

U.S. Congress

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91<sup>st</sup> CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 21

AUGUST 10, 1970, TO AUGUST 14, 1970

(PAGES 27853 TO 29176)

de la Garza	Jacobs	Randall
Deaney	Jarman	Rees
Dellenback	Johnson, Calif.	Reid, Ill.
Dent	Johnson, Pa.	Reid, N.Y.
Dingell	Jones, Ala.	Riegle
Donohue	Kee	Robison
Downing	Kastenmeier	Rodino
Dulski	Kee	Roe
Eckhardt	Kleppe	Rogers, Fla.
Edmondson	Kluczynski	Rooney, Pa.
Edwards, Calif.	Koch	Rosenthal
Ellberg	Kyros	Roth
Erlenborn	Landrum	Roybal
Esch	Latta	Ruth
Eshleman	Leggett	St Germain
Evans, Colo.	Long, Md.	Sandman
Farbstein	Lowenstein	Satterfield
Feighan	Lujan	Saylor
Fish	McCloskey	Schadeberg
Flood	McDade	Scheuer
Flowers	McDonald,	Schneebeli
Foley	Mich.	Schwengel
Ford, Gerald R.	McEwen	Scott
Ford,	McFall	Sebellus
William D.	Macdonald,	Shipley
Foreman	Mass.	Shriver
Fraser	MacGregor	Sisk
Frelinghuysen	Madden	Slack
Frey	Mann	Smith, Iowa
Friedel	Mathias	Smith, N.Y.
Fulton, Tenn.	Matsunaga	Snyder
Gallfanakis	Meeds	Springer
Gallagher	Michel	Stafford
Garmatz	Mikva	Staggers
Gaydos	Miller, Calif.	Stanton
Gettys	Minish	Steiger, Ariz.
Galmo	Mink	Stephens
Gibbons	Minshall	Stokes
Gilbert	Mize	Stratton
Gray	Mizell	Stubblefield
Green, Oreg.	Mollohan	Stuckey
Green, Pa.	Monagan	Taft
Griffin	Morgan	Taylor
Griffiths	Morse	Thompson, Ga.
Grover	Morton	Thompson, N.J.
Gude	Mosher	Tiernan
Halpern	Moss	Udall
Hamilton	Murphy, Ill.	Ullman
Hanley	Murphy, N.Y.	Van Deerlin
Hanna	Myers	Vander Jagt
Hansen, Idaho	Natcher	Vanik
Hansen, Wash.	Nichols	Vigorito
Harrington	Nix	Waldie
Harvey	Obey	Wampler
Hastings	O'Neill, Mass.	Watts
Hathaway	Ottinger	White
Hawkins	Patman	Whitehurst
Hays	Patten	Widnall
Hechler, W. Va.	Pepper	Williams
Heckler, Mass.	Perkins	Wilson
Helstoski	Philbin	Charles H.
Henderson	Pike	Winn
Hicks	Pirnie	Wolf
Hogan	Poage	Wydlar
Holifield	Podell	Wyman
Horton	Poff	Yates
Howard	Preyer, N.C.	Yatron
Hungate	Price, Ill.	Zablocki
Hutchinson	Pucinski	
Ichord	Purcell	

## NAYS—98

Abernethy	Gubser	Price, Tex.
Ashbrook	Haley	Pryor, Ark.
Blackburn	Hall	Quie
Buchanan	Hammer-	Quillen
Burke, Fla.	schmidt	Rallsback
Bush	Harsha	Rhodes
Cabell	Hosmer	Rivers
Camp	Hunt	Roberts
Carter	Jones, N.C.	Rousselot
Chappell	Jones, Tenn.	Ruppe
Clausen,	Kazen	Scherie
Don H.	Kuykendall	Schmitz
Collier	Kyl	Sikes
Collins	Landgrebe	Skubitz
Crane	Lennon	Smith, Calif.
Daniel, Va.	Lloyd	Steed
Denny	Lukens	Steiger, Wis.
Dennis	McClory	Talcott
Derwinski	McClure	Teague, Calif.
Devine	McMillan	Teague, Tex.
Dickinson	Mahon	Thomson, Wis.
Dorn	Marsh	Waggonner
Dowdy	Martin	Watson
Duncan	May	Whalen
Edwards, Ala.	Mayne	Whalley
Fascell	Melcher	Wilson, Bob
Findley	Miller, Ohio	Wold
Fisher	Mills	Wyatt
Fulton, Pa.	Montgomery	Wyllie
Fuqua	Nelsen	Young
Goldwater	Olsen	Zion
Gonzalez	Pelly	Zwach
Goodling	Pettis	
Gross	Pickle	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Fountain	O'Konski
----------	----------

## NOT VOTING—56

Abbt	Fallon	Passman
Alexander	Flynt	Pollock
Arends	Hagan	Powell
Baring	Hébert	Rarick
Berry	Hull	Reifel
Bray	Jonas	Reuss
Brock	Keith	Rogers, Colo.
Burleson, Tex.	King	Rooney, N.Y.
Caffery	Langen	Rostenkowski
Clay	Long, La.	Roudebush
Corman	McCarthy	Ryan
Cramer	McCulloch	Sullivan
Cunningham	McKneally	Symington
Daddario	Mailliard	Tunney
Dawson	Meskill	Weicker
Diggs	Moorhead	Whitten
Dwyer	Nedzi	Wiggins
Edwards, La.	O'Hara	Wright
Evins, Tenn.	O'Neal, Ga.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Arends.  
 Mr. Rooney of New York with Mrs. Dwyer.  
 Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Bray.  
 Mr. Burleson of Texas with Mr. King.  
 Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Langen.  
 Mr. Caffery with Mr. McCulloch.  
 Mr. Passman with Mr. Pollock.  
 Mr. Rarick with Mr. Cramer.  
 Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Reifel.  
 Mr. Daddario with Mr. Meskill.  
 Mr. Fallon with Mr. Jonas.  
 Mr. Tunney with Mr. Powell.  
 Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Berry.  
 Mr. Alexander with Mr. Keith.  
 Mr. Ryan with Mr. Clay.  
 Mr. Wright with Mr. Cunningham.  
 Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Roudebush.  
 Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Wiggins.  
 Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. McKneally.  
 Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Mailliard.  
 Mr. Baring with Mr. Symington.  
 Mr. Hull with Mr. Flynt.  
 Mr. Reuss with Mr. Diggs.  
 Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Dawson.  
 Mr. Abbt with Mr. Hagan.  
 Mr. Whitten with Mr. McCarthy.  
 Mr. Corman with Mr. Weicker.

Mr. O'KONSKI changed his vote from "yea" to "present."

Messrs. MAHON, WATSON, and McCLORY changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 1177, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 3637) to amend section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to equal-time requirements for candidates for public office, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MACDONALD OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 3637 and insert in lieu thereof the text of H.R. 18434 as passed.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to revise the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934 which relate to political broadcasting."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H.R. 18434, was laid on the table.

## APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 3637

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendment to the bill S. 3637 and request a conference with the Senate.

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

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STAGGERS, MACDONALD of Massachusetts, VAN DEERLIN, SPRINGER, and BROYHILL of North Carolina.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

## MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-376)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H.R. 16916, an Act making appropriations for the Office of Education for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

I am determined to hold the line against a dangerous budget deficit.

I am determined to hold the line against the kind of big spending that would drive up prices or demand higher taxes.

For that reason, I am today returning, without my approval, two bills the Congress has passed that would increase the Federal budget deficit by nearly one billion dollars.

1. *The Independent Offices Appropriations* bill, which includes funds for urban development, exceeds my budget request by \$541 million. I am mindful of the urgent needs of our cities, which is why my original request for urban renewal, water and sewer grants and housing subsidies was *double* the outlays in the last fiscal year of the previous Administration.

I am vetoing this bill because it would help drive up the cost of living, harming the people it is most designed to help. This kind of excessive spending would

also help cause the kind of huge deficits that drive up interest rates, which would make it impossible to speed the recovery of the housing industry.

2. *The appropriation for the Office of Education* is \$453 million over my budget request.

My request would have produced 28% more spending than in the last fiscal year of the previous Administration.

My budget asked \$3.97 billion for the educational purposes covered by this bill—an increase of \$972 million in spending over fiscal 1969. In addition, I have committed myself to ask the Congress for an extra \$350 million to fully fund the school desegregation program as soon as the Congress provides authorizing legislation.

This is only part of what the Federal government provides for education programs generally. *Total* spending on Federally supported education programs will reach nearly \$12 billion in 1971, the highest figure in history and substantially more than was provided for 1969. Thus the question is not one of cutting the present level of school funds. It is not even one of whether to increase school funds. It simply is a question of how *much* they are to be increased—and for what purposes.

Last March I stressed the urgent need for wide-ranging reforms in Federal aid to education. This bill raises the spending on old approaches that experience has proved inadequate, rather than moving boldly on the new approaches that we need—and it cuts requested funds for such forward-looking programs as drop-out prevention, educational opportunity grants and research.

My veto of both these bills is painful, but necessary to hold down the rising cost of living.

We cannot have something for nothing. When we spend more than our tax system can produce, the average American either has to pay for it in higher prices or in higher taxes.

At election time it is tempting for people in politics to say "yes" to every spending bill.

If I were to sign these bills that spend more than we can now afford, I would be saying yes to a higher cost of living, yes to higher interest rates, yes to higher taxes.

I flatly refuse to go along with the kind of big spending that is wrong for all the American people. That is why I must veto these bills which add an extra billion dollars of pressure on prices.

Taken individually, there is much that can be said in favor of every spending bill, including the ones I have vetoed.

But a President is not elected to see any one bill in isolation. He must see them as part of a whole, because his constituency is 200 million Americans.

Acting in the best interest of the nation as a whole, and concerned with the average family struggling to make their incomes meet rising prices, I have drawn the line against increased spending.

I urge the Congress to reconsider the spending course it has taken, and to place first priority on achieving our goal: a healthy economy, expanding

through peacetime activities, with reasonable price stability.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 11, 1970.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal and the message and bill will be printed as a House document.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the further consideration of the veto message of the President on the bill, H.R. 16916, be postponed until Thursday, August 13, 1970.

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

The motion was agreed to.

MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR  
SUNDRY INDEPENDENT OFFICES  
AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING  
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—  
VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRES-  
IDENT OF THE UNITED STATES  
(H. DOC. NO. 91-377)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

*To the House of Representatives:*

I return herewith, without my approval, H.R. 17548, an Act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

I am determined to hold the line against a dangerous budget deficit.

I am determined to hold the line against the kind of big spending that would drive up prices or demand higher taxes.

For that reason, I am today returning, without my approval, two bills the Congress has passed that would increase the Federal budget deficit by nearly one billion dollars.

1. *The Independent Offices Appropriations Bill*, which includes funds for urban development, exceeds my budget request by \$541 million. I am mindful of the urgent needs of our cities, which is why my original request for urban renewal, water and sewer grants and housing subsidies was *double* the outlays in the last fiscal year of the previous Administration.

I am vetoing this bill because it would help drive up the cost of living, harming the people it is most designed to help. This kind of excessive spending would also help cause the kind of huge deficits that drive up interest rates, which would make it impossible to speed the recovery of the housing industry.

2. *The appropriation for the Office of Education* is \$453 million over my budget request.

My request would have produced 28% more spending than in the last fiscal year of the previous Administration.

My budget asked \$3.97 billion for the educational purposes covered by this bill—an increase of \$972 million in spending over fiscal 1969. In addition, I have committed myself to ask the Con-

gress for an extra \$350 million to fully fund the school desegregation program as soon as the Congress provides authorizing legislation.

This is only part of what the Federal government provides for education programs generally. *Total* spending on Federally supported education programs will reach nearly \$12 billion in 1971, the highest figure in history and substantially more than was provided for 1969. Thus the question is not one of cutting the present level of school funds. It is not even one of whether to increase school funds. It simply is a question of how *much* they are to be increased—and for what purposes.

Last March I stressed the urgent need for wide-ranging reforms in Federal aid to education. This bill raises the spending on old approaches that experience has proved inadequate, rather than moving boldly on the new approaches that we need—and it cuts requested funds for such forward-looking programs as drop-out prevention, educational opportunity grants and research.

My veto of both these bills is painful, but necessary to hold down the rising cost of living.

We cannot have something for nothing. When we spend more than our tax system can produce, the average American either has to pay for it in higher prices or in higher taxes.

At election time it is tempting for people in politics to say "yes" to every spending bill.

If I were to sign these bills that spend more than we can now afford, I would be saying yes to a higher cost of living, yes to higher interest rates, yes to higher taxes.

I flatly refuse to go along with the kind of big spending that is wrong for all the American people. That is why I must veto these bills which add an extra billion dollars of pressure on prices.

Taken individually, there is much that can be said in favor of every spending bill, including the ones I have vetoed.

But a President is not elected to see any one bill in isolation. He must see them as part of a whole, because his constituency is 200 million Americans.

Acting in the best interest of the nation as a whole, and concerned with the average family struggling to make their incomes meet rising prices, I have drawn the line against increased spending.

I urge the Congress to reconsider the spending course it has taken, and to place first priority on achieving our goal: a healthy economy, expanding through peacetime activities, with reasonable price stability.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 11, 1970.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal and the message and the bill will be printed as a House document.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that further consideration of the veto message of the President on the bill H.R. 17548 be postponed until Thursday, August 13, 1970. This would have the effect of both messages being considered