains in the bill, but as final action has not been taken on the legislative authorization, it is still alive as an issue, and there is nothing to be gained by striking this from the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Then this is not even a supplemental appropriation bill? Is this the procedure of the House Appropriations Committee to put in the supplemental bills funds for items that are not even authorized by Congress?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, we have not had a situation like this since I have been on the committee. This is the last supplemental bill for the current year and the last opportunity for the committee to fund these increased salaries—if the bill becomes law. The funds are in here on that contingency.

Mr. GROSS. If the leader's pay in-

crease becomes law, there would be every opportunity to bring a bill to the House floor.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I hope this will be the last supplemental bill for this fiscal year.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman mean it could not put it in a regular appropriation bill?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. We will not have another one affecting this particular subject.

Mr. GROSS. Will we not have a house-keeping bill before this session is over?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Gross was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, we will not have an appropriation bill for the legislative establishment for the remainder of this fiscal year. I doubt if we will get the regular legislative bill for fiscal year 1970 on the floor before the 1st of July.

Mr. GROSS. This is a most unusual procedure, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I say to the gentleman this is the first time we have had a situation like this since I have been on the committee. The money cannot be spent, and will revert to the Treasury if the bill now pending before the other body does not become law.

Mr. GROSS. If it is not acted upon by July 1.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. That is correct. The extra funds can only be used if the bill pending in the other body becomes law.

Mr. GROSS. Then what is the gentleman going to do if the bill subsequently is passed?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. We will not have anything to act on.

Mr. GROSS. After July 1, if the bill subsequently is passed by the other body, then what will the gentleman do in order to get the money for the leadership?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. We are meeting that contingency, making provision for that contingency in this bill. I say to the gentleman that this is the last opportunity this fiscal year that we will have to fund the increased salaries if the bill becomes law and the salaries are increased. If the bill does not become law, then the money will not be spent.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

For an additional amount for "Administering the public debt", \$1,978,000; (and release of \$334,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee about the increase of nearly \$2 million—apparently it becomes more than \$2 million if we take into account the release of other funds—for the Bureau of Public Debt. Why would there be a supplemental in this regard?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEED. In this item of operation in the Government there are certain fees they have to pay to the Federal Reserve Banks and to the commercial banks throughout the country for services rendered in the cashing of bonds and other transactions. The major part of this item here is what is needed to finish paying the claims they will have for the remainder of this fiscal year. The volume of this sort of business is turning out to be considerably more than the original estimates over a year ago.

Mr. GROSS. So the debt is going up? Is that what the gentleman is saying and increasing the business of the Bureau of the Public Debt?

Mr. STEED. Some of this item could be attributed to the fact that the debt has gone up. Most of it is in the item of reimbursement we make to the Federal Reserve Banks and to the commercial banks for various services they perform for the Treasury Department.

Mr. GROSS. But that deals with the Federal debt. What is the total appropriation for the operation of the Bureau of the Public Debt? What is the annual cost this one agency of the Government to administer what it does with respect to the Federal debt?

Mr. STEED. I think, with the approval of the supplemental, it will bring the total cost for this item for this year to \$58 million.

Mr. GROSS. Between \$58 million and \$60 million, is that correct?

Mr. STEED. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. It seems to me the \$3 million which was just approved for culture could very well have been used to take care of the running expenses of the Bureau of the Public Debt. The public debt now is around \$370 billion. Is the interest alone on the debt about \$16 billion a year? What is the latest figure?

Mr. STEED. The interest on the public debt for the coming fiscal year is estimated to be \$17.3 billion.

Mr. GROSS. \$17.3 billion. It is going up fast. So is the cost of administering it. I can remember when that cost was down to around \$20 million. Does the gentleman remember that?

Mr. STEED. It has gone up \$300 million in the estimate since last January.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS
Compensation of Members, \$1,975,000;
SALARIES, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES
"Office of the Speaker", \$4,015;
POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 23, lines 12, 13, and 14, on the ground that, as admitted by the committee, this contains moneys to be appropriated that have not been authorized by Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inquire: Does the gentleman's point of order refer to lines 12, 13, and 14?

Mr. GROSS. Lines 11, 12, 13, and 14.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman, I believe, does not seek to reduce funds for the Office of the Speaker, as shown on line 14. The gentleman is, I believe, only referring to the pay increase for the Speaker and other Members—the item on line 12.

Mr. GROSS. Very frankly, I do not know which one of these line items contains all the funds, so I am just trying to take as much as I can to be sure I get the funds covered. If the gentleman will tell me what line they are in I will amend my point of order, with the permission of the Chair.

Mr. MAHON. The funds which have not been authorized are included in line 12, in the \$1,975,000 figure.

Mr. GROSS. Those are the only funds that have not been authorized?

Mr. MAHON. Yes; that is the figure involved. A small portion of that has not been authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Texas yield for a clarifying question on the part of the Chair? As the Chair reads this language it says, "for increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law." If the Chair understands language, this refers to a cost already authorized by and pursuant to law that is now in existence. Is that true?

Mr. MAHON. The Chair is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. GROSS. May I be heard, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GROSS. The committee admits there are funds contained in line 12 that are not authorized by law.

Mr. MAHON. The \$19,835 included in line 12 has not been authorized. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. You mean the \$1,975,000?

Mr. MAHON. No; \$19,835 has not been authorized. But it cannot be paid unless it is authorized. Otherwise, it would revert unused to the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair again is confused. The Chair sees no reference

to a figure of \$19,835 in the bill or in the language referred to here.

Mr. MAHON. It is part of the figure of \$1,975,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas state to the Chair that of the amount of \$1,975,000 there is \$19,835 that is not authorized?

Mr. MAHON. \$19,835.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is still in a quandary because the language in line 7 says, "for increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, all compensation due by law to Members of Congress is authorized. If it is not authorized, it cannot be paid.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. And this is for compensation for Members. Unless you go behind these figures it is clear that the whole sum would be authorized. What other sum Congress wishes to authorize can be authorized. It could be considerably above the \$1,975,000 because it is for the compensation of Members. If the figure is too high or in error, it is still authorized by law, because there is authorization for the payment of Members. Therefore, I have some doubt that the point of order lies against this. But the debate has disclosed the facts.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is constrained to hold that the gentleman's point of order is not well taken, because the money amount in line 12 cannot be used for any other purpose than increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law. Therefore, the gentleman's point of order is overruled.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. What was the purpose of the bill which passed the House and is now in the hands of the Senate with no action taken upon it in that body? That was the authorization bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair, of course, does not have that language before him and cannot answer the gentleman's question.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALL: On page 23, line 12, strike "\$1,975,000" and insert "\$1,068,789".

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is very simple. This amendment simply deducts \$906,211, which is the amount of pay increase for ourselves in this body and on which we did not vote at any time. It does not apply to the 2 months which have already been paid.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, this would deduct that amount of this ap-

May 21, 1969

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 3925

proportion for our pay increase, only for the months of May and June. Assuming there is no forward funding in this portion of the \$1,975,000 that pertains to the pay of the Members of the House of Representatives, by taking one-sixth of \$12,500, times the number of Members in this House, one arrives at this figure. Deducting it from the \$1,975,000, we have the remainder of \$1,068,789. It does not affect the pay of the judiciary or the executive branches.

The entire purpose of this amendment is clear cut. It is to avoid any more of the "sky being the limit" philosophy of raising our own pay. It is to get back in the groove and on the right track with the general belt tightening, the general economy and cuts that we are asking other branches, departments and people to make. It is starting at the epitomy and establishing a top in priority, where economy should begin and that is with ourselves. It is an attempt to rescind, in the hope that we can continue to rectify, when the next appropriation act affecting legislation of the pay of the Members themselves in fiscal year 1970 occurs, instead of the "Valentine's massacre" which I referred to on the floor of this House once before, as a massacre of the taxpayers when it was known that this pay raise which was brought on by this Commission would become effective on February 11, 1969. It did not. It became effective March 1, 1969. We have been paid for that and for the month of April, and this amendment calls for no retroactivity or payback of the Members.

This would simply deduct that amount which will be paid for in May and June, the balance of this fiscal year 1969.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the future good judgment of the Members of the House will preclude further payment in fiscal year 1970. It is that simple.

I urge support from those of you who have received many letters demeaning you for allowing a pay increase to go through without asserting or working the will of the House and voting ourselves in this matter.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that my friend from Missouri has offered this amendment. We have long been joined in the fight against the unconscionable pay increase for Members of Congress, the judiciary, and the executive branch of Government.

It is most unfortunate that under the law it is impossible to get at the pay increases for others, some of whose paychecks were increased by an outrageous 70 percent.

Here is the opportunity by supporting the amendment to rectify part of the mistake that was made when the pay increase bill was slipped through the backdoor of the House while the Members were conveniently on vacation last February.

And the Members of the House should be on notice, that unless the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri is adopted, a vote for this supplemental appropriation will be a vote for the first time by the Members of the House to give themselves an unconscionable 41-percent increase.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, there are a variety of views in the House with respect to the pay raise which was made effective for members of the judicial and executive and legislative branches of the Government. Some of us thought that a pay raise, while clearly justifiable in some respects was not timely at the moment it was put into effect and that the amount of the raise was too great.

I was among the group opposing the pay raise, but the pay raise has been enacted into law, and it is the law of the land. It has been in effect since March 1.

If this law is to be changed, then it is a matter for the appropriate committee of the Congress to consider, and it would be very inappropriate through this procedure to undertake to nullify the law with regard to one of the branches of the Government involving the pay raise.

So, regardless of one's original views as to the wisdom of the pay raise, to me it is clearly out of order at this time to undertake on an appropriation bill to revise or to modify the law with respect to the pay raise. The proper procedure would be through a legislative bill covering the entire Government and worked out by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and presented to the House.

There was not a direct vote on the pay raise legislation this year. There was a rollcall vote in 1967 when the Commission was authorized to set up a pay raise scale for officials of the Government. I was among those who voted against that proposal but it became the law.

As I stated, there was no direct vote on the pay raise issue this year but there was a rollcall vote in regard to the issue. Prior to the Lincoln Day recess it was proposed that the House not recess without taking a vote on the issue of the pay raise. I was among those voting not to adjourn for the recess because adjournment would have precluded any chance for a vote on the issue. I voted not to adjourn without taking action on the pay raise issue but a majority vote was to the contrary. This vote related to the issue but was, of course, not a direct vote on the issue. The debate in the House on February 5 just prior to the vote on adjournment made clear that the pay raise was the issue.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if it is not true that, if this amendment were adopted, the entire pay raise and all parts thereof would be nullified.

Mr. MAHON. Yes, it would cover the entire pay raise, as I understand it.

Mr. ALBERT. The Members could not get any portion of the pay raise.

Mr. MAHON. Yes; as I understand it, it would eliminate all the pay raises for the members of the legislative branch, but not other branches of the Government.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I fully share the views of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in urging that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close, and I ask for a vote.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HALL and Mr. MAHON.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 49, noes 165.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the remainder of title III of the bill deals in various pay raises for the various agencies of the government, funds to meet those pay raises as provided by law, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of title III be considered as read; in other words, that the bill be considered as read up to line 5, page 61, which is the end of title III, and that the bill be open for amendment up to that point.

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, did the gentleman say page 61?

Mr. MAHON. Up to line 5, page 61, which would be the end of these various parts relating to various portions of the Government—the end of title III of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Amendments would be in order?

Mr. MAHON. Amendments would be in order to that section.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman, under my reservation, one question: Does the gentleman have any idea of the amount of salary increases carried in this \$4 billion supplemental appropriation bill?

Mr. MAHON. Does the gentleman mean the pay raises to all agencies of the Government?

Mr. GROSS. The total contained in the bill.

Mr. MAHON. That total is contained in the chapter of the report entitled "Increased Pay Costs," that can be found on page 73 of the report. The total amount shown is approximately \$1.3 billion.

Mr. GROSS. \$1.3 billion?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Out of a \$3.8 billion appropriation?

Mr. MAHON. Yes; \$1.2 billion plus is in title I for the Defense Department for the war in Vietnam; title III relates to pay raise money for the various agencies and departments of the Government. There are some pay costs in title II. The pay raises were brought about by actions

May 21, 1969

of the last Congress, as the report explains on page 73.

Pay funds in titles II and III—which are recapitulated on page 73 of the report—total just under \$1.3 billion.

Title II, of course, contains a number of supplementals not related to pay costs.

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

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

Mr. HALL. May I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if, in that portion which the Clerk has just read prior to the unanimous-consent request, there is, to his knowledge, any more forward funding of the pay increase of the employees of the House? Those that I will speak of as the "employees" of the House?

Mr. MAHON. So far as I know, there is none whatever.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill is considered as read to line 5, page 61. Amendments are in order. Are there any amendments?

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

A moment ago, when my good friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. URALL), came down to the well and took 30 seconds of his 5 minutes, I had hoped to catch his attention because I wanted to tell him that, despite the fact that I had labored long and hard on a statement in support of a pay cut for this body, and despite the fact that I am aware that the gentleman from Arizona, himself, put in a lot of time this afternoon preparing an appropriate attack upon my amendment, nevertheless, I witnessed with tears in my eyes the expression of the sentiment of the House on the pay-cut amendment offered by my friend from Missouri, and I want the gentleman from Arizona and the rest of the Members of this body to know that I accept the decision as final.

Accordingly, I will not offer my amendment.

My amendment in effect would have placed a temporary ceiling of \$36,250 on congressional salaries. This would reduce by one-half the recent pay increase.

This was not an appealing amendment for me to consider offering nor for Members to contemplate voting upon. No one will contemplate a cut in his pay with enthusiasm. Most of us believe—justifiably I hope—that we are worth every penny of \$42,500. The expenses of running a congressional office are enormous and often outstrip our allowance. And on top of it all, I can tell you that the Findley family has encountered no difficulty spending all of my paycheck. With this in mind, I recognize that acceptance of my amendment would have been truly extraordinary—an unprecedented event.

Unprecedented is also the right word to describe the factors which motivated me to draft the amendment.

Inflation is the most serious domestic problem confronting us today. In March of this year, the increase in the cost of living was the largest since February 1951. Consumer prices have risen more in the first quarter of this year than at any time since 1956. Unless we bring this under control quickly, we are in serious trouble.

Fiscal restraint is a necessity, and nothing would be more helpful than for Congress itself to show some restraint. The bill before us now which includes money for the salary increase quite properly includes what is described as a "rigid" limitation on total federal expenditures. Because of budget pressures, many needed federal programs are being cut back or eliminated, and the surtax undoubtedly will be extended. The outlook for an increase in social security benefits is unclear to say the least.

In light of these factors, the 41-percent increase in congressional pay was poorly timed, to say the least, and the outrage which taxpayers have voiced is completely understandable. If the increase had been staged over 2 or 3 years, it would have been more acceptable.

In this period of deep fiscal crisis, when an emergency surtax is required, Congress should attempt to set an example for the rest of the country.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALL: On page 61, after line 4 insert the following:

"GENERAL PROVISIONS

"The Commission on Executive, Judicial, and Legislative Salaries established under Public Law 90-206 is hereby abolished. The salary increases recommended by the President as a result of the actions of said Commission are hereby rescinded."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve points of order on the amendment on the ground that it appears to be legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas reserves points of order on the amendment.

The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Texas reserving points of order in order that I may speak to this amendment.

Again this is a straightforward open-faced amendment. I do not accept the fact that our action here today on my prior amendment decision is final, especially without the Members of this House of Representatives ever having voted on their own pay increase. It is true that they did vote on the Commission as established for executive, judicial, and legislative salaries, back in 1967.

Up to this time, I have tried to be careful and be within the dictates of the Constitution. Members will note that the last amendment involved no one—those stating to the contrary notwithstanding—except we who are in the legislative branch and indeed we in this House of Representatives.

Now, of course, under the restrictions or rescindments or actions under rule XXI and the "Holman rule," we can, in

in an appropriation bill, take action by the act of the House to eliminate anything that costs additional expense from the General Treasury and that has been acted on previously.

I think that the amendment is in order. Certainly it is germane. Certainly it is a retrenchment on its face.

Very simply, this amendment would eliminate the Commission that has poor backing, poor strategy, and has been demonstrated to have poor timing, in that it has recommended without any vote of the Members and with them able to evade—as indeed we did in January and February—confrontation with a vote on our constitutional requirement to raise our own pay, which is just as much a requirement as it is for us to raise and support the armed services.

I do not believe we ever should have delegated this to the responsibility of the executive branch. I think it is time that we had an amendment to abolish the Pay Commission, which does retrench expenditures by the reduction of the salaries of the officers of the United States and, therefore, falls under the "Holman rule." This rule allows us to legislate in an appropriation bill—and there are resplendent examples, and many areas in which we can prove that it has been accepted in the past, and they can be quoted both from Cannon's Procedures and from our own manual.

Be that as it may, Mr. Chairman, all of us knew what the salaries were when we ran for office. Few of us have found that there was a sparsity of those who were ready to run against us at the same income rate. Many of us serve in the interest of representative government and the Republic as a duty, and at a financial sacrifice.

Finally, I think we should have stood and been counted on our bill setting up this spurious Commission and I am giving one additional chance for everyone to vote in support of abolishing it. Its being delegates our authority as legislators, our constitutional rights, and indeed our responsibilities, to the executive branch every 4 years to designate what the salaries of the executive and the judicial and the legislative branch will be.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am in complete sympathy with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri, but I advise the gentleman that under article III of the Constitution it says the pay of judges shall not be diminished during their continuance in office, and I wonder how a rescission of pay increase as provided in the gentleman's amendment would apply to the salary of the judges.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, that was in the amendment that was defeated on the vote a while ago. The intent here is to abolish the Commission.

It would abolish the Commission which would in the future bring forth recommendations every 4 years, and they would go into effect unless one or the

May 21, 1969

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 3927

other body of Congress took action against them within 60 days, having been revised down from the 90 days according to the original Reorganization Act of 1949.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I thank the gentleman. I apologize for having misunderstood the purpose of the amendment.

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

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

Mr. HAYS. Did I understand the gentleman's amendment as read abolished the Commission and abolished the pay raise the Commission ordered?

Mr. HALL. I would be glad to ask unanimous consent that the amendment be reread. It simply intends to abolish the Commission.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, again I wish to commend my colleague from Missouri for offering this amendment which would repeal the authority of a Presidentially appointed and Presidentially appointed commission to recommend the salaries of Members of Congress.

This is one of the most unholy delegations of power and authority ever made by Congress. To give a commission—any commission—and the President—any President—the power to recommend the pay of Congress is unthinkable.

No Member of the House or Senate should want to be in any way a pawn of any President and this amendment seeks to restore the independence of the legislative branch—indepedence which was supinely delegated in the 1967 pay act.

The time to correct that mistake is here and now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, this is a supplemental appropriation bill. I renew my point of order on two grounds: First, the proposal of the gentleman from Missouri is legislation on an appropriation bill; and, second, it is not germane to the supplemental appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HOLIFIELD). The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair has examined the amendment and the precedents, and would call attention of the House to Cannon's Precedents, volume 8, page 480, section 2914, which reads as follows: "to a section proposing legislation for the current year an amendment rendering such legislation permanent was held not to be germane."

Then, in section 2915: "to a provision in an appropriation bill proposing legislation for the fiscal year provided for by the bill an amendment proposing to make the provision permanent legislation was held not to be germane."

The Chair therefore rules that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri is not germane and therefore not in order; and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I wish to apologize to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) because on rereading the typed amendment—a copy of which I supplied him—I observe the last sentence does include therein—and this apology also would go to the gentleman

from Michigan (Mr. HUTCHINSON)—the elimination of the actions taken by the Commission which I sought to eliminate. I offer my apology. I made a misstatement of fact, and I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the RECORD will be corrected.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, am I correct in assuming that the portion of the bill beginning on line 5, page 61, has not been read?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MAHON. I ask that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV

LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 1970
BUDGET OUTLAYS

SEC. 401. (a) Expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Federal Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, shall not exceed \$192,900,000,000: *Provided*, That whenever action, or inaction, by the Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendations thereon, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on expenditures and net lending, and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted.

(b) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report periodically to the President and to the Congress on the operation of this section. The first such report shall be made at the end of the first month which begins after the date of approval of this Act; subsequent reports shall be made at the end of each calendar month during the first session of the Ninety-first Congress, and at the end of each calendar quarter thereafter.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COHELAN

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COHELAN: On page 61, line 5, strike out all of title IV and renumber title V on page 62 as title IV.

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

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, as I announced earlier, at the time we were considering the rule, I rise in opposition to the expenditure limitation placed on fiscal year 1970 outlays by this supplemental appropriation bill, and, of course, my amendment moves to strike title IV limitation entirely.

I want the Committee to know I did not arrive at this conclusion lightly. I pondered long and hard over the meaning and the effects of the limitation. As a matter of fact, earlier I was disposed to support the measure on the theory that this was the beginning of a possible legislative budget. I recognize the desirability of an annual congressional assessment of the appropriate levels of Federal revenues and expenditures.

In fact, as Members may know, I strongly endorse the fine recommendations of our former Secretary of the Treasury, Joe Barr, for the creation of a legislative budget.

I recognize, too, the need to maintain a restrained fiscal policy so that rising prices may be controlled.

However, I recognize, also, that the all too likely outcome of this ceiling—and mark this, please—the all too likely outcome to this ceiling is to guarantee substantial cuts in spending for urgently needed social programs.

Let me explain.

Under the provisions of this limitation total Federal spending for the 12 months of the next fiscal year cannot exceed \$192.9 billion unless Congress takes specific action to increase expenditures. This ceiling will be reduced by the amount of the spending reductions implicit in appropriation cuts which will, no doubt, be made in some areas by the Congress. The trouble is that the budget contains a very large number of mere estimates as to expenditures. Most of these estimated items represent civilian open-ended or fixed-cost programs. These are programs like social security, public assistance, medicaid, farm subsidies, veterans' benefits, and interest on the national debt. I refer you to page 16 of the President's 1970 budget on this.

These are all expenditures which the Government is by law committed to meet. Thus, if spending for these programs exceeds the budget estimates, the excess will have to be taken from spending for some other programs also authorized by the Congress.

Reductions in spending to offset these unbudgeted increases can be made only in that portion of the budget which is controllable.

The fact is that the controllable portion of the budget is comparatively small, and it contains almost all the social programs—such as antipoverty, education, health, job training, and housing—which a good many of us strongly believe must be substantially increased and not decreased.

Estimates of outlays for fiscal year 1970 show this: \$81.1 billion in civilian noncontrollable programs like social security and veterans' benefits. Our colleague, the gentleman from Texas, and others devoted to the veterans' programs were on the floor speaking about this today. Of the remaining \$111.8 billion, Defense accounts for \$80.4 billion, and \$31.4 billion is for other accounts. However, of the \$31.4 billion, \$18.9 billion is accounted for by uncontrollable expenditures due on obligations entered into in the previous fiscal year. This leaves us only with \$12.5 billion in civilian controllable expenditures.

If the current fiscal year is any example, the noncontrollable items will exceed their estimates by \$3 billion to \$6 billion and, if the practice of taking the reductions out of the hides of the social programs, rather than defense spending, is again followed, we could well find that spending for controllable domestic programs will have to be cut back by a staggering 25 to 50 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I urge an aye vote on this amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the proposal for an expenditure limitation, as set out in title IV of the bill, has been debated for 2 days.

The proposal, as explained in the committee report, has been available for

May 21, 1969

Members to review for 5 or 6 days. The matter was rather thoroughly discussed at the time we had the rule before the House today and the rule was passed overwhelmingly. This does not necessarily mean that everyone who voted for the rule is for the expenditure limitation. But, undoubtedly, the overwhelming majority of those who voted for the rule are in favor of the expenditure limitation.

The proposal was extensively debated here yesterday. I refer especially to the debate beginning on page H3830 of the Record of yesterday.

The gentleman from California has somewhat oversimplified the problem and the purpose of what is actually proposed in the expenditure limitation. I see no reason to belabor this issue further. We have had opportunity to discuss it in great depth previously and have done so.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS).

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

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, the only reason I asked the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to yield is to agree with the chairman that this suggestion has been thoroughly explored on yesterday and today. I concur in the chairman's views. I think this spending limitation will have a salutary effect. Therefore, I am opposed to the amendment and I join the chairman in asking that it be voted down.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment do now close and that all debate on the bill do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COHELAN

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COHELAN of California: On page 62, line 3, add the following as a new section:

"(c) The limitation set forth in subsection (a), as adjusted in accordance with the proviso to that subsection, shall be increased by an amount equal to the aggregate amount by which expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) for the fiscal year 1970 on account of items designated as "Open-ended programs and fixed costs" in the table appearing on page 16 of the Budget for the fiscal year 1970 may be in excess of the aggregate expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) estimated for those items in the April review of the 1970 budget."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment in that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, the rule pertaining to title IV only protects what is in the bill, not amendments to the bill.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, all this amendment does is to exempt from the

outlay limitation noncontrollable civilian expenditures. It is what I regard as a fallback amendment, just to make sure that if we are going to have this expenditure ceiling we are not going to take it out of the hide of the noncontrollable expenditures.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, all this amendment does is to insure that social programs will not be needlessly reduced by exempting from outlay limitations noncontrollable civilian expenditures.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman speaking on the point of order raised by the chairman of the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the Chair has requested the gentleman from California to speak on the point of order, and the Chair assumes that the gentleman is so doing.

Mr. COHELAN. On the point of order, Mr. Chairman, I am merely trying to explain the amendment, and its validity and its germaneness. It is similar to one offered by the Bureau of the Budget, and other provisions of last year's Expenditure Control Act. It differs only in that it calls for South Vietnam expenses to be controllable, and thus would not exempt them from the budget ceiling. There is also an additional advantage to my amendment which I could explain if I had the time, but in sum my amendment would insure that if the budget estimates for noncontrollable civilian expenditure programs were low, the increase would not have to come from expenditures in housing, health, education, job training, and the like.

It also treats all defense expenditures as controllable items.

Mr. MAHON. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman is discussing the merits of the proposed amendment, and not the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair has examined title IV. This is a new subparagraph to title IV. Title IV is legislation in a general appropriation bill, and all points of order have been waived in title IV, as a result of it being legislation. Therefore the Chair holds that the amendment is germane to the provisions contained in title IV and overrules the point of order.

The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. Did not the previous unanimous-consent action of the House eliminate all further general debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman is correct.

Mr. COHELAN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, is it all right for me to urge a "yea" vote on the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VANIK

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, but I cannot talk about it, as I understand.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VANIK: On page 61, line 10, After "\$192,900,000,000," insert ", of which the amount expended by the Department of Defense shall not exceed \$77,500,000,000".

The CHAIRMAN. Under the previous action of the Committee, all further debate has been eliminated.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, am I barred by the motion that was adopted previously? Does that preclude me from telling the House that this is a \$2.5 billion reduction?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Ohio is precluded from debate on his amendment in view of the action taken by the House on the limitation of debate.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. VANIK and Mr. MAHON.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 38, yeas 165.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I favor the expenditure ceiling that would hold spending next year to the \$192 billion level. I have already voted for the rule. Later today I must leave and may not be here for final passage of the bill due to a commitment I made to the student leaders at Virginia Polytechnic Institute several months ago. Tonight I will talk with the students at VPI about present campus unrest and academic freedom, and I feel I should honor this commitment. If I were here to vote on final passage, I would vote to hold spending to the \$192 billion level and reduce Federal spending wherever possible.

One of the greatest problems facing our country today is spiraling inflation. The housewife is finding her grocery bills are higher each week. The consumer is being shortchanged. Excessive Government spending bears down most heavily on the American housewife, the elderly, those drawing retirement benefits and pensions, and the American wage earner.

Last year I voted in favor of the \$6 billion cut in Federal spending. The question before the House now is the same as it was then—the stability, integrity,

May 21, 1969

and purchasing power of the American dollar. We must cut every nonessential expenditure of the Federal Government and save the American dollar.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, like so many Americans, I am opposed to the war in Vietnam, but I have voted for the supplemental appropriations bill which has nearly one-third of its expenditures earmarked for military operations in Southeast Asia.

I have listened to opponents of the bill who have argued that Congress could halt the war by refusing to authorize the military appropriations. On that basis, they have sought rejection of this bill in spite of the fact that more than two-thirds of the appropriations are for non-military purposes.

I supported an amendment to have the military appropriations voted on separately and I regret that the majority of my colleagues rejected this move. It would have brought the war into focus and would have given us the opportunity of concentrating completely on that very important matter.

As the bill now stands, we have very little discretionary control over these nonmilitary appropriations which represent the lion's share of the expenditures because the previous Congress has committed us to them. They involve, for example, grants to States for health and welfare; veterans compensation; medical and other costs; unemployment compensation payments; military retirement pay; college housing; social and rehabilitation services and disaster relief.

They are obligations that require fiscal responsibility and must be met.

If we rejected this bill because of its military appropriations at a time when we are at the conference table negotiating for peace, I fear the consequences could be disastrous. We would be announcing to the world that we no longer intend to defend ourselves. We would be going to the conference table with no cards at all.

Yes, let us hasten the process for peace. I agree that we are lingering too long at the conference table. I agree that our boys should be returned to American soil. I agree that they should not have to sacrifice their lives in the jungles of a foreign land where we are engaged in the most unpopular war in our history.

But while Americans are fighting in Vietnam, we have an abiding responsibility to give them everything they need for survival. Our fighting forces have brought the Communists to the point where they are trying to achieve at the conference table what they could not achieve on the battlefield.

Are we to tell the world at this time that we are abandoning our military effort; that we are pulling our purse strings tight? I am sure that now, more than ever, is the time for solidarity at home. I am convinced that we must stand united if we are to secure a meaningful peace at the conference table.

The military sector of this bill is designed to permit the South Vietnamese forces to assume a greater share of the burden of battle and to enforce peace when it comes.

Two major events that have occurred since the original budget requests for fis-

cal 1969 were submitted to Congress also contribute largely to the need for the passage of this bill. I am referring to the Tet offensive in Vietnam which caused losses of equipment far in excess of what was anticipated and the seizure of the *Pueblo* by the North Koreans which led to the callup of military forces to meet this military threat.

While I support this bill chiefly for the reasons set forth here, I remain deeply concerned about a war that has already taken 35,000 American lives and has caused our Nation to become most restless. The administration and this Congress must give the utmost priority to the attainment of an honorable peace in Vietnam. Every effort must be exerted to accomplish that goal as soon as possible.

I believe we can attain the peace we want under the circumstances we want reasonably soon if our Government does not buckle under the task that lies ahead and instead carries unity and strength to the conference table. That is why I do not oppose the military appropriations at this time.

After considering all facets of this bill and its importance to America at home and abroad, I could do nothing less than urge its passage.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, there are several necessary and desirable items included in this bill, but I shall vote against the bill as a whole if the unnecessary appropriations for additional procurement and other items related to the war in Vietnam remain intact.

If the bill were to be defeated at this stage, which would be most surprising, it could be promptly resubmitted to the House in appropriately modified form.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 made many important advances in our efforts to provide good housing and good neighborhoods for all of our citizens. There is nothing in the 17 titles of that bill, however, that is more important than the new interest subsidy programs designed to foster homeownership for families which could not otherwise afford it and a greatly expanded rental housing program. We all know the basic role which homeownership plays in our American way of life by giving families a sense of pride and dignity, a sense of responsibility for the community in which they live, and a sense of participation. The benefits of this aid for homeownership will go far beyond the individual families which receive them.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the Committee on Appropriations for the positive approach which they have displayed on most items in the complex supplemental appropriation request. At the same time I deeply regret that they failed to authorize the full \$50 million request for each of the interest subsidy programs. I am hopeful that the other body will grant the full request and hold it in conference. Another reduction which deeply concerns me is the complete elimination of the modest request for funds to enable HUD to carry out its extensive responsibilities under the fair housing legislation. The \$2 million requested in this supplemental is sorely needed for responsible administration of

these duties. Again, I am hopeful that the other body will include the full amount in its bill. In addition, we should all stand behind the budget requests for the coming fiscal year which contains the full authorization for interest subsidies in the amount of \$100 million for each of the programs. In the case of fair housing funds, I am hopeful that the committee can be persuaded that the original budget proposal of \$14 million is fully justified.

Mr. Chairman, there is an urgent need to move ahead with housing legislation already on the books. My Subcommittee on Housing recently concluded hearings on our national housing goals and the witnesses were unanimous that these goals can be met if our existing authorizations are fully and promptly funded. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill today so that we can get on with the job of providing a good home and a decent environment for every American family.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman for his courage in offering this amendment.

The whole pay package adopted pursuant to the Koppel Commission is inflationary. Unfortunately the parliamentary situation will not permit an amendment to attack the other pay increases or for the abolition of the Commission.

Let me say, the taxpayers are entitled to have the whole pay package voted on by their representatives in this body. The only way that can happen is for Members to sign the discharge petition on H.R. 7778. There has been no stampede to the Clerk's desk, and I suppose the prospects are rather slim that we will get a vote on that bill.

But, we can begin to regain the respect of the taxpayers if we approve this amendment—which I confess is unlikely.

As the author of H.R. 7778 to repeal the whole Koppel package. As the sponsor of the discharge petition, I can say to the gentlemen he is to be congratulated for his courage. This amendment will not win him many friends here. I know. But the gentleman well represents his people and the sentiment of the country. I urge a favorable vote.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, during the consideration of amendments to this bill, I expect to offer an amendment to title IV to provide that the expenditure limitation of \$192,900 million shall include a further limitation of expenditures by the Department of Defense of \$77,500 million.

This amendment would reduce defense expenditures by \$2½ billion from budgetary requests of approximately \$80 billion. It appears that there is no other way to achieve reduced defense spending. This amendment would leave the discretion for spending cutbacks within the Defense Department and the further action of Congress.

Better housekeeping in the Defense Department should make it possible to reduce the overall expenditures by 3 percent without impairing any essential defense need.

Recent reports of waste in the purchase of defective aircraft, tanks, and leaky submarines indicate that too little attention is directed toward careful

May 21, 1969

management and prudent economy in our Defense Establishment.

If the civilian sector of our Government can face budgetary cutbacks of almost \$3 billion, it seems to me that the defense sector should make the same kind of an effort.

I cannot support legislation which exempts the military sector from effective congressional oversight.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, there are those who make these regular supplemental appropriations a test of support or dissent regarding our policy in Vietnam. This strikes me as a superficial and erroneous interpretation of the legislative process.

An examination of the legislation turns up item after item of national concern. There are within this appropriation specific allocations that cannot be refused without doing serious harm to important domestic programs. The following examples of specific requests in this \$3.8 billion appropriation make this point rather clearly:

The vital programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are scheduled to receive an additional \$666.7 million through this appropriation. An important new program of interest subsidies for higher education facilities construction is included within this allocation.

Included in this appropriation is a nondiscretionary appropriation of \$35.9 million for the Department of Labor for unemployment and employee compensation claims. Obviously these are expenses that must be met.

Recognizing the grave national problem caused by a shortage of low- and middle-income housing this appropriation provides \$80 million for the homeownership and rental housing interest subsidy programs.

Included in the appropriation is \$25.4 million for the vital conservation programs of the Department of Interior.

The National Transportation Safety Board which is involved in the crucial matters of flight, rail, and auto safety is to receive additional funds under this appropriation. The merit of such an expenditure is patently obvious.

These are just examples of the needed and obligated expenditures to be covered by this supplemental appropriation.

Also contained in this legislation is a necessary ceiling on Federal expenditures for fiscal 1970. This ceiling is set at the administration's requested budget of \$192.9 billion and is a first step in reducing Federal spending in a wide variety of wasteful, unnecessary, and duplicative areas.

Establishment of this ceiling at this time, with the expectation that a lower ceiling and spending cuts can be established when tax legislation is considered, is an important means of controlling the steadily rising Federal budget.

In another realm this appropriation contains the funds for mandated pay for Federal employees. This accounts for \$1.3 billion or more than a third of the appropriation. This part of the Federal payroll is established by law and obligated. Therefore the funds must be appropriated or we will cause budgetary havoc in the various departments and agencies of Government.

Now, turning to the matter of Vietnam, it must be noted that the appropriation does include \$1.2 billion for military operations in Southeast Asia with a substantial amount of this to be used to cover expenses resulting from increasing tensions in Korea.

But the fact remains that the largest part of this section of the supplemental appropriation involves expenses connected with the war in Vietnam. This is not, however, a new appropriation. Nor will these funds affect our search for peace.

The appropriation will be used to pay for materials already contracted for by the Defense Department. By appropriating these funds we are discharging a commitment of the Federal Government for these are truly obligated moneys for defensive and support operations in the field.

As I have said in the past, I do not believe we can responsibly deny a single American boy in Vietnam the material to defend himself.

As I reiterate that these are obligated funds already contracted for, it becomes clear that we have no choice but to approve the appropriation. I am prepared to vote for the appropriation with the knowledge that these funds will not be used to enlarge the scope of the war in Vietnam and with the knowledge that contained herein are the funds for many important domestic programs.

Now there is no one more interested in achieving peace in Vietnam than I. Since coming to Congress more than 4 years ago I have repeatedly dissented from our policy in Vietnam in order to offer proposals for peace.

And I am deeply disappointed that we have failed to make greater strides for peace. The President's recent message acknowledged something I have said for years, "We must take risks for peace," and I believe we must do exactly that.

When, I ask, when will we take these necessary steps to end the war? The continued loss of American lives and the steady flow of our needed resources into Vietnam is a responsibility that the new administration cannot escape. Peace in Vietnam is essential if we are to join the domestic wars against poverty, hunger, joblessness, inadequate housing, and substandard education. Certainly these domestic needs deserve a priority.

Moreover as one who has long dissented from American policy in Vietnam, I must repeat my strong feeling of unhappiness at the failure of the South Vietnamese to assume their role in the fighting. For months we have been told that the South Vietnamese will take on a greater combat role enabling us to begin bringing American boys home. I am tired of waiting for this action. If the South Vietnamese are not prepared to fight their own war I see no reason why we should fight it for them.

The appropriation before us today, however, is not a test of support or dissent on the matter of Vietnam. Although I dissociate myself from our unsuccessful and inexcusable policy errors in Vietnam, I would consider a vote against this appropriation irresponsible and a dereliction of my duty as a Member of the Congress.

But I also consider it the height of ir-

responsibility to give American lives in a war for a people that are unwilling to protect themselves.

Just as the Congress must vote approval of the appropriation before us today, so must the administration immediately move toward peace in Vietnam. To do less would be to violate the trust of the American people.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, after much travail and thought, I have concluded that I must vote against the passage of this bill.

In arriving at this position in opposition to the bill I have given consideration to the demands for fiscal restraint, to the virtues of the committee's action in support of low-cost housing to the purchase of additional lands for the Redwood National Park, and to other necessary and worthwhile programs. However, I have also given consideration to the potentially devastating effects of the expenditure ceiling, to the implications of continued funding of Vietnam expenditures at their present levels, and to the intrusion of the Federal Government into university affairs as provided in amendments to the bill.

On balance, I have concluded that there is more bad than good in this bill.

I would like for a moment to expand on these compelling considerations.

I have been a strong supporter of the efforts to enact and secure full funding for the section 235 homeownership assistance program and for the section 236 rental assistance program. Accordingly, I was pleased with the action of the committee in recommending the authorization of \$40 million in additional contractual authority for each of these programs. I am only disappointed that the full \$50 million requested by both the past and the present administrations was not granted. I am hopeful however that the Senate will approve the full request for these urgently needed funds.

As one of the original sponsors of the legislation to create the Redwood National Park in California, I am appreciative of the promptness with which the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, under the able leadership of Chairwoman JULIA HANSEN, has acted in appropriating funds for this park. This bill authorizes the expenditure of another \$19 million to complete the purchase of lands obtained by the Government under a decree of legislative taking. The previous appropriation earlier this year, together with the funds provided in this bill, bring to \$72 million the amounts available for the purchase of the park in the very first year after its creation. I am warmly supportive of the appropriation of these funds, and am deeply pained that other objectionable provisions of the bill prevent me from supporting the entire measure.

I have today at some length attempted to explain to the Members of this body the evils I see in the expenditure limitation which is provided in this bill. In a nutshell, it is my fear that—while this limitation appears on its face not to reduce domestic expenditures below the levels requested in the budget—it will have the result of requiring enormous reductions in social spending to make up for underestimates of noncontrollable spending, like the interest on the public

May 21, 1969

debt. I am not willing to lend my support to this action which has the potential to gut the urgently needed and presently underfunded programs for health, education, housing, job training, pollution control, and antipoverity efforts.

Mr. Chairman, we have today heard many very thoughtful statements on the situation in Vietnam. I have for several years closely followed the tragic events in that tragic far away country. I have witnessed for the past 2 dozen months the growing revulsion with the war by the American and Vietnamese people. And throughout the same period I have witnessed small changes in the allied conduct of that war in the effort to wind down the conflict and find a stable peace. However, I have witnessed no new and major allied policy changes. Earlier this year I urged the President and his advisers to not only attach larger importance to the urgency of finding a solution in Vietnam, but to conduct a thorough review of our policy objectives with regard to the war and the settlement which would be acceptable to us. President Nixon in his recent statement offered to take some steps toward troop withdrawal and the recognition of a coalition government. But the conditions attached to these statements indicate that we have not yet conducted a thorough rethinking of our position in Vietnam. Accordingly, I am troubled today by this bill which appropriates funds to support continued fighting at current levels.

I am troubled too by amendments which have been adopted today which augur for a greater Federal involvement in the troubles of our colleges. As the representative in Congress of one of the most troubled of these communities, I can say that it is my considered judgment that in all but the most extreme circumstances it is best to leave the university problems to the university. Only when violence exceeds the capability of the local authorities is there any appropriate role for Federal intervention—and then only as a mediator, conciliator, and factfinder.

In sum, Mr. Chairman, I have weighed the virtues and shortcomings of this bill, and I have found it lacking in sufficient merit to overcome the substantial dangers it opens up.

I urge the defeat of this bill.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. MAHON, 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. HOLIFIELD, 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. 11400) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry

amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MAHON, 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?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Scherle amendment to page 15, at the end of line 6.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros. The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: On page 15, at the end of line 6, strike the period and insert the following: "Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act for annual interest grants authorized by section 306 of the Higher Education Facilities Act, as amended by PL 90-575, shall be used to formulate or carry out any grant to any institution of higher education unless such institution is in full compliance with section 504 of such Act."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken: and there were—yeas 329, nays 61, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

YEAS—329

Abbitt	Caffery	Fish
Abernethy	Camp	Fisher
Adair	Carter	Flood
Addabbo	Casey	Flowers
Albert	Cederberg	Flynt
Alexander	Chamberlain	Ford, Gerald R.
Anderson, Ill.	Chappell	Ford,
Anderson,	Clancy	William D.
Tenn.	Clausen	Foreman
Andrews, Ala.	Don H.	Fountain
Andrews,	Clawson Del	Friedel
N. Dak.	Cleveland	Fulton, Pa.
Annunzio	Collier	Fulton, Tenn.
Arends	Collins	Fuqua
Asibrook	Colmer	Gallfanakis
Aspinall	Conable	Garmatz
Ayres	Conte	Gaydos
Baring	Corbett	Gettys
Barrett	Coughlin	Gethno
Beall, Md.	Cramer	Gibbons
Belcher	Cunningham	Goldwater
Bell, Calif.	Daniel, Va.	Gonzalez
Bennett	Daniels, N.J.	Goodling
Berry	Davis, Ga.	Gray
Betts	Davis, Wis.	Green, Oreg.
Bevill	de la Garza	Griffin
Blaggl	Delaney	Griffiths
Blister	Dellenback	Gross
Blackburn	Denny	Grover
Blanton	Dennis	Gubser
Boggs	Derwinski	Hagan
Boland	Devine	Haley
Bow	Dickinson	Hall
Bray	Dingell	Halpern
Brinkley	Donohue	Hamilton
Brock	Dowdy	Hammer-
Brooks	Downing	schmidt
Broomfield	Dulski	Hanley
Brotzman	Duncan	Hansen, Idaho
Brown, Mich.	Dwyer	Hansen, Wash.
Brown, Ohio	Edmondson	Harsha
Broyhill, N.C.	Edwards, Ala.	Harvey
Broyhill, Va.	Ellberg	Hays
Buchanan	Erlenborn	Hechler, W. Va.
Burke, Fla.	Esch	Heckler, Mass.
Burke, Mass.	Eshleman	Henderson
Burleson, Tex.	Evans, Colo.	Hicks
Burlison, Mo.	Evins, Tenn.	Horton
Bush	Fallon	Hosmer
Byrne, Pa.	Fascell	Hull
Byrnes, Wis.	Feighan	Hungate
Cabell	Findley	

Hunt	Morton	Smith, Calif.
Hutchinson	Mosher	Smith, Iowa
Ichord	Murphy, Ill.	Snyder
Jacobs	Myers	Springer
Jarman	Natcher	Stafford
Joelson	Nedzi	Staggers
Johnson, Calif.	Nelsen	Stanton
Johnson, Pa.	Nichols	Steed
Jonas	Obey	Steiger, Ariz.
Jones, Ala.	O'Konski	Steiger, Wis.
Jones, N.C.	Olsen	Stephens
Jones, Tenn.	O'Neal, Ga.	Stratton
Karsh	O'Neill, Mass.	Stubblefield
Kazen	Passman	Stuckey
Kee	Patman	Sullivan
Keith	Pelly	Symington
King	Pepper	Taft
Kleppe	Perkins	Talcott
Kluczynski	Fettis	Taylor
Kyl	Philbin	Teague, Calif.
Kyros	Pickle	Teague, Tex.
Landgrebe	Pike	Thompson, Ga.
Landrum	Pirnie	Thomson, Wis.
Langen	Poage	Tiernan
Latta	Poff	Tunney
Lennon	Preyer, N.C.	Udall
Lipscomb	Price, Ill.	Ullman
Lloyd	Price, Tex.	Utt
Long, La.	Pryor, Ark.	Van Deerlin
Long, Md.	Pucinski	Vanik
Lukens	Purcell	Vigorito
McClary	Quie	Waggonner
McClure	Quillen	Wampler
McCulloch	Rarick	Watkins
McDade	Reid, Ill.	Watson
McDonald,	Rhodes	Watts
Mich.	Rivers	Weicker
McEwen	Roberts	Whalen
McFall	Robison	Whalley
McKneally	Rogers, Colo.	White
Macdonald,	Rogers, Fla.	Whitehurst
Mass.	Ronan	Whitten
Madden	Rooney, N.Y.	Widnall
Mahon	Rooney, Pa.	Williams
Mailliard	Rostenkowski	Wilson, Bob
Mann	Roth	Wilson,
Marsh	Roudebush	Charles H.
Martin	Ruth	Winn
Mathias	St Germain	Wold
May	Satterfield	Wright
Meeds	Saylor	Wyatt
Michel	Schadeberg	Wydler
Miller, Calif.	Scherle	Wylie
Miller, Ohio	Schneebell	Wyman
Mills	Schwengel	Yatron
Minshall	Scott	Young
Mize	Sebelius	Zablocki
Mizell	Shriver	Zion
Mollohan	Sikes	Zwach
Monagan	Sisk	
Montgomery	Slack	

NAYS—61

Adams	Farbstein	Moorhead
Anderson,	Foley	Moss
Calif.	Fraser	Nix
Ashley	Frelinghuysen	O'Hara
Bingham	Gallagher	Ottinger
Bolling	Gilbert	Patten
Brademas	Green, Pa.	Podell
Brasco	Hanna	Powell
Brown, Calif.	Hathaway	Rees
Burton, Calif.	Hawkins	Reid, N.Y.
Button	Hollifield	Reuss
Celler	Kastenmeier	Rosenenthal
Chisholm	Koch	Roybal
Clay	Leggett	Ryan
Cohelan	Lowenstein	St. Onge
Conyers	McCarthy	Stokes
Corman	Matsonaga	Thompson, N.J.
Daddario	Mayne	Waldie
Diggs	Mikva	Wolf
Eckhardt	Minish	Yates
Edwards, Calif.	Mink	

NOT VOTING—43

Bates	Helstoski	Randall
Blatnik	Hogan	Reifel
Burton, Utah	Howard	Riegle
Cahill	Kirwan	Rodino
Carey	Kuykendall	Rumsfeld
Clark	Lujan	Ruppe
Cowger	McCloskey	Sandman
Culver	McMillan	Scheuer
Dawson	MacGregor	Shipley
Dent	Meskill	Skubitz
Dorn	Morgan	Smith, N.Y.
Edwards, La.	Morse	Vander Jagt
Frey	Murphy, N.Y.	Wiggins
Hastings	Pollock	
Hébert	Railsback	

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

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Scheuer against.
Mr. Dorn for, with Mr. Carey against.
Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Dawson against.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana for, with Mr. Helstoski against.
Mr. McMillan for, with Mr. Murphy of New York against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rodino with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Meskill.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Bates.
Mr. Biatnik with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Riegler.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Clark with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Hogan with Mr. Rumsfeld.
Mr. Wiggins with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Burton of Utah with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Vander Jagt with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Pollock with Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Reifel with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. MacGregor with Mr. Kuykendall.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CEDERBERG moves to recommit the bill H.R. 11400 to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 347, nays 40, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]
YEAS—347

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Alexander
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Baird
Barratt
Beall, Md.
Belcher
Bell, Calif.
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Blaggi
Bluester
Blackburn
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyles, N.C.
Broyles, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Burleson, Mo.
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Caffery
Camp
Carter
Casey
Celler
Chamberlain
Chappell
Clausen
Don H.
Clawson, Del.
Cleveland
Coville
Collins
Colmer

Conable
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Coughlin
Cramer
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniel, Va.
Daniels, N.J.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dennis
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Donohue
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Ewins, Tenn.
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Fish
Fisher
Flood
Flowers
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Foreman
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gaydos
Gettys
Gialmo
Gibbons
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Hagan
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammer-schmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey
Hathaway
Hays
Heckler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Henderson
Hicks
Hollifield
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Anderson, Calif.
Ashbrook
Bingham
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Calif.
Cederberg
Chisholm
Clancy
Clay
Cohelan
Conyers
Diggs
Edwards, Calif.
Farbstein
Fraser
Ichord
Jacobs
Jarman
Johnson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
Karth
Kazen
Kee
Keith
King
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kyros
Landgrebe
Landrum
Langen
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lukens
McCarthy
McClary
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McKneally
Macdonald, Mass.
Madden
Mahon
Malliard
Mann
Marsh
Martin
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Michei
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Mizell
Mollohan
Monagan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morton
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Pattman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Purcell

Quie
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Roybal
Ruth
St Germain
St. Onge
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schlerle
Schwengel
Scott
Sebelius
Shriver
Sikes
Slak
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steirer, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubbinsfield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Symington
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Welcker
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wold
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach
Gilbert
Gross
Haley
Hall
Harsha
Hawkins
Kastenmeier
Koch

Kyl
Latta
Lowenstein
Mikva
Miller, Ohio
Mosher
Ottinger
Podell
Powell
Quillen
Rees
Rosenthal
Ruppe
Ryan
Schneebeil
Stokes
Vanik

NOT VOTING—48

Bates
Burton, Utah
Cahill
Carey
Clark
Cowger
Culver
Dawson
Dent
Dorn
Edwards, La.
Findley
Frey
Hastings
Hébert
Helstoski
Hogan
Howard
Kirwan
Kuykendall
Lujan
McCloskey
McMillan
MacGregor
Meskill
Morgan
Morse
Murphy, N.Y.
Nelsen
Pollock
Railsback
Randall
Reifel
Riegler
Rivers
Rodino
Rooney, N.Y.
Rumsfeld
Sandman
Scheuer
Shipley
Skubitz
Smith, N.Y.
Watts
Widmalm
Wiggins

So the bill was passed.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Niden.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Waldall.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Riegler.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Meskill.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Rumsfeld.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Bates.
Mr. Randall with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Hogan.
Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Smith of New York with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Pollock with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Wiggins with Mr. Hastings.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members speaking on the bill may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks and that I may be permitted to revise and extend my remarks, and insert certain tabular material and pertinent extracts otherwise.

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

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. McCLOREY. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 58 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record be corrected accordingly.