

Ruscetta, Nicola A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tablas, Frank, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tuchterman, Denis W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Warden, Beryle E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wise, Eugene E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Witt, Marquis G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wolford, William F., xxx-xx-xxxx

NURSE CORPS

O'Brien, Clare E., xxx-xx-xxxx

VETERINARY CORPS

Hemphill, Frazier E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Otter, Jason I., xxx-xx-xxxx

The following officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force (Medical Corps), in the grade of lieutenant colonel, under the provisions of section 593, title 10, United States Code, and Public Law 92-129, with a view to designation as medical officers, under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, with effective dates to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Kozub, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roberts, Perry T., xxx-xx-xxxx

The following persons for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 593, title 10, United States Code, and Public Law 92-129, with effective dates to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be colonel

Schupp, Franklin J., xxx-xx-xxxx

To be lieutenant colonel

Edwards, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Orr, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whitmore, Harold E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Max W., xxx-xx-xxxx

The following officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force (line of the Air Force), in the grade of colonel, under the provisions of sections 593 and 8351, title 10, United States Code, and Public Law 92-129.

Hastie, Doyle W., xxx-xx-xxxx

The following officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force (line of the Air Force) in the grade of colonel, under the provisions of sections 593, 8351, and 8392, title 10, United States Code, and Public Law 92-129.

Day, Paul R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Frymire, Richard L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx

The following Air Force officers for reap-

pointment to the active list of the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, from sections 1210 and 1211, title 10, United States Code:

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be colonel

Holmes, Capers A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tucker, Albert S. J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx

To be lieutenant colonel

Daley, Robert F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hess, Marvin J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Powers, Harold M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tatsios, Theodore G., xxx-xx-xxxx

To be major

Bache, Ronald H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gough, Richard M., xxx-xx-xxxx

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 25, 1972:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

John W. Warner, of Virginia, to be Secretary of the Navy.

Frank P. Sanders, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of the Navy.

Robert D. Nesen, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

U.S. ARMY

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list, in grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Hugh McClellan Exton, XXXX
 XXXX Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. James Benjamin Lampert, XXXX
 XXXX Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

U.S. NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

LINE

John D. Chase John 'L' Butts, Jr.
 David M. Rubel William M. Pugh II
 Robert S. Salzer Ward S. Miller
 Paul E. Pugh Roger E. Spreen

James Ferris
 John H. Dick
 William H. Livingston
 Howard E. Greer
 Jon L. Boyes
 Donald C. Davis
 Donald V. Cox
 Herbert S. Ainsworth
 Earl P. Yates
 Donald D. Engen
 Oliver H. Perry, Jr.

Edwin K. Snyder
 Herbert F. Matthews, Jr.
 Dean L. Axene
 Patrick "J" Hannifin
 James W. Nance
 Rembrandt C. Robinson
 Worth H. Bagley
 Clarence M. Hart
 Lewis A. Hopkins

MEDICAL CORPS

William C. Turville

SUPPLY CORPS

Charles Becker

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Richard G. Hutcheson, Jr.

DENTAL CORPS

Anthony K. Kalres

In the Air Force

The nominations beginning Richard E. Buckley, to be lieutenant colonel, and ending Theresa C. Carfagno, to be lieutenant colonel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on Apr. 4, 1972.

In the Army

The nominations beginning Charles W. Boohar, Jr., to be captain, and ending Lawrence E. Vaupel, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on Apr. 10, 1972.

In the Navy

The nominations beginning Andrew R. Adams, to be ensign, and ending Johanna H. Gorman, to be commander, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on Apr. 4, 1972;

The nominations beginning Richard D. Adams, to be commander, and ending Richard J. Zimmerman, to be commander, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on Apr. 4, 1972; and

The nominations beginning Douglas W. Barron, to be commander, and ending Gerald F. Sullivan, to be commander, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on Apr. 4, 1972.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, April 25, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
 The Reverend Monsignor Joseph B. Coyne, pastor, Church of the Little Flower, Bethesda, Md., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Creator and Legislator, pour forth Your blessings upon the Members of this distinguished assembly.

The membership of this House has been invested by its peers with the privilege and duty of legislating for them. Grant them, great God, omniscient and omnipotent, the discernment they need to be equal to the challenge of their office. Grant them a keen sense of justice and equity; of selflessness and generosity; of compassion and understanding. Help them, by Your grace, to be all that men expect them to be for so many have placed their trust in them. Keep them always men of eminent moral stature in whom the Nation takes pride.

Thus, they will fulfill their mission and mandate, distinguish themselves and

add luster to this Nation of free men under God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

TRIBUTE TO MSGR. JOSEPH B. COYNE

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, Msgr. Joseph B. Coyne, who gave the opening prayer

today, is the pastor of Little Flower Church in Bethesda, Md., and an inspiration and spiritual aid to all of us who are members of the parish.

He became pastor of Little Flower last June, but has long been a familiar and beloved figure in the archdiocese of Washington.

Born in Baltimore in 1919, he attended Loyola High School and College and St. Mary's University there.

He was secretary and administrative assistant to the late Bishop John M. McNamara, auxiliary bishop of Washington.

He founded St. Andrew the Apostle Parish in Silver Spring, Md., and was the first pastor there.

Monsignor Coyne has been a key figure in the arrangements for the annual benefits for the Lt. Joseph P. Kennedy Institute here, a school for the mentally retarded.

I am proud that he is pastor of Little Flower and I am proud that he could be with us today.

DESERVED HONOR TO TEXAS FAMILY

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

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the attention of the House to a family in the Fairview community of Wilson County, Tex., that has been selected the Texas FHA Farm Family of 1971. Out of a field of 20 nominees, this top State honor went to Mr. and Mrs. Charles H. Freeman and their two daughters and two sons.

I report briefly on the Freeman family's achievement because it portrays the effectiveness of the Farmers Home Administration program which many of us have supported for years. In 1958, though the Freemans had very limited resources, they negotiated their first Farmers Home Administration loan. Wise use of their credit and diligent work by the family enabled the Freemans to operate a 500-acre farm, 124 acres owned and the rest rented.

Their major crop has been peanuts, raised by irrigation, and their efforts have raised their yield considerably above 100 bushels per acre. They have also raised beef cattle.

Mr. and Mrs. Freeman have been active community leaders, as have their children, both at home and at college.

The honor that has come to them is clearly earned. Their friends and neighbors will honor them at a dinner in Floresville, Tex., on April 28. The main speaker is to be James V. Smith, our former colleague who is now national FHA Administrator. I hope to attend that event, but I want my fellow Members to share with me gratitude for the Freeman family for their splendid achievements. In these days when the family farm is disappearing in many regions, it is good to see that there are still people like the Freemans helping to produce the food and fiber for our Nation.

GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT AND CONSUMER PRICE REPORTS ARE FAVORABLE

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

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, preliminary data on the economy's progress during the first quarter leaves no doubt that we are embarked on a strong and vigorous expansion. Total gross national product—GNP—soared more than \$30 billion, at a seasonally adjusted annual rate. This advance of almost 12 percent far exceeds the 7.6-percent increase during the previous quarter. While the real growth of the economy at 5.3 percent was somewhat below that in the fourth quarter of 1971, it is still a healthy increase and well above the trend rate of growth over the last 5 years.

All sectors participated in the advance. Business expenditures on durable equipment rose 7 percent and purchases by all levels of government rose almost as much. The consumer sector showed unusual strength as residential construc-

tion spending soared 10 percent. Consumer spending on durable goods also rose substantially. As further evidence of strengthening consumer demand, the savings rate dropped to 7.4 percent.

Developments on the price front are admittedly difficult to appraise, but I note with considerable hope that the March seasonally adjusted Consumer Price Index did not rise at all for the first time in over 5 years. Key food prices leveled off or declined.

These are preliminary figures and are subject to revisions. However, this initial data is quite encouraging—that we are in the midst of a strong and sustainable expansion with increasing stability of price levels.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unable to be on the House floor on April 20 to be recorded on roll-call No. 119, the vote on H.R. 14070, to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, including the funding for the space shuttle program. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the listing of my name under the pairs under the "until further notice" section be stricken, to reflect this fact.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FIRE RESEARCH AND SAFETY ACT AND STANDARD REFERENCE DATA ACT

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 930 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 930

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13034) to authorize appropriations to carry out the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968 and the Standard Reference Data Act, and to amend the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), to make improvements in fiscal and administrative practices for more effective conduct of certain functions of the National Bureau of Standards. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) pending

which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 930 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for the consideration of H.R. 13034 authorizing appropriations for the Fire Research and Safety Act and the Standard Reference Data Act. In addition to authorizing appropriations to carry out the purposes of those acts, the bill amends the Organic Act of the Bureau of Standards.

The National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control, recently appointed by the President, was established by the Fire Research and Safety Act to make a study and investigation of the causes of fire and to make recommendations thereon. None of the funds authorized by H.R. 13034 are to be used by the Commission.

The standard reference data system within the Department of Commerce, which is administered by the Bureau of Standards, collects, compiles, evaluates, publishes, and disseminates information to be made available to scientists, engineers, and the general public.

The authorization is a continuing one with no specific amounts set forth. The funds requested for the purposes of the Fire and Research Safety Act for fiscal year 1973 are \$4,928,000. Funds requested for the Standard Reference Data Act for fiscal year 1973 are \$2,795,000.

The Organic Act is amended to provide that statutory authorizations for appropriations for the Bureau be on a multiple-year basis or without fiscal year limitation. This would enable the Bureau to conduct its research and development activities more effectively.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule in order that the bill may be considered.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the purposes of H.R. 13034 are to provide a continuing authorization of such funds as are necessary to carry out the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968, and the Standard Reference Data Act and to amend the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards.

The most significant change in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards is the addition of a new section 18, which provides that appropriations for the Bureau may be on a multiple year basis or be without fiscal year limitation.

With regard to the cost, the bill authorizes such sums as may be necessary in fiscal year 1973 and succeeding years. While this authorization is open ended, in the past, appropriations have not been excessive. Funding for the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968 was \$1,030,000 in fiscal year 1971 and \$1,310,000 in fiscal year 1972. The request for fiscal 1973 is \$4,928,000. Funding for the Standard Reference Data Act was \$2,400,000 in fiscal year 1971, and \$2,265,000 in fiscal year 1972. The request for fiscal year 1973 is \$2,795,000.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 120]

Abourezk	Foley	Mills, Ark.
Abzug	Ford	Moorhead
Ashley	William D.	Morgan
Badillo	Fountain	Morse
Baring	Fraser	Murphy, N.Y.
Barrett	Fulton	Nix
Belcher	Gallifanakis	Patman
Blaggi	Gallagher	Peyser
Blester	Gaydos	Pirnie
Bingham	Gialmo	Preyer, N.C.
Blanton	Goldwater	Pryor, Ark.
Blatnik	Goodling	Rees
Boland	Gray	Riegle
Brasco	Green, Pa.	Rooney, Pa.
Byrne, Pa.	Griffin	Rosenthal
Caffery	Griffiths	Rostenkowski
Camp	Hagan	Runnels
Carey, N.Y.	Hall	Ryan
Carney	Hanna	Scheuer
Celler	Hansen, Wash.	Slack
Chisholm	Hawkins	Staggers
Clark	Hebert	Steed
Clay	Heinz	Stephens
Conyers	Ichord	Stokes
Coughlin	Johnson, Pa.	Stubblefield
Culver	Jones, Ala.	Taylor
Curlin	Jones, Tenn.	Teague, Calif.
Dent	Kee	Ullman
Diggs	Kluczynski	Vander Jagt
Dow	Kuykendall	Vigorito
Dowdy	Long, La.	Waggonner
Dulski	Lujan	Ware
Dwyer	McDonald,	Williams
Edwards, La.	Mich.	Winn
Eilberg	McEwen	Wright
Erlenborn	McMillan	Yatron
Esch	Macdonald,	Young, Tex.
Eshleman	Mass.	Zion
Fisher	Madden	
Flowers	Miller, Calif.	

The SPEAKER. On this rolloall 318 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FIRE RESEARCH AND SAFETY ACT AND STANDARD REFERENCE DATA ACT

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13034) to authorize appropriations to carry out the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968 and the Standard Reference Data Act, and to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), to make improvements in fiscal and administrative practices for more effective conduct of certain functions of the National Bureau of Standards.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVIS) that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 13034.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13034) to authorize appropriations to carry out the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968 and the Standard Reference Data Act, and to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), to make improvements in fiscal and administrative practices for more effective conduct of certain functions of the National Bureau of Standards, with Mr. HANLEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVIS) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Science and Astronautics has taken testimony on H.R. 13034 and strongly urges its passage. This bill authorizes funds for fiscal year 1973 and subsequent years for the National Bureau of Standards to carry out the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968, the Standard Reference Data Act and to make amendments to the Organic Act of the Bureau to improve their administrative practices.

In the past, for both the Fire Research and Safety Act and the Standard Reference Data Act, authorizations have been approved every 2 years. This year we combined those two authorizations in one bill because of the relatively small amount of money involved in each program. The sums actually programed in prior years by the Bureau of Standards have been approximately \$1 million for fire research and about \$2.5 million for the standard reference data work. However, for fiscal year 1973 the requested amount for fire research and safety has been increased to \$4.928 million. In view of the relatively small amount of money planned to be used, the Bureau has repeatedly requested that the committee approve a continuing authorization for these two measures. The bill before you contains language authorizing "such sums as may be necessary for succeeding fiscal years." These two acts are the only activities of the Bureau of Standards that require authorizations. The great majority of their funds require no specific authorization and their budget requests go directly to the Appropriations Committee. If this bill is passed, the effect is that the Bureau of Standards will go directly to the Appropriations Committee for essentially all of their funds thereby simplifying their procedures. We believe that this procedure is beneficial for the Government and will add flexibility to the operation of the Bureau. Since the Science and Astronautics Committee has legislative jurisdiction over the Bureau and will be requiring status and progress reports periodically,

the Congress can keep close surveillance over its operation. Also, we can always reverse this procedure if the situation warrants.

The need for fire and fire related safety research is highlighted by the statistics that are presented to us. It is estimated that fire kills more than 12,000 American citizens each year, many hundreds of thousands are injured and fire damages and property loss exceeds \$2 billion each year. It has been estimated that the indirect cost of fire losses is 2.6 times the direct loss, or approximately \$5.2 billion indirect loss. The total of the indirect plus direct loss is in excess of \$7.2 billion per year and is increasing.

The funds authorized by this bill will enable the National Bureau of Standards to conduct research in areas not now being adequately carried out by any private or governmental agency. Further, the funds will enable the central purpose of the 1968 act to be realized, namely, the establishment of a focal point upon which research efforts at fire control and prevention can be centered, and of a coordinated national program for such activity.

The fire research work to be carried out by the Bureau includes the following:

First. Investigations of fires as to their causes, frequency of occurrence, and severity of losses;

Second. Research into causes and nature of fires, and the development of improved methods and techniques for fire prevention and control;

Third. Public education on fire hazards and safety;

Fourth. Fire information reference service;

Fifth. Education and training programs for professional firefighters; and Sixth. Demonstration projects.

We believe that the country needs more effective measures of protection against the hazards of fire and that the additional responsibility for fire research and other factors contained in the Fire Research and Safety Act should provide the necessary assistance to our firefighting organizations to reduce the hazards of fire and, therefore, the deaths, personal injury, and property damage resulting therefrom.

The enactment of this bill will make Federal resources available for support of increased private, public, and governmental efforts in fire research and safety. Present research efforts are carried out by fire equipment and building materials industries, trade associations, commercial laboratories, nonprofit organizations, universities, insurance companies, and Government agencies. The major proportion of this research, however, is either product oriented or mission oriented. Inadequate attention is being given to basic research. Instead, great reliance is placed on empirical fire testing methods. For example, there is evidence that present fire codes and inspection requirements introduce an inflexibility in building design and construction. Under the authorization of this bill, the Bureau plans to develop better evaluation techniques for new building materials, for new types of building design, and for new types of

firefighting equipment. These techniques will stimulate industry to new innovations in these areas from a fire-resistance viewpoint because the evaluation methods will be more reliable.

The Standard Reference Data Act—approved July 11, 1968—declared the policy of the Congress to make critically evaluated reference data readily available to scientists, engineers, and the general public. Under the terms of the act, the Secretary of Commerce is assigned the primary responsibility in the Government for providing for the collection, compilation, critical evaluation, publication and dissemination of standard reference data. The National Bureau of Standards is further delegated the responsibility for carrying out this act. The activities supported by this authorization include many projects which improve the Nation's capability to respond rapidly to the need for reducing air pollution, improving energy sources and distribution, developing new products, and strengthening technology and science in the United States. These benefits are derived through having good data readily available as needed to solve the technical problems associated with these areas of national need.

In addition to providing reliable reference data for use by the entire scientific and technical community, the program serves another important function. Through the critical evaluation process, the generation of data in the laboratory is strongly influenced; standards of measurement are upgraded, and the reporting of results in the scientific literature is improved. This serves to increase the effectiveness of the national investment in scientific research. At a time of severe restrictions on science funding, this increase in effectiveness from the standard reference data program may be equal in importance to the benefits derived from the availability of the data.

H.R. 13034 also provides for a continuing authorization of such sums as may be required by the Bureau for their work; that is to go directly to the Appropriations Committee for funds to cover the work being performed under the Standard Reference Data Act. This is the same procedure as outlined above for the Fire Research and Safety Act.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, there are a number of amendments to the Organic Act of the Bureau that are desirable to clarify functions that have been overtaken by time. The committee has considered these amendments and considers them essential to improved administrative practices in the Bureau of Standards.

AMENDMENTS TO THE ORGANIC ACT

The proposed amendments to the Organic Act would permit the following improvements in the fiscal and administrative practices of the Bureau for more effective conduct of its research and development activities:

First. Appropriation of funds to remain available beyond 1 fiscal year.

A new section would be added to the Organic Act of the Bureau of Standards providing statutory authorization for appropriations to be without fiscal year limitation.

Most research and development appropriations for other agencies are provided as "no-year" funds, available until expended. Their justification is found in the uncertainties inherent in research programs, the high incidence of unpredictable factors that compel readjustment of program activity, and the need for flexibility to permit prompt response to changed circumstances. Final determination of the availability of funds usable on a multiple year basis would be contained in the appropriation bill for the agency.

Second. Clarification of authority to engage in teaching and training activities in areas of special NBS competence.

This amendment modifies paragraph 19 of section 2 of the Organic Act to clarify the authority of the National Bureau of Standards to engage in teaching and training activities in areas of special NBS competence. In particular, it would enable Bureau scientific and technical personnel under certain circumstances to teach at educational institutions of higher learning as part of their official duties.

Third. Clarification of authority to perform services for international organizations and governments of friendly countries and their institutions.

This proposed revision of section 3 of the Organic Act would clarify the authority of NBS to perform its services for international organizations of which the United States is a member and for friendly countries and their institutions. At present, NBS has specific authority to exercise its functions only for the Federal Government, State and local governments, and for institutions and firms within the United States.

Fourth. Increase monetary limitation relating to construction and improvement of NBS buildings and facilities from \$40,000 to \$75,000.

This limitation has become burdensome over the past several years because of increased construction costs. Extensive construction authorization in excess of this amount still must be sought in the normal budget process.

Fifth. Clarification of authority to provide care, maintenance, and protection of the buildings and property of NBS.

This amendment clarifies existing law which limits the Secretary of Commerce in his responsibility for "the care, maintenance, and protection of the buildings occupied by the Bureau of Standards of the Department of Commerce in the District of Columbia."

The Bureau is no longer located in the District of Columbia but in Gaithersburg, Md., and it also operates facilities in Colorado.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes by presentation. I will be pleased to answer any questions that you may have.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 13034, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Fire Research and Safety Act and the Standard Reference Data Act.

I would also like to praise my distinguished colleague from Georgia on his remarks and on his exhaustive efforts as

chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development.

This legislation was unanimously reported by the Science and Astronautics Committee.

It is my firm belief that the Fire Research and Safety Act represents a vehicle by which it is possible to greatly reduce the loss of human life and the destruction of property resulting from fire.

It is estimated that each year 12,000 American citizens perish and over \$2 billion of property is damaged or destroyed due to fire.

The funds approved by the committee will enable the National Bureau of Standards to initiate fire research in areas not currently being carried out by private organizations or governmental agencies.

Presently, the vast majority of fire research is either product or mission oriented.

Not enough attention has been directed to basic research in the area of fire prevention.

It is the design of this bill to remedy this inadequacy.

The standard reference data program is one of the National Bureau of Standards' most refined projects.

Specifically, this program is one that makes critically evaluated reference data available to the scientists, engineers, and the general public.

The acceleration of scientific technology in the past decade together with the anticipated achievements in the future highlights the need for the continuation of this program.

The standard reference data system functions and will continue to function to keep this voluminous output manageable.

Mr. Chairman, I impress upon my colleague's the vital services provided by both of these programs and ask that they give their full support to the bill before us.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank my colleague from California for his generous remarks and thank him for his great cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any amendments to the bill and I do not know of any opposition to the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman from Georgia yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. With reference to—what is it called? The data—

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Standard reference data.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; standard reference data.

Is any revision or use of that designed to promote the metric system?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. It has no reference whatsoever to that system.

I might say to my colleague from Iowa that we do have a metric system bill in the mill this year which I strongly support and I hope that he will in his wisdom find a way to support it himself.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to my friend from Georgia that he may strongly sup-

port it, but I am just as strongly opposed to the imposition upon this country of the metric system at this time because of the Nation's financial difficulties and the enormous costs involved.

I just want to be sure that there is no money for the promotion of the metric system in this bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. There is absolutely none.

I would say to my good friend that when you come right down to it, we are truly on a metric system now, when the only way you can define an inch is that it is 25.4 millimeters long. I do not think the expense is going to be as great as my good friend might think it would be.

Mr. GROSS. I would not want to even have to think about measuring a fish that I might have caught in terms of whatever that was you came up with under that system. If that is the way it operates you would soon be resorting to the googol.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I suggest to my friend from Iowa that whatever the length of the fish is, it would still be that length under the metric system. However, it would also depend upon the viewpoint of the fisherman who caught the fish.

Mr. GROSS. I want to be sure the game warden agrees it is the legal length under your system.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Whatever length you apply to it, it is still that length, but you cannot count on the fisherman at all times as to his estimation of its length.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 13034. My district is fortunate in having an educational facility devoted solely to the training and facilities of fire officers and firefighters. I refer to the Fire Service Extension Department of the College of Engineering at the University of Maryland. This is the one school in Eastern United States which offers a bachelor of science degree in fire protection engineering.

There has been, and continues to be, close liaison between the university and my office. We jointly recognize the need for more training, more research and more funds devoted to firefighting and to the prevention of fires.

I therefore support the appropriation of more funds and the goals proposed by H.R. 13034. We have long needed a single agency, the National Bureau of Standards, to be fully responsible for carrying out the provisions of title I of the Fire Research and Safety Act.

In my district the services and facilities of firefighters, both professional and volunteer, cost approximately \$12 million per year. At this rate the annual cost for the Nation would be \$4 to \$5 billion. The number of professional firefighters in the United States is approximately 150,000; the number of volunteers approximately 2 million. Certainly those who expend this amount of money and those who train this number of people need technical guidance at the Federal level.

Whereas our local police work closely with the FBI and State police forces, the firefighters have been neglected. Only

recently has it been recognized that there should be a national research, educational and statistical coordination agency. The State fire marshals are for the most part still principally law enforcement and fire prevention agencies with small staffs. I therefore applaud the purpose of H.R. 13034 which gives recognition to the national need.

Today the insurance industry, the Underwriters Laboratories, and Government activities such as NASA, do research as best serves their purposes. No one agency really can serve the public unless it is the NBS which can and should coordinate the research now being done and undertake that research which no one now does. It can adopt for firefighting the lessons learned by the moon shots. It can research the fire-resistant qualities of building materials. It can improve the design and use of fire-economics of fire-fighting equipment which is expensive; for example, \$80,000 to \$100,000 for an aerial truck; \$35,000 to \$60,000 for a pumper; \$185,000 to \$250,000 for the average firehouse.

Firefighting training needs technical guidance. For example, just last week Department of Labor representatives came into my office and announced the establishment of a job training corps for the underprivileged. It is expected to spend somewhere in the neighborhood of \$2 million a year in training 300 youths. One of the half dozen areas in which training would be given is fire and police services. The question is immediately raised as to who would be responsible for the technical elements of the fire program. Would it be local, State, or national groups? Hopefully, such a training institution could look to NBS for technical guidance.

Within the past month at the request of the Fire Service Extension Department of the University of Maryland and the Maryland State Fireman's Association, we were able to help obtain space and facilities for Maryland's first in a series of regional fire training centers. These regional training centers will expand the University of Maryland's services to fire, rescue, and ambulance personnel throughout the State. The University of Maryland has a 35-year history in fire protection. However, for most firefighters in the State, attendance at the university would have often meant leaving the home station without adequate emergency service. Regional training is a logical extension of the university's services. However, progress in research and training at the Federal level is equally as important as programs at the local level. I trust improved guidance and performance will be obtained by the passage of H.R. 13034.

Mr. McKEVITT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 13034 which would implement the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968.

While the measure carries other provisions including authorization of funds for the Standard Reference Data Act and to make administrative improvements for the National Bureau of Standards, implementation of the Fire Research and Safety Act is the most signifi-

cant part of the measure, at least in my opinion.

It is estimated that fire kills 12,500 Americans a year, leaves many, many more injured, and results in property damage and loss of almost \$3 billion a year. Add to this estimates that the indirect costs of fire losses could be more than \$5 billion a year and we have ample reason for implementation of the Fire Research and Safety Act.

The proposed authorization and subsequent appropriation will permit the National Bureau of Standards to implement title I of the act. This will mean a centering of fire control and prevention efforts. In short, a coordinated national program of research into the problem. As the committee noted, the program should lead to better design techniques in structures and equipment, improved firefighting procedures, improved fire codes and a reduction of the losses from fire.

Title II of the program created the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control although no funds authorized in this bill may be used by the Commission. The Commission was recently appointed by the President and in the view of some experts will be able to make a major contribution. One of these experts is Myrle K. Wise, chief of the Denver Fire Department. Chief Wise said this in a recent letter to me:

The National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control has the opportunity to achieve far-reaching goals in contributing to the security of the lives, possessions and happiness of the American people.

Determination of a program which will eventually serve to reduce the mounting loss of life and property.

Provide a means of research and development so as to incorporate the latest methods and materials.

Provide a system for the dissemination of technical data and research publications for the use of fire departments throughout the country.

Make readily available a current data manual on all hazardous materials.

Collect pertinent data to resolve the rising trend in arson crimes and to curb the disturbing and dangerous increase in false alarm rates.

Implement legislation which will accomplish the urgent needs of the fire service on a national level and provide the funding necessary to carry out these programs.

The rising death toll, 12,500 per year, and the nearly three billion in property damage denotes the urgency of the times for measures which will reverse the trend and provide the citizens of this country with some measure of relief from the hazards of fire.

Mr. Chairman, we owe it to the American people to fully implement the Fire Research and Safety Act and to see that necessary funds are provided to bring about greater protection against death, injury, and damage to property resulting from fire.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to add my support to H.R. 13034, the proposed Fire Research and Safety Act. This legislation has enormous potential for improving our defenses against the ravages of fire, through funding of research and other fire prevention activities by the National Bureau of Standards.

I rise at this point so that the record

will show the concern that exists in many quarters over our failure thus far to standardize the threads and couplings used in fire hoses.

A major conflagration at best is an unpleasant affair; when firefighting equipment cannot be used because it will not fit together, the results can be tragic.

Robert Ely, a veteran official of the San Diego Fire Department, has labored tirelessly for standardization of this gear, even to the point of designing a special power thread cutting machine that permits homogenizing of threads without removing couplings from the hose.

But Bob Ely, who has also served for the past 13 years as chairman of the committee on standardization of the International Association of Fire Chiefs, cannot achieve this necessary uniformity of equipment by himself.

Unfortunately, when he has turned to government agencies for help, he has usually been told that while his goals are laudable, there is not enough money on hand to achieve them.

H.R. 13034 should make a difference, in this regard.

I am encouraged by the estimate of the Committee on Science and Astronautics that \$4.9 million should be made available for the fire research and safety program, under the Bureau of Standards, over each of the next 5 years.

Chief Ely's power tools for standardizing fire hose threads can be reproduced—but at a cost, of course. Already these machines have been successfully employed in California, Alaska, Washington and by the U.S. Forest Service. Could not the funds which H.R. 13034 authorizes be used to help facilitate the distribution of these tools wherever they are needed in the United States?

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I include the text of a recent letter by Mr. Ely to President Nixon, summarizing the need for standardization.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF FIRE CHIEFS, INC.,

Washington, D.C., September 10, 1971.

RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As chairman of a committee having national scope, we wish to inform you and others charged with the welfare, safety and protection of our country that a serious, dangerous and costly condition exists in the fire defense of our country. We refer to the use of so many non-standard fire hose coupling screw threads.

With the advent of the nuclear age we are going through a time of peril for our country and have become much more dependent upon our neighbor, another city or another state or states in order to survive. In the event of any nuclear attack on this country, there will be much confusion and many problems. Why should we compound our problems by having our fire fighting equipment with non-standard screw threads that will not fit our neighbors nor our neighbors fit ours?

When we read fire service history we find that during the bombing of England their fire fighting operations were impaired considerably because of non-standard fire hose couplings, also during the heavy bombings of Stuttgart, Germany, many adjacent cities were called for aid and they found to their dismay that their fire equipment was of no value due to non-standard fire hose couplings.

Much work has gone into this standardization program. Standard threads for all sizes

of fire hose couplings have been adopted in the U.S. and some states have passed laws requiring these standards. However, this is not enough as there are many cities, military installations, state operated facilities, as well as private installations that do not conform to the National standards. Even our great production city of Detroit has non-standard fire hose threads. Also Washington, D.C. does not have National standard fire hose screw threads on their 1½ inch fire hose.

For over 98 years the International Association of Fire Chiefs have adopted resolutions (see attached latest resolutions) recommending that all fire hose threads should be standard. Resolutions and recommendations have not been enough to get the job done. It is evident that proper legislation and financial help will be necessary to help get all fire hose threads standardized in the United States.

We urge your active support and leadership in this very important standardization program and ask that you take the necessary steps to aid and assist the fire service to standardize all fire hose coupling screw threads nationwide.

Sincerely,

ROBERT ELY,

Chairman, International Association of
Fire Chiefs Committee on Standardization
of Fire Hose Screw Threads.

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

A bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968 and the Standard Reference Data Act, and to amend the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), to make improvements in fiscal and administrative practices for more effective conduct of certain functions of the National Bureau of Standards

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Commerce such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1973 and succeeding fiscal years to carry out the purposes of the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-259; 82 Stat. 34).

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Commerce such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1973 and succeeding fiscal years to carry out the purposes of the Standard Reference Data Act (15 U.S.C. 290-290f; 82 Stat. 339).

SEC. 3. (a) The Act entitled "An Act to establish the National Bureau of Standards", approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, is further amended by adding the following section:

"SEC. 18. Appropriations to carry out the provisions of this Act may remain available for obligation and expenditure for such period or periods as may be specified in the Acts making such appropriations."

(b) Such Act is further amended by striking the period at the end of paragraph (19) of section 2, by inserting a comma in lieu thereof and by adding the following: "and including the use of National Bureau of Standards scientific or technical personnel for part-time or intermittent teaching and training activities at educational institutions of higher learning as part of and incidental to their official duties and without additional compensation other than that provided by law."

(c) Such Act is further amended by revising the first sentence of section 3 to read as follows: "The Bureau is authorized to exercise its functions for the Government of the United States and for international organizations of which the United States is a member; for governments of friendly countries; for any State or municipal government within the United States; or for any scientific society, educational

institution, firm, corporation, or individual within the United States or friendly countries engaged in manufacturing or other pursuits requiring the use of standards or standard measuring instruments: *Provided*, That the exercise of these functions for international organization, governments of friendly countries and scientific societies, educational institutions, firms, corporations, or individuals therein shall be in coordination with other agencies of the United States Government, in particular the Department of State in respect to foreign entities."

(d) Such Act is further amended by deleting in section 14 the figure "\$40,000" and substituting in lieu thereof the figure "\$75,000".

(e) Such Act is further amended by revising section 15(b) to read as follows:

"(b) The care, maintenance, protection, repair, and alteration of Bureau buildings and other plant facilities, equipment, and property."

(f) That portion of the Act of April 29, 1926 (44 Stat. 356; 40 U.S.C. 14a) which relates to the National Bureau of Standards is hereby repealed.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

THE CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

THE CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 3, line 9, delete the word "organization," and insert in lieu thereof the word "organizations."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HANLEY, 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. 13034) to authorize appropriations to carry out the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968 and the Standard Reference Data Act, and to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), to make improvements in fiscal and administrative practices for more effective conduct of certain functions of the National Bureau of Standards, pursuant to House Resolution 930, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

THE SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

THE SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

THE SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks with respect to the bill H.R. 13034 just passed by the House.

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

There was no objection.

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE NATURAL GAS PIPELINE SAFETY ACT OF 1968—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I herewith transmit the Fourth Annual Report on the Administration of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968. This report has been prepared in accordance with Section 14 of the Act, and covers the period of January 1, 1971, through December 31, 1971.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 25, 1972.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS TO THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 929 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 929

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14108) to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 929 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 14108 authorizing appropriations to the National Science Foundation.

The authorization for the Foundation for fiscal year 1973 is in the amount of \$673.8 million. In addition, \$7 million are authorized in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department determines to be in excess of the normal requirements of the United States.

A line item budget was approved by the legislative committee rather than a lump sum authorization. There are 13 categories included in this line item budget. However, it is provided that 10 percent of the allotment for a category may be transferred to another. No higher percentage than that may be transferred without notice to the House and Senate committees followed by a waiting period of 30 legislative days or prior approval of the committees.

The legislation is similar to that of previous years.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 14108 is to authorize funds for the National Science Foundation for fiscal year 1973. The bill authorizes \$673,800,000, plus \$7,000,000 for expenses incurred outside the United States, to be financed from foreign currencies which are determined to be in excess of the normal requirements of the United States. The \$673,800,000 is broken down as follows:

- Scientific research project support, \$270,600,000;
- National and special research programs, \$106,900,000;
- National research centers, \$42,300,000.
- Computing activities in education and research, \$19,500,000;
- Science information activities, \$9,500,000;
- International cooperative scientific activities \$4,700,000;
- Research applied to national needs, \$80,000,000;
- Intergovernmental science program, \$1,200,000;
- Institutional improvement for science, \$18,000,000;
- Graduate student support, \$20,000,000;
- Science education improvement, \$71,800,000;
- Planning and policy studies, \$2,500,000; and
- Program development and management, \$26,800,000.

In addition, the bill provides that the National Science Foundation shall not transfer more than 10 percent of the funds allotted for one of the thirteen categories to another category unless notice is given to the appropriate House and Senate committees followed by a waiting period of 30 legislative days or the committees have approved the transfer prior to the expiration of the 30-day period.

Section 7 provides that colleges and universities may deny or withdraw financial assistance from participants in acts which cause substantial disruption to such institutions. This section is identical to provisions included in NSF authorizations for the last 3 years.

Section 8 amends the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to reemphasize support of science education programs at all levels.

The National Science Foundation request was for \$646,000,000 plus \$7,000,000 in excess foreign currency. The Committee on Science and Astronautics increased this by \$27,800,000 for a total of \$673,800,000 plus \$7,000,000 in excess foreign currencies.

The only departmental letter in the committee report is from the National Science Foundation supporting the original request. There are no minority views in the report. The committee reported the bill unanimously by a voice vote.

Chairman MILLER has requested a 1 hour, open rule.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14108) to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, 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 consideration of the bill H.R. 14108, with Mr. HANLEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVIS) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the bill (H.R. 14108) authorizes \$673,800,000 for the National Science Foundation in fiscal year 1973, plus \$7 million in excess foreign currencies. The bill before us today is a clean bill which reflects a number of changes made by the Committee on Science and Astronautics to the administration request.

H.R. 14108 includes a net increase in funds of \$27.8 million over the NSF request. I should like to point out that even with this increase, the total of the authorization is only \$21.3 million above the NSF authorization for fiscal year 1972, or an increase of about 3 percent.

The committee held 9 days of open hearings on this authorization, including three sessions with non-Government witnesses. We had the benefit, therefore, not only of testimony from the NSF officials but some of the best judgments and opinions from the academic community and other related groups.

After two markup sessions in subcommittee, the full committee approved the

bill under consideration today by a unanimous vote. In our opinion, H.R. 14108, even with the increases made by the committee, provides only the minimum resources necessary for our Nation to maintain adequate progress in scientific research and science education.

As I have noted, there were a number of changes made in the NSF request. In particular, there were increases totaling \$36.5 million made in certain programs, and reductions totaling \$8.7 million in other programs. I shall go into more detail later concerning the specific actions which were taken, but, first, I should like to briefly describe the overall objectives of the National Science Foundation activities which will be supported by this authorization. I should also like to point out that the committee has approved a line item budget rather than the lump sum authorization which was requested. This line item budget, which consists of 13 categories, reflects the changes in priorities made by the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

The largest single budget category is that of "Scientific research project support." Programs under this category provide support for a large part of the basic research activity conducted by individual scientists and groups of scientists in this country. The \$270,600,000 approved for this category will enable the continuation of research into the fundamental processes and phenomena which can eventually yield the answers to the important scientific, technological, and environmental questions facing us today. This research permits the discovery of those natural laws which undergird advanced technology, and ultimately provide for our Nation's security and economic well-being.

In fiscal year 1973, the "Scientific research project support" category incorporates the program for "Specialized scientific research equipment and facilities." This was formerly a separate budget category and represents about \$12 million of fiscal year 1973 funds.

The "National and special research programs" category totals \$106.9 million. These major research efforts include such activities as the international biological program, the global atmospheric research program, the international decade of ocean exploration, and U.S. research activities in both the Arctic and Antarctic. There are two new programs within this category in fiscal year 1973 which are designed to increase the effectiveness with which research and development results are incorporated into our Nation's economic activities. These two programs which have committee approval are the experimental R. & D. incentives program and the national R. & D. assessment program. Together their budgets total \$22.3 million.

Funding for the National Research Centers has been approved at a total of \$42.3 million. These five research centers carry out the kinds of scientific research requiring a concentrated effort and specialized facilities and staffing. The centers are the National Astronomy and Ionosphere Center, the Kitt Peak National Observatory, the Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory, the National Radio Astronomy Observatory, and the

National Center for Atmospheric Research.

Funds approved for "Computing activities in education and research" total \$19.5 million. The objectives of programs in this budget category are to develop basic knowledge in computer sciences, develop new uses of the computer in the educational process, and find new ways of utilizing computers in scientific research.

The sum of \$9.5 million is authorized for the category "Science information activities." The objective of these activities is to develop and improve technical information systems which serve the scientific and technological disciplines, and at the same time insure that not only are these information systems as responsive as possible to the Nation's needs, but that unnecessary duplication does not occur.

Authorized funds for international cooperative scientific activities total \$4.7 million. I should point out that it is the policy of the United States to encourage international cooperation in fields of science, and this particular NSF program is one of the major ways by which this policy is implemented. It also helps hold down the cost of certain types of scientific activities by making possible global cooperation on scientific problems which are common to many nations.

The category "Research applied to national needs" is authorized at a level of \$80 million and is designed to support problem-oriented research important to the Nation. The major emphases in fiscal year 1973 will be on three problems: Energy research, municipal systems research, and regional environmental systems research.

The intergovernmental science program authorization of \$1.2 million is designed to assist State and local governments in utilizing science and technology in their programs and services. This program was initiated in fiscal year 1969, and has already had an impact in 27 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

The committee authorized \$18 million for the category "Institutional improvement for science." Our Nation can be assured of quality science education and academic research only if our colleges and universities themselves are strong and viable organizations. Programs in this category will help provide the necessary funds for institutional administrators to assure strong institutional support for science programs.

Graduate student support totaling \$20 million is authorized to provide our Nation with the necessary flow of highly talented individuals into scientific research and teaching. These programs set a national standard for scientific excellence in graduate education of which all of us can be proud.

The authorization of \$71.8 million for science education improvement will improve the effectiveness of science education at all levels of the educational process. The wide variety of useful and innovative NSF science education programs help assure not only a quality education for the specialist, but adequate training in the scientific method for the nonscientist as well.

The program development and management authorization of \$26.8 million pays the expenses of administering all of the NSF scientific research and education programs. The fact that this represents only about 4 percent of the total NSF budget illustrates, I believe, the overall efficiency of the NSF management effort.

A separate section of the bill authorizes \$7 million for the special foreign currency program. This program utilizes excess foreign currencies to support scientific research and scientific and technological information activities in the six countries where excess foreign currencies are available.

I should now like to briefly describe how the bill before us today, H.R. 14108, differs from the administration bill which was considered by the committee, H.R. 12753. The bill which we are now considering contains a line item budget consisting of 13 budget categories, which represent the major program categories within the total National Science Foundation effort. This line item budget is similar in form to that contained in the fiscal year 1972 authorization act, Public Law 92-86. There is authority for NSF to transfer up to 10 percent of a category into or out of that category, and other transfers can be made after congressional notification. A difference is that 30 legislative, rather than 30 calendar, days must pass before such transfers in excess of 10 percent of a category can be made without approval of the authorizing committees of the House and Senate.

I should like to describe in more detail the budget actions taken by the committee. As I mentioned earlier, the net increase above the NSF request was \$27.8 million.

BUDGET INCREASES

Four line item categories were increased by committee action.

The category intergovernmental science programs, was increased by \$200,000, to a total of \$1.2 million. This will permit State and local governments not only to make better use of the potentials of science and technology, but to help assure proper transfer of research results into specific practical applications related to local needs.

Institutional improvement for science was increased by \$11 million for a total of \$18 million for fiscal year 1973. Even with this increase, funding for this important program, which helps assure the viability of our institutions that provide advanced education in the sciences, is still much below its earlier obligation levels. For example, in 1968, NSF obligated more than \$83 million in this category.

"Graduate student support" was increased by \$10.8 million, for a total of \$20 million. The committee has noted that total NSF support for graduate students has declined over recent years, in spite of the fact that increased research funding has made many more graduate assistantships available. We hope the increase of \$6.8 million in fiscal year 1973 for predoctoral fellowships will assure that this trend of declining support for graduate students is reversed.

Included under "Graduate student support" is \$4 million for postdoctoral fellowships. This will support and retrain young scientists in fields directly related to national goals in science and technology.

I should also like to point out that the committee recommends that the NSF utilize \$9.5 million of impounded funds to establish a new "Graduate designated traineeship program," which would support students in fields of great national interest, such as the environmental sciences.

There is an increase of \$13 million for "Science education improvement." There were eight specific science education programs which were increased by a total of \$14.5 million, and one program was reduced by \$1.5 million. Let me say a word about these programs.

The "Undergraduate student originated projects" were increased by \$1.5 million, to a total of \$3.5 million. This program challenges our talented undergraduates to apply science and technology in innovative ways to important problems.

The "Technician/technologist education projects" are recommended at a \$3 million level, including a \$1.5 million increase. In the committee report we point out the important role which 2-year colleges should play in implementing this particular increase.

"Proposed experimental projects" to encourage initiatives in science education were cut in half by committee action, reducing it to a level of \$1.5 million. Although its objectives are laudable, the committee feels it should be implemented at a lower initial level.

An increase of \$3 million for "Secondary schoolteacher projects" will permit continued improvement of the quality of science faculty at the secondary school level. This increase brings the total for these projects to \$16.1 million.

The "Science faculty fellowships and research participation program" was restored to a level of \$2.1 million, in order to help assure continued improvement of the science faculty in undergraduate and 2-year institutions.

The "Undergraduate scientific instructional equipment projects," which provide instructional and laboratory equipment, were increased \$1.6 million to a level of \$4 million. These projects require a 1-to-1 matching from non-Federal sources.

Four-year "College and university projects" have been increased \$2 million to a total of \$4 million. You may recall this program in previous years under the title "College science improvement program." It has played a vital role in revitalizing science education at our undergraduate colleges.

The program of "High school student projects," known previously as the "Student science training program," was increased by \$1.4 million, for a total of \$3.4 million. This activity helps assure that the most talented potential scientists in our secondary schools are identified and challenged to utilize their abilities.

The "Undergraduate student projects" were increased \$1.4 million for a total of \$5.4 million. This was previously known

as the "Undergraduate research participation program," and has been very successful in stimulating curriculum changes in undergraduate colleges.

In order to hold the net increase for NSF to a minimum, the committee reluctantly made reductions in certain programs. Funds for "Scientific research project support" were reduced by \$4 million. Because NSF has stated that no funds are needed to fund research projects transferred from other agencies in fiscal year 1973, the reduced total of \$270.6 million should be adequate for scientific research projects.

There is a reduction of \$2.2 million in the "National and special research programs." The request for \$22 million for the "National R. & D. assessment program" was reduced to \$20 million, and the "R. & D. incentives program" was reduced from \$2.5 million to \$2.3 million. The funds approved should permit both of these new programs to be instituted without serious difficulties.

The bill, H.R. 14108, also includes certain changes not related to the fiscal year 1973 budget totals. Section 8 of the bill amends the NSF Basic Act to insure that the Foundation maintains adequate support of science education at all levels.

Section 2 of this bill puts appropriate floors under institutional improvement, graduate student support, and science education improvement. It also establishes maximum levels for the programs of institutional grants for research management improvement and experimental projects to insure initiatives in science education.

Mr. Chairman, the remainder of the bill, H.R. 14108, is similar to the administration bill, H.R. 12753, as well as to the NSF authorization for fiscal year 1972, Public Law 92-86.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the bill before us today deserves the strong support of every Member of the House. A strong base of science and technology is important to this country in all of its activities, ranging from military defense to pollution abatement, and from economic growth to intellectual achievement.

The National Science Foundation is increasingly responsible for maintaining the health of our scientific research and our science education activities. This bill has received the unanimous, bipartisan endorsement of the members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics. I urge each and every one of my distinguished colleagues to support H.R. 14108.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, would my friend from Georgia yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am having a little difficulty in reconciling the figures. With the \$7 million in foreign currency, this is a \$680 million authorization; is that correct? \$673,800,000 plus \$7 million?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Yes, that is true; \$7 million is authorized to be expended in foreign currency.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. So it makes an authorization of \$680 million?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. What was the actual appropriation for fiscal year 1972?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. It was \$622 million.

Mr. GROSS. \$622 million.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Apparently the actual appropriation—or was it the authorization—for 1971 was \$494 million? Is that correct?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. No.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I believe the request last year was \$622 million, and the House appropriation was \$585 million. I believe that was the House appropriation last year.

Mr. GROSS. Then the appropriation was above the request?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I would like to comment a little on that. There was what has come to be known as the Mansfield amendment to a recent Armed Forces Authorization Act, which said the Department of Defense could not engage in any scientific research unless it could be demonstrated the scientific research was closely related to the defense of our country. Following that, a number of agencies—not just DOD, but others also—decided they might have a difficult time justifying their request for scientific research before the committees of the House and the Senate. So it turned out to be a sort of domino effect, and a number of agencies relegated their pure scientific research to the National Science Foundation. The result was that last year the National Science Foundation was one of the few parts of our Government that found it had as much money to spend as the Bureau of the Budget asked for. The DOD had less, and so did many of the other agencies. But the National Science Foundation had the same as it asked for, and the reason is what I have just related to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Then do I understand that this authorization is a minimum of \$186 million above the 1971 fiscal year figures?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The appropriation for fiscal year 1971 was \$511 million plus \$2 million excess foreign currencies, making a total of \$513 million. The rest of it is a matter of mathematics. I think the gentleman had reference to the NSF obligation level, which was \$494 million.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any money in this bill for promotion of the metric system?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. No. I will have to confess I wish there were, but there is not. There may be, Mr. Chairman, a little bit for a book that was put out in support of the metric system. I do hope the gentleman will reexamine his thoughts with respect to the metric system.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Georgia is a great pleader, but I am afraid he is some distance away from converting the gentleman presently addressing the gentleman from Georgia in the matter of the metric system.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I should hope with the passage of time that we may have a change of heart.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I may become mel-

lower with age, and "never" is a long time, but I am afraid that in the foreseeable future I will not be convinced by the gentleman with respect to changing the system of measurement of weights in this country.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. All I can say is if a person owns a piece of land with a sycamore tree some distance from a creek, he will still own the piece of land between the sycamore tree and the creek. He may adopt another name for the distance, but the sycamore tree will still be the same distance from the creek. But I will still entertain the hope my friend from Iowa will change his thoughts on this.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of H.R. 14108.

I wish to join with my distinguished colleague from Georgia in expressing my enthusiastic support for the programs of the National Science Foundation.

The \$673.8 million unanimously approved by the Science and Astronautics Committee for this bill represents an increase of only 4 percent above last year's NSF authorization.

This is a well-balanced and fiscally restrained level which is consistent with President Nixon's affirmed desire to harness "the discoveries of science in the service of man."

One of the most important items in the bill, in my opinion, is the program designated research applied to national needs, commonly referred to as RANN.

The RANN program was conceived with the idea of establishing a means to alleviate this Nation's more pressing societal problems by developing solutions that are both conceptually sound and capable of implementation in the not-too-distant future.

As a consequence, RANN has embarked upon a program designed to attack the problems of energy depletion, environmental deterioration, disaster and natural hazard control and the decline in effectiveness of municipal systems and services.

There are also a number of new and unique programs included in NSF's budget for this year.

Two of these include the experimental R. & D. incentives program and the national R. & D. assessment program.

The incentives program is aimed at encouraging increased investment in R. & D. by the civilian sector and in improving the application of R. & D. results.

The assessment program will involve the intensive study and assessment of the manner in which science and technology contribute to national objectives including economic growth, job creation, and improvement in the general quality of life.

These programs are, of course, in addition to the major activities traditionally pursued by the National Science Foundation.

In particular, under the major program category of scientific research project support, the Foundation provides support for individual scientists and groups of scientists in examining fundamental life processes, natural laws, and phenomena.

This work will insure a strong base of confidence in fundamental research in addition to providing new knowledge ultimately applicable to our national needs and purposes.

Finally, I would like to address some of the budget changes the committee made in the program categories of institutional improvement for science, graduate student support, and science education improvement.

All three of these programs were granted nominal increases by the committee as a means of improving the nature of education in the sciences.

Clearly, improvement in the educational system on a broad scope requires the selective application of Federal funds.

I think that none of us can deny that this Nation needs a strong and vigorous scientific and technological base to help insure the welfare of its citizens.

I believe that the NSF program represents an aggressive response to the need to develop the scientific and intellectual talent of our youth and young scientists.

Mr. Chairman, this year's budget provides an optimum approach in addressing both basic and problem oriented research with a careful balance struck between the efforts in the two areas.

USF is fully committed to insuring the continued strength and vitality of this Nation's scientific capability.

The program we bring to the floor today reflects that commitment.

It is for this reason that I request my distinguished colleagues to join with me in supporting H.R. 14108.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I note on page 3 of the bill there is \$5,000 for official consultation. What happens in the spending of \$5,000 for official consultation? Could the gentleman enlighten the House?

Mr. BELL. I am not sure which line the gentleman speaks of.

Mr. GROSS. It is about line 15 on page 3 of the bill.

Mr. BELL. I do not have that before me.

Mr. GROSS. This is H.R. 14108.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that is standard language that all the agencies use. It is for entertainment.

Mr. GROSS. For entertainment?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Basically that is true. All the agencies use that language.

The gentleman has put his finger on a delicate nerve, and the name of the nerve is entertainment.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, is this what the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) calls the tools of the trade?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I have not heard him use that expression, but I would guess that the gentleman from Iowa is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman think \$5,000 was enough for all these

scientists to finance their official consultations?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Well, if they would purchase the products in my home district, it would cost less than that, although the products might be without benefit of some revenue stamps. But I would say it is standard for the agencies.

Mr. GROSS. And something like this would be used to promote the metric system, would it?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Well, I would hope so; but that is not the purpose.

Mr. GROSS. Going to a more serious aspect of the bill, this is considerably above last year and I still do not have the figures and the report does not clearly define the actual appropriation for 1971.

Mr. BELL. It is \$18 million more than the 1972 proposal, if I may interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. It seems to me you could not have found some way to reduce this bill by \$18 million, rather than increase it and further compound the serious financial situation that exists in this country due to failure to balance the budget. On the contrary, we are facing a \$38 billion to \$40 billion deficit at the end of June of this year? You could not find any way to reduce it. Is that correct?

Mr. BELL. I am certainly sympathetic to the gentleman's concepts of the economy. I have many times supported the gentleman's views, but in this situation I think the need for education in this country still has to be maintained. There was a feeling in the committee that this should not be reduced in the interest of retaining the Nation's scientific and technological education at the highest level.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I simply would like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from California to say, yes, we could have economized here; we could wipe out the whole National Science Foundation budget. But we would be pennywise and pound foolish if we did so. We have some competitors on this planet such as the Common Market and Japan and we need to go forward with scientific education. The NSF programs go all the way through our high schools, and we have to depend on them. This is the wisest way we can spend money.

Mr. BELL. I think you must bear in mind that the United States has been the leader technologically in the world and is fighting for its lead position now. It has in the past developed that lead position through its achievements in the field of science and technology. If we give this lead away to Japan and to other nations, we will just be that much further behind. We must remember that they have nearly caught up with us due primarily because of their ability to copy us and our methods of technology. Unless we keep on top of the game, they will get ahead of us, because they will start moving ahead in the world of technological knowledge and further advance themselves in industry at our expense.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I have every sympathy for unemployed Ph. D.'s, but I am also becoming more and more sympathetic to the

taxpayers of this country who are going to be confronted with the proposition of staying off a real financial debacle. I do not know whether the lot of the scientists is going to be better than it was in 1932 when that fateful day comes but I am sure there will be a lot of them unemployed. It just seems to me in all of these bills there ought to be a contribution toward economy and a balancing of the Federal budget.

Mr. BELL. I certainly agree with the gentleman. In this particular area, though, is one in which I think the gentleman must agree that if we are going to stay ahead we must keep business and industry up to an optimum rate. The best chance we have of doing it is through greater technological and scientific education. In turn, of course, the resultant development helps pay some of our taxes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOSHER).

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I join all of the Science Committee in enthusiastic support of the fiscal year 1973 authorization bill for NSF as presented here today.

At the time of last year's authorization, I emphasized that the final NSF budget reported by the committee had been significantly amended from that originally requested by the Foundation.

The bulk of last year's changes were directed toward either restoring or increasing the funds for NSF programs relating to institutional support for science and to science education support.

Basically, our amendments last year were designed to place greater emphasis on science education by improving school science programs and permitting them to be tailored to the requirements of the individual school system. We wanted to encourage a thrust in NSF work toward the development of innovative approaches to science education training and course curriculum development.

I continue to feel that these same NSF program categories—in particular, institutional improvement for science, graduate student support, and science education improvement—remain inadequately funded. All three of these important areas have received severe budget reductions within the past 2 years with the result being that much important work has been dropped.

I therefore strongly endorse the actions of the committee again this year, to increase support for these three categories.

The work of NSF under the institutional improvement for science program is directed toward upgrading college and university level science programs. This funding is also used for university grants in support of various types of research efforts.

This program category, as it provides a flexible source of funds for use by colleges and universities, has systematically been cut back by NSF over the past several years. At the same time, when our Nation's colleges and universities are facing severe financial difficulties, the

committee feels that funding for this activity should be significantly increased.

I personally feel it very important for the universities to be able to continue supporting important research projects in spite of temporary lapses in outside funding. Similarly, it is also essential for a university to be able to obtain adequate backup funding from time to time as financial commitments from State and local governments are delayed. Thus, this program is of major importance as it is designed to assure greater continuity in the more significant basic science research projects being undertaken by the academic community.

The second budget category to which the committee reallocated funding was the NSF graduate student support program. The primary objective of this effort is to provide a reasonable and continuous flow of highly talented, well educated individuals into science career fields. This support is aimed particularly at the qualitative rather than the quantitative aspects of scientific training. This work therefore plays a very positive role in insuring that an adequate number of highly trained students will be available to work in science fields of national interest and importance.

A final program category to which funds were reallocated is science education improvement. Seven of the eight activities carried out under this program received a nominal increase.

NSF work within this program is directed to supporting science improvement at the high school and undergraduate levels and underwriting both student and teacher projects. These funds also support the training of technicians and technologists. The need for these technically trained people in our society has greatly increased in recent years and this NSF program will do much to fill that void.

Basically, this year's budget for NSF as amended by the committee is an attempt to insure that education in the sciences is best adjusted to contemporary and foreseeable needs. We think that the NSF program is an excellent one as it addresses the full educational process—from improving the manner in which knowledge is conveyed to emphasizing the people actually a part of the system.

In accomplishing this, the program seeks to develop within the individual school, college, or university its own internal capability for self-rejuvenation in science education. In this manner, much greater leverage is created in the application of our funds with an ever increasing number of students and teachers able to benefit.

Mr. Chairman, I have very strong feelings about the need to continue support for basic scientific research and development. The work now being pursued within NSF is fundamental to advancing our society and preserving its success.

In order to maintain our national strength, we must have an adequate and effective NSF program. I feel that this bill is a major step in that direction and I strongly urge that my colleagues provide it their full support.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one point in response

to some of the questions that were raised by my friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) and that is this.

Back when I was in college the economists used to point out that there were four ingredients necessary to a viable economy. One was labor, one was land and all the things that come from land such as the agricultural products, the trees and the exploitation of mineral resources; another was education, and another was capital.

Those are the four classic things that were thought to form the basis of a viable economy.

However, it seems to me that in the last 2 years we have come in this country to realize that there is a fifth component, and that is technology, the know-how to turn man-hours into more useful products with less expenditures of manpower, and use more ingenuity in the manufacture of useful things and in furnishing services.

Now, this year it seems to me that we have come to the realization that there is a sixth component and that is the quality of the product.

I think we are all aware of the fact that the manner to insure a better quality of life is going to depend not only upon the first four components that I mentioned, but also on the use of technology, because we must be assured of the technology to preserve and improve the quality of life.

So, I would say that this is a wise investment. It is an investment that ought to be made.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I hope and urge all members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union to agree with me that this bill ought to be supported.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. DEVINE. Just as a point of information for the record, how much does this bill authorize in violation of the budget—how much in excess of the budget?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Now, I would say to my very good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, that the budget is not a law. I, rather, would like to quarrel with the word "violates."

I would say that Congress makes its own law. The Office of Management and Budget does not make the rules or the law.

Mr. DEVINE. I do not like the word "busting" the budget. However, is this in excess of the budget?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The budget is an undeveloped idea which the House disagreed with—at least our committee did—and we think they should have allocated \$27 million more than they did.

A lot of this is for institutional support, the support of our colleges and universities that provide scientific and technological education to our young people.

Mr. DEVINE. But it exceeds the budget by approximately \$27 million?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is right.

Another large part of the budget is for a program called RANN which stands for Research Applied to National Needs.

There is a big increase over last year's budget in that regard. I would say two things, institutional grants and science education are the two places where the major portion of that \$27 million was added.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. I was intrigued with the concept of "violating" the budget.

Is it not a fact that the House has further violated the President's budget during the current fiscal year by reducing it overall by several millions of dollars?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I believe that is true.

Mr. JACOBS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), the chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, be printed in the *RECORD* at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us, which the gentleman from Georgia has so well explained, is an annual authorization required by law to authorize appropriations for the National Science Foundation for fiscal 1973.

Since the substance of the bill has been outlined by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development and is described in great detail in the committee report, I will confine my comments to several particular areas of which, I think, the House should be aware.

First, it is difficult really to over emphasize the importance of the work of the National Science Foundation.

This is the only agency in the Government of the United States whose chief function is to see that basic research in science and education in this country are maintained in a state of continuing health. No other agency has this mission.

While many of the mission-oriented agencies do support a measure of basic research, that research is naturally allied to specific problems and its transfer into other areas is often cumbersome or accidental.

Today, and during the past year or so, a great clamor is being heard—particularly here in Congress—to go all out on applied research.

I do not for a moment downgrade the importance of applied research. Without it, we as a government body will not be able to achieve the goals which the times demand.

But let us not kid ourselves. We are not going to get very far, either, if we slight basic research and science education, or if we make our support of them so inconsistent and undependable that they cannot flourish.

All the applied research in the world is not going to do the job if we do not acquire new fundamental knowledge and obtain new insights into ultimate scientific truth.

There is scarcely a major problem

facing the Nation today which does not require the application of new or developing science and technology.

The tools with which we have been forced to work up to now are not good enough. And without adequate effort in the field of basic research we simply will be unable to produce the new tools we need.

This is true, I believe, in every category, whether that category is described in terms of a program or in terms of a scientific discipline.

It is just as true, also, in such fields as political and social science as it is in the so-called hard sciences or the life sciences.

If we do not keep up in fundamental science—and there are some indications that we have been slipping in the past several years—our position, domestically and internationally, will be extremely vulnerable.

In fact, there are some who would go further and who would argue that we are already in serious trouble.

A second point which I wish to emphasize is the critical need for maintaining a high state of excellence in science education throughout a broad range of educational institutions.

Most of us are aware of the difficult financial plight of virtually every college and university in the country—whether it be the Ivy League, the great State universities, the smaller liberal arts college, or the junior and community college.

The problem is not confined merely to private schools. While they may be hurting most, their being hurt is having an equally deleterious effect on the State-supported schools, especially the State colleges.

As the cost of education rises and private schools are forced to increase charges, fewer and fewer young people—except the affluent who can afford it or the poor who get it free—can handle such costs.

Hence more and more are depending on State institutions, which, in spite of certain limited access to tax revenues, are finding it very difficult to cope.

Among the undesirable side effects of this situation is the fact that many State universities are drastically limiting the number of out-of-State students they will accept while raising their academic requirements as a means of holding down in-State enrollments.

Clearly, if this continues, an unhealthy inbreeding will result.

Incidentally, do not be misled by recent press stories concerning changing rates of application increase. Statistics on this are complex, and, in any case, have little to do with academic finances.

It is partly for reasons such as these that our committee has restored the cuts in support of science education which have been made in the Foundation's programs over the past several years.

We are making that effort again in this bill, including the institutional support program which has been practically orphaned in recent years.

Some of my colleagues will recall that in the past I have been particularly interested in the so-called institutional grants system of support for science education.

Such support differs from the research grant or the graduate student grant or the summer science institute or the various education measures where stipends are paid directly to students.

The institutional grant goes directly to the institution to be used, within the general limits of fostering science education, as the institution sees fit.

It has the great advantage of flexibility; and often the application of a few dollars in areas which are apparent to educational administrations but which may not be discernible to us or to the Government bureaucracy, can make an enormous difference in the successful functioning of that college or university.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of this bill as reported.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CABELL).

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in very strong support of the bill H.R. 14108. I would like to say that the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVIS), and the members of their committees, have certainly worked diligently and most responsibly to bring a bill before this House that can be entirely and completely justified in its purpose and in the allocations that are made to the National Science Foundation.

I think this is one of the most important measures we have with reference to maintaining our position in the field of technology, of science education, and taking it down to the grass roots where it is needed to maintain the interest on the part of the secondary schools as well as all our institutions of higher learning. This will pay dividends to us in the years to come.

Mr. Chairman, this bill will permit the National Science Foundation to continue effective support of American science and technology. The committee has carefully reviewed the budget request for fiscal year 1973 and while the changes made and incorporated in the authorization bill are not major, they do contribute, I believe, to a more balanced program.

The committee gave particular attention to the need to keep the Foundation's program well balanced with respect to basic and applied research. The Members of this body recall that in 1968 the Congress amended NSF's Organic Act to permit the Foundation to engage in the support of some applied research in addition to basic research which had been supported all along. That new authority was not intended to detract from the NSF's primary role as a supporter of research and education in the basic sciences. The committee, therefore, both last year and this year, took particular pains to review the relative emphasis on these types of research.

In entering into projects of applied research, NSF uses certain ground rules. Applied research projects must be oriented toward the solution of significant national problems where the agency can make a contribution through the application of science and technology. Fur-

thermore, such projects should be uniquely suited to solution by means of the traditional pattern of NSF-university collaboration, and they must either fall outside the responsibility of existing agencies, or span the area of responsibility of several agencies.

The largest portion of the Foundation's applied research is found in the program of research applied to national needs, or RANN, for short. The RANN program now uses 12 percent of NSF's total budget and when other, but smaller applied research projects are included and the basic research work within RANN is excluded, the volume of applied research supported by the Foundation amounts to about 15 to 18 percent, depending on which of the borderline cases are included. This is a high percentage and is already beyond the expectations of the Congress in passing the 1968 amendments.

In conformity with the desire clearly to delineate the intent of the Congress with regard to the major activities of NSF, the bill includes a line item breakdown of the authorization. The line item type of authorization for the NSF was introduced last year for the first time. The main reason for the use of this form of authorization is to discourage the transfer of funds between major program categories.

I believe that the program presented to the Congress and the subsequent changes made in that program by the Congress should essentially be followed. The procedure for congressional notification in cases where transfers become necessary serves to preserve the flexibility needed in the Foundation's program.

Another important aspect of NSF's program is the education program. I want particularly to call attention to the significant role which NSF plays in supporting science education at the smaller educational institutions.

The committee heard testimony confirming the increasing trend toward a broadening of the spectrum of scientific and technical education in the smaller colleges, and in the 2-year junior colleges. These institutions are experiencing an increased demand for educational opportunities in fields which require training in science and technology. With these needs in mind, the committee has made a number of increases in the program categories for undergraduate education.

The undergraduate student originated projects program, for which \$2 million was requested, has been increased by \$1.5 million, to \$3.5 million.

The technician/technologist education projects program, for which \$1.5 million was requested, has been increased by \$1.5 million, to \$3 million.

The science faculty fellowships and research participation program, which was not funded in the budget proposal, has been restored and funding in the amount of \$2.1 million has been authorized.

The undergraduate scientific instructional equipment projects program, for which \$2.4 million was requested, has been increased by \$1.4 million, to \$4 million.

The program of 4-year college and university projects, known in former years as the college science improvement

program, for which \$2 million was requested, is being doubled to \$4 million.

The undergraduate students projects program, for which \$4 million was requested, is being increased by \$1.4 million, to \$5.4 million.

These actions, Mr. Chairman, will, on a modest scale, strengthen the science education efforts of the country's undergraduate colleges from which the scientists, engineers, and technicians of the future must come.

Mr. Chairman, I support the National Science Foundation authorization bill before the committee. I believe it will provide the National Science Foundation with the funds that it must have to carry forward the useful and well-managed program of support of American science.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON).

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman not only for yielding me this time but to express my appreciation for the tremendous job he has done on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, a number of members of the Science Committee are pointing out the extra effort which the committee has made in the last several years to maintain a reasonable and appropriate level for the support of science education.

This is the third year in a row, to my knowledge, that our committee has endeavored to get across to the Foundation that it should maintain support for science education at a level commensurate with its past efforts. Therefore, I would like to direct particular attention to the committee's action in boosting funds for science education in various categories by about \$33 million, while reducing authorization for certain other programs by approximately \$7 million.

Last year the committee took similar action without going above the administration's total NSF budget. We were supported in this by the Appropriations Committees of both Houses. Nonetheless, the Office of Management and Budget froze most of the education increase and did not permit the obligation of these funds for fiscal 1972—although they are presumably to be released for this purpose in fiscal 1973.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention to the comments in the committee report entitled "Executive Impoundment of Appropriated Funds," which appears on page 97.

As that brief commentary states, we are well aware that it is not always feasible that all moneys appropriated by the Congress be obligated precisely as requested or precisely on time. On the other hand, it is becoming increasingly clear that some authorities in either OMB or in the Foundation, or in both, are opposed to the maintenance of the Foundation's traditional role in support of science education.

The reasons given have been, first, that the employment market does not warrant previous levels of support, and, second, that the increased funding of project research can be considered a substitute for previous programs of graduate fellowships and traineeships. The preponder-

ance of other testimony appears to be to the contrary.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to go into the substantive arguments on the merits of this facet of the Foundation's programs. The record is extensive on this score and others have made or will make appropriate observations. But I do think that the Foundation would be well advised to heed what the committee has been trying to say these last several years. I am breaching no confidence in pointing out that the committee seriously considered this year three separate methods for requiring the equal percentage obligation of funds in all line-item categories. We decided to hold up on any such procedure until we see how this year's funds are handled. Next year could be another story.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER).

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I think the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVIS) and the members of his subcommittee have done an outstanding job in presenting this legislation.

I also would like to commend the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVIS) for the eloquent remarks he made a few moments ago concerning the need for consideration of the quality of American life in addition to the other factors which he summarized as being necessary for a viable economy.

In one of the four points he mentioned the exploitation of our resources. Our natural resources have been exploited too much to the disadvantage of people living in areas which are being ripped apart to feed the demands of production, power, and energy. This is why I am very pleased that the gentleman's committee has devoted so much attention to the RANN program—research applied to national needs—which I believe is one of the most promising aspects of the developing programs of the National Science Foundation.

Finally, I wish to indicate that our committee and, indeed, this Congress, has great confidence in the leadership of the National Science Foundation under Dr. H. Guyford Stever, who is doing such an outstanding job as the Director of the National Science Foundation.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER) for his generous remarks, and to express agreement with the thought he expressed. He has done a fine job in the Committee on Science and Astronautics and in the House of Representatives in leading the fight to preserve and improve the natural environment. In particular, he has recognized the value of science and technology in this regard, and I commend his foresight.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state my support for H.R. 14108, and commend the National Science Foundation for its continuing research into many of the frontiers of science. The work of the NSF contributes greatly to

the seemingly endless technological advancements of the United States.

However, Mr. Chairman, I see one field in which the authorization for NSF is inadequate. This is the field of energy research and technology.

The importance of energy to this country is obvious to all of us. To quote a widely used phrase, electricity has become the life-blood of the Nation. We all take advantage of our energy resources for a multitude of purposes, from making toast to heating our homes. The national demand for electricity is doubling approximately every 10 years. Total annual expenditures for energy amounted to 9½ percent of the GNP in 1970 and the energy industry accounts for about 20 percent of the country's capital investments. Energy is unquestionably a crucial factor in the growth of the Nation.

But our energy resources are not endless, though our uses seem to be infinite. Frequent power failures and brownouts today give us an indication of the scope of the problem we will face in the near future. Current energy resources are strained and will become insufficient in just a few years. Present forms of energy also pose a constant pollution threat. New nuclear energy facilities endanger our environment and, in the case of a nuclear accident, human lives as well. Also, our mineral reserves needed for nuclear energy can be eventually exhausted. The only solution to the threat of inadequate energy is new energy sources.

Developing new, safe, economical energy sources will require new directions in research and funding. Adequate energy supplies for future energy needs depends on the pursuit of creative endeavors in this field. However, Mr. Chairman, the current NSF authorization appears to provide less than 5 percent of the Foundation's fiscal year 1973 funds for research into energy. Further, only a fraction of this 5 percent will actually be used for research into new energy sources. Probably less than \$10 million out of a total NSF budget of \$680 million is to be used to develop future energy sources.

This lack of funds is certainly not due to scientific ignorance of possible energy sources. Scientists today are aware of numerous potential, but undeveloped energy sources. The Government is now aware of 43 potentially pragmatic sources. Many of these sources are more powerful, more economical, cleaner, and safer than our energy of today. NSF is seeking some authorization of funds for research into future sources of energy, such as solar energy and geothermal energy. These are some of the possibilities—but there are others. Research and development of such new sources of energy is crucial to the continued growth of our country. I urge NSF to increase their efforts for such new energy research.

There is another reason why NSF must be encouraged to expand its research into future energy sources. The electric utilities industry has been negligent in its own efforts toward research and development of energy sources. The junior Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF) has pointedly and repeatedly illustrated

the inadequacy of the utilities' work in R. & D. The Senator has made speeches in the Senate which have included Federal Power Commission statistics for the past 2 years listing the utilities industry's costs of advertising and promotion and costs of research and development. A look at the figures is shocking. Here we are, rapidly approaching an unprecedented crisis in our energy sources, and our utilities are spending seven times as much on advertising and promotion as they are on research and development. This is even more ludicrous when one realizes that many of our major utilities are virtual monopolies with no conceivable need to expend large amounts of money on advertising and promotion.

In 1970, major electric utilities spent, according to their own annual reports, close to \$400 million on advertising and promotion, but only \$46 million on R. & D. Over 25 percent of the country's major utilities spent absolutely nothing on research and development. Not one company contributed as much as 1 percent of its operating revenue to R. & D. Moreover, much of the research and development expenditures goes toward existing energy techniques, not new energy sources. And yet this is in spite of the fact that research and development costs are fully recoverable. R. & D. is included in the operating costs, which are passed on to the customer. With an energy crisis looming closer every year, how can we tolerate such a ridiculous order of priorities in the utilities industry?

The energy crisis must be resolved as soon as possible. If the utilities continue to refuse to exercise their responsibility for research into future energy sources, the burden will fall on NSF. NSF currently does not have the capacity to handle the awesome task of meeting the coming energy crisis. The utilities possess the economic resources to not only meet, but also defeat the energy shortage facing us. We do not need the utilities advertising or promoting awareness of the energy crisis, we need efforts to solve it. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the National Science Foundation will assume a larger share of the job of finding feasible new energy sources. The problem of our energy depletion is too urgent to wait for individuals or companies—the public sector must face and resolve the issue now.

In conclusion, I would like to enter in the RECORD at this point an editorial of April 21, 1972, from the Cleveland Plain Dealer, which describes the seriousness of the energy crisis—particularly if we continue to rely on our present fuel sources:

THE COMING ENERGY CRUNCH

Treasury Secretary John B. Connally and Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover had strikingly different views about the U.S. energy shortage in testimony before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs the other day.

"Our oil and other hydrocarbon resources are not scarce," said Connally. "We have vast resources of hydrocarbons. We need not fear running out of these resources physically."

Rickover, though, said he thought the nation was consuming its finite resources at a dangerously rapid rate.

"While it took 600 millennia to create the earth's deposits of fossil fuels, we are using them up in a time span measured by decades," he said. "The fossil fuel age may well

prove to have been one of the briefest epochs in man's long history on earth."

It would be pleasant to be able to share Connally's vision of bounty. But we think Rickover's view is the more realistic one.

The United States does have abundant coal reserves—enough to last 800 years in some estimates. But of course 800 years is a mere snap of the fingers in the time span Rickover speaks of.

Reserves of gas and oil are considerably less abundant. The nation is down to a 13-year supply of gas (counting the gas in Alaska that awaits development of a pipeline to bring it to market) and a seven- or eight-year supply of oil.

Meanwhile, consumption of gas, oil and coal continues to increase exponentially, at an ever-rising rate.

Gas & Oil Journal anticipates that more oil will be consumed throughout the world in the decade of the 1970s than was consumed in the 110 years after Col. Drake drilled the first Pennsylvania wildcat well in 1859.

Rickover has some suggestions for conserving the limited energy supply that we are sure America will be hearing more about in the future, unpleasant though they may be. Among them:

Tax policies to discourage big families and thus curb the growth in population.

Higher taxes on bigger automobiles, to discourage their use to conserve fuel.

Tax and rate policies that would discourage promotional efforts by utilities.

Progressive rates for power users, so that unit charges rise as consumption increases. Again the idea would be to conserve power and to force improved efficiency in its use.

It is not a happy prospect. But we do not see how it can be avoided for long.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, other Members, including the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, Mr. MILLER of California, have called attention to the importance of basic research.

I would like to lend my voice to the theories which they have put forward and reemphasize the fact that virtually every socially useful bit of technology used in modern civilization has sprung from efforts made in the field of basic, or fundamental, research.

This kind of research normally is done simply because the researcher is curious to find out new information in a given field or to prove out some theory which he may hold with regard to it. A review of the history of science and technology discloses that on occasions acquired fundamental knowledge does evolve in reverse—that is to say, applied scientists or people working in development areas may stumble on something that is important and useful without knowing exactly how it works. From this they manage to deduce the basic scientific knowledge or truth with a more complete understanding of what is involved. But this is a rare occasion.

Most of the time, while the basic researcher is not pointing his research toward a specific goal, such as developing a new fuel or a new gear or a new fabric, the result of his work becomes the basis on which applied scientists who are working toward such goals must depend.

I might illustrate this with very brief mention of only three fields which the Science Foundation is supporting.

First, for example, there is molecular biology. Such research is being done so that investigators will learn how living

cells are put together and how they interact and operate. But from their efforts, may come considerably advanced understanding of human ailments and thus new and more effective methods of medical treatment.

A second example is in the field of materials research and the transformation of energy. Here the immediate objective is simply to acquire new knowledge about discovery of new materials and how they react under different conditions, including what goes on in the chemical or mechanical reactions which transfer the energy contained in such materials from one form to another. But it is research such as this which may provide us with information to cope with what is becoming a rapidly increasing crisis in the existence of all developed countries. That is, the need for additional and new forms of energy. As many Members know, our old reliable sources, fossil fuels, cannot be relied upon much longer, and there is much difficulty still with the application of nuclear fuels.

A third area of support is that of astronomy, including beginning work on the so-called very large array—VLA—system of radio telescope activity. One might wonder what could come out of efforts to learn more about the nature and origin of the universe which would have any useful application. But I would point out, in this connection, that this is precisely the way radar developed—and I do not think that anyone questions the value or utility of this remarkable applied system of what is essentially a principle of electronic echo-ranging first devised to probe the upper reaches of the earth's atmosphere and beyond.

Mr. Chairman, I support the passage of this bill.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my support for H.R. 14108 and to urge my colleagues to vote for its enactment. I am particularly appreciative of the experimental research and development incentives and the research and development assessment programs which have been proposed by the National Science Foundation.

In my own district and throughout the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, we desperately need an acceleration of economic growth and a consequent increase in employment opportunities. We must look for and take advantage of every opportunity to achieve these goals.

The National Science Foundation has supplied the initiative for the academic community to become involved in the search for solutions. Because in my district we have both the economic problems and a large academic community, I welcome these initiatives.

I am convinced that the academic community will be responsive. The University of Massachusetts at Amherst has already responded to the NSF initiatives. Officials of the university have supplied me with a proposal for a productivity institute that demonstrates the understanding and sensitivity that exists at the university for the job to be done, and the capability and willingness of academic people to get it done.

In any discussion of the faltering economic condition, we hear about foreign competition, balance of trade, and in-

flation. Certainly these issues are important, but there is one issue that is equally important, the issue of productivity.

In discussing productivity, we must realize that we are not talking only about machines and hardware. We are talking about people, the organization of people, and the motivation and satisfaction of people that could lead to a more productive job.

The productivity institute proposed by the University of Massachusetts recognizes these factors. The institute would include, in good balance, major imports of business management and human factors as well as engineering. It recognizes that man, machine, and management comprise the productivity system. The key feature of the proposal is its attention to a balanced emphasis on research and development in the man-machine-management system, on education, on applications in partnership with industry, and on public information.

I would like to explain how this worthy proposal relates to the NSF programs in terms of purpose and support. The productivity institute itself would house, be the focus of, and manage projects specific to the purposes of the research and development incentives program. Thus, it would be funded by the incentives program. The research and development program would consist of specific projects of concern to national productivity and would be supported largely by Federal agencies or by matching Federal and non-Federal funds. Several such projects, to be tackled during the first year, are listed in the proposal.

The education part of the program would be supported largely by the State, as is the case with other educational programs at the university.

The applications programs, which would be concerned with specific and immediate problems of industrial productivity, would be supported mainly by cooperating industry.

The public information program could be handled perhaps as an overhead item, part of the cost of doing business.

I find the proposal exciting. I am proud of the fact that the University of Massachusetts has responded to the need and has demonstrated a willingness and a capability to enter this field of applied research and development.

If this kind of interplay between Federal and State government, universities and industries can be achieved—and can be made effective in terms of our productivity problems—the new programs proposed by the National Science Foundation certainly deserve our support.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14108, which would authorize appropriations to the National Science Foundation for fiscal year 1973. The funds for the NSF have increased significantly over the past few years, and this is as it should be. The NSF programs are extremely important to the well being of our Nation. We can maintain our position of leadership in world affairs only if we have a strong scientific and technological base.

The National Science Foundation has wide responsibilities for promoting the progress of science in this country. In ad-

dition to its well known responsibilities for supporting scientific research and education in the sciences, it is also directed to provide scholarships and graduate fellowships; to foster the exchange of scientific information both within the United States and abroad; to support the development and use of computer and other scientific methods and technologies; to evaluate the status and needs of the various sciences and the support which is available to them from both the public and the private sectors; and maintain a current register of scientific and technical personnel.

The National Science Foundation, with these broad responsibilities, has undergone substantial evolution since it was established in 1950. We have seen, for example, a significant problem-oriented research effort result from the 1968 amendments which authorized applied research. The NSF instituted a program of interdisciplinary research related to problems of our society, and this has in turn evolved into the program research applied to national needs. As has been pointed out already, this bill contains an authorization of \$80 million for the RANN program.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that one of the most important problem areas within the RANN program is that of energy research and technology. Under its advanced technology applications program the NSF is emphasizing studies of energy resources, transmission and conversion technologies, and overall energy systems. It is devoting a substantial effort to research on the environmental impact of energy production and use.

I feel that I cannot overemphasize the importance of energy research and development to our Nation. In 1970, for example, we found that about 10 percent of our gross national product was devoted to expenditures for energy. These expenditures are expected to increase to 12½ percent by the year 2000.

It is clear that in order to bring online the necessary electrical generating facilities and transmission lines, and to assure adequate energy for all needed activities, we shall have to rely on the fruits of research and development programs which are now just getting underway, or still on the drawing boards. Conventional fuel shortages, traditional conversion methods, and the present state-of-the-art overhead transmission lines cannot meet the technological and environmental requirements of the future. New energy forms as well as new conversion and transmission techniques must be studied and implemented.

Mr. Chairman, I have had the privilege of chairing the task force on energy of the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development during this Congress. Our studies have carefully scrutinized those research and development needs which I have just described. We on the task force have found that the energy research and technology program of the National Science Foundation has been one of the most fruitful in this country. The money spent through its grants and contracts will be repaid many times over through tangible contributions to the solution of our energy crisis.

In emphasizing the importance of the

research activities of the National Science Foundation, I should not like to overlook its equally important science education responsibilities. The statutory requirement for NSF to provide scholarships and graduate fellowships has been implemented so that we find our country at the forefront in training talented scientists and engineers. In its actions, the committee has recognized the importance of these activities, and increased funds for graduate fellowships by \$6.8 million and restored a postdoctoral fellowship program at the level of \$4 million for fiscal year 1973.

The committee has also recognized the importance of our 4-year colleges in producing outstanding undergraduates with a strong science background. I am aware of the success of 4-year colleges in this regard because of the excellent examples which I have observed in my own congressional district. The addition of \$2 million for 4-year college and university projects, \$1.6 million for undergraduate scientific instructional equipment and \$1.4 million for undergraduate student projects were made with my strong personal support.

Mr. Chairman, I spoke earlier of how the National Science Foundation programs have evolved during its short history in order to accommodate the new realities of our scientific and technological environment. An example of the need for such evolution has come to the forefront this year during our committee deliberations. Many of us in this Chamber are aware of the rapidly increasing role which community or 2-year colleges play in our system of higher education. In spite of this, we have noted that only about \$1 million of the budget which NSF requested was expected to be obligated for community colleges. We felt that this was inadequate, and that the level of support for community colleges should be more in line with their potential role in science education.

Consequently, two programs have been significantly increased with community colleges specifically in mind. These are the technician/technologist education projects which prepare students for work in many technical fields, and the science faculty fellowships and research participation program which permits capable science faculty members to participate in advanced education and research activities which increase their effectiveness as teachers and scientists. It is my expectation, and that of my colleagues on the committee that the increases which total \$3.6 million for these two programs will serve as a catalyst for helping our community colleges play effective roles in the technical education of our citizens.

Mr. Chairman, these few examples demonstrate, I believe, the importance of the total National Science Foundation program. I strongly support the bill, H.R. 14108, and call on my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, for the following categories:

- (1) Scientific Research Project Support, \$270,600,000.
- (2) National and Special Research Programs, \$106,900,000.
- (3) National Research Centers, \$42,300,000.
- (4) Computing Activities in Education and Research, \$19,500,000.
- (5) Science Information Activities, \$9,500,000.
- (6) International Cooperative Scientific Activities, \$4,700,000.
- (7) Research Applied to National Needs, \$80,000,000.
- (8) Intergovernmental Science Program, \$1,200,000.
- (9) Institutional Improvement for Science, \$18,000,000.
- (10) Graduate Student Support, \$20,000,000.
- (11) Science Education Improvement, \$71,800,000.
- (12) Planning and Policy Studies, \$2,500,000.
- (13) Program Development and Management, \$26,800,000.

Sec. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other Act—

(a) not less than the amount stipulated for the purpose of "Institutional Improvement for Science" in category (9) of section 1 shall be available for that purpose, and of such amount not more than \$4,000,000 shall be available for institutional grants for research management improvement;

(b) not less than the amount stipulated for the purpose of "Graduate Student Support" in category (10) of section 1 shall be available for that purpose, and of such amount not less than \$16,000,000 shall be available for graduate fellowships and not less than \$4,000,000 for postdoctoral fellowships;

(c) not less than the amount stipulated for the purpose of "Science Education Improvement" in category (11) of section 1 shall be available for that purpose, and of such amount not more than \$1,500,000 shall be available for experimental projects to encourage initiatives in science education.

Sec. 3. Appropriations made pursuant to authority provided in sections 1 and 5 shall remain available for obligation, for expenditure, or for obligation and expenditure, for such period or periods as may be specified in Acts making such appropriations.

Sec. 4. Appropriations made pursuant to this Act may be used, but not to exceed \$5,000, for official consultation, representation, or other extraordinary expenses upon the approval or authority of the Director of the National Science Foundation, and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

Sec. 5. In addition to such sums as are authorized by section 1, not to exceed \$7,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, for expenses of the National Science Foundation incurred outside the United States to be paid for in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States.

Sec. 6. No funds may be transferred from any particular category listed in section 1 to any other category or categories listed in such section if the total of the funds so transferred from that particular category would exceed 10 per centum thereof, and no funds may be transferred to any particular category listed in section 1 from any other category or categories listed in such section if the total of the funds so transferred to that

particular category would exceed 10 per centum thereof, unless—

(A) a period of thirty legislative days has passed after the Director or his designee has transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate a written report containing a full and complete statement concerning the nature of the transfer and the reason therefor, or

(B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Director written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

Sec. 7. (a) If an institution of higher education determines, after affording notice and opportunity for hearing to an individual attending, or employed by, such institution, that such individual has been convicted by any court of record of any crime which was committed after the date of enactment of this Act and which involved the use of (or assistance to others in the use of) force, disruption, or the seizure of property under control of any institution of higher education to prevent officials or students in such institution from engaging in their duties or pursuing their studies, and that such crime was of a serious nature and contributed to a substantial disruption of the administration of the institution with respect to which such crime was committed, then the institution which such individual attends, or is employed by, shall deny for a period of two years any further payment to, or for the direct benefit of, such individual under any of the programs specified in subsection (c). If an institution denies an individual assistance under the authority of the preceding sentence of this subsection, then any institution which such individual subsequently attends shall deny for the remainder of the two-year period any further payment to, or for the direct benefit of, such individual under any of the programs specified in subsection (c).

(b) If an institution of higher education determines, after affording notice and opportunity for hearing to an individual attending, or employed by, such institution, that such individual has willfully refused to obey a lawful regulation or order of such institution after the date of enactment of this Act, and that refusal was of a serious nature and contributed to a substantial disruption of the administration of such institution, then such institution shall deny, for a period of two years, any further payment to, or for the direct benefit of, such individual under any of the programs specified in subsection (c).

(c) The programs referred to in subsection (a) and (b) are as follows:

(1) The programs authorized by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950; and

(2) The programs authorized under title IX of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 relating to establishing the Science Information Service.

(d) (1) Nothing in this Act, or any Act amended by this Act, shall be construed to prohibit any institution of higher education from refusing to award, continue, or extend any financial assistance under any such Act to any individual because of any misconduct which in its judgment bears adversely on his fitness for such assistance.

(2) Nothing in this section shall be construed as limiting or prejudicing the rights and prerogatives of any institution of higher education to institute and carry out an independent, disciplinary proceeding pursuant to existing authority, practice, and law.

(3) Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the freedom of any student to verbal expression of individual views or opinions.

SEC. 8. Section 3(a)(1) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended—

(1) by inserting “, including educational programs at all levels,” after “scientific research potential”; and

(2) by striking out “scientific activities” and inserting in lieu thereof “scientific and educational activities”.

SEC. 9. This Act may be cited as the “National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1973”.

Mr. BELL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the penultimate word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask a question concerning information to be found on page 20 of the report under the title of “Social Psychology” wherein it is stated that a study was made of the Watts riot and evidently the report came to the conclusion that racism in Los Angeles was labeled symbolic because it was formal and subtle.

Mr. Chairman, I guess my education has been somewhat neglected for I do not know what to make of that kind of a description of what the study produced. I wonder if someone on the committee can tell me what labeling something symbolic means, and then its relation to informality and subtlety?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I would like to make an agreement with the gentleman from Iowa. I would like for him to define the word “penultimate” and then I will try to define “symbolic.”

Mr. GROSS. I am told that that means next to the last. Now, will the gentleman answer my question?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Does the gentleman believe that is what it means?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I take it for granted that that is what it means. In fact, the dictionary indicates it.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. You did not say that at the outset.

But I will say in seriousness, the word “symbolic” simply means this. It is like an assassination. You do not assassinate a man because you hate him or because of anything that he has done. It is because of something you are trying to express.

I might say that the last 5, 6, or 7 years have been an age of assassinations. We had an assassination of John F. Kennedy, the President. We had an assassination of Robert F. Kennedy, a Senator. Then Malcolm X and George Lincoln Rockwell. We had an assassination in Mississippi of Medgar Evers. We had an assassination on the sidewalks of Montgomery. I would say that all of those are symbolic. There was no personal animus there.

If you have a family fight between a husband and wife and they wind up in court, that is not symbolic—that is personal. But if you have something that is

purely trying to establish some sort of emotional state, then that is symbolic.

Mr. GROSS. There was nothing informal about those acts of assassination was there?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. This says it was informal. It is pointing out something about it was informal. They were not dressed in tuxedos.

Mr. GROSS. Is formality always associated with a tuxedo or white tie and tails?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I would say, some of the invitations that Members of Congress get, and I include the gentleman from Iowa, usually say either formal or informal.

Mr. GROSS. Well, the gentleman from Iowa does not own the equipment that goes with the formality the gentleman from Georgia is talking about. I assure him of that.

But let me ask—in view of all the studies that have been made—did the National Science Foundation have to go into a study of the Watts riots? That has been studied and restudied and studied some more.

Then I note a little farther down on the same page that studies are being made for a “program that will enable political scientists to conduct research on political behavior using larger amounts of data, frequently derived from direct observations, than has been traditional in this field. The subject matter is probably the most complex of all the social sciences.”

I believe we can agree on one thing—that political science as displayed and demonstrated, call it what you will, in the House of Representatives and perhaps the other body, might be referred to as complex, complicated, and subtle—but I doubt it.

I wonder what all of these expenditures for such purposes are leading to and why they have to be duplicated and rediscovered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(Mr. GROSS (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Georgia) was granted permission to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I would say, first, that I, myself, majored in political science in college, and I would be the last to agree that politics is a science. I do not believe it is. I think that is a misnomer.

Mr. GROSS. What is it?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Politics?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. It is an art. It is a pragmatic pursuit. You do the best you can and hope for the best. That is all I can say.

Mr. GROSS. You pursue it as hard as you can, and then hope for the best and fear the worst?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is correct. I would have to agree with the gentleman. But I would like to say this about the study of behavior as respects the Watts riots, of all the riots, and

crime in general. Crime is one of the most expensive things that can beset a community. I spent 25 years in a courtroom before I came to this Chamber, and I would say that in some of those years I was really worried for fear the county would go broke on account of jury pay, jail maintenance, the prison system, and all those things. So I cannot think of a better area to devote a little money than to try to discover the causes of crime.

I cannot think of a better area. I admit that it is not a science, but I will say that it is one of the most expensive things our taxpayers are burdened with, that is, crime.

Mr. GROSS. We are spending millions on crime studies in other bills. Does the gentleman have any idea what such a study under this bill will cost?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I do not know, but I would say it should have been studied, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GROSS. Or how much is going to be spent on the study of political science?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. No, I do not think anything will be spent on political science.

Mr. GROSS. The report says you are going to make a study of it. I wondered if you had any idea how much would be spent for that purpose.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I would answer that, Mr. Chairman, with respect to social science. But when we come down to political science I would have to join with my colleague and say I really do not think there is such a thing.

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

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

Mr. BELL. I point out that \$1.5 million would be spent on political science, so-called.

Mr. GROSS. And that has been studied since the beginning of time, has it not?

Mr. BELL. I suppose it has been studied before.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. If the gentleman would yield with respect to that figure, I think that applies to social science, not to political science. There was \$24.6 in the budget request and the committee cut it back to \$24.2.

Mr. GROSS. That is \$24 million you are talking about?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. For social science?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Do you believe that will make any change for the better in the socialistic welfare program?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. It may. I have only this to say: It is better to light a candle than it is to curse the darkness.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the antepenultimate word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Georgia or the gentleman from California would yield for a point of information, I would direct their attention to page 89 of the report under that section entitled “Committee Actions.” The last sentence in the first paragraph states:

The NSF request was \$27 million or 4.4 percent over the fiscal year 1972 appropriation.

Then the next paragraph states:

After careful review of this budget, the Committee recommends a number of changes, including a net increase in funds of \$27.8 million over the NSF request.

The question is whether or not the \$27 million requested by NSF in the 1972 appropriation is exceeded on top of that by another \$27.8 million.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I would say apparently they had to be together, because the total, as you will notice on page 89 of the committee action, the bottom of the fourth paragraph, the total authorization approved by the committee is \$54.8 million, which is twice \$27 or 8.9 percent above the fiscal year 1972 appropriation.

Mr. DEVINE. You would say the amount that it exceeds or violates the budget still remains at \$27 million, or would it be \$54.8 million?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. It would be \$27 million.

Mr. DEVINE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I believe the gentleman might like me to explain a little further.

Mr. DEVINE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I would like to say there were some funds which were impounded by the administration which were appropriated last year which were not expended.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14108, the authorization for fiscal year 1973 for the National Science Foundation.

The National Science Foundation is charged with maintaining the health and vitality of science in this country, and developments in the last few years have tended to magnify its importance.

Many of the other mission agencies of the Government, in particular the Department of Defense, have cut back their support of research—notably, basic research. The National Science Foundation, more than ever before, is the agency to which the research community must look for support.

The importance of research has been emphasized by a number of recent developments. The adverse balance of payments is, at least in part, due to the increased competition which American high-technology products are meeting abroad. To stay competitive, the knowledge base on which this form of technology is founded must continue to expand through a strong program of research.

The energy crisis, which a few years ago was only a small dot on horizon, has become a full-blown storm commanding wide public attention. A significant part of the solution to that crisis must come from new energy sources and new conversion processes which, in turn, must be derived from research.

These and other developments strongly suggest that the Nation's research enterprise must be strong and must continue to grow. The bill before us today will contribute to that aim. It would authorize new obligatory author-

ity for the National Science Foundation in the amount of \$673.8 million, an amount which together with reimbursements and the expected release of \$21.7 million impounded from the budget of the current fiscal year, will make the Foundation's budget \$695.7 million.

The fact that some of the funds authorized and appropriated by the Congress for the current fiscal year were not released for use by the NSF is unfortunate. It is particularly unfortunate that almost all of the funds impounded were for the support of education and educational institutions. The science education activities which the Foundation supports are no less important than the research projects, the research facilities, and the national research programs which the Foundation supports.

These science education programs have two major objectives. One objective is the training of future scientists and engineers. The other objective is to bring to the nonscience student an understanding of the role played by science and technology in his own life and in the life of modern society.

I have here a letter from the dean of the graduate school and research at Kent State University in the redrawn congressional district I hope to represent next year, and he points out how in the last 2 years, at a time when institutions such as Kent State and Akron University were really beginning to fulfill the promises of earlier commitments, much of the programmatic support of the NSF has been curtailed, and it has occurred ostensibly as a result of inflation, the reduction in the job market for doctoral level scientists, and the recognition that Federal science projects could not continue to expand at a rate exceeding that of the rest of the economy without the shift of major funds from departments such as Defense. This has been particularly noticeable in the psychology department and the chemistry department in Kent State University, departments whose development has been drastically curtailed as the result of NSF cutbacks.

Gentlemen, this is a very modest, and in some ways an inadequate budget, if we are going to move ahead and allow the universities to continue to keep pace with the developing needs of our society.

Last year, the Science and Astronautics Committee made a point of singling out the science education program of the NSF. Its importance was stressed in the committee's report. The report which emerged from the Labor and Public Welfare Committee of the other body similarly stressed the value of the science education program. The intent of the Congress was thus clear.

This year, I hope that the intent of Congress as expressed in the authorization bill and in the committee report will be followed and that the NSF will be permitted to go forward with a strong, well-balanced program of support of science education.

I should like to call attention to a few of the components of this program which in my view deserve special attention.

The program of graduate student support should, in my view, be continued at the level of former years. The committee

shares this view, and accordingly the bill contains an authorization for this program in the amount of \$20 million. Of this total \$16 million is for graduate fellowships, which will assure that assistance is available for the Nation's young graduate students showing the highest promise of becoming outstanding scientists.

The same letter I referred to earlier, from the dean of the Graduate School and Research at Kent State University points out the vital importance of expanding our graduate student program. All we are doing in this authorization is maintaining it at the existing level. Again this underscores the fact that this is a modest program—probably too modest.

The remaining \$4 million would be devoted to a program of postdoctoral fellowships which I believe is of particular importance in insuring that some of the best young Ph. D.'s in the country can continue their advanced studies for the next 2 or 3 years.

The release of the impounded funds, which I referred to earlier, will be used to resume the program of traineeships, but with a new focus. Unlike the earlier traineeship program, which permitted the individual university to allocate the funds to graduate students in any discipline they might choose, the new program would permit the recipient institutions to select specified fields of study in which a clear national need exists for highly trained scientific manpower.

This bill provides the NSF with a well-balanced program of support for American science. I am happy to join the chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVIS) and the chairman of the full Committee on Science and Astronautics, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) in urging its approval.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RARICK

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RARICK: Page 2, line 15, insert a new subsection:

"(a) not less than the amount stipulated for the purpose of 'Scientific Research Project Support' in category (1) of section 1 shall be available for that purpose, and of such amount not more than \$10,000,000 shall be available for research to determine the relationship of heredity (genetics), to educational achievement and intelligence and the application of such findings to the improvement of educational practices."

The remaining subsections of section 2 shall be renumbered subsections (b), (c), and (d) accordingly.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, with billions of taxpayer's dollars being invested in busing of schoolchildren, the development of an equal employment bureaucracy, urban renewal, model cities, and a myriad of social experiments all based on what experience is proving to be the fallacious assumption that an improvement or change in environment will somehow mysteriously raise the level of intelligence and initiative, there is an imperative need for research to inquire into and determine the relation of heredity to educational achievement and in-

telligence for the improvement of educational practices and to develop solutions to educational problems based on facts and scientifically derived truths.

For example, last month a reassessment was made of the 1966 Coleman report which had been compiled at Johns Hopkins University. Daniel Moynihan, a social scientist and former aide to President Nixon, participated in the new analysis and reportedly had this to say: "It still came out about the same way" confirming Coleman's principal finding that nonschool factors, particularly family background, are much more important in determining educational achievement than anything connected to the school—and this included equipment, class size, or teacher preparation.

The theory of social justice that holds intelligence can be suppressed because of social injustices is not sufficiently tested as a scientific basis on which to develop research and the future course of our country. The commonly advanced notion that social injustices have been the primary cause of poverty and inequality, without any consideration of genetic differences in human capacity, is unfair and unjust to all concerned. To attempt to solve our problems without using available evidence of statistics gained by experience is irresponsibility.

If every social injustice on earth were removed tomorrow, there would still be many people who would remain relatively poor and there would still be widespread differences in intelligence, initiative, and status. Since conflicting views exist in the academic community regarding the relative importance of genetics and environment in the level of educational achievement and intelligence, I feel that scientific studies of the genetic aspects of our Nation's human potential and human quality problems would be meaningful and should be undertaken in the interest of objectivity.

The roles of both heredity and environment in determining the level of academic achievement and intelligence have been prejudged by society because of emotional bias and without sufficient scientific evidence.

My amendment merely points out the existence of a crying need to seek facts upon which to base honest solutions and calls for research to determine the relation of heredity to educational achievement and intelligence and the application of the findings toward improving educational practices.

The search for truth regardless of where it may lead should be the basis for all scientific studies. This basic study is imperative if we are to find the answers to our problems.

I urge adoption of my amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, ho and hum.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the reason why I feel opposed to the amendment is simply that it is questionable, in my opinion, if a scientific study like this could well be made. But I would like to note in pass-

ing it does not change the amount authorized in the bill whatsoever. It simply undertakes to earmark certain funds. I would say it undertakes to fulfill a function which just as well could be initiated by the National Science Foundation itself. We do not tell them exactly how to spend the money we appropriate for their individual programs. They are allowed, as they should be, a good bit of discretion in the exact area in which they devote funds. I do not think the Congress of the United States ought to enter into the area of telling the National Science Foundation exactly which projects to follow. They have the authority to do this now. This does not change the amount of money they would receive, and I simply think it is an amendment that is not necessary and is not a proper legislative function.

Mr. RARICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RARICK. Will the gentleman agree that a scientific study into genetics and heredity and their relationship to behavior and intelligence is of the utmost importance to the American people?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I do not have any reason to disagree with that if I understood the gentleman correctly, but I say to my good friend from Louisiana we would have welcomed your testimony before our subcommittee. I wish you had come before us. This comes a little suddenly. I did not get an advance copy of the amendment. I do not think there is any reason why the National Science Foundation could not go into it if they want to without this amendment. If the gentleman would wish, Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to write a letter to the Director of the National Science Foundation expressing the view that he give the matter consideration.

Mr. RARICK. I appreciate the gentleman's kind offer. I think, of course, offering this amendment today, regardless of which way the vote goes, may have the same effect of notifying the people in the scientific fields that there are those of us who believe, as apparently the chairman of the committee does, that it is a worthy scientific endeavor. There has been no definitive scientific study made in this all-important field. Certainly we should study the root causes of the problems rather than merely the effects that are plaguing our country.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I am not sure, Mr. Chairman, that there have not been some studies in this field. I really am honest in saying that I am not sure about this.

I would say that in the event the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Louisiana should fail, we would invite the gentleman to come before our subcommittee where he could express his views with the greatest freedom.

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

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I am, certainly, in no way interested in thwarting our ability to address ourselves to the many critical questions that must be researched and in-

vestigated in this country and throughout the world.

I certainly am in no way an opponent of intellectual pursuits and academic freedom.

I would only suggest to my colleagues in general—and, specifically to the author of the amendment—that there are too many life and death questions before us which must be investigated and dealt with before we entertain a proposal to spend a ridiculous amount of money researching in an area where the author of this amendment has so clearly underscored his real motivation.

We have before us life and death questions with respect to our environment: whether human life will survive on the face of this earth 20 years from now. We face grave issues of international and domestic importance which are of such magnitude that we must spend as many dollars as we can in order to arrive at expeditious and intelligent solutions.

But, there is no question in my own mind and, I hope, certainly no question in the minds of any of my colleagues that the overriding reason for this amendment is racist in its origin, motivation, and mentality.

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to spend billions of dollars, let us spend trying to save human life instead of attempting to continue to perpetuate racism and fan the flames of fear, hatred, and divisions in this country.

Mr. Chairman, if we are really interested in intellectual pursuit, technological advancement, and research in order to deal with the myriad of truly serious questions and conditions which exist in this country and in the world, let us not be trapped into supporting this amendment. We have too many pressing problems now pending before us to waste millions of dollars in order to allow some people to conduct a campaign of racial antagonism and to promote a mentality of racism in the country. Let the record show that our efforts here were directed at addressing the serious human questions of our times. I urge all of my colleagues to vote down this amendment.

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

Mr. DELLUMS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. I commend the gentleman for his statement and say for the record that his statement is obviously entirely extemporaneous and one of the most eloquent statements of the priorities of our country that I have ever heard.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RARICK) there were—ayes 1, noes 35.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Boggs) having assumed the chair, Mr. HANLEY, 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. 14108) to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 929, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

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

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 329, nays 16, not voting 88, as follows:

[Roll No. 121]

YEAS—329

Abbutt	Clausen,	Gibbons
Abourezk	Don H.	Gonzalez
Adams	Clawson, Del	Grasso
Addabbo	Clay	Green, Ore.
Anderson,	Cleveland	Griffin
Calif.	Collier	Gubser
Anderson, Ill.	Collins, Ill.	Gude
Anderson,	Collins, Tex.	Haley
Tenn.	Colmer	Halpern
Andrews, Ala.	Conable	Hamilton
Andrews,	Conte	Hammer-
N. Dak.	Conyers	schmidt
Annuizio	Corman	Hanley
Arends	Cotter	Hansen, Idaho
Aspin	Curlin	Hansen, Wash.
Aspinall	Daniel, Va.	Harrington
Badillo	Daniels, N.J.	Harsha
Baker	Danielson	Harvey
Baring	Davis, Ga.	Hastings
Begich	Davis, S.C.	Hathaway
Belcher	Davis, Wis.	Hays
Bell	de la Garza	Hébert
Bennett	Delaney	Hechler, W. Va.
Bergland	Dellenback	Heckler, Mass.
Betts	Dellums	Helstoski
Bevill	Denholm	Henderson
Biaggi	Dennis	Hicks, Mass.
Blatnik	Derwinski	Hicks, Wash.
Boggs	Dickinson	Hillis
Bolling	Diggs	Hogan
Bow	Dingell	Hollifield
Brademas	Donohue	Horton
Bray	Dorn	Hosmer
Brinkley	Dow	Howard
Brooks	Downing	Hull
Broomfield	Drinan	Hunt
Brotzman	Duncan	Hutchinson
Brown, Mich.	du Pont	Ichord
Brown, Ohio	Eckhardt	Jacobs
Broyhill, N.C.	Edmondson	Jarman
Broyhill, Va.	Edwards, Ala.	Johnson, Calif.
Buchanan	Edwards, Calif.	Jonas
Burke, Fla.	Evens, Tenn.	Jones, N.C.
Burke, Mass.	Fascell	Karh
Burleson, Tex.	Findley	Kastenmeier
Burlison, Mo.	Fish	Kazen
Burton	Flood	Keating
Byrnes, Wis.	Ford, Gerald R.	Keith
Byron	Ford,	Kemp
Cabell	William D.	Koch
Caffery	Forsythe	Kyl
Camp	Fraser	Kyros
Carlson	Frelinghuysen	Landrum
Carter	Frenzel	Latta
Casey, Tex.	Frey	Leggett
Cederberg	Fulton	Lent
Celler	Fuqua	Link
Chamberlain	Garmatz	Lloyd
Chappell	Gialmo	Long, Md.

McClory	Pettis	Smith, Calif.
McCloskey	Pickle	Smith, Iowa
McClure	Pike	Smith, N.Y.
McCollister	Pirnie	Spence
McCormack	Poage	Springer
McCulloch	Podell	Stanton,
McDade	Poff	J. William
McFall	Powell	Stanton,
McKay	Price, Ill.	James V.
McKevitt	Price, Tex.	Steele
McKinney	Pucinski	Steiger, Ariz.
Mahon	Purcell	Steiger, Wis.
Mailliard	Quile	Stratton
Mallory	Quillen	Stuckey
Mann	Railsback	Sullivan
Martin	Randall	Symington
Mathias, Calif.	Rangel	Talcott
Mathis, Ga.	Reid	Teague, Calif.
Matsunaga	Reuss	Teague, Tex.
Mayne	Rhodes	Terry
Mazzoli	Riegle	Thompson, Ga.
Meeds	Roberts	Thompson, N.J.
Melcher	Robinson, Va.	Thomson, Wis.
Metcalfe	Robison, N.Y.	Thone
Michel	Rodino	Tiernan
Mikva	Roe	Udall
Miller, Ohio	Rogers	Ullman
Mills, Md.	Roncalio	Van Deerlin
Minish	Rooney, N.Y.	Vanik
Mink	Rosenthal	Veysey
Minshall	Roush	Waggonner
Mitchell	Roussetot	Waldie
Mizell	Roy	Wampler
Mollohan	Roybal	Whalen
Monagan	Ruppe	Whalley
Morse	Ruth	White
Mosher	Ryan	Whitehurst
Moss	St Germain	Whitten
Murphy, Ill.	Sandman	Widnall
Murphy, N.Y.	Sarbanes	Wiggins
Myers	Satterfield	Wilson, Bob
Natcher	Saylor	Wilson,
Nedzi	Scherle	Charles H.
Nelsen	Schneebeli	Wolf
Nichols	Schwengel	Wyatt
Obey	Scott	Wyder
O'Hara	Sebelius	Wylie
O'Connor	Seiberling	Wyman
O'Neill	Shipley	Yates
Passman	Shoup	Young, Fla.
Patten	Shriver	Zablocki
Pelly	Sikes	Zion
Pepper	Sisk	Zwach
Perkins	Skubitz	

NAYS—16

Abernethy	Flynt	Montgomery
Archer	Gross	Rarick
Ashbrook	Grover	Schmitz
Clancy	King	Snyder
Crane	Landgrebe	
Devine	Lennon	

NOT VOTING—88

Abzug	Fountain	Madden
Alexander	Galifianakis	Miller, Calif.
Ashley	Gallagher	Mills, Ark.
Barrett	Gaydos	Moorhead
Blester	Gettys	Morgan
Bingham	Goldwater	Nix
Blackburn	Goodling	Patman
Blanton	Gray	Peyser
Boland	Green, Pa.	Preyer, N.C.
Brasco	Griffiths	Pryor, Ark.
Byrne, Pa.	Hagan	Rees
Carey, N.Y.	Hall	Rooney, Pa.
Carney	Hanna	Rostenkowski
Chisholm	Hawkins	Runnels
Clark	Heinz	Scheuer
Coughlin	Hungate	Slack
Culver	Johnson, Pa.	Staggers
Dent	Jones, Ala.	Steed
Dowdy	Jones, Tenn.	Stevens
Dulski	Kee	Stokes
Dwyer	Kluczynski	Stubblefield
Edwards, La.	Kuykendall	Taylor
Eilberg	Long, La.	Vander Jagt
Erlenborn	Lujan	Vigorito
Esch	McDonald,	Ware
Eshleman	Mich.	Williams
Evans, Colo.	McEwen	Winn
Fisher	McMillan	Wright
Flowers	Macdonald,	Yatron
Foley	Mass.	Young, Tex.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Dent with Mr. Blester.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Yatron with Mr. Heinz.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Jones of Tennessee.

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Kee.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Eshleman.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Ware.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Coughlin.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Eilberg with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Boland with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Goodling.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Winn.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. Flowers with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Gaydos with Mr. Williams.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Peyser.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Goldwater.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Galifianakis.
Mr. Stokes with Mr. Carney.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Bingham.
Mr. Hanna with Mrs. Abzug.
Mr. Vigorito with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Preyer of North Carolina with Mr. Steed.

Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Scheuer.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Slack.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Stephens.
Mr. Runnels with Mr. Wright.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Clark with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Mills of Arkansas.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Culver.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Foley with Mr. Hungate.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Young of Texas.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the introduction of House Resolution 939 last Thursday, a typographical error inadvertently listed the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. JAMES T. BROYHILL, as a cosponsor instead of Mr. JOEL T. BROYHILL of Virginia. Therefore, I make this statement to correct the RECORD.

THE LATE DR. FRANK L. BOYDEN

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, many times

I have taken the floor to inform this body of significant events from my home State of Massachusetts which have nationwide impact. I have never had sadder news to impart, however, than I have today.

Dr. Frank L. Boyden, the legendary headmaster of Deerfield Academy for 66 years, is dead. Frank Learoyd Boyden was much more than just the longtime headmaster at one small private preparatory school. He was the undisputed leader in his field; the headmaster of headmasters; the man whose name sprang immediately to mind when one thought of excellent preparatory schools and the great contribution they have made to this Nation.

Dr. Boyden died shortly after 1 o'clock this morning in his home on the Deerfield Academy campus where he had spent the vast majority of his 92 years.

Mr. Speaker, there is not enough time here today to mention all the milestones of Dr. Boyden's life, to catalog all the honors he has received. One indication alone of the stature of this man is the more than 2 dozen honorary degrees he has received.

But all the honors, all the acclaim, do not give an accurate picture of how this great educator has touched the lives of so many thousands of men in this country. A product of a one-room schoolhouse education, Frank Boyden went on to Amherst College and, shortly after graduation, took over the direction of a 14-pupil academy at Deerfield. Throughout his remarkable career, he built that small school into one of the greatest preparatory schools in the country. His graduates have distinguished themselves in this Chamber, in other high seats of government, in the arts and in the professions.

They are, in truth, the legacy left by Frank L. Boyden. Their accomplishments make up the greatest tribute anyone could pay to this great and good man—the only tribute he was interested in.

I was privileged to count Dr. Boyden as one of my closest and most valued friends. When I first ran for the Congress in 1958, my success was due, in no small measure, to the fact he served as cochairman of my campaign. When the time came for my son to go to secondary school, it was Deerfield Academy that I turned to. His graduation from the academy was one of the proudest days of my life.

It is tempting at this time, to say that Dr. Boyden's death marks the end of an era. And as far as headmasters are concerned, perhaps it does. But he leaves behind a school anchored in the rock of his persistence and dedication. It is not the end of an era for Deerfield Academy, for Dr. Boyden's influence will not be that easily or shortly diminished.

To his wife Helen Childs Boyden, an outstanding teacher and an invaluable helpmate to her husband in the building of the academy, to the rest of their family, and to all the friends of Deerfield Academy around the world, I extend my deepest sympathies.

I will conclude, Mr. Speaker, by reading only one of the many tributes to this great man. This one was presented by the President of the United States on May 10, 1967:

PRESIDENTIAL CITATION

The President of the United States of America awards this commendation to Frank Learoyd Boyden for distinguished service to the Nation. As headmaster of Deerfield Academy, he has enriched the minds, guided the spirits, and uplifted the aspirations of several generations of young Americans. Through his achievements, his kindly wisdom and his commitment to human welfare, he has encouraged standards of excellence which have enabled America's independent schools to become a continuing source of vitality in American education and quality in American life.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, with the death of Frank Boyden, America's private secondary schools have lost their most distinguished symbol; western Massachusetts has lost a living legend; Deerfield Academy's thousands of graduates and associates have lost a friend—a close one. And so have I.

In his 66 years as headmaster, Frank Boyden brought to Deerfield dozens of buildings, thousands of students, and millions of dollars. Far more importantly, however, he gave his unique spirit to the place, and it is that spirit that has made Deerfield the outstanding institution that it is.

It was a spirit of helpfulness. No visitor to the Deerfield campus could lose his way for long without being asked, "Can I help you?" by any number of Deerfield students. Frank Boyden taught them never to be too busy to help someone. It was a philosophy he practiced as well as preached.

It was a spirit of encouragement. Deerfield students were always made to feel they could reach the full limits of their capacities. They were never cajoled or threatened into performing. Mr. Boyden let them know what he thought they could realistically attain, and most of them reached it.

It was a spirit of friendship. Certainly his score of honorary degrees entitled him to be called "doctor," but by his own choice he was universally known as "Mister" Boyden. For years his "office" was a desk in the main hall, where anyone could stop and talk with him, ask his advice and receive his encouragement. He knew every student by his first name, and was never known to forget one of his more than 5,000 graduates.

He loved many things. First, of course, came his wife, Helen, who served as teacher, mother, and grand dame to generations of Deerfield boys. He loved Deerfield itself, the Berkshires looming in the distance, the historic green valley in which it lies. He loved athletics, and boys, and helping them learn.

He loved horses, and for many years used a horse and buggy to make his rounds of the campus. On his 50th anniversary as headmaster the alumni presented him with a new horse and buggy—as far as is known, the first ever to grace the ballroom of New York's Waldorf-Astoria. He made good use of it.

Politics, too, was a passion of his, and it meant a great deal to Massachusetts office-seekers to have Frank Boyden in their corner. For if you had Frank Boyden, you had a legion of supporters—not just Deerfield graduates, but thousands

of others who were touched by Frank Boyden and his school.

Frank Boyden was, without question, the dean of American headmasters. Once, when Deerfield was in serious financial trouble, the headmasters of Exeter, Andover, and Taft school helped raise \$1.5 million for this rival school. In later years Frank Boyden more than returned the favor, helping many schools with advice on fundraising and educational matters. He had an entree into the homes and hearts of leaders in every field; his judgment was often asked, and accepted.

To list Frank Boyden's honorary degrees, trusteeships, articles, and honorary mentions would be an exhaustive undertaking. It would also be an inappropriate one; he was not that kind of man. He was recently awarded the Distinguished American Award by the National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame—and that, no doubt, pleased him as much as anything else.

For he was, in the finest sense of the term, a simple man. He had no complicated educational theories. His own philosophy of education he put once:

I believe in boys. I believe in keeping them busy, and in the highest standards of scholarship. I believe in a very normal life. It generally seeps in.

For me, for my brothers and friends who attended Deerfield, and for the thousands of others who lives were so deeply affected by the advice and example of Frank Boyden, it did indeed "seep in."

He was a modest man, an unassuming man who took the greatest pride in his academy and the accomplishments of its graduates. When he retired 5 years ago, after 66 years as headmaster, one of those chosen to find his successor summed his problem up in these words.

"He throws a long shadow," the committee member said, "We'll find a replacement, but we'll never find anyone who can take his place."

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Congressman CONTE taking thoughtful leadership and calling our attention to the death this morning of Frank L. Boyden, the beloved headmaster of Deerfield Academy. On October 10, 1967, several of us joined in paying tribute to Dr. Boyden on the occasion of his retirement as headmaster. It is now our sad and difficult task to find the words to pay appropriate tribute to this remarkable man on the day of his death.

Under the leadership of Frank Boyden, Deerfield Academy grew from a struggling institution, of only 14 students in 1902 to one of the foremost preparatory schools in the Nation with a student body of over 500, a fine endowment, and a beautiful and historic campus.

One of Frank Boyden's many significant contributions in the field of education was preparing others to become educational leaders. A truly extraordinary number of his students and faculty have become leaders of educational institutions.

It has been my great good fortune to enjoy a particularly long and warm association with Frank Boyden. During the mid-thirties I was one of his boys. I re-

call vividly the advice and encouragement he so generously offered. As a U.S. Representative who earnestly tries to keep in touch with his constituents, I have always thought that Dr. Boyden's relationship with his students was an inspiring example. His "office" was located right out in the open, in the main hallway where every student passed several times during the day on his way to and from classes. Frank Boyden really kept in touch with his students.

During the summer, the Boydens would come to my home town of New London, N.H., so fortunately I was able to keep in touch with them over the years. The advice, encouragement and inspiration which I received from Frank and, of course, his wife Helen, thus continued. I was also able to see perhaps more clearly than some others the impression they made on those who never even attended the great institution which they created.

My early interest in public service and political activity was encouraged by Dr. Boyden's belief that his students should interest themselves in public affairs. He practiced what he preached.

Attempting to find words as I joined others here on the floor of the House to pay tribute to Frank Boyden in October 1967, I observed that he worked to inspire us to always do better and to be better. Thanks to him, countless people have followed that creed and our country is the better for it. This is truly the best and most enduring tribute to the memory of this man.

The sorrow and sadness which I feel at this time is leavened by the certain knowledge that Frank Boyden and what he has done lives on in the hearts and minds of the thousands of people who have been inspired by his words and deeds.

To his beloved wife, Helen, truly a part of the Boyden legend and tradition, and their children, I express my sympathy, my great respect, and my deep thanks for the inspiration which Frank Boyden of Deerfield Academy has provided for me and so many others.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all my colleagues have 5 legislative days to insert their remarks on Dr. Frank Boyden in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

PROGRESSIVE LABOR PARTY TO HOLD DEMONSTRATION ON U.S. CAPITOL GROUNDS ON APRIL 29, 1972—A CAUSE FOR CONCERN

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

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 29, 1972, the Progressive Labor Party, a violence-prone Marxist-Leninist group, will stage a "May Day Fight for Socialism" demonstration on the U.S. Capitol Grounds for the ostensible purpose of petitioning for a "30-hour work-

week with 40 hours pay" and an end to the Vietnam war. The real objective, of course, will be the promotion of PLP's particular brand of communism.

In am sure everyone remembers last spring when the Nation's Capital was disrupted by waves of militant protesters. The demonstrations were widely advertised as peaceful but violence erupted in a manner to shock the Nation. Over 13,000 arrests of unruly demonstrators were made and the total cost figures for the demonstrations amount to over \$7 million. It was indeed a tribute to law enforcement that under these chaotic circumstances the Government was not disrupted and the city was not paralyzed as the protesters vowed they would do.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that as early as April 6 last year, on the floor of the House, I called attention to the Communist leadership in the antiwar coalitions sponsoring the protest demonstrations in Washington last spring. I gave ample advance warning of the chaos that these groups planned for the Nation's Capital. However, the mass news media largely chose to ignore the information I provided and, in my opinion, failed to act responsibly in its predemonstration reporting. The public was not adequately informed. Crowds, Mr. Speaker, constitute a problem under such conditions and many individuals sincerely interested in peace would surely not have participated in the demonstrations last year if they were aware that the demonstrations were primarily a Communist-led operation.

As chairman of the House Committee on Internal Security, I consider it my responsibility to once again alert my colleagues and the American public to the current demonstration being planned by the Progressive Labor Party on April 29. In applying for a demonstration permit, Wallace Conner, the Progressive Labor Party representative, indicated that a minimum of 2,000 persons will participate in the April 29 demonstration. The Progressive Labor Party has given a great deal of publicity to this demonstration and participants have been lined up in major cities throughout the country. Among the activities planned by the Progressive Labor Party is a march around the Capitol Building prior to gathering at a rally site on the east front Capitol Plaza to voice demands for a wage boost for the "working class" and an end to the Vietnam war. Although the authorities have informed the Progressive Labor Party that a march around the Capitol Building will not be permitted, it is not known at this stage whether the Progressive Labor Party will accept this ruling.

Many of our citizens are well aware of the objectives of the Communist Party in this country, but few have any knowledge about the nature of the Progressive Labor Party. The willingness and readiness of the Progressive Labor Party to engage in violence to accomplish its goals was brought out during an intensive investigation of this organization by the Committee on Internal Security.

Committee investigation disclosed that the Progressive Labor Party was formed

by dissident elements of the Communist Party, U.S.A., led by former CPUSA leaders Milton Rosen and Mortimer Scheer, both of whom were expelled from the CPUSA in December 1961 for following the Chinese Communist Party line. The Progressive Labor Party over the years has been active in exploiting and aggravating racial discord in this country.

For those desiring further information concerning the aims and activities of the Progressive Labor Party, copies of the committee's 1971 hearings on this organization are available from the committee and the Government Printing Office.

I pointed out in the committee's 1971 annual report that our investigation of the Progressive Labor Party proved beyond doubt that the Progressive Labor Party is a tightly organized Marxist-Leninist group which once had strong leanings toward the Communist philosophy of Mao Tse-tung but now accuses China as having sold out to the "revisionists" in the world Communist movement. The Progressive Labor Party may no longer be acting on the direct orders of Peking, but you may be certain that its goals remain the same—the destruction of our system of free enterprise.

The Progressive Labor Party has been highly effective in penetrating the New Left movement in this country through the Worker-Student Alliance faction of the Students for a Democratic Society. This has, of course, given the Progressive Labor Party considerable influence among young people, particularly college youths.

As a Marxist-Leninist group, the Progressive Labor Party believes that the working class in this country will form the base of a revolution here. It is therefore understandable why it concentrates on issues of prime interest to the working class, such as its current demand for a 30-hour work week for 40 hours pay. This is the old communist tactic of "issue exploitation" in an effort to achieve an aura of respectability. Historically, the Communists have never been genuinely interested in the welfare of the working class but rather seek to seize upon working class issues in an effort to further Communist objectives.

There is every reason to believe, insofar as the leadership of the forthcoming Progressive Labor Party demonstration is concerned, that the antiwar protest angle is being used primarily as a "gimmick" designed to draw in well-meaning persons and the more naive antiwar protesters. While I have no intention of issuing a blanket denouncement of all those who will participate in this forthcoming demonstration, I do feel it is important that we sharply differentiate between the motives of those who would manifest their feelings in an orderly manner and those who would attempt to seize on this opportunity as a means of expressing their vengeance, hatred, and animosity toward our society and would take advantage of this demonstration to bring about violence in the Nation's Capital.

The coordinators of the April 29 dem-

onstration are activists Michael Golash, Deidre Golash, and Wallace Conner. It is important to note that Michael Golash is a longtime Progressive Labor Party member. He played a leading role in the massive and violent demonstrations at Columbia University in April 1968. In the space of 5 days, militant vanguard of some 200 revolutionary students physically seized control of five major Columbia University buildings.

Although for obvious reasons Progressive Labor Party leaders do not speak of the use of violence during the forthcoming demonstration on April 29, one thing is fairly certain—violence will be employed by the Progressive Labor Party if its leaders feel violence will serve their purpose.

Although I do not believe that large crowds will participate in this demonstration as it is doubtful that the smoother operating Communist Party, U.S.A. and Trotskyite Communists will extend themselves in cooperating, I do feel that the demonstration is fraught with risk. The fact that the Progressive Labor Party has in the past exhibited a propensity toward violence should not be dismissed as insignificant. As a result of the committee's investigation, I am exceedingly concerned that the concept of violence has become an integral part of the philosophy of the Progressive Labor Party. Although I recognize the right of peaceful assembly, when a Communist group like the Progressive Labor Party is in a position to use such an assembly for its nefarious cause then reasonable restraint must be the order of the day. The U.S. Capitol Police and the Metropolitan Police must be prepared and must be constantly watchful of events on April 29. Additionally, the citizens of the community and the Nation must be alerted to the efforts of this Communist organization to recruit young people into its membership for participation in its growing defiant protests against law and order.

A widespread underestimation of the menace which the Progressive Labor Party present to the internal security of the United States is just the impression the Progressive Labor Party desires to present. The ability of this organization to seize upon items of discontent and to fan the sparks of civil disobedience into actual strife presents a serious cause for concern.

AIR SERVICE TO SMALL CITIES

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

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, Mr. James Vance of Worthington, Minn., appeared before the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Commerce. Mr. Vance is published of the Worthington Daily Globe and also serves as president of the Local Airline Service Action Committee.

Mr. Vance very concisely describes the problems of living in areas which are considerable distance from any metropolitan airport and suggests some reasonable remedies. I would like to include

at this point his testimony before the committee relative to providing air service to small cities:

AIR SERVICE TO SMALL CITIES (By James Vance)

Gentlemen: I am James Vance of Worthington, Minnesota. My principal occupation is publisher of the *Daily Globe*. Today I appear in my capacity as President of the Local Airline Service Action Committee, an informal group representing small and medium-size cities across the country concerned with the adequacy of their air service. LASAC was formed in 1964 to oppose the erosion of airline service to smaller communities.

Scheduled air service to small cities has deteriorated for years. Your Committee can do two things:

1. Set policies suggesting appropriate action for federal agencies under present law.
2. Initiate changes in the law.

If firm directions come out of your hearings, long-needed remedies can start being to work.

I am here on behalf of the Local Airline Service Action Committee (LASAC), speaking for small and medium-sized cities whose economic life depends on linkage by air with the jet mainstream. Large cities are equally affected; they live by the flow of commerce from the smaller.

Since 1964, NASAC witnesses have come to protest against the deterioration of air service. Today, it is not enough to keep the present airline points on the map. We are concerned also with communities now without service and urgently in need of it.

There has been no systematic approach or any long-term plan or policy. Decisions on air service—whether to give it, downgrade it, or remove it—have been made point-by-point with too little regard for the needs of a region or of the nation.

Your Committee can cut through this confusion by insisting on a system plan that will identify the points to be served. This can be done under existing law without added cost.

First, let me say that today's problems are due to no failure of Congress. Congress gave status to the local service airlines in the 1940s as a new class of carriers for the express purpose of creating short-haul networks feeding into the long-haul routes of the trunklines.

The certificate of each local airline says in plain words:

"It is in the public interest to establish certain air carriers who will be primarily engaged in short-haul air transportation as distinguished from the service rendered by trunkline air carriers. In accepting this certificate, the holder acknowledges and agrees . . ."

Since the 1950s, the locals have drifted far from this role. The trouble started when their old DC-3s no longer could serve economically. In 1957, Congress granted loan guaranty to retire these World War II planes. But instead of developing new aircraft for their assigned job, the locals bought jets unsuited for short hops and light traffic, and too big for many of the airports.

To help pay for the jets, the Civil Aeronautics Board gave the locals long routes to compete with the trunks to the injury of the latter without much help to the locals. To reduce losses and subsidies, the locals tried to shed their low-traffic points, abetted by CAB's use-it-or-lose-it policy and by the FAA-CAB idea of single-airports for adjacent cities.

These policies were abandoned after LASAC protests were backed by concerned members of Congress. Then the local airlines found a new way to pull out of their losing points, with CAB's blessing, by letting commuter air carriers substitute. Some 80 pairs of certificated points now are thus served. These market pairs involve 100 cities.

Where the local airline takes a strong

hand in helping the substitute make good, as in the case of the Allegheny commuters, the more frequent flights by lightplanes can be better accepted than infrequent trips by jetliners. But, the smaller planes, as stated in past LASAC testimony, are a downgrading of service. The commuter lines are unstable. There have been many failures. Now the National Transportation Safety Board is so concerned over their safety as to have ordered a major investigation nation-wide.

No more substitutions should be forced on American Communities until something is done to assure safety and competence. Of 520-odd certificated airline points in the United States, about half depend on local airlines and are not served by trunklines. I urge that your Committee call a halt to deletions and transfers.

It is time to declare that scheduled air transportation is an economic necessity. Every ten years, the U.S. Census shows that population is declining in hundreds of counties, especially in the Midwestern heartland, and gaining in big cities.

Scheduled flight is a means of checking this flow. City after city has held its own or moved ahead through air service that attracts employment-creating industry. Each family that is displaced from a small city, and goes on relief in a big one, will cost the taxpayers upwards of \$2,500 a year in direct welfare and larger sums in public services—schools, police, sanitation, and housing—that must be provided.

Keep a family employed in smaller communities and the saving is immense. The adverse economic impact on the nation and the large cities can outweigh the cost of keeping a city on the airline map. It is short-sighted to judge scheduled air service merely on airline and subsidy balance sheets without giving weight to human needs.

When national policy is stated in these terms, the next step is to decide where air service is most essential. This is a matter of system planning. The Airport and Airway Development Act provides \$15 million a year for planning, to be matched by a third as much in State and local money. Such grants are to be used for master plans for airports and also for State-wide aviation system plans.

In the State plans, it can be decided what cities most need air service, including points now served and some that are not. This is quite within the scope of the law but it is not being done. The planners should consider such factors as accessibility to existing airline fields and the adequacy of ground transport. With rail passenger trains gone and bus service reduced, many communities are isolated. Aviation is the best answer in many cases.

In my own State of Minnesota, we not only want to be sure that no present airline points are discontinued but we have blank spots where cities unserved are in need of linkage with the larger centers. For these needs to be officially recognized, we need a State system plan that will fit into broader plans for the region and for the whole nation.

There is a National Airport System Plan being developed by the Federal Aviation Administration which will list airports and projects eligible for funds. CAB should make a list of cities that require scheduled air service and give each a Certificate of Essentiality. Those now served thus will have a secure future and those without service will be in line to get it.

There is unused authority for the Civil Aeronautics Board to work with the States to this end. Section 204(b) of the Federal Aviation Act reads as follows:

"The Board is empowered to confer with or to hold public hearings with any State aeronautical agency, or other State agency, in connection with any matter arising under this Act within its jurisdiction, and to avail itself of the cooperation, services, records, and facilities of such State agencies as fully

as may be practicable in the administration and enforcement of this Act."

While CAB often has dealt with the States informally, the close cooperation that the law allows has not been effectively used. In view of the trend of federal policy to place more responsibility with the States, the way is open.

Another step that can be taken now is for the Department of Transportation to aid in providing transportation for small cities as well as large. Other Departments that deal with urban areas also can help on the premise that halting the flow of people out of the smaller cities will help check an unhealthy growth of the larger cities.

Still another step is for the Civil Aeronautics Board to decide the question of a higher weight limit for air taxi aircraft and thus settle uncertainties that make it hard to plan.

At this point, I have completed the first part of my statement, on what can be done under existing law. All the foregoing can be set in motion if your Committee so directs after these hearings. To summarize:

A. A firm policy can be set, to recognize the overriding necessity for air service to small communities for reasons affecting the nation's economy.

B. System plans can be made by States and regions, to decide which cities most need scheduled air service.

C. The Civil Aeronautics Board can hold formal hearings with the States to give such cities ratings of essentiality in a national plan.

D. Department of Transportation and other agencies can figure transportation projects for small cities as well as large.

E. The question of air taxi weight can be decided.

If these steps are taken immediately, sound plans will be ready, to make the most of any changes in the law that may follow. Action must not wait for laws to pass. The time to begin is now. Indecision has continued too long.

When it is determined which cities are to be served, there comes the question of who serves them. Since the local airlines are certificated to meet the needs of their regions, all possible effort should be made to get them to do the job.

Where this is not feasible, there should be quick procedures for commuter air carriers to take over. But the locals should continue to have back-up responsibility on the route segments for which they are certificated.

Great areas of the country may be involved. Commuter line substitutions thus far are mainly in the East, within the systems of Allegheny and Northeast Airlines. Elsewhere, airline pilots have resisted substitutions that would reduce their flight time. But there are many low-traffic points where the cost of enplaning passengers is high.

The fare structure of scheduled air transportation also affects air service use at smaller communities. Generally speaking, the cost of living is lower in the smaller communities. But, air transportation costs more per mile for short distances than for long distances. The airlines rate is based on a \$16.00 terminal charge plus a rate per mile. The rate per mile decreases as the mileage increases. Consequently, the terminal charge forces the short-distance traveler to pay more per mile than the long-distance passenger. I pay a higher rate per mile to travel from Worthington to the Twin Cities than a Twin Cities-Los Angeles passenger pays. Attention to this matter is required.

New legislation which the Committee is considering is needed for two reasons: to insure responsible performance by commuter air carriers and to give them incentives to take the responsibility. The Pearson Bill (S. 796) goes in that direction.

The bill would also authorize a limit on the size of aircraft used by the limited class,

a regulation which the Civil Aeronautics Board is not authorized to apply to the certificated airlines under existing law.

I would like to see this measure spell out more in detail just how CAB is to set up this class of carriers. The old system of proving public convenience and necessity by detailed procedures is too long and costly. On the other hand, some minimum qualifications are needed. Congress should not leave this altogether to Board discretion.

The wisdom and foresight of the Board, in view of the record we have outlined, leaves much to be desired. I am not impressed with the CAB Chairman's proposal to offer a few experimental contracts by competitive bids in a three-year experiment. Broader solutions are needed now. Such bidding nearly bankrupted the pioneer airlines in the 1930s. There is no incentive to bid on losing points with no tenure.

For a commuterline to succeed, it must have some route protection against cutthroat competition and must have subsidy for the loser points. Whether the subsidy should be paid directly or channeled through the local airlines is a question.

It seems to me that the issues are too complex and opinions too divided for us to expect adequate legislation at this session of Congress. But I hope your Committee will set guidelines that will point the way to action as early as possible next year.

Guidelines are needed also for development of new aircraft. There never has been a DC-3 replacement. Some more economical and efficient aircraft types are needed: (1) a replacement for the Convairs and the Fairchild F-27s in the 60-seat range; and (2) a commuter plane in the 25-seat range.

I hope your committee will stress the urgency of federal aid in developing prototypes for such service. The commuter plane is especially important to smaller cities that cannot be served economically by larger craft.

As commuter air carriers and air taxis are held to the old arbitrary maximum of 12,500 pounds gross takeoff weight, they are limited to planes of some 18 passengers. With these, it is difficult to break even or to give good service.

The CAB examiner's finding that the limit should be raised to a maximum of 30 passengers or 7,500 pounds payload is under review by the Board. This should be settled. We can then develop new aircraft useful for local airlines as well as for commuter lines.

How can development be encouraged and speeded? Federal aid for prototypes would be inexpensive as compared with larger craft and is an investment that can bring great returns. Proposals have been made also for loan guaranty of financial aid for commuter air carriers to purchase such craft and put them into the service of America's smaller cities.

Summarizing again, new legislation and appropriations are needed for:

A. Creation of a class of air carriers to fly aircraft of limited capacity.

B. Aid in the development and financing of new and more efficient aircraft, especially in the local and commuter classes of some 60 and 26 passengers, respectively.

Meanwhile, I urge that your Committee demand immediate action on the steps that can be taken under present law.

IMPROVEMENT OF POTOMAC RIVER WATER

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

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most repulsive sights for boatmen and those who stroll the banks of the Po-

tomac is about at an end. That is the sight of masses of human waste that has been allowed to flow, untreated, directly into the river.

This should be generally eliminated by the opening of a new pumping station under the Theodore Roosevelt bridge and the closing of the Georgetown gap in the sewer system. A contract for the latter has now been signed. Under it, the gap which permitted raw sewage to flow into the Potomac will be closed by the end of July, according to the District Government.

This will be accomplished by temporary piping that will be suspended under the Whitehurst Freeway. By the end of 1973, under the same contract, a permanent closing of the "gap" will be in place, underground.

Also this summer, alum will be used at the Blue Plains treatment plant that serves the District, and Maryland and Virginia suburbs. The alum will settle solids in the water more rapidly, permitting them to be carted off for use as fertilizer rather than dumped into the river.

These steps are good ones and should result in a visible improvement in the river.

It will still be badly polluted, however, and we must make sure that the long-range improvements that have been started at Blue Plains are continued. These are threatened because the Federal matching funds are included in the clean water legislation now tied up in conference.

If we are not to be able to complete work on the legislation, we should nevertheless make sure we somehow finance the Blue Plains work. I have just introduced a back-up bill that would permit the District to borrow the amount expected, eventually, as a Federal matching grant. This would prevent an interruption in the Blue Plains work—and would help guarantee that we, in our work to clean up the Nation's waterways, are not embarrassed by pollution in our own backyard.

I hope my colleagues will consider carefully my proposal—and any other proposal that may be made—for keeping the important Blue Plains work going.

THE TRAGEDY OF EXTENDING THE WEST FRONT

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the action of the Senate a couple of weeks ago in including in the legislative appropriation bill a provision requiring that no construction work can begin on the controversial extension of the west front without specific authorization by Congress, it is quite possible that this House will soon be called on to vote on whether the House will or will not go along with the Senate provision on this point when the conference committee on this bill makes a report to the House.

To assist Members in making a decision on this issue, to give them a little better idea of just what serious damage will be done to the Capitol as we know

it now, I believe an article which appeared in the Washington Post this morning will be most instructive, and I urge my colleagues to read it, if they have not already done so.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include the article in question, written by Charles C. McLaughlin, a student of the works of Frederick Law Olmstead, Sr., who was the designer and creator of the famous Olmstead terrace which now graces the west front and which would be totally destroyed by the proposed extension, with very disastrous results. The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 25, 1972]

CAPITOL EXTENSION PLAN—WHY DESTROY A NATIONAL MASTERPIECE?

(By Charles C. McLaughlin)

The dream of extending the central portion of the United States Capitol another 44 feet towards the Mall is nearly 100 years old. Thomas U. Walter, architect of the present dome and the wings for the Senate and House, proposed such a marble addition in 1874. What is new about the present plan is that it will destroy the present terrace, completed in 1890, which Frederick Law Olmstead first proposed in 1874.

The Olmstead terrace is the third attempt to solve an aesthetic problem of which few tourists or members of Congress are aware. The west front of the U.S. Capitol juts out over the crest of Capitol Hill so that it presents a four story facade towards the Mall. This is not only unclassical, but it does not match the three story facade of the east side of the building because this subbasement level is visible above the ground. To hide this embarrassing subbasement, Charles Bulfinch heaped a great earth embankment or berm all around it, leaving a courtyard inside to allow light and air to the subbasement windows. Walter continued this embankment around the subbasements of his House and Senate wings, which were built in 1867.

Frederick Law Olmstead was commissioned landscape architect of the Capitol grounds in 1874. He suggested that the unkempt earth embankments should be removed and replaced by a 50 foot windowless stone platform that would add an effect of stability, endurance, and repose to the Capitol by giving it a handsome foundation. Behind these blank walls there are now 137 rooms lighted with windows facing an interior courtyard and skylights built into the walkways above.

The Senate Committee on Buildings and Grounds suggested that the walls facing the Mall should be pierced with windows. But Olmstead testified that the windows would ruin the effect he had intended. It would be like punching holes in a dam. The solidity of the blank walls and terrace, he said, is to counteract any sense one might have that the Capitol, perched over the edge of the hill, was about to slide down it. He provided only seven archways in the center section between the two great stairways. Six of these, against the advice of Olmstead, have been made into tall windows.

The Commission on the Extension of the Capitol seems to have forgotten the reason why Walter Bulfinch and Olmstead insisted on windowless platforms to enhance the monumental effect of the west side of the Capitol. The commission's plan is to embellish the terrace with 36 tall square windows to give the occupants of four private dining rooms, two restaurants, and some hideaway offices a sweeping view down the Mall towards the Washington Monument. It is hard to see these windows in the model of the extended Capitol which is on display in Statuary Hall. But they will glitter in the western sun and, lighted up at night, will make the west front of the U.S. Capitol look like a

five story wedding cake, nearly twice the height as the east front.

Another feature of the Commission's plan, which might easily escape notice, is the service road which will be cut across the west lawn. It will allow large trucks and service vehicles to pass under the middle section of the terrace to stop at truck docks placed under the stairways. The former Architect of the Capitol, J. George Stewart, was unable to persuade Congress to build underground truck facilities below the east plaza when the east front was extended and therefore added them to his west front scheme. Close scrutiny of the plan for the roadway level of the terrace discloses that there are 9,052 square feet of "unassigned public space" between the truck docks. This appears to be intended as a large, all-weather bus terminal for the seven million or more tourists who visit the building every year.

This cannot be hidden by bushes and trees and will spoil the carefully planned effect of monumental dignity Olmstead's landscaping and great terrace has achieved.

An unexpected dividend from my Olmstead research has been the discovery of Montgomery Meigs's letters discussing the Walter plan to extend the west front of the Capitol in 1875. In these, written to Olmstead and Senator Justin Morrill, the former engineer in charge of the construction of Walter's dome and the new Senate and House wings, argued that it would be "an error to extend the central portions of the old building, thus hiding the further wing in oblique views and spending money to diminish the apparent magnitude and grandeur of this noble building."

Applying his argument to the present extension plans, one realizes that the projection of the central facade 44 feet to the west would cut the building in half when seen from the side because the extended center section would block a view of the further half of the Capitol. One would miss the Senate when viewing the Capitol from the House side and vice versa. Olmstead, who had to accommodate the provisionally accepted Walter plan into his terrace design, admitted to Meigs that "as to the west portico, I thought that a reduction from the assumed projection of 40 feet beyond the line of the present wall would be better than any addition to it." When shown one of the Meigs letters, even Walter acknowledged that the author had made "many well-studied points."

Looking at the model of the extended Capitol it is hard to realize that the Capitol is situated at the top of a steep slope. The fact that one views the real building from below means that any projection of the building will be emphasized far more than if it were placed on a flat surface. The building already presents a massive appearance on the edge of Capitol Hill. A projection of its center would accentuate the central portico and diminish the importance of the dome. The extended central facade with the proposed peaked rather than present flat, pediment would obscure much of the lower part of the dome in a close view. To see as much of the dome as one now does, one would have to back down to the foot of the hill.

The earlier proposal to expand the Capitol building was abandoned when the Library of Congress was built in 1897. The various House and Senate office buildings and the Supreme Court Building diminished the demand for space in the Capitol building itself. In the past 20 years, however, the east front extension was built—a marble reproduction of the original sandstone facade. The extension of the west front proposed by Stewart has so far been averted not only for reasons of economy, but also to preserve the original Bulfinch west front facade. Now there is also an increasing awareness of the genius of Olmstead, who gave the Capitol a setting which is a happy blend of formal and

informal landscape. The awareness, coming as it does in Olmstead's sesquicentennial year, must culminate in saving his terraces.

There are other ways of solving the practical problems of what to do with seven-million tourists, where to place truck docks, and how to meet the demand for office space. There is no reason to destroy a national architectural masterpiece for a questionable expediency.

VOTING RECORD OF LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, to insure the fullest possible public access to the votes I have cast in Congress I now request permission to insert in the RECORD the following complete compilation of my voting record in the first session of the 92d Congress:

VOTING RECORD OF LAWRENCE J. HOGAN, 92d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

[Passed (P) or Defeated (D) by House of Representatives]

AGRICULTURE

Voted:

For a bill to permit American wine producers to display their products at international trade fairs. (P)

For the continuation of the International Coffee Agreement Act of 1968. (P)

For a three-year extension of the Sugar Act of 1948 to retain the long-term price stabilization effect of the Sugar Act and the long-term protection it has afforded to American sugar producing areas. (P)

For cooperative agreements between the Agriculture Secretary and states and localities to aid law enforcement in National Forests, with provisions for federal reimbursement for expenditures by states and localities in connection with such law enforcement activities. (P)

For broadening and expanding the powers of the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with countries in the Western Hemisphere to prevent or retard communicable diseases of animals, where the Secretary deems such action necessary to protect the livestock, poultry, and related industries of the United States. (P)

For the modernization and consolidation of existing Farm Credit law to meet current and future rural credit needs and to provide for the farmer-owned cooperative system of making credit available to farmers and ranchers and their cooperatives. (P)

For continuation of the International Coffee Agreement Act of 1968 until September 30, 1973. (P)

Agriculture appropriations for fiscal year 1972

For a limitation of \$20,000 per crop per farm on farm subsidies except on sugar and wool. (P)

For an amendment to forbid funding of any stream channelization project administered under the Secretary of Agriculture, unless the project was in the construction stage before July 1, 1971. (D)

Against an amendment to forbid food stamps to households needing assistance because any member of the household is on strike. (D)

After a Senate-House Conference to resolve differences between the two versions of the bill, voted against the \$13.3 billion Agriculture Appropriations bill because it appropriated \$1.17 billion more than the budget request and because it did not contain a \$20,000 limit on most farm subsidy payments. (P)

Grain Reserve bill

For a substitute amendment to the Grain Reserve bill to provide for the storage of grain reserves only in producer-owned facilities rather than in both producer-owned and commercial storage facilities. (D)

For an amendment to strike from the wheat and feed grains loan-rate amendment the provision for a 25 percent increase in loan levels. (D)

For an amendment which would have required the release price of grain reserves to be set at 100 percent of the commodity's parity price instead of at 120 percent of the past five-year average market price. (D)

Against an amendment which would have allowed the Agriculture Secretary to store the grain reserves in the homes of "hungry Americans" unable to afford sufficient food to maintain their good health. (D)

Against the establishment of a reserve supply of up to 300 million bushels of wheat and 25 million tons of feed grains. (P)

CIVIL RIGHTS

Voted:

For a \$600,000 increase to \$4 million in the appropriations for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. (P)

Against a substitute amendment providing court enforcement powers in lieu of "cease and desist" authority for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (P) On final passage, voted for this substitute measure when it was clear that the "cease and desist" measure had failed. (P)

For an amendment to the joint resolution proposing an equal rights amendment to the Constitution clarifying that the rights referred to in the resolution were those of people, including both citizens and non-citizens. (D)

For an amendment to the equal rights amendment to retain Congressional authority to exempt women from the draft and retain laws characterized as "reasonably promoting the health and safety of the people." (D) On final passage, voted for the joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women. (P)

For a motion to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration of the resolution to amend the Constitution with regard to prayer in public buildings. (P)

For the resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings. (D)

For equality of treatment for married women federal employees with respect to preference eligible employment benefits, cost-of-living allowances in foreign areas, and regulations concerning marital status generally. (P)

CRIME, DRUG ABUSE, LAW ENFORCEMENT

Voted:

For an amendment to the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for the development and operation of treatment programs for certain drug abusers who are confined to or released from correctional institutions and facilities. (P)

For an increase on the limit on dues for U.S. membership in the International Criminal Police Organization. (P)

For establishment of an independent Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice. (D)

For the temporary assignment of a U.S. Magistrate from one judicial district to another. (P)

Against a motion to kill a bill which proposed establishing by law the canine corps in the D.C. police department. (D) After defeat of this motion the bill passed by a voice vote.

For payment of the cost of medical, surgical, hospital, or related health care services for D.C. policemen, firemen, U.S. Park Police, the Executive Protective Services, and the U.S. Secret Service, retired for total disability incurred in the line of duty. (P)

For a treatment and rehabilitation program in the Veterans Administration for servicemen and veterans suffering from drug abuse or drug dependency. (P)

ECONOMICS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Voted:

Against an increase in the national debt ceiling from \$395 billion to \$430 billion. (P) This vote was cast in protest of excessive government spending.

For additional financing for rural telephone service by setting up a Rural Telephone Bank with initial government financing, but with the object that it would eventually be privately controlled. (P)

Against an amendment to the National Debt Ceiling bill to disallow the sale of \$10 billion in government bonds at interest rates higher than the old 4¼% ceiling. (D)

For the continuation of various small business programs through fiscal year 1972 and to increase the ceiling on SBA business loans from \$2.2 billion to \$3.1 billion. (P)

For a \$5.5 billion authorization bill which included \$2 billion for a proposed public works acceleration program as well as funds for the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, and the Appalachian Regional Development Act. (P)

For a 90% federal loan guarantee from banks to major businesses in financial trouble instead of a 100% guarantee. (D)

Against federal emergency loan guarantees for financially distressed major businesses. (P)

Against the bill to extend the life of the Export-Import Bank, to exclude the bank's receipts and disbursements from the U.S. budget and to increase the ceiling on the bank's loans, guarantees and export insurance. This vote was a protest against acceptance of a Senate provision to water down a prohibition against bank financing to nations which support nations with which we are in armed conflict. (P)

For temporary insurance for the members' accounts of certain Federal Credit Unions. (D)

For extension of the duration of copyright protection in certain cases. (P)

For extension of the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to set the maximum interest rates for government-backed mortgages through June 30, 1972. (P)

For an amendment to require that wage and salary increases negotiated before the wage-price freeze began August 15, 1971, be paid retroactively if price, tax budgetary or productivity increases had been made to accommodate the pay increases. (P)

Against an amendment which would have required that all information submitted in compliance with the implementation of wage-price controls be a matter of public record with the exception of trade secrets and processes. (D)

For an amendment which would have allowed Presidential authority to review pension and retirement plans which the Phase II authority bill would otherwise exempt from controls. (D)

For extension through April 30, 1973, of the President's authority to implement Phase II of his economic stabilization plan of controls on prices, wages and interest rates. (P)

*EDUCATION**Education appropriations*

Against an amendment to the Education appropriations bill which would have added \$728.6 million to the appropriation for 26 separate educational programs. (D)

For the bill making appropriations for the Office of Education and related agencies for fiscal year 1972, including an anti-busing provision. (P)

For tabling a motion to agree to the Senate amendments which proposed spending \$816 million more than the House had previ-

ously voted for the Office of Education appropriations bill. (P)

For a \$5.146 billion appropriations bill for the Office of Education and related agencies for fiscal year 1972. (P)

Anti-busing amendments

Against an amendment to the Education appropriations bill which sought to strike out anti-busing provisions included in the bill. (D)

For a motion to bring to the House floor a resolution directing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to furnish the House with a list of public school systems which will be receiving federal funds and which will be engaging in busing school children to achieve racial balance. (P)

For adoption of the resolution requesting the HEW Secretary to furnish information on busing to the members of the House of Representatives. (P)

Against a bill to assist school districts to meet special problems incident to desegregation, and to the elimination, reduction, or prevention of racial isolation in elementary and secondary schools. (D) The objection to this bill is that it would have authorized federal aid part of which would be used to pay for busing.

For postponement of any U.S. District Court order to force busing to achieve racial balance until such time as the Supreme Court has had an opportunity to act on any appeal. (P)

For the Ashbrook amendment to the Higher Education bill prohibiting the use of funds for busing of students or teachers to overcome racial imbalance, or for the purchase of equipment for such transportation. (P)

For an amendment to the Ashbrook amendment adding language that forbids any officer or employee of HEW or the Office of Education, or any other Federal agency, to force States to expend States or local funds for purposes for which Federal funds cannot be expended, particularly busing. (P)

Against an amendment to the Ashbrook amendment that would exclude local education agencies who are carrying out a plan of racial desegregation of its schools pursuant to the order of a court of competent jurisdiction. (D)

Against an amendment to the Higher Education bill to direct the Commissioner of Education to make a full and complete report on the needs incident to carrying out plans for the elimination of racial segregation in elementary and secondary schools to be completed on or before July 1, 1972. (D)

For the Emergency School Aid Act as a new title to the Higher Education bill, including the Ashbrook anti-busing amendment and providing a definition of neighborhood schools. (P)

Higher education bill

Against an amendment to the Higher Education Act to revise the distribution of educational opportunity grants. (D)

Against an amendment to the Higher Education bill which sought to strike out Title VII—general institutional aid to institutions of higher education. (D)

For an amendment to the Higher Education bill to place the requirement that each State maintain its effort in higher education on the individual institutions. (P)

For an amendment to the Higher Education bill that would terminate funds to any institution or class of institutions, after a final determination that the institution is in violation of the U.S. Constitution. (D)

For an amendment to the Higher Education bill to strike out Title IX—interns for political leadership. (P)

For an amendment to the Higher Education bill to exclude all-male or all-female undergraduate schools from the "prohibition of sex discrimination" language in the bill. (P)

Against extending the benefits of land-grant colleges to the Colleges of the Virgin Islands and the University of Guam. (P)

Against restoring Title XIV to the Higher Education bill to establish the National Institute of Education. (P)

For an amendment to the Higher Education bill to strike out Title XV—establishing a program of Ethnic Heritage Studies. (P)

For a comprehensive study before implementation of any new Federal youth camp standards. (P)

For amending the Higher Education Act of 1965 and other acts dealing with higher education to incorporate the various antibusing amendments included in the previous section. (P)

For a one-year extension of the student loan and scholarship provisions of Titles VII and VIII of the Public Health Service Act. (P)

For increased manpower for the health professions. (P)

For training more nurses. (P)

Against an amendment to the Military Health Personnel bill that sought to strike out language providing that the Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences be located within 25 miles of the District of Columbia. (D)

For the establishment of a Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences. (P)

For VA assistance in the establishment of new state medical schools, for the improvement of existing medical schools affiliated with the Veterans Administration, and for the development of cooperative arrangements between the VA and higher education and medical institutions. (P)

For the transfer of \$150 million to provide for additional funds for free and reduced cost lunch programs for poor children. (P)

For a joint resolution to assure that every needy school child will receive a free or reduced price lunch as required by the National School Lunch Act. (P)

ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTION CONTROL/CONSERVATION

Voted:

For a national environmental data system to serve as a national clearinghouse for information on environmental subjects. (P)

For a criminal penalty for shooting at certain birds, fish, and other animals from or by aircraft. (P)

For a \$2.35 billion Interior appropriations bill for fiscal year 1972. (P)

For a resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Environment in the Congress. (P)

For controls on the dumping of wastes in the oceans, coastal and other waters and for establishment of a marine sanctuaries program. (P)

Against an amendment to the pesticide bill to strike the stipulation that the Environmental Protection Agency not consider "lack of essentiality" a criterion for denying registration of any pesticides. (D)

Against an amendment to allow judicial review of EPA's pesticide actions for "any person adversely affected" rather than "any party at interest." (D)

Against an amendment which would deny reimbursement of funds to producers for pesticides removed from the market, unless the producer can show that the pesticides' harmful effects could not have been anticipated. (D)

For amending the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act to provide more comprehensive regulation and control over the manufacture, distribution and use of pesticides. (P)

Against the creation of a Marine Mammals Commission and requiring a permit for the killing of sea mammals either for commercial purposes or for sport. (D)

Alaska Native claims settlement bill

Against an amendment to the Alaska Native Land Claims Act to provide comprehensive land planning for Alaska in addition to settlement for the Alaska Natives. (D)

For the settlement of the land claims of the Alaska Natives. (P)

After a Senate-House Conference to resolve differences between two versions of the bill, voted for the settlement of certain land claims of Alaskan natives by granting them full title to 40 million acres of land, \$463.5 million over a ten-year period and \$500 million from mineral revenues. (P)

Against establishment of a select committee of the House to conduct an investigation of all aspects of the energy resources of the United States. (D)

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Voted:

Against the authorization of a \$5 million U. S. contribution to pay claims for damages to Micronesian Islands inhabitants arising out of World War II hostilities, establishment of a Micronesian Claims Commission, and authorization of the payment of noncombat Micronesian claims for the period prior to July 1, 1951. (P)

For a motion to table a resolution requesting the President to furnish the text of the Vietnam Papers, contents of which had been leaked to the press. (P)

For the authorization of \$3,444 million in foreign aid for fiscal year 1972, and \$3,494 million for fiscal year 1973. (P)

For an amendment which sought to cut the Peace Corps authorization by \$27 million. (D)

For a resolution calling for the humane treatment and release of U.S. prisoners of war held by the North Vietnamese and its allies in Southeast Asia. (P)

For a Senate amendment to the Military Procurement authorization to remove the U. S. embargo on the importation of chrome ore from Rhodesia. (P)

For authorization of \$36 million for fiscal year 1972 and \$38.5 million for fiscal year 1973 operations of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. (P)

For the sale of certain U.S.-flag passenger vessels to foreign purchasers. (P)

For loans of 16 naval vessels to Spain, Turkey, Greece, Italy and South Korea. (P)

Against an amendment to include in the foreign operations appropriations \$50 million, in additional appropriations for the U.S. contribution to the U. N. development program for underdeveloped countries. (D)

For a \$3 billion appropriations bill for fiscal year 1972 for foreign operations including funds for the Agency for International Development, Peace Corps and foreign economic and military assistance. (P)

For continuing appropriations for foreign operations through February 22, 1972, or until the regular fiscal 1972 appropriations for foreign operations is enacted into law. (P)

For tabling the motion to instruct House conferees on the foreign aid bill to agree to the Mansfield amendment to the foreign assistance bill which would have required complete U. S. withdrawal from Indochina, contingent upon the release of prisoners of war within six months after enactment of the bill. (P)

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

For equality of treatment for married women federal employees with respect to preference eligible employment benefits, cost-of-living allowances in foreign areas, and regulations concerning marital status generally. (P)

Against an amendment to the Government Blue-Collar Wage Board bill to exclude employees paid by nonappropriated funds. (D) After defeat of this amendment, the House passed on a voice vote the bill to reorganize

the pay schedules with pay increases for prevailing wage rate federal employees.

For the resolution disapproving the alternate pay plan for pay adjustments for federal employees under statutory pay systems. (D)

For the bill to provide maximum entrance and retention ages, training, and early retirement for air traffic controllers. (P)

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Voted:

For a two-year extension of the period within which the President may transmit to Congress reorganization plans under the Reorganization Act of 1949 concerning the executive branch of the federal government. (P)

For the \$4.067 billion Appropriations bill for the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments for fiscal year 1972. (P)

For the \$18.3 billion Appropriations bill for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, NASA, and the Veterans' Administration for fiscal year 1972. (P)

For the \$8.156 billion Transportation Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1972. (P)

For an amendment to the HUD, Space, Science, VA Appropriations which would strike out \$3 million for counseling services for the Federal Housing Administration. (D) After defeat of this amendment, the \$18.1 billion appropriations bill passed on a voice vote.

For the \$2.7 billion Transportation Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1972. (P)

For an amendment to the Atomic Energy Commission Authorization bill to cut out \$3.5 million for a demonstration atomic waste repository project in Kansas. (D) After defeat of this amendment, the House passed the AEC Authorization on a voice vote.

For a resolution giving authority for agencies whose appropriations bills had not yet passed to continue spending at previous year's levels. (P)

For the establishment of a National Advisory Committee on the Oceans and Atmosphere. (P)

For the Supplemental Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1971 which provided \$6.9 billion for various agencies. (P)

Against a resolution which disapproved of Presidential Reorganization Plan No. 1, which proposed a new agency called ACTION to include VISTA and various other volunteer programs. (D)

For the \$622 million National Science Foundation authorization bill for fiscal year 1972. (P)

For the \$3.4 billion National Aeronautics and Space Administration authorization bill for fiscal year 1972. (P)

For the \$450 million Legislative Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1972. (P)

For the \$4.5 billion Treasury-Postal Service Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1972. (P)

For a resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1972. (P)

For an amendment to limit the consumer protection agency intervention in agency and court proceedings to an advisory status. (D)

Against an amendment that sought to extend the authority of the consumer protection agency to participation in informal proceedings and in adjudication seeking primarily to impose a fine or penalty. (D)

For the establishment of an Office of Consumer Affairs in the Executive Office of the President and a Consumer Protection Agency in order to secure within the Federal Government effective protection and representation of the interests of consumers. (P)

For further continuing appropriations for departments and agencies whose regular fiscal 1972 appropriations have not yet been enacted into law. (P)

For a \$786 million supplemental appropriations for several departments and agencies for fiscal year 1972. (P)

For an additional \$2 million appropriation for the Transportation Department's international aeronautical exposition at Dulles Airport in 1972. (D)

Against the continuation of assistance for schools in federally impacted areas by providing that federal property transferred to the Postal Service in these areas will remain federal property for two years. (P)

For a \$3.4 billion supplemental appropriations bill for various departments and agencies for fiscal year 1972. (P)

Supersonic transport

Against an anti-SST amendment to the resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1971. (P) After adoption of the anti-SST amendment, the resolution was passed on a voice vote.

For an amendment to the Supplemental Appropriations bill to revive funding for the SST by using \$85.3 million for SST prototype construction rather than for SST termination. (P) After adoption of the amendment, the House passed the Supplemental Appropriations bill on a voice vote.

Against a Senate amendment to the Transportation Appropriations bill to pay \$58.5 million to various aircraft companies to cover termination costs on the SST project. (P)

HEALTH WELFARE SAFETY

Voted:

For a one-year extension of the student loan and scholarship provisions of Titles VII and VIII of the Public Health Service Act. (P)

Against the modified closed rule for consideration of H.R. 1, the Welfare Reform/Social Security bill, to open the bill to more amendments than the modified closed rule permitted. (P)

For a motion to strike out Title IV, the Family Assistance Plan, from the omnibus Welfare Reform/Social Security bill. The Family Assistance Plan, in my opinion, represented additional Federal expenditures for welfare recipients without adequate reform provisions to correct existing abuses. (The motion to strike was the only vote allowed under the modified closed rule under which the bill came to the floor.) (D)

For the omnibus Welfare Reform/Social Security bill, including Title IV, after the motion to strike it was defeated. (P)

For increased manpower for the health professions. (P)

For training more nurses. (P)

For a motion to kill the bill permitting more states to allow 102-inch wide instead of 96-inch wide buses to use the Interstate Highway System within their borders. (D) After defeat of this motion, the bill passed by a voice vote.

For a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that certain Public Health Service facilities remain open and within the Public Health Service. (P)

For promoting the safety of ports, harbors, waterfront areas, and navigable waters of the United States. (P)

Against an amendment to the Military Health Personnel bill that sought to strike out language providing that the Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences be located within 25 miles of the District of Columbia. (D)

For the establishment of a Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences. (P)

For strengthening the National Cancer Institute and the National Institutes of Health in order to conquer cancer as soon as possible. (P)

Labor-HEW appropriations

Against an amendment to the Labor-HEW Appropriations bill adding an additional \$200 million to the bill for health and hospital programs. (D)

Against an amendment to the Labor-HEW Appropriations bill adding \$82.4 million for vocational rehabilitation programs, in addition to other money in the bill for the purpose. (P)

Against an amendment to the Labor-HEW Appropriations bill adding \$84 million for child welfare services, in addition to the amounts already in the bill for this purpose. (D)

For the \$20.5 billion Labor-HEW Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1972. (P)

Against the \$20.8 billion Labor-HEW Appropriations bill after the addition of Senate amendments increasing the appropriation over the House version. (P)

Economic Opportunity Act amendments

Against an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act amendments to reduce the population requirement from 100,000 to 10,000 to qualify as a prime sponsor for benefits under the comprehensive child development provisions. (P)

For an amendment which sought to coordinate child development programs with other federal day care programs by reducing the level under which a family of four would be entitled to free day care service from \$6,960 to \$4,320. (D)

Against an amendment establishing as a new title to the bill, the Comprehensive Child Development Act. (P) I opposed this particular child development program because the provisions of this bill would have created an unworkable administrative and fiscal monstrosity.

Against an amendment to strike the automatic 4 percent set-aside for Puerto Rico of OEO funds for Head Start, local initiative, and other programs and place Puerto Rico and the trust territories in the same position as the States. (P)

For an amendment to strike Title X, the Legal Services Corporation. (D) I opposed the provisions creating this corporation because by allowing it to operate free from Congressional or Executive control, it might finance adversary proceedings against Government at all levels.

For a motion to kill the Economic Opportunity Act amendments as amended with the new title, the Comprehensive Child Development Act. (P)

For the Economic Opportunity Act amendments including a Comprehensive Child Care title whose provisions are in accord with provisions originally included in the Welfare Reform/Social Security bill. (P)

Against the Economic Opportunity amendments as amended by the Senate to authorize the establishment of a comprehensive child development program and to establish a private, nonprofit legal services corporation. (P) This bill was later vetoed by the President.

Black lung disease

For extending black lung benefits to orphans whose fathers die of pneumoconiosis. (D) Because this vote was taken under suspension of the rules and the bill failed to pass by a 2/3 majority, it had to be reconsidered under regular House procedure allowing the bill to be amended.

For reduction of the social security disability payments for miners eligible for and receiving black lung benefits so that their social security benefits would be figured on a comparable basis with accident victims receiving compensation under state law instead of on a more favorable basis. (D)

Against deletion of provisions extending federal participation in the black lung program for additional years until January 1, 1975. (D)

For extension of black lung benefits to orphans of miners who die of pneumoconiosis (black lung disease). (P)

LABOR AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Voted:

For a 10 percent increase in railroad retirement annuities. (P)

For a resolution to end temporarily the railway signalmen's strike with a temporary prohibition of strikes and lockouts in regard

to this dispute and providing for an interim 13.5% pay increase for the signalmen. (P)

For an amendment which proposed a manpower revenue sharing program as a substitute for the authorization of funds for public service jobs for the unemployed without revenue sharing. (D)

Against an authorization of \$4.9 billion for fiscal year 1971-75 for federal funds for public service jobs at the state and local level in an effort to provide more employment. (P)

For an authorization of \$2.5 billion reduced from \$4.9 billion during a Senate-House Conference) to provide public service jobs at the state and local level. (P)

Against an amendment proposing that the formula for distributing funds under the Emergency Employment Act should be based solely on the proportion unemployment in each state bears to unemployment in the whole United States. (D)

Against an amendment proposing that no funds in the Emergency Employment Appropriations be used to pay any applicant state or local government or its officers or employees for administering the program or reviewing the application for funds. (D)

For a \$1 billion appropriations for the Labor Department to put into effect a plan for federally subsidized public service jobs at the state and local level. (P)

For a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Labor for fiscal year 1972. (P)

For extension of emergency unemployment compensation for an additional 13 weeks. (P)

METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON AFFAIRS

Voted:

Against a motion to kill a bill which proposed establishing by law the canine corps in the D.C. police department. (D) After defeat of this motion, the bill passed by a voice vote.

For a bill which would have authorized holders of D.C. liquor store licenses to sell their licenses back to the D.C. Government. (D)

For an amendment to the Supplemental Appropriations bill to restore to the bill \$34.2 million in subway funds for the District of Columbia. (D)

For payment of the cost of medical, surgical, hospital, or related health care services for D.C. policemen, firemen, U.S. Park Police, the Executive Protection Service, and the U.S. Secret Service, retired for total disability incurred in the line of duty. (P)

Against a two-year extension of existing authority for the erection of a memorial in the District of Columbia to Mary McLeod Bethune. During the debate it was alleged that Mary McLeod Bethune had been a Communist. (P)

For authorization of \$130 million in grants and federally guaranteed loans to finance hospital construction in the District of Columbia. (D)

For an additional \$2 million appropriation for the Transportation Department's international aeronautical exposition at Dulles Airport in 1972. (D)

D.C. revenue bill

Against an amendment to the D.C. Revenue bill that sought to reduce the Federal payment to the District of Columbia by \$44 million. (D)

Against an amendment to the D.C. Revenue bill that sought to reduce the Federal payment to the District of Columbia by \$25 million. (D)

Against an amendment that sought to provide coverage for area truck drivers under the D.C. Minimum Wage Act, and to provide overtime pay for work over 40 hours a week or provide ICC certification. (D)

For the bill to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1972 and 1973. (P)

D.C. appropriations bill

For an amendment to the D.C. Appropriations bill to appropriate \$72 million for the District of Columbia's share of costs during fiscal year 1971 and 1972 for continued construction of the METRO. (P)

Against an amendment which would have halted subway funding until METRO complies with provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. (D)

After a Senate-House Conference to resolve differences between the two versions of the bill, voted for a \$932.5 million District of Columbia appropriations measure for fiscal year 1972. (P)

MILITARY AND SECURITY**Voted:**

For a \$508 million authorization for maritime programs, including ship construction subsidies for fiscal year 1972. (P)

For an increased authorization of \$570,000, instead of \$450,000, for the expenses of the House Internal Security Committee. (P)

Against a motion that the Internal Security Committee authorization be recommitted to the House Administration Committee with instructions that hearings be held on the necessity of the \$570,000 authorization. (D)

For a \$570,000 authorization for the House Committee on Internal Security. (P)

Against an amendment to limit ABM funding to that necessary to complete work at the Grand Forks and Malmstrom bases during the SALT negotiations and to cut \$51 million in SAFEGUARD funds. (D)

Against an amendment to cut \$370.2 million for development of the B-1 manned bomber. (D)

Against a reduction of \$507 million in proposed research and development funds, in effect a cutback to fiscal 1971 funding level plus a five percent allowance for inflation. (D)

Against a reduction of proposed 1972 research and development funds in the Military Procurement Authorization to the fiscal 1971 appropriation level. (D)

For the \$2.4 billion military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1972. (P)

For the \$21 billion Military Procurement Authorization for weapons research and procurement for fiscal year 1972. (P)

For the military construction appropriations bill for fiscal year 1972. (P)

Against an amendment to strike out \$801,600,000 for procurement of F-14 airplanes from the Defense Appropriations bill. (D)

Against an amendment that sought to limit funding for any additional active duty personnel (over the number provided in the Defense Appropriations bill) that the President may deem necessary over a 60-day period. (D)

Against an amendment that would limit total net expenditures to 95 percent of the funds budgeted for the Department of Defense, resulting in a cut of \$3.8 billion. (D)

Against an amendment that sought to reduce total Defense Appropriations to the fiscal year 1971 level, a reduction of \$1.5 billion. (D)

For the \$70 billion Defense Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1972. (P)

For a motion to permit the Subversive Activities Control Board to assume the function of holding hearings to determine what organizations should be considered as subversive. (P)

For an amendment that the repeal of the detention camp provisions of the Internal Security Act should not be construed to affect the powers of the President under the Constitution or other laws of the United States, provided that no U.S. citizen shall be apprehended or detained for the prevention of espionage or sabotage solely on account of race, color, or ancestry. (D) I felt that total repeal of this title of the Internal Security Act without this explanatory

amendment would provide legal restrictions on Presidential power in case of a national emergency.

Against an amendment that no U.S. citizen shall be imprisoned or otherwise detained by the United States except pursuant to an act of Congress. (P)

For repeal of Title II of the Internal Security Act, which authorized detention camps in case of an internal security emergency where the government might detain persons whom there would be reasonable grounds to believe would engage in sabotage or espionage. (P)

Selective service amendments

Against elimination of the two-year extension of the President's draft induction authority as of June 30, 1971. (D) Although I feel we should strive for a volunteer armed services, I believe the President should be able to rely on the availability of the draft in his efforts to wind down U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia.

Against an amendment to extend the President's draft authority for only one year, instead of two years. (D)

Against an amendment to have conscientious objectors serve in public service for two years instead of three years and against language in the draft bill that called for automatic induction of conscientious objectors who serve unsatisfactorily in public service. (D)

Against an amendment to end involuntary assignment to Southeast Asia after December 31, 1971, and involuntary extension of service in Southeast Asia of those inducted before that date. (D)

Against an amendment which sought to prohibit the use of draftees in any war except for declared wars or in case a declared war is imminent. (D)

Against an 18-month extension of the draft instead of a 24-month extension. (D)

For extension of the draft for two years, for authorization of the military active duty strengths for fiscal year 1972, and for an increase in military pay. (P)

For tabling a Senate amendment to the draft bill which proposed establishing as U.S. policy the withdrawal of all U.S. military forces from Indochina subject to the release of all U.S. prisoners of war. (P)

After a Senate-House Conference to resolve differences between the two versions of the bill, voted for amending the Selective Service Act, providing military pay increases and extending the draft. (This bill contained a provision that a withdrawal from Vietnam should be completed as soon as possible, but set no specific deadline.) (P)

Vietnam withdrawal amendments

Against an amendment that funds authorized by the Military Procurement Authorization could not be used to support the deployment of U.S. military personnel or the conduct of any U.S. military operations in or over Vietnam, Cambodia or Laos, after December 31, 1971. (D)

Against the Nedzi-Whalen amendment that funds could not be used to support the deployment of U.S. military personnel or the conduct of any U.S. military operations in or over Vietnam, Laos, or Cambodia after December 31, 1971, but with certain clarifications and modifications including a provision that it not be construed to limit the use of funds for purposes which may be necessary to ensure the return of prisoners of war. (D)

Against an amendment proposing that no funds be expended after June 1, 1972, to support the deployment or maintenance of U.S. military operations in or over Indochina after June 1, 1972, if the North Vietnamese have released our prisoners at least 60 days before that date. (D)

For tabling a Senate amendment to the draft bill which proposed establishing as U.S. policy the withdrawal of all U.S. mili-

tary forces from Indochina subject to the release of all U.S. prisoners of war. (P)

For a motion to instruct the House conferees on the Military Procurement Authorization not to agree to any Senate amendment that is not germane to the House bill—namely the Mansfield amendment to terminate hostilities in Indochina. (D)

Against an amendment to withhold funds for the Defense Department after November 15, 1971. (D) After defeating this amendment, the House passed a continuing resolution to continue funding until the regular appropriations bills are passed. (P)

Against an amendment to halt funding for any military combat or military support operations by U.S. forces in or over South Vietnam, North Vietnam, Laos or Cambodia after June 30, 1972; and for an orderly withdrawal of all U.S. military forces at a date certain, subject to the release of all American POW's and an accounting of all Americans missing in action. (D)

PUBLIC WORKS**Voted:**

For deletion of a provision of the Public Works and Economic Development Act which proposed a \$2 billion authorization for constructing basic public works in areas of substantial or persistent underemployment. (D)

For the \$5.5 billion public works authorization for projects including the \$2 billion for constructing basic public works and for regional economic development programs including Appalachian regional programs, after the prior vote to delete the \$2 million provision had failed. (P)

For extension of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act which contained a \$4 billion authorization over several years for public works (reduced by a Senate-House Conference from the original \$5.5 billion in the House bill), for economic development and for Appalachian regional development. (P)

Against an amendment prohibiting the use of funds appropriated in the Public Works-AEC Appropriations bill for nuclear testing on or in the vicinity of Amchitka, Alaska, in the Aleutian Islands. (D)

For an amendment to delete \$100,000 from the Public Works-AEC Appropriations proposed for further study of the Dickey-Lincoln public power project in Maine. (P)

For the \$4.5 million Public Works-AEC Appropriations for fiscal year 1972. (P)

TAX LEGISLATION**Voted:**

For the bill relating to the income tax treatment of just compensation received from the United States with respect to property taken under the act of Congress which established the Redwood National Park. (D)

For the Revenue Act of 1971 to reduce individual income taxes to provide a job development investment credit and to reduce certain excise taxes. (P) Under the rule by which this bill came to the floor of the House only an up-or-down vote was allowed. The bill was not allowed to be amended as is customary with complex tax measures.

VETERANS LEGISLATION**Voted:**

For a treatment and rehabilitation program in the Veterans Administration for servicemen and veterans suffering from drug abuse or drug dependency. (P)

For a Survivor Benefit Plan for members of the armed services. (P)

For liberalization of the provisions relating to payment of veterans disability and death pensions. (P)

For liberalization of the provisions relating to payment of veterans dependency and indemnity compensation. (P)

For VA assistance in the establishment of new state medical schools, for the improvement of existing medical schools affiliated with the Veterans Administration, and for

the development of cooperative arrangements between the VA and higher education and medical institutions. (P)

MISCELLANEOUS

Voted:

For Representative Gerald Ford of Michigan as Speaker of the House. (D)

For an amendment to eliminate from the Rules of the House a 31-day rule by which, if the House Rules Committee held a bill that long without reporting it out for a vote, the Speaker could have the bill brought to the floor for a vote. (P)

Against cutting off debate and amendments on the resolution establishing the rules of the House for the 92nd Congress because of a proposal to strip the Republican minority of the right to one-third of certain committee staff jobs, which right the Minority had gained as a part of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. (D)

Against a motion to table presentation of an amendment to keep the Republican minority staff rights on committees. (P)

Against adoption of the House Rules for the 92nd Congress in protest of the provision stripping the Republicans of minority committee staffing rights. (P)

For a resolution electing Democratic members and chairmen of the various House Committees. (P)

For partial compliance with a court order in regard to making available House documents, many concerning the former House Un-American Activities Committee. (P)

For the resolution proposing an amendment to the U.S. Constitution to lower the voting age to 18 for all elections, state and local as well as federal. (P)

For liberalization of the naturalization laws to permit naturalization of aliens over the age of 50 with at least 20 years of U.S. residence, even if they cannot demonstrate and understanding of the English language. (P)

For authorizing the U.S. Postal Service to receive a \$2 fee for execution of an application for a passport. (P)

For a resolution expressing the best wishes of the House on the occasion of the 87th birthday of Harry S. Truman. (P)

For additional foreign travel for the Education and Labor Committee. (D)

For certain foreign travel by House Post Office and Civil Service Committee Members and staff. (P)

For extension of the provisions relating to government procurement of commodities produced by the blind to commodities produced by other severely handicapped individuals. (P)

Against a motion to adjourn on June 17, 1971. (D)

For certain foreign travel for the Education and Labor Committee, less extensive than that requested in a previous resolution that was defeated by the House. (P)

For bringing into effect an international agreement in regard to inventors' certificates used in some countries instead of patents. (P)

For an increase in the fiscal year 1971 authorization for the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission from \$373,000 to \$670,000. (P)

For delegating to the House Administration Committee the authority to adjust the amount of allowances to Congressmen from the contingent fund for such things as clerk-hire, postage, travel to and from home district, district office rental, telephone and telegraph expenses, etc. (P)

Against a motion to adjourn on November 1, 1971. (D)

Against a motion to adjourn on November 2, 1971. (D)

For a resolution providing that conference reports may be considered by the House on the same day they are reported for the remainder of the 1971 session of Congress. Under the rules of the House, conference reports must be filed three days before consideration. (P)

AMERICAN PEOPLE WANT ACTION ON PRESIDENT NIXON'S ANTI-BUSING PROPOSAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, how long it is going to take the Democrat-controlled Congress to understand that the American people want action on President Nixon's antibusing proposal.

Almost one month has passed since the President went before the Nation and set the record straight, and still nothing is happening. The President rightly placed the blame for the busing turmoil squarely where it belongs, in the hands of misguided social planners and the courts. Yet, one begins to get the impression that too many Congressmen are in agreement with the social planners and those judges who continue to ignore the overwhelming majority of American parents who, as the President said—

Have been left in confusion, anger, fear and turmoil and do not want their children bused to unsafe neighborhoods miles away from their homes—just to meet some social planner's concept of what is considered to be the correct racial balance.

The President acted in the interest of the people—all of the people—not just the ones who can afford to send their children to private school, like the leading Democrat liberals and presidential aspirants. The President knows that millions of Americans worked hard, sacrificed and "have invested their life's savings in a home, in a neighborhood they chose because it had good schools. They do not want their children bused across the city to an inferior school." The President knows that the homeowners are the ones who will have to make even greater sacrifices if they want to educate their children in an environment which the parents have chosen. Moreover, the President knows that Americans do not want to see their children being used in dubious social experiments.

Knowing all this, the President has recommended the strongest measures possible. He knew that the ultra-liberal Democrats would never allow a constitutional amendment to pass the Senate. Moreover, the President knew that even if it were possible to overcome Senate Democratic opposition, the amendment process itself would take an additional 2 to 5 years. That is why he said, "We need action now."

Mr. Speaker, the President has recommended to the Congress two bills: the first, the Student Transportation Moratorium Act of 1972 and the second, the Equal Educational Opportunity Act of 1972. If Congress is to act in the interest of the people it should process bills such as these without further delay.

The first bill would put a stop to the dubious decisions of the judges who are intent upon disregarding the majority of American citizens. This bill is aimed at stopping the disruption of lives, while Congress considers less divisive and more realistic solutions to this problem.

The second bill is aimed at providing equal education for all students. But more than that, the second bill provides the Congress with a way out of their

present dilemma of finding ways for the Federal Government to finance education in urban areas. If the ultra-liberal Democrats are truly committed to helping big cities, why do they continue to fight the President?

That the President should be drawing the fire of ultra-liberal Democrats and the ultra-liberals in the news media is understandable; they have been out of touch with the people for years. But that the President should be coming under the attack of conservatives, is surprising. Some conservatives have said that the President did not take the strongest measure available to him. They argue that what is needed is nothing less than a constitutional amendment. As desirable as this might be it is a fact that a constitutional amendment would be too time consuming to attempt now. It would be well for us to remember that the President is not opposed to such an amendment. He has said that eventually a constitutional amendment might be necessary. The point is that he wants action now "not 2, 3, or 5 years from now."

Others have said that the legislation he proposed was too weak. This criticism is totally invalid. If the busing bill were enacted now the busing moratorium would immediately save some 50 communities in dozens of cities from the upheaval of busing. However, with each day of delay Federal irresponsible judges are taking advantage of inaction and ordering new busing while they have the chance. The recent decision in Detroit is a perfect example of this kind of judicial contempt for the public will. The President's moratorium would stop all new busing, which means that city-suburban busing decisions, like the one made in Richmond, would not be forced upon the people.

Finally, there are those who are saying that this legislation does nothing for those who are presently being bused because of an earlier court decision. This is not true. First, the bill has a self-destruct clause in which says that all busing will end after a 5-year period. Second, all desegregation orders terminate in 10 years from the date of passage. Third, school district lines cannot be ignored or altered unless it is proven that they were drawn for segregation purposes. Fourth, the bill stipulates that racial balance is not required and affirms and establishes that pupils be assigned to schools closest to their homes. In addition, the bill has a reopening clause which clearly gives a community the right to reopen any earlier decision and to have any case reconsidered in the light of the new legislation.

It should be emphasized that the Nixon administration's Justice Department would obviously recognize and respect the intent of Congress and the strong views of the President and cooperate with school boards and school administrators who wish to reopen earlier decisions in the interest of better education for their pupils.

In his message to Congress the President noted that if Congress had not abandoned its responsibility in this field the courts would not have abused their powers. Hence the President said—

The time has come for the Congress—to provide guidance.

If Americans are still frustrated and confused by this problem the blame now rests with the majority party in the Congress. In my opinion the people should continue to voice their opinions on the busing issue to their Congressman who, prior to the adjournment of this Congress, should act and put the interest of education above that of social experimentation.

Mr. Speaker, the solution to the problem of providing proper educational opportunities for all students will not be solved by an emphasis on those questions which arouse emotional responses. It is obvious that court edicts on busing have increased racial tensions and have not contributed to educational improvements. The practical alternative to continued court orders and the resulting controversy is prompt congressional action on the President's proposals.

IN SUPPORT OF A NATIONAL NO-FAULT AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE SCHEME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address this body today as a principal sponsor of legislation. But more fully, more correctly, I speak on behalf of an idea, a concept, a hope, a belief. It is to those things I wish to direct my remarks. As is the case for every Member of this Congress, I represent hundreds of thousands of constituents. Their concerns are, of necessity and wish, my concerns. When an individual is troubled enough to write me, I become aware of that trouble. When we get a pattern of such calls and letters we begin wondering if a national problem exists—one that transcends individuals concerns. Then newspaper and magazine articles dealing with the subject become popular and are read very closely. Along about this time individuals, associates, and organizations are invited to, and do make their individual voices heard, through reports, analyses, position papers, and studies. And a Federal lawmaker asks himself a preliminary but also ultimate question, "Is this a problem area wisely and properly a subject for beneficial Federal legislation?"

Mr. Speaker, my sponsorship of no-fault insurance legislation is both a symbolic and, I believe, fitting response to that question. I say it is a fitting response because of the compelling weight of 24 separate reports in the Department of Transportation study on automobile insurance. Their overwhelming thrust is that we are presently saddled with a system that is not doing the job it should. There is very widespread agreement with the statement of Secretary Volpe that "the present system needs change badly and needs it now." Certainly a large segment of my constituency is aware that the present situation is inadequate. Many of them have personally borne the heavy burdens of its inefficiencies and inequities.

Too many are paying too much for too little protection. And many suffer financial loss or disaster when compen-

sation from an accident is inadequate or long delayed or both. This segment of dissatisfied motorists and accident victims is large and growing larger. It is oftentimes vocal, and it is becoming increasingly aware that there can be a better system of providing for automobile insurance. These people deserve a better break.

When States, via financial obligation laws, encourage, induce, or require the purchase of automobile liability insurance, it is not unreasonable to say that they take on an obligation to see that consumers receive good value for their money. Nor is it inaccurate to say that in most cases the obligation has not been met.

If my colleagues were to study the above-mentioned Department of Transportation reports, they would see described an auto insurance system that is increasingly unworkable and unacceptable. These reports catalog the deficiencies on inefficient and overly expensive systems. We, as national systems analysts, should not allow the present arrangement to continue. As elected national officials concerned about the well-being and future of that Nation, we cannot allow it to continue.

I spoke of an idea, a concept, a hope, a belief. What I mean is this: I know it is within the capability of this Congress to take the proposals represented in H.R. 5220 and to fashion a scheme of automobile insurance which will equitably fulfill the Nation's needs. I believe that now is a fitting time for all who have a stake in the present to accept and welcome the likely arrival of a new and needed system of automobile insurance. The vested interests which have succeeded in blocking no-fault proposals in the past will, I suspect, find their ability to do so increasingly weakened as good hard supportive data and proposals of increasing merit are advanced.

Let me describe some of the elements which I feel such a comprehensive no-fault insurance program should or could contain. The number of automobile accidents occurring annually is very large—on the order of 20 million accidents, or roughly one of every five motor vehicles. In most accidents only minimal damage occurs and traditional liability or financial responsibility is readily ascertainable. For many others, fault determination proceedings are dysfunctional—insurer goes against insurer when in the long run both insurers and their consumers would be better off sparing the blood of battle. This is not to say we should abolish the tort system when serious disability or disfigurement result. A comprehensive scheme of merit would need to draw an equitable line between the bulk of cases where administrative or quasi-judicial, no-fault payment determinations should be made and those where a negligence action is the most reasonable remedy.

Payment of medical expenses of those cases handled under no-fault procedures should be prompt or periodic, and the added burden of duplicate payments should be resolved. Conceivably pain, suffering, and inconvenience awards should be regularized, perhaps as a percentage of medical expenses in all but

the most serious cases. Property loss and medical injury claims should ideally be handled by the same procedures.

The person with a bad driving-citation record should be made to pay for his driving violations with higher premiums. And the drinking driver, who exacts incredibly high costs in lives, injuries, and property damage, could be dealt with far more effectively as a subject of a comprehensive national automobile insurance scheme than as a participant in any State program. Most particularly these individuals should be made to bear the costs of their conduct in increased premiums.

Another necessary element of a comprehensive scheme would be those measures which could induce lower costs for automobile repairs. I believe that a financial incentive could be incorporated into the package to remedy auto repair practices which are presently a national scandal. Provisions affecting both initial crashworthiness and repair expenses could be included.

An elimination of the present prohibition against group policies in many States deserves its place in the comprehensive scheme. These State measures which impinge on the public welfare should no longer be accepted. Effective title registration, with its potential for greatly limiting the market for stolen automobiles, deserves to be included, and moderately high property damage deductibles could form part of the general package, in order to add another financial inducement for cautious driving.

Many or most of these individual elements, which I have roughly sketched here, have already been proposed at one time or another. These elements of a comprehensive scheme could be combined into a whole of great and lasting value. Indeed, those proposals which would be difficult to enact on their own may stand a much better chance as part of a comprehensive scheme. The end result is one well worth the efforts necessary to achieve it.

Effective implementation of a comprehensive automobile insurance scheme would require Federal administration or Federal standards. This Federal presence is needed for several reasons. The very rationale of a comprehensive scheme is that its benefits be broadly available; if the scheme is to be of value let its advantages be widely distributed. For national insurers, the benefits of uniform standards rather than diverse schemes—say a dozen or more in the 50 States—should be apparent. Finally, the greatest hope for true and lasting reform lies here at the Federal level in a comprehensive scheme for automobile insurance.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT OF 1972

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the House recently expressed a proper concern for the disabled and handicapped when it passed the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1972 by an unanimous vote. This legislation, which I cosponsored, will

enable millions of disabled Americans to lead happier, more productive lives and enjoy a greater sense of dignity and self-worth.

In Buffalo, the Niagara Frontier Vocational Rehabilitation Center has achieved an impressive record with its programs to rehabilitate our handicapped by preparing them for work and helping them to get jobs, and the legislation which received such enthusiastic support by our colleagues is essential in helping rehabilitation centers throughout the country meet the current and future needs for service to handicapped and disabled individuals.

It is my hope that the Senate will soon see fit to act on this measure and that it will likewise receive the unanimous endorsement of that body.

Dr. Edward Newman, Commissioner of the Rehabilitation Services Administration in Washington, recently spoke before the Rehabilitation Association of Western New York emphasizing the need to enhance the public-private partnership so that handicapped persons may return to their rightful place as participating members of their families and communities. I believe his remarks would be of interest to our colleagues in the House and Senate, and I include them at this point:

REMARKS BY EDWARD NEWMAN, COMMISSIONER, RSA

When social service professionals get together these days, most of the discussion is about the welfare crisis, and what can be done about it. For welfare is indeed in a state of crisis, growing more urgent and threatening every day not only to those who must administer the programs, but to those elected officials who are responsible for the health and vitality of the State and the local community.

While this problem is uppermost in the minds of every thoughtful citizen and every responsible public official, we must not lose sight of the fact that, during these past four decades of the decline and perhaps imminent fall of public welfare, there has been another human resource program under public auspices whose record of achievement has been on the ascendant.

It has served people whose incomes were at or near the poverty-level, and whose problems were complicated by physical or mental disability. It has consistently grown in numbers of people served as well as numbers restored to productive work, and furthermore, its cost benefits are easily accountable and visible.

I speak, of course, of the public program of vocational rehabilitation, and I submit to you that this program has a great deal to offer as a model and guide to those who are framing the new welfare structure.

Basic to the success of the rehabilitation program are the rehabilitation facilities and workshops which were operating in this country long before the Public Welfare Program. The rehabilitation facility movement began when one of the first rehabilitation centers was established in Cleveland in 1889. Your own Niagara Frontier Vocational Rehabilitation Center in Buffalo, (directed by the very able president elect of the Rehabilitation Association) is a direct descendant of this program. One of the highest priorities of the rehabilitation program is to continue making use of the private and public resources to help people leave the welfare rolls, by preparing them for work and helping them get jobs.

Today, the national mood demands that the greatest emphasis in public programs be

placed on dependency reduction, and the de-institutionalization of people. In striving to meet both of these goals, rehabilitation facilities and workshops will play a crucial role, since they form the very basis of our approach to the new rehabilitation service system. This system is unique among public programs, because it relies essentially on the resources in the local community—medical, educational, vocational, and the private, voluntary rehabilitation facilities.

By design, not chance, the rehabilitation program over the years has carefully cultivated these community resources through the establishment of facilities, through leadership, and through program development. Last year, for example, one-third of all the basic program funds appropriated for rehabilitation were spent in establishing or purchasing services from rehabilitation facilities.

The key to this delivery system is "interdependence"—the joint planning and the programs provided by the public and private, voluntary sectors. Our mutual goals—the reduction of dependency, and de-institutionalization—can be accomplished only through the enhancement of this public-private partnership.

As advocates for the disabled, we are concerned about comprehensive services to handicapped people, and the removal of obstacles—whether they be legal, bureaucratic, attitudinal or whatever. As many of you know from your work with the State program, at various times to various people, vocational rehabilitation has been classified as a health problem, an educational problem, a social services problem or a manpower problem. The confusion arises because vocational rehabilitation is all of these: a system addressed to the total needs of the handicapped person. The labels are not important, as long as the integrity of the delivery system remains. The fragmented needs of individuals—educational, medical, psychological, social services, job placement and follow-up, are put together again as components of the total VR system.

For example, we need only to look at the Niagara Frontier Vocational Center. Comprehensive services are provided, beginning with a careful evaluation and assessment, leading to a sequence of services, and finally to independent living or vocational employment. The array of services includes: counseling, evaluation, adjustment, training in occupational skills, job try-out, placement, physical therapy and remedial education.

Service integration takes place through coordination with the Employment Service, the Buffalo Board of Education, the New York Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Goodwill Industries, the Community Rehabilitation Center, the Workshop for the Mentally Retarded, the Welfare Office, and the Commission for the Visually Handicapped. The State VR agency purchases services from this fine facility, and has provided special funds to train handicapped persons in job skills, as well as technical assistance to exchange ideas and to improve service. Johnny Evanko, the area coordinator, has the reputation of working very effectively with the private sector. A relationship with the University is established through Dr. Jacques, the Director of the rehabilitation counseling program at the State University here in Buffalo.

But you know all this. I did not come from Washington to tell you what is already widely recognized—that the Niagara Center is an outstanding example of a rehabilitation facility which serves as a keystone of an integrated service delivery system.

I cite it as an example of what we are moving toward as we develop a national model for integrated service delivery for every State.

I cite it also as a success story of the vocational rehabilitation program at a time

when program planners for public programs are looking for success stories in a generally disheartening scenario.

Many people are growing more impatient with needy and dependent people who do not appear to want to help themselves. Many more are impatient with the programs we have developed so far to help dependent people to restore their independence and dignity.

In 1954, when the U.S. Congress passed legislation which substantially broadened the scope of the rehabilitation program, authorizing a series of sweeping changes and reforms, President Eisenhower said, "This law is especially noteworthy in two respects. In the first place, it emphasizes to all the world the great value which we in America place upon the dignity and worth of each individual human being. Second, it is a humanitarian investment of great importance, yet it saves substantial sums of money for both Federal and State governments."

That statement, true in 1954, remains equally true today. Last year, approximately three-quarters of a billion dollars was added to the Nation's economy as a result of the rehabilitation program, which restored a record 291,272 disabled people to productive activity. Our studies showed that these people earned an estimated \$770 million more than the year before they entered the process. Projected as lifetime earnings, these figures exceed 9 billion dollars in increased earnings—just for those rehabilitated in 1971, and of course taxpayers will share substantially in these earnings, as increased taxes paid by the rehabilitants—and the reduction in tax-supported payments for their maintenance.

I am sure my friend Frank Zweig will agree that statistics are only one view of the program's benefits to society. We do not support this program because it pays us back for every dollar put into it. We support it because it is right—right in the context of American society, right in the context of human concern for our fellow citizens, and right in the context of contributing to our nation's strength and well-being.

One measure of an enlightened, democratic society is the degree of public concern displayed for the well-being of its citizens.

In the Seventies, we look forward to increasing the number of rehabilitations annually. This year, we expect to reach 300,000. But even at this pace, we are not keeping abreast of the rising numbers of newly-handicapped. Like other actuarial statistics, it is a factor of our growing population, the hazards of our own way of life—especially the highways—and the toll taken by birth defects and disease.

We anticipate growing demands on a program which has always been dynamic rather than static, and which has always "reached out" rather than "sat tight." While we seek to remain responsive to the financial, manpower, and technological demands of a growing client population, we also must see to it that every measure is taken to intensify the effectiveness of our program—to make it deeper as well as broader.

We must press vigorously for more accessible public buildings, business establishments, and places of employment through the removal of architectural barriers—including public transportation which often is the last obstacle between the disabled person and a job.

We must continue our campaign to make employers aware that instead of hiring the disabled as a duty, they will be employing trained people with special skills.

We must encourage the establishment of rehabilitation facilities which meet the needs of disabled people and of their employers.

We must require better standards of performance and accreditation of programs to insure quality services.

We must do far more than we have done

to take the program to those who can benefit from it, but who—for whatever reason—are not receiving essential services.

We must continue our own internal program analysis and self-study to develop a better system of delivery of services to disabled people, in the interests of efficiency and productiveness.

And we must become far more active as advocates for the handicapped—knocking at the doors of legislators and congressmen, local government officials, and the general public, to win their support and to tell them the rehabilitation story.

For in the final analysis, the growth and effectiveness of the rehabilitation program in the community and in the neighborhood—as it reaches out to your neighbor, your friend, or perhaps someone in your own family—is directly related to the support given to the program by community people. In establishing a matching program for funding the State-federal partnership, Congress saw to it that the States could set their own benchmarks, by virtue of their own willingness to participate financially. The character and vigor, the concern and the scope of each State's program is determined, ultimately, in the community, and in the State Capitol by a Legislature and a Governor who set the State's contribution, and by elected officials in Washington who establish the limits of the Federal share.

I am well aware of the administrative and financial difficulties which impede optimum growth of the New York State program, as indeed they do in many States in the nation whose rehabilitation closures and rates lag far behind their proportionate populations and affluence.

There are some bright spots in the New York picture, especially here in Western New York where Buffalo is the center for many progressive approaches to unmet needs. Buffalo's rehabilitation rate has been significantly ahead of the State average, and the area has moved decisively into the area of providing services to minority groups, the disadvantaged, and the rural disabled. Outreach efforts in model cities programs in the area, and for rural populations, find counselors in such settings as social service agencies and county hospitals—even using an answering service to make sure no calls for help or information are missed.

The Niagara Center, with one of the few training services grants in the nation and the only one in the State outside of Metropolitan New York, has been one of the major reasons for such commendable activity in the State.

Last year, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the State-federal program of vocational rehabilitation, President Nixon paid tribute to the rehabilitated citizens who have made this program a success. He said, "I salute the courageous handicapped people who are the true heroes in these victories over tremendous adversity."

In a few years, we will mark the 200th anniversary of American independence, and of our founding as a new nation and a new society. In 1976, I earnestly hope that we can point to the rehabilitation program as evidence that America has kept faith with its principles, and that after two centuries we are still committed to seeking for every American his fullest opportunity for rewarding work, for dignity, and for independence.

THE ADMINISTRATION PROMOTES COVERUP OF RED CHINA ILLEGAL DRUG TRAFFIC SUPPLY

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, recent-

ly I commented before this body on the nature of a serious paradox with which the Congress and the American people have been confronted. The paradox centers around the administration's well-publicized efforts to stop the flow of narcotic drugs in this country, but its ambiguous and contradictory stand on the role that Communist China has played, and I believe continues to play, in the illicit international trafficking of these drugs.

In my previous remarks on March 29 I pointed out that for nearly 20 years—roughly from 1949 to 1967—there appeared to be no doubt in the applicable agencies of our Government that Peking was deeply involved in the drug trade—that it grew poppies for cultivation—that it refined them for opium—that it processed the opium into heroin, and it illegally disseminated both to markets throughout the world. The profits derived from the trade, variously estimated to range from a half billion to 800 million annually, went to help finance communism's four horsemen—guerrilla warfare, subversion, espionage, and propaganda. The U.S. Government did not deny Red China's activities toward this end, and through its Bureau of Narcotics, reported on them in an official capacity before the United Nations and elsewhere.

PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGN AT WHITE HOUSE

But since 1969 that has all changed. The present administration's position on the matter is ambiguous and contradictory. On the one hand some of its spokesmen maintain that no evidence of Peking's involvement in the drug trade can be found while others indicate that it can. Other administration spokesmen now insist Mao's regime was never involved—which is to say that all previous evidence offered by past administration's was just so much nonsense. In my remarks on March 29, 1972, I included the White House memo on the subject which was pure propaganda.

To focus on this serious contradiction for a moment, Mr. Speaker, let me quote the words of John E. Ingersoll, Director of the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs—BNDD—commenting in December of this past year:

Speculation concerning Chinese Communist activity in world narcotics traffic has caused concern periodically since 1949. On the basis of evidence available to us today we do not consider Mainland China to be a significant source of illicit opiates. We will not discount such information, however, because of the enormity of China's involvement with drugs in the past and the presence in the Yunnan province of China's tribal elements with a history of opium production and traffic.

Now comparing Mr. Ingersoll's position with that of the White House memo of February 15, 1972, which I entered in my remarks of March 29, clearly illustrates the contradiction to which I refer, for the memo addresses itself to what Mr. Ingersoll describes as "the enormity of China's involvement with drugs in the past" as so much propaganda.

Mr. Speaker, I have emphasized this point again not just because of the deliberate confusion the White House has

created but also because I believe there is a parallel to be drawn between this kind of information and the kind of information we were getting prior to the Cuban missile crisis in 1962. You will recall that voices were raised here in both Houses by a handful of Congressmen, who in spite of administration statements to the contrary, kept maintaining that the Soviets were bringing nuclear missiles into Cuba. Then, as now, the administration word was—we have no reliable intelligence on the matter to indicate that the rumors are anything more than anti-Communist propaganda. In 1962 it was propaganda coming from anti-Castro Cubans. Today, according to the White House memo, its propaganda put out by supporters of the Republic of China against de facto or de jure recognition of Peking. Fortunately, in 1962 our U2s were over-flying Cuba and the photographs they took could not be kissed off as an anti-Communist aberration. Unfortunately, today we are no longer over-flying mainland China, so we do not know if they are growing poppies or pumpkins.

In 1962, as today, the few Congressmen who spoke out got most of their information from unofficial sources, and by that I mean from ordinary people who saw things and reported them, or from newsmen who knew how to bird-dog a story and refused to accept the official line in the face of accumulating evidence. Today I would like to add two such pieces of evidence to the record. The first comes from a man formerly associated with the International Red Cross who has spent many years in Southeast Asia and particularly in the so-called Golden Triangle area of northern Thailand, Laos, and Burma.

He says:

On the Chinese side of the North Vietnam, Laos, and Burma borders there is an interwoven network of military posts on a full operational basis, conducting the military, political and propaganda war against Southeast Asian countries. From this network of advanced bases intelligence operations and transportation points extend all through Southeast Asia. Corruption and bribery are an essential part of everyday life there and assures full protection for China's activities. They have a built-in network of collaborators in the vast Chinese communities all through Southeast Asia. The richer the merchant, the more powerful the politician—the easier it is to buy him. There is a saying in Bangkok, "the Chinese could smuggle their wall through Bangkok, and no one would know it." Intelligence and narcotic officials in SEA agree that narcotics trade on a large scale is strictly a Chinese affair. Officials in Bangkok maintain that Chinese narcotics traffic is tightly interwoven with their military and weapons activities.

This statement by an informant who has asked that his name be kept confidential, illustrates to some degree the intricate web that Peking has spun and controls throughout the area. The official U.S. position in this regard, however, as described by Mr. Ingersoll is that insurgent groups, operating in the golden triangle do in part control opium production and trade and do use the proceeds "for funds, arms, and other supplies needed for support purposes."

But how is it that the man who has lived on the scene for so long knows that

the Red Chinese run the show and Mr. Ingersoll does not?

Next from a noted British journalist comes this confidential note written in November:

The headman for almost all narcotics transported out of Yunnan to the ports is known as Prince Jimmy Yang, Director of the Ringcorn Hotel in Chiang Mai in Northeast Thailand. His partner is a General Lee, an off and on General in the Loloan Army, but commanding a guerrilla force of close to 800 men operating on both sides of the Chinese border. This army transports the stuff from Yunnan to Chiang Mai via Ben Holsol. Yang and Lee bought the entire 1970 harvest from Yunnan from the Chinese Communist Government. A friend of mine in Ben Holsol saw the opium and heroin stocks brought in. The operation has the full protection and assistance of General Ouan Rathikoun, Commander in Chief of the Lao Armed forces.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that our BNDD does admit Rathikoun's part in the drug traffic, but says he has now retired, which I suppose makes everything all right again. That is until we come to an official report written last year by the Public Security Bureau of the Thai Government, titled—"Data on the Production and Sale of Narcotics by the Chinese Communists." I will quote several significant points before I insert the full report in the Record. Under the heading of Smuggling Routes, I quote: Narcotics produced in the Yunnan border area is purchased by the Chinese Communists in Yunnan for processing, unquote.

Under the heading of Masters Behind the Sources, I quote: Most poppy farmers are tribal people, living in the mountainous areas of Yunnan, Burma, Thailand, and Laos. They are controlled by the Red Chinese narcotics sponsoring agencies. And finally under the heading of Narcotics Seized, and I quote: In September 1971 Singapore police seized 1,000 kilos of raw opium, known as Yunnan opium, which had been buried by a seaside resort.

Mr. Speaker, the full text of the Thai Government report follows:

DATA ON THE PRODUCTION AND SALE OF NARCOTICS BY THE CHINESE COMMUNISTS

Source of these data: The following data are provided by the Public Security Bureau of the Thai Government.

Cultivation areas: Poppies can be grown only in uplands. The largest poppy plantation in the Far East is in the border area between Burma and Yunnan province of China, the second largest plantation is in the border area between Burma and Laos and the third largest plantation is in the border area between Thailand and Burma.

Annual output: (1) The Yunnan-Burma border area produces about 2,000 tons of opium a year. (2) The Burma-Laos border area produces 750-1,000 tons a year. (3) The Thailand-Burma border area yields 200-300 tons a year.

Sales price: The price at the place of origin is U.S. \$40-50 per kilo. After shipping to secret markets in Indochina, the price increases to U.S. \$80-100.

Smuggling routes:

(1) Land routes: Opium produced in the Thailand-Burma border area is smuggled into Thailand's Chiang Mai, Bangkok and other places in southern Thailand for distribution to Malaysia and Singapore. Narcotics produced in the Burma-Laos border area is smuggled into Vientiane through Pathet Lao-controlled regions. Narcotics produced in the Yunnan-Burma border area is purchased

by the Chinese Communists in Yunnan for processing.

(2) Air routes: Red Chinese agents smuggle the narcotics by air to Vientiane, Saigon, Hongkong, Singapore and other Southeast Asian cities. Narcotics are bought by British and American gangs of smugglers for redistribution.

Masters behind the scenes: Most poppy farmers are tribal people living in the mountainous areas of Yunnan, Burma, Thailand and Laos. They are controlled by the Red Chinese narcotic-sponsoring agencies.

Narcotics seized: The Thai government seized three tons of opium from smugglers in 1970 and about one ton in the first seven months of 1971. Thai and South Vietnamese police have confiscated 291 kilos of opium and 120 kilos of heroin in joint operations so far this year. In September, 1971, Singapore police seized 1,000 kilos of raw opium (known as Yunnan opium) which had been buried near a seaside resort. It was believed these drugs were smuggled into Singapore from Thailand.

Difficulties involved: There are three reasons why it is difficult to prevent the smuggling of narcotics: (1) Poppies are grown in mountain areas which are difficult to reach. (2) Poppy farms are protected by armed bandits. (3) Because poppy farms are located in border areas, action against them involves political problems.

Mr. Speaker, to shift the scene a bit but not the subject, Interdoc is a highly regarded European political information center, headquartered at the Hague. As many of my colleagues know, Interdoc's output on East-West developments is well documented and totally objective. In a recent publication Interdoc reviewed a book by a German author, Dr. F. W. Schlomann, titled—"The Maoists, Peking's Efforts in Western Europe." The reviewer says in part:

Schlomann's account of the role of Peking's embassies in the West is absorbing, as is that of trade missions, press agencies and the like. In fact, this is the first book to my knowledge to give an outline of the organization and pattern on Communist China's silent approach to the West. . . Attention is paid to the political—not the gastronomical—role of the Chinese restaurants and the organization in which the Communist restaurateurs are often the leading men. Nor has the writer avoided the embarrassing subject of the export of narcotics from China. It is sad to reveal that Chinese Communist propaganda in the West seems to be financed largely from the proceeds of opium and other narcotic sales.

The review is inserted at this point:

REVIEW OF THE BOOK "THE MAOISTS, PEKING'S EFFORTS IN WESTERN EUROPE" AS IT APPEARED IN "EAST-WEST CONTACTS" THE PUBLICATION OF INTERDOC

DIE MAOISTEN, PEKINGS FILIALEN IN WESTEUROPA

(By Dr. F. W. Schlomann, 300 pages, ed. Societats-Verlag, Frankfurt am Main)

Chinese Communism is concentrating more and more on Western Europe. Schlomann has tried to recognize the scope of this slow and hidden penetration. He has discovered groups, people and organizations working under the guidance of Peking and Tirana. He cites also frustrated idealists suffering from some kind of political yellow fever after having been bitten by the Mao bug.

Schlomann's account of the role of Peking Embassies in the West is absorbing, as is that of trade missions, press agencies and the like.

In fact this is the first book to my knowledge, to give an outline of the organizational pattern of Communist China's silent approach to the West.

The book gives a good deal of data, distin-

guishing cautiously between "it is rumored" and "it is". Attention is paid to the political—not the gastronomical—role of the Chinese restaurants and the organization in which the communist restaurateurs are often the leading men.

Nor has the writer avoided the embarrassing subject of the export of narcotics from China. It is sad to read that communist propaganda in the West seems to be financed largely from the proceeds of opium and other narcotic sales.

Especially interesting and important is the information on the many pro-Chinese splinter-parties in Western Europe, their struggle for life and, incidentally, their ferocious fight to obtain recognition from Peking or Tirana.

Interesting and important though the book may be, it falls short on one very important aspect, viz. Chinese communist industrial and technological espionage. I can hardly conceive that Dr. Schlomann should have forgotten this and I entertain the hope that one day he will apply himself to this much refined practice of "brain-sucking".

Yes, it is sad to read it, and equally sad to relate that the director of Japanese intelligence when accompanying Emperor Hirohito on his world trip last year, was quoted in Paris as saying:

We have said for years that Mainland China is exporting illegal narcotics to Japan.

But the greatest sadness of all, Mr. Speaker is, as I have shown in my remarks last month and today, there are sources in a host of countries around the world—official and unofficial—who recognize Peking's part in the narcotics trade, but despite a vast expenditure of funds and much said about the seriousness of the problem, our Government does not. Why not? Are all others wrong and the administration right? Is the evidence I have presented on these two occasions spun out of moonbeams or poppy-seeds?

I began these remarks talking about the administration's deliberate contradictions and ambiguity. I pointed out an example of the contradiction, now I would like to close with an example of the ambiguity. On November 16, 1971, the Washington Post ran an Associated Press story by Jean Heller and Mark Brown. The headline was, "Spying, Drug Traffic Linked to Chinese Illegally in the U.S.," and the lead paragraph states:

As many as 4,200 aliens from Communist China sneak into the U.S. every year, according to secret Justice Department records, which say some of the aliens are on espionage missions and others are involved in narcotics traffic.

I would like to enter the article in the Record Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks, but the point is that from it we can see that the Justice Department, the FBI, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, all seem to be aware of a serious problem which is drug connected and emanates from Red China, while others in the administration say they are looking for proof of same, or that it does not really exist.

I do not see how it is possible to take the pieces of information I have presented here and not begin to fit them into some kind of pattern that reveals the outline of a well-established plan and policy, total in its concept and determined in its use of narcotics as a weapon against us. If the administration re-

fuses to take the word of Chou En-lai on the subject, I do not. I will continue to seek out evidence of Peking's involvement in this most despicable of all trades—not just because I support the Republic of China, which I do—not just because I see communism wherever it sits as a threat to man, which I do, and not just because I wish to embarrass the administration, but because in a manner so grave the public has the right to know. And toward that end I will do everything in my power to see that the public does know. Mr. Speaker, I will have more to say on this crucial subject at a later date.

Mr. Speaker, just as in the field of our critical needs of national defense this administration has fostered a false sense of security and promoted an attitude of appeasement in our country, it has created its own credibility gap in dealing with Communist China. Since it is committed to telling the American public that we can now do business with these mass murderers and work for peace, it is committed to rewriting the hard facts of Red China's inglorious and criminal participation in the international illicit drug traffic. The American people must be forewarned of this propaganda drive by the White House revisionists and I will continue to tell this story, fully aware that it will be vindicated eventually since it is correct.

The article from the Washington Post follows:

SPYING, DRUG TRAFFIC LINKED TO CHINESE ILLEGALLY IN UNITED STATES

(By Jean Heller and Mark Brown)

As many as 4,200 aliens from Communist China sneak into the United States every year, according to secret Justice Department intelligence reports which say some of the aliens are on espionage missions, and others are involved in narcotics traffic.

Only one in 10 of these illegal aliens is caught and deported, the reports say. Among those identified by the government, many have been traced to the Hong Kong Seaman's Union, an organization said by the FBI to be engaged in espionage. Other Chinese aliens taken into custody have been carrying narcotics shipments destined for U.S. contacts.

According to a source in the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the mainland Chinese have been coming for about five years, entering this country by jumping ship in U.S. ports or by way of smuggling operations in the United States and Canada.

Just last week, according to the confidential reports, INS smashed a ring engaged in smuggling Chinese sailors from Vancouver, British Columbia, into the United States at Bellingham and Blaine, Wash., at \$1,000 a head.

The operation was broken up after the U.S. Border Patrol caught one group of the aliens as they crossed the border on foot a mile east of Blaine. A second group made it to the New York metropolitan area. Three of them were arrested last Wednesday in Newark, and told authorities they made their first contact with the smugglers in Hong Kong.

Earlier this year, U.S. and Canadian authorities shut down a large Chinese smuggling ring operating between Montreal and New York City. However, the intelligence reports say there is evidence that the Montreal operation has reopened, and that another ring is operating out of Windsor, Ontario, smuggling mainland Chinese through Detroit.

According to IRS sources, as many as 2,500 mainland Chinese are smuggled into the

United States each year. Another 1,700 jump foreign-flag vessels in U.S. ports. The intelligence reports said 5,640 entered that way between 1965 and 1970.

Chinese seamen among the flood of illegal aliens have been traced by the FBI to the Hong Kong Seaman's Union. An FBI intelligence report described the union this way:

"HKSU has voiced vehement opposition to United States military action in Vietnam and dissuades seamen from serving aboard ships carrying strategic materials to Vietnam. Conversely, the HKSU encourages seamen to sail on ships bound for North Vietnam. HKSU has approved a policy of placing Communist seamen on Western ships for the purpose of sabotage or capture in the event of future hostilities.

The FBI report said that Chinese ship-jumpers in the United States had arrived in vessels flying Liberian, Norwegian, British, Panamanian, Dutch, Israeli, Swedish and Danish flags.

The report contains an informer's allegation that a New York Chinese association believed to be a contact point for smuggled aliens used a deserting crewman to help carry out the murder of two members of a rival organization.

One of the victims was shot at the door of a restaurant in New York's Chinatown. The other one drowned. His body was found on Manhattan Beach in Brooklyn.

Smugglers bringing aliens into the country charge from \$100 to \$1,000 per person, authorities say.

TAX REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the time has come to set the record straight on tax reform.

Every election year we usually hear a great deal of irresponsible talk about the inequities of our tax system. This year is no exception, potential candidates for President, and others, are again making their false promises to the people.

It has often been said that what a man does, speaks louder than what he says he will do. This is so true when the person has a record of talk and little action.

History will show that those who have talked the loudest about tax reform in the past always put their promises on the shelf after the elections were over. They always did this in favor of giveaway and high-priced legislation, which must be paid for by the taxpayer, for whose concern they show some interest in today. It is almost a joke to believe that Senators MUSKIE, HUMPHREY and some others have any compassionate interest in the taxpayers other than for political purposes.

If 200 wealthy people in the United States do not pay taxes because of our present laws, whose fault is it that the laws are on the book today? Who is to blame for not having changed or repealed these so-called loopholes? Let us look at the record.

An elementary schoolchild knows that before a Member of the House of Representatives, or the Senate, can vote for or against tax reform legislation, it must first be cleared by the Ways and Means

Committee in the House, and the Committee on Finance in the Senate. Of course, the President cannot approve or veto tax reform legislation until it is passed by both Houses of the Congress.

It is diversionary to blame the President of the United States, regardless of his political party, with the failure to pass meaningful tax reform legislation. To blame the President is an insult to the intelligence of the American people.

The record shows that the majority party has for a long number of years controlled the tax writing committees in the House and the Senate. If Senators HUMPHREY, MUSKIE, KENNEDY, and all the rest wanted tax reform in the past, they could have had it. If they want tax reform this year, there is still time. Their party controls the machinery. They wrote the present laws of which they now complain. Their leadership schedules committee hearings in both tax-writing bodies.

I am a member of the minority on the Ways and Means Committee. If those who talk the loudest are really serious, I say to them, that the time to act is now. One of the Nation's major airlines has a well-known advertisement which goes like this, "We're ready when you are."

THE EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT: THE NEED FOR A REALISTIC EXPANSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ, is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, it has become increasingly clear that the unemployment rate has been at a critical level for the past several months. And as things are going, there does not seem to be much real hope for improvement. If anything can be expected, it is that the situation can only become worse if ignored.

In 1971, the Emergency Employment Act established a program which attempted to provide a solution to this problem by establishing Federal employment for the unemployed.

During this year, this program received \$1 billion with which to work; and, 150,000 persons were employed through it in 50 States and several territories in the following areas: public works and transportation, education, law enforcement, health and hospital, parks and recreation, social services, environmental quality, fire protection, and a few other fields.

In view of our need, 150,000 employment opportunities does not seem to be affecting the unemployment rate very much, since even a conservative estimate places our new employment need at almost 20 million jobs. Moreover, this unemployment crisis eventually affects 72 million Americans.

When the President signed the Emergency Employment Act into law, he understood the grave need to provide some kind of aid to the 5.9 percent of the people of this country who are presently unemployed. This act, however, can only be seen as a beginning and additional efforts are necessary.

For this reason, I am introducing this

week with Congressman HAWKINS and 60 other cosponsors, a bill that would take up the work begun by the Emergency Employment Act and increase its effectiveness. Senator CRANSTON, together with several other senators, have already introduced a similar bill in the Senate side of the House.

This bill would provide funds for more than 1.5 million jobs for unemployed and underemployed Americans in the first full year of operation. It would authorize \$3 billion this fiscal year, \$7 billion in fiscal 1973, and \$10 billion in succeeding fiscal years for a continuing program of public service employment. In areas of especially high unemployment it would authorize funds for a new special employment and economic development program for economic development coordinated with public service employment to help these areas become more economically self-sufficient. And broadly representative public service councils would be created to assist local governmental units.

Recognizing the seriousness of this situation, as you may know, I have been involved in submitting legislation to create the necessary jobs. I introduced such a bill earlier this year intended to increase Accelerated Public Works assistance to high unemployment 'special impact' areas by \$195 million for a total of \$475 million in fiscal year 1973. Thus, it is that in addition to today's "public service" employment bill, I also have supported and continue to support "public works" programs which would provide jobs in such areas as the construction of hospitals, libraries, and dams. Either—and preferably both types of approaches—is necessary to help deal with the problem. The President seems to have a particular repugnance regarding public works programs, which I feel he must re-examine. But, in any event, at the very least this present bill will begin to deal with this crisis on a more realistic level.

The importance of working to help the American people in this area cannot be emphasized enough; therefore, I can hope and urge the Committee of Education and Labor to schedule hearings soon on this bill to expand the Emergency Employment Act.

ELDERLY TAX CREDITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation to assist the elderly in maintaining the homes of their choice. One thrust of my bill is to provide the elderly renters and homeowners with the financial means to withstand the burden imposed on them by rising property taxes. The other aim of the bill is to help the elderly absorb the cost of home improvements and repairs. Both steps are necessary to insure that our senior citizens can choose the option of an independent living situation.

I have spoken many times about the economic hardships facing the elderly. For the most part, they live on fixed incomes and employment opportunities are extremely limited. These conditions,

combined with runaway inflation in the cost of food, medical care, and housing, strains the ability of the elderly merely to survive. Individuals over 65 have a higher poverty rate than any other group in the population—recent estimates show that between one-third to one-half of them live in unacceptable conditions.

In the past few years a new card has been added to the almost stacked deck against the elderly: the skyrocketing property tax. Maintaining the home of their choice is a prime concern of the elderly, yet this regressive and unfair tax is making this increasingly impossible. Used mainly to finance education—from which the elderly derive the least direct benefit—the property tax hits hardest at the poor and those on fixed incomes.

The inequity of the property tax is inevitable since it does not take account of a person's ability to pay. The sole criterion is the assessed valuation of property a person owns. Thus, if an elderly homeowner's land is worth the same as that of a rising young executive, both pay the same amount despite the fact that the elderly person's income is much smaller. I, therefore, feel it is grossly unfair that property taxes take a much larger percentage of the senior citizens' income.

Accordingly, my bill gives each person over 65, whose annual income is under \$6,500, a Federal income tax credit of up to \$300 for State and local property taxes. For those elderly who rent, the bill provides a tax credit equal to 25 percent of the annual rent paid, up to \$300. In the case of the elderly who pay no income tax, they would be entitled to cash payments from the U.S. Treasury of up to \$300 a year on the amount of property tax or rent paid. In those cases where the State or locality allows exemptions, this bill would allow for additional deductions if the State or local exemption does not cover the total property tax payment.

Yet property tax is not the only obstacle the elderly face in living in a safe and comfortable environment. The cost of home repairs and improvements, as anyone who has ever needed a plumber, a carpenter, or an electrician well knows, is rising at a rate that defies belief. To enable the elderly to keep up with these increases, my bill would grant tax credits of up to \$350 for home repairs or improvements to those earning under \$6,500. Such action is necessary for the elderly to maintain a decent place to live.

Growing old in our society, however rewarding it should be, is often a trying and tragic time. This is only made more difficult when the elderly are forced to move to new, often inferior, surroundings because they can no longer afford to live in the homes they worked all their lives to own. The human cost of such suffering is often severe. Neighborhood friends are often lost and homes that contain cherished memories cannot be replaced. The anxiety caused by the high cost of maintaining a good home is another cost that cannot be calculated.

We must make certain the elderly can live in the kind of homes they want. These are the principal features of my bill:

First. Allow income tax credits of up to \$300 for State and local property taxes for homeowners 65 years of age and up who are earning under \$6,500, and a like amount for tenants who pay rent.

Second. Allow income tax credits of up to \$300 for home repair and improvement costs incurred by those in the above age and income group.

Third. Allow cash payments to those 65 years of age and up who pay no Federal income tax but still pay property tax or rent.

Fourth. Allow Federal tax credits even if there are State or local exemptions or credits if such credits do not exceed property tax paid.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 14610

A bill to allow a credit of not more than \$300 against Federal income tax for State and local real property taxes (or an equivalent portion of rent) and for home repair and improvement expenses paid by individuals who have attained age 65 with respect to their residences

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits allowable) is amended by renumbering section 42 as 43, and by inserting after section 41 the following new section:

"Sec. 42. Residential real property taxes (or equivalent rent) and home repair and improvement expenses paid by individuals who have attained age 65.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—In the case of an individual who has attained the age of 65 before the close of the taxable year, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter an amount equal to the sum of—

"(1) the amount of real property taxes paid by him during the taxable year which were imposed by a State or political subdivision thereof on property owned and used by him as his principal residence, or the amount of rent constituting real property taxes, as defined in subsection (c) (6), plus

"(2) the amount paid by him during the taxable year for the repair or improvement of his principal residence (whether or not such residence is owned by the taxpayer).

If the amount allowed as a credit under this section exceeds the tax imposed by this chapter (reduced by the credits allowable under sections 33, 35, 37, 38, 40, and 41) such individual shall be paid from the United States Treasury an amount equal to such excess.

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The total tax credit and payment from the Treasury under subsection (a) for any taxable year shall not exceed \$300 (\$150, in the case of a married individual filing a separate return).

"(2) ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME OVER \$6,500.—The credit otherwise allowable under subsection (a) for any taxable year (determined after the application of paragraph (1)) shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount by which the taxpayer's adjusted gross income for the taxable year exceeds \$6,500 (\$3,250, in the case of a married individual filing a separate return).

"(3) JOINT OWNERSHIP.—In the case of property owned and used by two or more individuals (other than a husband and wife) as their principal residence, the limitations provided by paragraphs (1) and (2) shall, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, be applied as if such individuals were a single individual.

"(c) SPECIAL RULES.—

"(1) HUSBAND AND WIFE.—In the case of a

husband and wife who file a single return jointly under section 6013, the age requirement contained in subsection (a) shall be treated as satisfied if either spouse has attained the age of 65 before the close of the taxable year.

"(2) PROPERTY USED IN PART AS PRINCIPAL RESIDENCE.—In the case of a property, only a portion of which is used by the taxpayer as his principal residence, there shall be taken into account, for purposes of subsection (a), so much of the real property taxes paid by him on such property as is determined, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, to be attributable to the portion of such property so used by him. For purposes of this paragraph, in the case of a principal residence located on a farm, so much of the land comprising such farm as does not exceed 40 acres shall be treated as part of such residence.

"(3) Real property tax on cooperative housing.—For purposes of subsection (a) (1), an individual who is a tenant-stockholder in a cooperative housing corporation (as defined in section 216(b))—

"(A) shall be treated as owning the house or apartment which he is entitled to occupy by reason of his ownership of stock in such corporation, and

"(B) shall be treated as having paid real property taxes during the taxable year equal to the portion of the deduction allowable to him under section 216(a) which represents such taxes paid or incurred by such corporation.

"(4) Real property tax in case of change of principal residence.—If during a taxable year a taxpayer changes his principal residence, subsection (a) (1) shall apply only to that portion of the real property taxes or rent paid by him with respect to each such principal residence as is properly allocable to the period during which it is used by him as his principal residence.

"(5) Real property tax in case of sale or purchase of principal residence.—If during a taxable year a taxpayer sells or purchases property used by him as his principal residence, subsection (a) (1) shall apply only to the portion of the real property taxes with respect to such property as is treated as imposed on him under section 164(d), and, for purposes of subsection (a) (1), the taxpayer shall be treated as having paid such taxes as are treated as paid by him under such section.

"(6) Rent constituting real property taxes.—For purposes of this section, the term 'rent constituting real property taxes' means an amount equal to 25 percent of the rent paid during a taxable year by a taxpayer for the right to occupy his principal residence during that year, exclusive of any charges for utilities, services, furnishings, or appliances furnished by the landlord as a part of the rental agreement.

"(D) ADJUSTMENT FOR REFUNDS

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount of real property taxes paid by an individual during any taxable year shall be reduced by the amount of any refund of such taxes, whether or not received during the taxable year.

"(2) INTEREST.—In the case of an underpayment of the tax imposed by this chapter for a taxable year resulting from the application of paragraph (1), no interest shall be assessed or collected on such underpayment if the amount thereof is paid within 60 days after the taxpayer receives the refund of real property taxes which caused such underpayment.

"(e) DEDUCTION NOT AFFECTED.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) shall not affect the deduction under section 164 for State and local real property taxes.

"(f) CREDIT NOT AFFECTED BY STATE OR LOCAL REDUCTIONS.—No reduction, under State or local law, in the amount of real property taxes required to be paid in the case of individuals who have attained the age of 65

shall affect the allowance of a credit under this section with respect to the reduced amount of such taxes paid by the taxpayer."

(b) The table of sections for such subpart A is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 42. Residential real property taxes (or equivalent rent) and home repair and improvement expenses paid by individuals who have attained age 65.

"SEC. 43. Overpayments of tax."

(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

CANADA AGREES TO EXPORT MORE OIL TO THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the principle arguments used by the Interior Department and the oil companies in favor of the trans-Alaska pipeline is that it could be built 2 to 3 years earlier than a trans-Canadian oil pipeline and would thus bring the needed oil to market sooner.

Recently, I urged the Interior Department to ask the Canadian Government if it would be willing to increase its exports of oil to the United States during the consideration and construction of a trans-Canadian oil pipeline. Today, I would like to include in the RECORD some comments by Canada's Energy Minister Donald S. Macdonald, who announced in the Canadian Parliament on April 9 that he had informed various American officials, including Secretary of the Interior Rogers C. B. Morton and Secretary of State William Rogers, that Canada would be willing to supply additional quantities of oil to the United States during consideration and construction of a trans-Canadian pipeline. Mr. Macdonald states in part that—

I made it clear that Canada was prepared to supply additional quantities of oil to the United States not only for a 2 year period, but a longer period.

This revelation is extremely significant and, on the basis of logic, it should eliminate the Alaskan pipeline proposal from serious consideration. From virtually all of the evaluations, we know that a trans-Canadian oil pipeline, built alongside a trans-Canadian gas pipeline which will be built in any event, is both environmentally and economically superior to a trans-Alaska pipeline. We are now told by the Canadian Government that the U.S. energy picture will not even be hurt temporarily by a 2- to 3-year delay in building a Canadian pipeline, since Canada will make up the difference in increased exports of oil. In fact, such an arrangement would be advantageous to the United States since, during construction of a Canadian pipeline, we would be getting the same amount of oil that we would be getting from a trans-Alaska pipeline without depleting our own supplies of oil.

In short, Mr. Macdonald's offer, on behalf of the Canadian Government, eliminates the last intelligible argument for the Alaska pipeline route; namely, that

it would get the Alaskan oil to market more quickly than would a Canadian pipeline.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Interior Department recently issued its long-awaited environmental impact statement on the proposed 780-mile Alaska pipeline. The impact statement concluded that a trans-Canadian pipeline—from Alaska's North Slope to Chicago—would cause less environmental damage in five of six major areas than would a trans-Alaska route. The impact statement also concluded that a trans-Canadian and a trans-Alaskan route would be economically "equally efficient," although Interior admitted that it did not consider certain economies that would result from building parallel gas and oil pipelines across Canada. The trans-Canadian gas pipeline is expected to be built to transport the large quantities of Alaskan gas to Midwest markets regardless of which oil pipeline is built.

The Canadian Government has repeatedly expressed its opposition to a trans-Alaska pipeline because of the danger possible tanker spills would pose to its west coast. The Canadians have consistently favored a Canadian oil pipeline for both environmental and economic reasons.

I believe that the Canadian offer to supply the United States with more oil during consideration and construction of a trans-Canadian oil pipeline is so significant that the Interior Department should agree to revise its impact statement to include consideration of this offer. Such a revision would be strong evidence of good faith on the part of the Interior Department.

The following is the text of an exchange on the floor of the Canadian House of Commons between Member of Parliament David Anderson and Energy Minister Donald S. Macdonald on April 9:

Q. Mr. David Anderson (Esquimalt-Saanich). In the light of American concern over their supply of oil during the two year period required to evaluate alternative transportation routes to the trans-Alaska pipeline system may I ask the Minister whether he has made clear to his United States counterparts Canada's willingness to make oil available to the United States during this period so that a proper evaluation of a route might be undertaken free of short term security consideration?

A. The Honorable Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Both in my discussions with Secretary Morton and other officials of the United States Administration in Washington and recently with Secretary Rogers last week, I made it clear that Canada was prepared to supply additional quantities of oil to the United States not only for a two year period but a longer period and that this would be facilitated by their lifting of their quota system.

HEARING ON ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE ACT AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary announces that a public

hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 4, 1972, at 10 a.m., in room 2226, Rayburn House Office Building on H.R. 13644, H.R. 13906 and H.R. 13987, bills to amend the Administrative Conference Act.

H.R. 13644 was introduced by Mr. CELLER, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, at the request of the Administrative Conference of the United States. Mr. RAILSBACK introduced identical H.R. 13987 and Messrs. ERLNBORN and BROWN of Ohio cosponsored identical H.R. 13906. The subcommittee expects to hear Hon. Roger C. Cramton, Chairman of the Administrative Conference, in support of the legislation which, among other things, would remove the appropriations ceiling applicable to the Conference.

TO CONTROL THE PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF BARBITURATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I introduce for appropriate reference an amendment to the comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970. As a supporter of this legislation I looked upon its passage with high hopes. My city, New York, as any one who reads the papers knows, is the narcotic capital of the world. There are as many addicts, as much narcotics and as many dangerous drugs in New York City as in the rest of the cities and localities of the United States combined. However, as in any legislation that is passed in this body, there are compromises and agreements made by many parties in order to get needed legislation on the books.

This was true of the 1970 drug law.

The original comprehensive drug legislation was introduced in the U.S. Senate on April 9, 1969. That legislation included in its provisions production quotas over the major legitimate pharmaceutical drugs of abuse in the United States, the amphetamines and the barbiturates. In succeeding months the administration introduced their own version of this legislation but without such controls. In an unusual display of unanimity the administration worked closely with the Senate committee that held legislative hearings and reported and floor managed this legislation in the Senate. One of the compromises that came about as a result of the desire of everyone to get this legislation passed into law was the all-important question of production quotas over the stimulants and depressants which everyone knew were being overproduced by the billions and were being diverted into the criminal traffic. Unlike heroin, cocaine, marijuana, LSD, however, these drugs are produced by large and powerful companies in the United States who have lobbied for years against the inclusion of these drugs under any type of governmental control.

For example, these companies held up the passage of the 1965 drug amendments for years because of their inten-

sive lobbying campaigns in both Houses of Congress. With this history in mind, Attorney General John Mitchell sent a representative, the then deputy chief counsel of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, to the Senate subcommittee charged with shepherding the drug bill through the Senate. He reasoned that if amphetamines and barbiturates were put under production quotas in the version of the bill sent to the floor, the bill would meet such strong opposition from the drug lobby, that its chances for quick passage or even final passage, would be put in jeopardy.

Reluctantly the Attorney General's representative asked the bill's manager, the late Senator Dodd of Connecticut, to remove production controls over amphetamines and barbiturates in any bill that was ultimately reported. The Dodd bill which contained such production quotas was based on 10 years of investigation which showed a burgeoning abuse of the amphetamines and barbiturates. While both the administration and the Senate committee agreed that production quotas were desirable and necessary to protect the health of our citizens, Senator Dodd agreed to drop his insistence on the inclusion of these drugs under a quota system but only on the assurance from the representative of the Attorney General that these drugs would be administratively moved from schedule III of the 1970 act which does not call for production quotas to schedule II which does call for such quotas, within 6 to 12 months subsequent to the signing of the legislation into law by President Nixon.

This has not happened.

The bureaucratic process is slow and as anticipated, at the beginning the lobbies are powerful.

Many Members of both Houses have commented on the need for such quotas on these two widely abused drug types. Hearings have been held by House committees and as a result of pressure from both Houses such quotas were finally totally called for in November of 1971.

For some reason, however, the administration has not kept its promise with regard to the barbiturates. Yet these drugs are widely overproduced, widely diverted to the criminal traffic, widely abused by the young and old alike, and probably account for more deaths than the opiates, the stimulants and the hallucinogens combined.

They account for 25 percent of all deaths due to acute poisoning in the United States every year.

They killed over 3,000 Americans in 1971 compared to 1,700 who died from heroin and the opiates.

They have caused tens of thousands of auto accidents, aggressive crimes, pointless brutalities, murders, accidental deaths, and suicides since 1960.

Like the opiates, they are addictive, causing a physical dependence that is physiologically and mentally worse in the opinion of most physicians than heroin and morphine addiction.

Unlike the opiates, which cause a condition of drowsiness and languor, the barbiturates can cause a condition of hy-

steria and giddiness—that is why they are called "goof balls"—they make people "goofy"—and in the advanced stages, they cause aggressiveness and psychosis, a self-induced insanity.

Let me describe just one segment of the testimony of the chief of police of Los Angeles who described a bizarre case illustrative of the new "craze" among our youth for "goof balls".

He told of how a 17-year-old Los Angeles boy who had been on barbiturates for 4 months decided on the spur of the moment to hold up a taxi driver. During the robbery in which he was helped by two friends, he held a knife pressed to the stomach of the cabbie, and after getting the man's money, plunged the knife into him. The cabbie succeeded in getting out of his car, and ran down the street yelling for help, clutching his stomach. The boy pursued him and stabbed him in the back 12 more times; the man died several hours later.

Now this boy had never committed an offense; he had been working for 15 months; his neighbors described him as a quiet, even-tempered person before he took to using barbiturates. And the police psychiatrist said that the use of barbiturates had completely changed his personality, turning a peaceful, law-abiding young man into a savage, ruthless killer.

And this was not an isolated case.

A brief résumé of several narcotic squad reports from the Los Angeles Police Department revealed a picture of what these drugs were doing to tens of thousands of that city's youth. The ages in these cases range from 12 to 17:

Female, age 15, tenth grade, high school, Los Angeles. Subject came to the attention of the Police when she was found unconscious in a vacant lot on Normandie Boulevard near the Harbor area. Officers were summoned to the scene by witnesses who had seen two boys and a girl drag the subject and another girl from an automobile and leave them in the vacant lot. Subject was taken to the Harbor General Hospital where she was treated for ingestion of four capsules of Seconal. Officers apprehended the two boys, one age 17, the other age 15, and one girl age 15, referred to above, near the scene.

75 Seconal capsules and four Benzedrines were found in the car. Subject stated she obtained her first drugs (Seconal) at a Halloween dance. The day before her arrest, she obtained two 'red devils' (Seconal) from a girl at school. That same day she obtained seven more from a boy for \$1.00 (on credit). She paid back the two to the girl at school. She then received seven more from another school friend. That night, she took four while baby sitting and went to sleep. The following morning after being taken home by her mother, she was too groggy to go to school so she "ditched" school. She took four more capsules during the day. She had no memory of being in a car with boys or being taken to a vacant lot. She stated she was unaware of the danger of the drugs and took them out of curiosity and because of tensions with the family.

The second female, age 15, tenth grade, high school, Los Angeles. Subject was found unconscious by the police in a vacant lot on Normandie Boulevard near the Harbor area with the girl referred to above. Subject stated she had been taking "red devils" at parties for about a year and one half. Subject states that, on the previous day, she had purchased three 'red devils' and two benzedrines from a 15 year old boy at school. On the morning of her arrest, she purchased five

dollars worth of "red devils" (34 Seconal capsules). She consumed five Seconal capsules and two benzedrine tablets prior to losing consciousness. She was taken to the Harbor General Hospital in "critical" condition. Subject stated she started using drugs because "everyone else was doing it" and she wanted to see what they were like.

Tragedies such as this are happening in American cities every minute of every hour, right now, today. But the real tragedy is that the cases I have just cited are not of today—they happened 10 years ago. This testimony, and thousands of pages like it, was given to the Congress that long ago.

And here we are—still looking for "proof" that these drugs are over produced—despite the fact that President Nixon told the AMA in 1971 that of the 5 billion barbiturates produced in 1971—half of them were diverted into the criminal traffic. The same ratio we heard from President Kennedy in 1962.

And here we are—still trying to determine if abuse of these drugs causes crime despite the fact that leaders in the Congress said in 1964 that these pills were increasingly causing some of the most vicious, cold-blooded, cruel crimes in history.

And here we are—still trying to convince the American Medical Association that these drugs are over prescribed and that physicians are a major cause of diversions—despite the fact that a 10-year study of arrests for criminal barbiturate diversion proved that 80 percent of those arrested were physicians and pharmacists.

I am not questioning today the reasons these drugs have not been put under strict production quotas as originally promised, although I do find it strange that the major producer of these drugs has had its lobbyists stalking the Halls of Congress and at least one of its corporate officers, in positions of influence in the administration.

Whatever the reasons are, I think it is time we quit playing games with these deadly capsules, and powers.

There is no need to prove that they are dangerous, that they are addicting, that they have caused criminal behavior, that they are overproduced, and that they are turning large numbers of American youth into stumbling zombies.

My amendment is designed to put an immediate stop to this. The rescheduling of barbiturates would bring about four major regulatory controls which I am convinced would solve the problem. It would:

First. Subject all transfers of barbiturates, all transactions, except to a patient, to the system of triplicate order forms which has traditionally been applied to narcotics.

Second. Require special permits for their import or export.

Third. Put a blanket prohibition on the refilling of barbiturate prescriptions.

Fourth. Establish annual barbiturate production quotas for the entire country.

Mr. Speaker, the travesty of goof ball abuse has gone on for too long. We do not need more justification than we already have for the immediate reduction of the production of these drugs in America today and additional controls over their distribution.

My amendment is a simple one.

It would achieve the goal of guaranteeing that these legitimate drugs will only be used legitimately and that the thousands of American children—"goof ball" addicts and multiple drug users alike—will have removed from them their supply of this dangerous substance.

The bill follows:

H.R. 14600

A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to transfer barbiturates from Schedule III to Schedule II of such Act

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the schedules of controlled substances set out in section 202(c) of the Controlled Substances Act are amended—

(1) by inserting at the end of Schedule II the following:

"(d) Any substance which contains any quantity of a derivative of barbituric acid, or any salt of a derivative of barbituric acid;" and

(2) by striking out subparagraph (1) of paragraph (b) of Schedule III and by redesignating subparagraphs (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), and (10) of such paragraph as subparagraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), and (9), respectively.

PUBLIC SERVANT—OR MASTER?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, as one who has a well-established interest in trying to protect Government employees from being forced to pay union dues to hold public jobs, I was most interested in a recent article in Barron's for April 17 entitled "Public Servant—Or Master?"

Certainly associations of public employees can and do play a vital role. The newly created Postal Service affords an unparalleled opportunity to see whether the idea of collective bargaining by public employees almost on as broad a basis as is commonly done in the private sector is a practicable workable relationship.

But I took the position there that we cannot and should not agree to make the union shop a negotiable issue and that we must protect the public employee's right to join or refrain from joining a union.

The same principle should be applicable to all public employees, and I commend the following article to all of my colleagues for their consideration:

PUBLIC SERVANT—OR MASTER?: CONGRESS IS WEIGHING BILLS TO PROMOTE UNIONIZED GOVERNMENT

(By Shirley Scheibla)

WASHINGTON.—For the first time since passage of the National Labor Relations Act (Wagner Act) in 1935, Congress is considering measures dealing with unions of government employees. Hearings, underway for four days in March, resumed last week; they are expected to run into June.

At issue is whether the federal government should pre-empt the regulation of labor relations for state, county and municipal governments and authorize compulsory unionism and strikes. Subcommittee Chairman Frank Thompson, Jr., (D., N.J.) says the hearings are the opening gun in a battle which may continue well beyond the cur-

rent session of Congress. Although they have been virtually ignored by the media, their outcome could have a more profound effect on society than the National Labor Relations Act. It could even be a giant step toward a U.S. labor government.

HIRING HALL

Measures now being weighed by the subcommittee would authorize not only the union shop, but also the hiring hall. Under the former, an employee would have to join the union after being hired, and it would be his exclusive bargaining representative. Under the latter, the government would have to obtain new employees from the recognized union.

Perhaps the most explosive proposal before the subcommittee is the one to legalize strikes by employees of state and local governments. Though against the law now, such strikes are on the rise. According to Rep. Sam Steiger (R., Ariz.), public employees last year struck 412 times, at a cost of two million mandays of work. The figures compare with 42 work stoppages back in 1965.

The problem is whether the U.S. needs more rigid enforcement of the bans against such work stoppages, or whether, as the sponsors of all three bills contend, public and private employees should enjoy the same prerogatives. This raises the question of whether those who perform the vital services of government should be allowed to withhold them as a bargaining device. Moreover, since strikes are an economic weapon, should they not be limited to private industry which functions for profit, and where employers, unlike governments, can resort to counter-measures like lockouts?

Rep. Thompson told Barron's that, of the three bills under consideration by his subcommittee, H.R. 7684 is the most likely to pass. Besides voiding state and local strike bans for government workers, it would override right-to-work statutes in the 19 states which bar compulsory unionism. It would affect such vital employees as policemen, firemen, hospital workers, teachers and sanitation workers. It also would make all terms and conditions of employment subject to collective bargaining, thus giving unions enormous power over the conduct of government.

DUES CHECK-OFF

Moreover, it would entrench that power by mandating the check-off of union dues from government payrolls upon employee authorization. Further, it would create a National Public Employee Relations Commission, with powers exceeding those of the National Labor Relations Board. For instance, there would be no court appeal from the decisions of the Commission involving issues of representation, although it would allow certification of an exclusive representative of workers without election by secret ballot. It also would permit the Commission to grant immunity from prosecution, except for perjury, thus making it possible for an embezzler of union funds to escape punishment by first testifying at the Commission.

HR 7684 was introduced by Rep. William L. Clay (D., Mo.), former business representative of the City Employees Union in St. Louis and former education coordinator of the Steamfitters Local No. 562 in St. Louis. According to James Marshall, president of the Assembly of Government Employees, the bill was written by the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), Jerry Wurf, AFSCME president, lead-off witness when the hearings opened on March 8, heartily endorsed the Clay bill, but asked for a new provision to make the agency shop mandatory. This would mean that employees would pay union dues as a condition of employment without actually having to become union members.

HR 12532, introduced by Rep. Thompson, would extend coverage of the National Labor Relations Act to state, county and municipal

employees. "I don't consider public employees different from private employees. My personal view is that my bill is the best of the three," he told Barron's, "since the National Labor Relations Board already is in operation." But he quickly added that he introduced his bill only as "a discussion point," and that observers who say that opening up the Labor Relations Act could be like opening a can of worms may be right.

That leaves the third bill, HR 9324, introduced by Rep. Augustus Hawkins (D., Calif.), which applies to teachers only. According to Subcommittee Chairman Thompson, it lacks enough support to be reported out.

BITTER FIGHT

Once private industry realizes the potential impact on it of the Clay bill, Congress is likely to have a bigger fight on its hands than those involving the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

According to Kurt L. Hanslowe, member of the Cornell University faculty and former assistant counsel for the United Auto Workers: "The union shop in public employment has the potential of becoming a neat mutual back-scratching mechanism, whereby public employee representatives and politicians each reinforce the others' interest and domain, with the public employee and the individual citizen left to look on, while his employment conditions, his tax rate and public policies generally are decided by entrenched and mutually supportive government officials and collective bargaining representatives over whom the public has diminishing control."

The ramifications of strengthening unionism in state and local governments are mind-boggling. Back in 1935, when Congress considered the issue, 2.7 million persons were employed by state and local governments. Now the total exceeds 10 million, against three million for the federal government; AFSCME President Wurf reports that today six out of every 10 jobs created are in state and local government. He says such employment will rise to 14.1 million by 1980.

CONCEPT UNACCEPTABLE

Basic to the whole controversy is the degree to which collective bargaining is appropriate for public employees. Some conservative Congressional staff experts maintain that it should be limited to a narrow area—issues not spelled out in law. Otherwise, they maintain, the government will be delegating its sovereignty. But Mr. Wurf testified before the Thompson Subcommittee: "When you strip it down, the concept of sovereignty means only one thing as far as labor relations are concerned: that is that the boss will call the shots. That concept is unacceptable to the employees of government."

What is subject to collective bargaining varies greatly by states and localities. Hence, according to one union leader, AGE President Marshall, it is a mistake to attempt to define this by federal statute.

According to the Labor-Management Foundation, a non-partisan research organization, "The constitutionality of Congress imposing collective bargaining upon the states is highly questionable. But if it is imposed, there should be certain limits mentioned." Once a union establishes collective bargaining, of course, its next step is to seek exclusive representation of workers, which the Clay bill authorizes.

SPOILS SYSTEM

Reed Larson is executive vice president of the National Right to Work Committee, which led the drive to enact right-to-work statutes in 19 states. He says the pending bills would introduce a modern version of the spoils system to state and local governments. After a union obtains exclusive representation, Mr. Larson explains, it then complains about "free riders" who obtain the

benefits of union bargaining without paying dues.

After obtaining exclusive representation, the next step by the union is to ask for an agency shop, requiring payment of union dues by non-joiners. Obviously this is hard to differentiate from the compulsory membership of the union shop. All three bills before the subcommittee would authorize both. (The federal government has effectively safeguarded by executive order the right of its employees to refrain from paying for unwanted union representation.)

While the stated aim of the hearings is to establish labor peace, enforced unionism for government workers already has been the major cause of several strikes and court cases. According to Mr. Larson, demands by the United Federation of Teachers (AFL-CIO) for an agency shop in the 1968 New York City school strike received no attention in the press until after the teachers went back to work. Says Mr. Larson, "Several weeks later, The New York Times said, 'The Board of Education believes that the strike was called more to enforce that demand than for any other reason.'"

LIFEBLOOD OF THE UNION

Mr. Wurf's union called the strike of sanitation workers in Memphis during which Martin Luther King was killed. Newspaper and TV accounts gave the impression that the chief issue was racial discrimination. Yet last month, Mr. Wurf said it was the check-off of union dues, under which they are deducted from pay checks. He testified: "The most important and serious strikes in our union have centered around non-economic issues. In Memphis, it was dues check-off. Our members, most of whom are black, understand that dues check-off is the lifeblood of the union, which they consider the best mechanism of hope for a better work-a-day life." Mr. Wurf told the subcommittee that his union, which is growing at the rate of one thousand new members a week, now has 525,000 members.

Michigan is the only state in which the agency shop is widespread. Now it is being challenged in three court cases backed by the National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation. In one, about 500 Detroit teachers are fighting a threatened dismissal for refusal to pay dues to the Detroit Federation of Teachers, an affiliate of the American Federation of Teachers. (They objected to the use of their money for political activities.) Detroit has an unusual agreement in its union contract which stipulates that no one shall be fired for non-payment of dues so long as that individual is challenging the compulsion in court. About 280 additional Detroit teachers have brought legal actions in other cases.

Another Foundation-backed case in Michigan involved Mrs. Margaret Maki, a public school teacher for 30 years. When she learned that the Association asked that she not be given a raise and that it was spending her compulsory contributions, in part, for political activities, she stopped her payments. She was fired for that reason although she would have retired in three months.

The third case involves Carol Appelgate, a public school teacher for 18 years, who is covered by tenure, designed to prevent capricious discharge for matters unrelated to conduct or competence. She was fired because she refused to pay dues, under an agency shop, to the Grand Blanc Education, an NEA affiliate. When the Thompson Subcommittee refused her request to appear at the hearings, Rep. Steiger took her to the witness table with him when he testified and asked that her written statement be incorporated in the record.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Another opponent of Michigan's agency shop, James Nixon, also accompanies the Congressman and filed a statement. Mr. Nixon has been a city employee in Detroit for over

19 years. For 12 years he was a voluntary member of the AFSCME. But he objects to a city agreement with the union which requires him to pay dues no matter how well the union serves him. He said that, as a black worker, he is particularly conscious of individual civil rights, one of which should be to work for his government without being forced to join a union.

According to Mr. Nixon, thousands of city employees protested that the agency shop contract violated their freedom of choice, and several of them went to court and obtained a temporary injunction against such compulsion. The court order came on the day hundreds of city employees had received dismissal notices solely because they refused to pay compulsory union dues.

Says Reed Larson: "Ironically, the one-million-member National Education Association union and its ideological counterpart, the 200,000-member American Federation of Teachers (AFL-CIO), have pushed hardest for enactment of state tenure laws. Yet now they propose national politics of compulsory union that would irrevocably wipe out that protection. Which poses a root question: Are NEA and AFT union bosses more interested in the welfare of the teachers they allegedly represent—or in perpetuating and expanding their power through the vehicle of compulsory unionism?"

Mr. Larson says his committee will file an amicus curiae brief in a case pending before the Wisconsin Employees Relations Board in which NEA has charged a school board with an illegal practice for negotiating with an unrecognized representative of teachers.

Besides compulsory unionism, another fundamental issue involved in the hearings is the wisdom of legalizing strikes of state and local government employees. NEA argues that Congress might as well end the prohibitions, since they have not served their purpose. Mr. Wurf contends the right to strike is inherent in collective bargaining.

All three bills, according to the Labor-Management Foundation, assume that forcing unwilling public workers into unions will lessen disputes. But the U.S. Chamber of Commerce points out that the more organized workers are, the more they strike. The Foundation adds, "Apparently, the sponsors of the bills believe . . . that the public would suffer fewer legal strikes than they do illegal strikes. This double-talk philosophy is as illogical as it sounds."

James Marshall, aforementioned president of the 600,000-member Assembly of Government Employees, says the Clay bill would encourage patronage, jeopardize the merit system and take the public out of running the government. He says his union never has had a strike and maintains the Clay bill "would open up more avenues for public strikes because it says all laws and rules are out the window subject to control of a federal commission." He told Barron's: "I happen to represent a hell of a lot of people. But I'm also a citizen and I want the government services due a citizen."

PRISON REFORM

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, prison reform to deal with deplorable conditions in our city, State, and Federal prisons should have a high priority for every legislature. Unfortunately, since the prison riots of the last 2 years, however, very little has been done. I have been working with an ad hoc task force here in the House on prison legislation and I would like to bring to the attention of our colleagues correspondence which I have had

with the commissioner of corrections of the city of New York on one particular aspect of prison reform, namely, family visitation. The correspondence follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 7, 1972.

HON. BENJAMIN J. MALCOLM,
Commissioner of Corrections,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR BEN: I have formed a Congressional Task Force on Correction Reform of twelve members of Congress who are interested in providing some leadership in the House in the field of prison reform. One problem of concern to the Task Force is that of homosexual assaults in the prisons. On Thursday, February 3d, I introduced a bill to permit conjugal furloughs in the federal prison system. The concept of conjugal furloughs is, of course, not new but in my examination of the existing federal law I found that, except for family visitations outside the prison permitted adolescents on a regular basis, there is no provision permitting outside visits by adult prisoners to their families except for special emergency situations.

Entitled, the Family Visitation Act of 1972, this bill is intended to deal with part of the homosexuality problem in our prisons by making normal sexual relationships possible through family visitations. However, in discussing this problem with Norman Carlson, Director of the Bureau of Prisons, I was informed that the current thinking is that sexual assaults in prisons are not primarily related to sexual deprivation, although that is a significant factor, but rather to other factors, not necessarily related to sex.

I have read the report entitled, "Report on Sexual Assaults in the Philadelphia Prison System and Sheriff's Vans" issued as the result of an investigation conducted jointly by the Philadelphia District Attorney's Office and the Police Department in 1968. You are probably familiar with the report; if you have not read it, may I suggest that it is worthwhile reading. The investigators of that prison system estimate that in the twenty-six month period under study two thousand sexual assaults occurred.

They documented 156 such cases by interviews of prisoners and of those special cases only 96 had been reported by inmates to prison authorities and of that number only 64 were reflected in prison records. The report states that the comparatively low number of cases reported by inmates is the result of the following: "first, many guards discourage complaints by evincing an attitude that they do not wish to be bothered . . . secondly, inmates have little faith in the ability of the guards to protect them from retaliation should they complain . . . thirdly, inmates who complain are themselves subjected to a form of punishment . . . and finally, sometimes very little comes of a complaint."

The report also indicates that the detention facilities are more apt to have problems of this nature than are the sentenced correctional facilities because the detainees will have a larger number of aggressive individuals collected in one place. And furthermore, there are more work, educational and recreational programs available to sentenced prisoners than those held in detention. I would assume without knowing the facts that the Philadelphia prison system is hardly exceptional and that a similar situation, if an investigation were made, would be found in our city jails and detention facilities.

It is interesting to note that over half of the Philadelphia prisoners are detainees. Because of the court backlogs, the average daily detentioner population of the Philadelphia Prison system has nearly doubled in the last decade. A similar situation exists in New York.

You will recall that in February 1970 I distributed a questionnaire in the Tombs, after making an inspection of the facility

with former Commissioner of Corrections, George McGrath. The questionnaire revealed rather shocking facts, e.g., that many prisoners were sleeping three or four in a cell, one on the floor, without even a mattress. What I believe your Department should do, if you haven't already, is conduct in the Tombs, and ultimately in every detention and correctional facility maintained by the City, a survey, including questionnaires and personal interviews, to ascertain the facts pertaining to sexual assaults taking place in the prisons. With this statistical information you would better be able to take the measures necessary to protect those confined from such assaults.

The recommendations made in the Philadelphia Report were the following:

1. Increased guard supervision
2. Structural improvements in the facilities
3. Additional programs for inmates, such as:

a. The opportunity to receive conjugal visits from lawful husbands or wives;

b. The opportunity to work voluntarily within the prison at wages comparable to wages paid for similar work in the community;

c. Intensive and frequent group therapy sessions;

d. Adequate counseling and social work services by a staff of at least 40 qualified social workers or counselors;

e. Social responsibility seminars on such subjects as narcotics addiction, alcoholism, marriage and the family, how to find and retain jobs, civic responsibilities and others;

f. Training in music, painting, drama, filmmaking and other forms of emotional expression;

g. Handicrafts such as woodworking, ceramics, leatherworking, models;

h. Recreation programs staffed by qualified athletic coaches and instructors;

i. Adequate library services including the privilege of borrowing books to read during confinement in cells or dormitories.

I know, Ben, that you have every desire to meet the difficult problems of running underfunded, understaffed and overcrowded prison facilities. The way I believe you can best meet your responsibility is to focus public attention on the problems because only if the public is concerned will their duly elected representatives appropriate the necessary monies so needed to deal with many of these problems.

Now, if in fact these problems don't exist in New York City correctional institutions as they evidently existed and may continue to exist in Philadelphia, then indeed New York City is unique. You, George McGrath and I were responsible for introducing the methadone program in the Tombs in July of 1970. The three of us were responsible for introducing college courses operated by John Jay College, including coeducational classes at Rikers Island in 1971. We were responsible for making certain that every adolescent under the age of 18 required by law to receive an education, is now getting such education at the Rikers Island correctional facility, again in 1971.

I would like to assist you now in dealing with one of the most traumatic experiences that any prisoner can possibly confront, to wit, sexual assault upon him or her. We ought to find out what the facts actually are. I would very much appreciate hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER
OF CORRECTION,
New York, N.Y., April 19, 1972.

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ED: In response to your letter concerning sexual assaults in our institutions please be advised of the following:

In order to determine the extent of the problem we did an indepth survey and found a preponderance of these assaults occurred among our adolescent population. As a result of this on-sided problem, we requested Dr. Kaufman, Director of Psychiatry for the Prison Health Services to evaluate this problem from a psychiatric point of view. I am enclosing a copy of his report for your information.

As you well know we are continually improving our operation to relate to all problems in our institutions. In the Mental Health area, staff has been tripled and new approaches used to deal with such problems as sexual assaults, i.e. Mental Health Aides, Suicide Prevention Aides and intensive therapy. Our Bill for weekend furloughs has passed the State Senate and we expect it to pass the Assembly. This will permit sentenced inmates to go home on 72 hour passes. We will open during the course of 1972 a new facility to house 1080 adolescents and to provide better programs for them. Our Educational, Library and Counseling services are also being improved, not only to attack the problem of sexual assaults but the entire problem of rehabilitation.

I trust that this information will be of some help to the task force. Your continued concern is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN J. MALCOLM,
Commissioner.

PRISON HEALTH SERVICES,
New York, N.Y., March 10, 1972.

To: Director of Operations, Department of Correction.

From: Edward Kaufman, M.D., Director of Psychiatry, PHS.

Subject: Sexual assaults on inmates.

1. This is in reference to your memo dated February 29, 1972, subject as above.

2. The problems you pose in your memo are complex, and the psychiatric literature is replete with books and other publications on the subject; divergent views are not infrequently found among psychiatrists dealing with this problem. Thus, simple solutions are not easily formulated.

3. Listed below are some widely accepted views regarding homosexual behavior by persons who are not basically homosexual in orientation, particularly among adolescents:

a. Adolescence is the period during which the sexual drive is strongest.

b. The adolescent may be perceived as half boy, half man. Developmentally he has emerged from a latency period during which he interacted mostly with other males, and during which there was some confusion regarding sexual identity. Most individuals experience some homosexual feelings during early adolescence but this is generally resolved in the course of normal socialization. (The Kinsey Study on "Sexual Behavior of the Male" found that over 40% of males in the U.S. had at one time in their lives had a homosexual contact to the point of orgasm.) Incarceration interrupts the course of this aspect of the socialization process.

c. Incarceration not only exacerbates sexual frustration, it also minimizes any areas for submission of the sexual drive.

d. There is a higher incidence of homosexual behavior in uni-sex institutions (military, colleges, boarding school, etc.) than there is in institutions with both sexes. (Studies of animal sex behavior reveal that when no female of the species is present, the male will attempt to have sex with another male usually the most passive). Actually, the incidence of homosexual assaults (and consensual homosexual acts) is probably higher than the official statistics of any prison system. If the figures in your memo imply an increase in the incidence of this phenomenon, it really means that better observation and reporting are being done, or that more inmates are reporting it, rather than that there has actually been an increase in this type of behavior.

e. Adolescents in correctional institutions tend to manifest poor impulse control; they are likely to act upon impulses rather than suppress them, without much concern for the consequences.

f. In the prison culture, the homosexual aggressor who plays a male role does not perceive himself as a homosexual and does not experience the peer pressure or derision which he himself may apply to the "punks".

g. At times, a homosexual assault in prison may represent an act of defiance against the prison authority (and thus against society) in which the inmate obtains gratification from "getting away with it". In the case of a black homosexual rape against a white, it may represent a drive to abuse another as the black feels himself to have been abused.

4. The above statements do not attempt to explain any particular homosexual act. They are phenomena which are frequently present in the commission of such behavior. The psychodynamics operative in any specific incident of homosexual assault can only be arrived at by an in-depth study of the incident and the individuals involved.

5. As stated above, solutions to this problem are difficult to accomplish because we are dealing with the basic nature of man. Some strategies which might result in a lessening of the problem, but which may not be immediately feasible, are:

a. A lessening of overcrowding (as you suggest in your memo) and more adequate supervision. This implies a speedup of court procedures and the recruitment of more Correction Officers. Realistic bail and ROR by the courts would also contribute toward reducing the census; these approaches should be applied extensively to victimless crimes or offenses relating more to morality than crimes (such as prostitution or narcotics usage).

b. Training of Correction Officers designed at increasing their awareness of the problem and all its ramifications.

c. Closed circuit TV in housing areas.

d. Weekend passes and/or furloughs for carefully screened inmates. I realize that this may require legislative action.

e. Conjugal visits (at Rikers Island) for carefully screened inmates.

f. Single cell occupancy for all inmates except those revealing signs of mental depression.

g. Eliminate "dead spaces" that cannot be seen, in all housing areas where they exist.

h. Eliminate as many cell areas as possible and convert into open dormitories or wards.

i. Have an experienced, skilled superior officer in the receiving room assign housing to newly admitted inmates so that the overtly aggressive and the weak and passive inmate are housed apart. A simple rating scale might be developed to assist in this type of screening for housing.

j. In so far as is possible, attempts should be made to utilize larger housing areas and to develop these units along therapeutic community lines. In this type of unit, the inmate-residents would act as censors of homosexual assaults and would agree that the violator be moved from their unit to a housing area with greater security. This kind of peer pressure produces a higher degree of conformity than fear of official, institutional disciplinary action.

6. I trust this information has been of help to you. Please feel free to call me if you would like to discuss any of my comments in greater detail.

EDWARD KAUFMAN, M.D.,

Director of Psychiatry, Prison Health Services, Health Services Administration.

STOPPING AUTO THEFTS

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, surprising as it may seem, it is possible for any car thief to obtain through the mail a legitimate license plate and registration document for a stolen car without ever having to show proof of ownership. I am today introducing legislation to prevent this.

My legislation amends title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the mailing of any motor vehicle license tag or registration document unless such a license tag or registration document was issued pursuant to a written application in which the name, address, and State of residence of the owner of the motor vehicle as well as proof of ownership has been certified. And it makes it unlawful for any individual to mail an application containing false information for the issuance of any motor vehicle license tag or registration document.

One example all too well demonstrates the need for this legislation. On December 6, 1971, New York State Senator Albert Lewis telephoned Andalusia, Ala., and ordered license plates for a 1968 white, two-door Mercury Cougar. He then sent a telegram to the probate judge in Andalusia setting forth the make of the car, its year, its identification number, and his return address as Albert Lewis, general delivery, general post office, 33d Street and Eighth Avenue, New York City. And he telegraphed \$30 to cover the cost of the plates and mailing charges. The vehicle for which he applied for license plates and registration documents was that day on the nationwide stolen car alarm from Massachusetts.

Yet the following day—December 7—a set of legitimate license plates were mailed to him from the Alabama Probate Court with a registration made out in his name, route 1, Andalusia, Ala.

What State Senator Lewis did, any car thief, scoundrel, or uninsured motorist can do. The implications of this are staggering. According to nationally syndicated columnist Jack Anderson, a single probate judge in Alabama handles 30 to 35 out-of-State registrations a day. That is over 10,000 a year. And that is just one judge.

It is estimated that the impact of this procedure on thwarting the recovery of stolen cars is substantial. Last year, there were 96,621 reported auto thefts in New York City. Only 26,211 of these cars were recovered. No one knows how many of the remaining 70,410 automobiles are being driven around New York or elsewhere with legitimate Alabama license plates on them.

But the results of this unfettered policy go far further than the question of stolen cars. This practice not only allows car thieves to obtain bona fide registration documents, thus making their apprehension and the recovery of stolen cars more difficult, but it also means that the vehicle can escape annual safety inspection, and thus be in defective or hazardous condition. It means that non-Alabama residents can obtain a registration without the necessity of obtaining automobile liability insurance. It provides a method by which sales tax laws can be evaded; it is a drain upon the revenue of the applicant's State of residence. It provides the opportunity to avoid tickets for traffic parking violations.

Although present New York State law

does require an out-of-State car to be re-registered within 30 days, this law is virtually impossible to enforce, for law enforcement officials must prove the physical presence of the car in New York continuously for 30 days in order to prosecute for an alleged violation.

Clearly, Federal legislation is needed to meet this problem.

As a former assistant district attorney and a member of the House Judiciary Committee, I know full well that this legislation will not wipe out automobile thefts. But it will make it a lot tougher for the criminal to get away with stealing a car. And that is a start.

TRADE PERSPECTIVES FOR INDUSTRY, AGRICULTURE, AND LABOR

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

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, much has been written and spoken on our trade problem. Usually some particular aspect of the problem is discussed or argued.

Recently I received a paper that is not noted for its brevity but for its more comprehensive coverage of the subject. It was prepared by O. R. Strackbein of the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy.

Mr. Strackbein goes into all principal aspects of our trade policy, linking it with our experience with the agricultural program since the mid-thirties, the postdepression legislative action which extended controls over many sectors of our economy, and the rise of ever sharper competition from abroad as a result of the wide diffusion of our industrial technology to the other industrial countries.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not undertake to brief Mr. Strackbein's paper but present it in full at this point in the RECORD with the hope that it will be read by all Members for a more comprehensive view of our trade problem and its bearing on our economic progress in the future.

The article follows:

TRADE PERSPECTIVES FOR INDUSTRY, AGRICULTURE, AND LABOR

(By O. R. Strackbein, president, the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, March 3, 1972)

I

When our national farm policy, under pressure of extremely low farm prices, in the 1930's veered from *laissez faire* to governmental interference, a torrent of discussion and even acrimonious debate raged throughout the country.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, the principal legislative instrumentality of the shift, was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. It was reenacted in modified form in 1935. The basic principle of the legislation rested on the parity price concept.

Since agricultural prices had declined much more sharply than the price of manufactured goods, i.e., goods the farmers themselves bought, the farmers' weak competitive position was regarded as entitled to remedial support. The bargaining position of the farmer was relatively weak because he could not cut back his output temporarily simply by laying off workers and then resuming production as supply was no longer excessive, as industry was able to do. Moreover, weather conditions, over which he had no control, sometimes had more influence

over crop size than any planning the farmer might undertake. Beyond these difficulties which reduce their competitive footing, farmers are scattered far and wide over the countryside, thus making joint or cooperative action, such as is necessary for control of supply, relatively difficult.

Under the new farm program certain crops, regarded as basic, were accordingly made eligible for governmental payments under the new legislation if the prices were found in comparison with a base period, to be below the level of parity with the prices of the articles farmers buy. If the price of wheat on the market, for example, was 80 cents per bushel while the price of the goods the farmer purchased was \$1.00, the government would pay the farmer the difference, or 20 cents per bushel.

In order to avoid such an increase in planting as would cause the market price to fall still lower, thus requiring the government to pay more, the Agricultural Adjustment Act provided for removal of surpluses from the market, and other legislation provided for acreage control and retirement of land from cultivation in return for other payments. Provision was also made for the imposition of import quotas if imports interfered materially with any program.

The legislation represented overt interference with free enterprise and set aside the competition that supposedly nurtures the free market. The action was justified in the name of the national economic emergency.

A few years later wages were also removed from the free play of market forces by statutory action establishing obligatory collective bargaining and minimum wages. These controls have become a permanent part of our regulatory processes.

Relative price declines 1929-32

Whereas the wholesale prices of all commodities including farm products declined from an index of 95.3 in 1929 to 64.8, where 1926 prices equal 100, the index of farm prices dropped from 104.9 to 48.2. The decline for all commodities was 30.5 percentage points while on farm products the drop was 56.7 percentage points. The index on metal and metal products fell only 20.3 points, or from 100.5 to 80.2. Building materials fell 24.0 points, chemicals and allied products, 20.1 points, fuel and lighting, 12.7 points, house furnishings, 19.2 points, and miscellaneous items 18.2 points.

Agricultural machinery and equipment declined only 13.8 percentage points. Electricity rose by 10.2 points. Motor vehicles fell 12.9 points, plumbing and heating 28.2 points, lumber by 35.3 points. None fell as sharply as agricultural products.

The following Table presents the 1929-32 wholesale price declines for various products:

WHOLESALE PRICE DECLINES, FARM AND OTHER PRODUCTS 1929-32
(1926=100)

Product	1929	1932	In percentage points	In percent
Farm products (all).....	104.9	48.2	56.7	54
Grains.....	97.4	39.4	58.0	59
Livestock and poultry.....	106.1	48.2	57.9	54
Other products:				
Leather.....	113.2	65.1	48.1	42
Shoes.....	106.3	86.1	20.2	19
Clothing.....	90.0	63.0	27.0	30
Fuels and lighting materials.....	83.0	70.3	12.7	15
Anthracite.....	90.1	88.4	1.7	1
Electricity.....	94.5	104.7	+10.2	+10
Petroleum products.....	71.3	45.4	25.9	36
Agricultural machinery and equipment.....	98.7	84.9	13.8	13
Motor vehicles.....	100.0	87.1	12.9	12
Brick and tile.....	94.3	77.3	17.0	18
Cement.....	89.0	74.3	14.7	16
Lumber.....	93.8	58.5	35.3	37
Chemicals.....	99.7	79.0	20.7	21
Furniture.....	95.0	75.0	20.0	21
Auto tires and tubes.....	54.5	41.1	13.4	24

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1951, table 325, p. 280.

The relatively sharp decline in agricultural prices from 1929 to 1934 as visible in the Table, confirms the weak competitive position of farms compared with industrial producers at that time. Historically agrarian producers are in normal times relatively weak in bargaining power face to face with industry.

Reversal of the downtrend

If next we compare the increase in wholesale farm prices from 1932 to 1939 with the increase in wholesale prices of nonfarm products, we will be able to observe the effects of the farm program toward bridging the gap between farm and other prices.

INCREASE IN WHOLESALE PRICES, 1932-39
(1926=100)

Product	1932	1939	Percent increase
All commodities.....	64.8	77.1	19
Farm products.....	48.2	65.3	35
Grains.....	39.4	58.6	48
Livestock and poultry.....	48.2	72.2	49
Other farm products.....	51.4	62.6	21
Other products:			
Shoes.....	86.1	102.6	19
Clothing.....	63.0	82.0	30
Cotton goods.....	54.0	67.2	24
Anthracite.....	88.4	75.8	-14
Electricity.....	104.7	78.6	-24
Agricultural implements and equipment.....	84.9	93.4	10
Motor vehicles.....	87.1	93.4	7
Brick and tile.....	77.3	91.4	18
Cement.....	74.3	91.3	23
Lumber.....	58.5	93.2	59
Chemicals.....	88.8	84.7	-4
Fertilizer materials.....	63.7	67.9	6

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1951, table 325, p. 280.

From 1932 to 1939 farm prices reversed themselves. The wholesale price of farm products had increased 35% by 1939 while the price of all commodities had increased only 19%. Moreover, the 19% included the price of farm products. Therefore it seems safe to say that farm prices rose twice as much from 1932 to 1939 as nonfarm prices.

Nevertheless on the 1926 base of 100, the index of farm prices had not yet overtaken the index for all commodities, including farm products. The farm price index had risen to 65.3 compared with 77.1 for all commodities from 1926. By 1941 the gap had been narrowed considerably, the farm price index standing at 82.4 and that for all commodities at 87.3.

Elimination of the price differential

By 1950 the farm price index had gone ahead, standing at 170.4 compared with 161.5 for all commodities on the 1926 base.

At this point we move to a different base line, namely 1947-49 as 100. On that base the farm price index had risen to 108.7 by 1950 while that of all commodities, including farm products stood at 81.8. This seeming discrepancy compared with the preceding base merely meant that farm prices rose since 1947-49 while the price of other products fell between that base and 1956.

From 1950 on farm prices moderated, in fact receding to 97.2 in 1960 and ending at 111.0 in 1970. The all-commodity wholesale price index, which had fallen to 81.8 in 1950 on the 1947-49 base, began a fairly steady upward course, reaching 94.9 in 1960 and 110.4 in 1970, or nearly the same level as the index for farm products which, as we have just seen, stood at 111.0 in 1970.

Of course, there were wide individual variations in the prices of both farm and industrial products. Grains moved from 121.3 in 1950 down to 98.8 in 1970 on the 1947-49 base. Livestock moved from 110.2 to 116.7 in the same period. Live poultry dropped from a high of 185.7 in 1950 to 99.6 in 1970. Fluid milk went from 76.5 to 115.3 while eggs fell from 134.5 to 126.8.

Among the industrial products there were also considerable variations. Cotton products between 1950 and 1970 dropped from 109.5

to 105.6 in 1970. Manmade fiber products also went down, from 135.8 to 102.1. Apparel, on the other hand, moved in the opposite direction, going from 90.5 in 1950 to 111.0 in 1970. Footwear, went from 70.2 to 113.0 while leather moved from 98.9 to 107.7.

Petroleum products moved from 85.1 to 101.1 in the 20 years, industrial chemicals, from 84.0 to 100.9, prepared paint from 71.2 to 112.4. Agricultural chemicals and chemical products fell slightly from 89.4 to 88.4. Tires and tubes, rose from 79.5 to 109.0, lumber, from 86.6 to 113.7, agricultural machinery, from 65.2 to 113.0. Household furniture moved from 75.6 to 111.6, concrete products, from 78.2 to 112.2, motor vehicles from 77.9 to 107.4.

WHOLESALE PRICES ON FARM AND OTHER PRODUCTS, 1950-70
(1947-49=100)

Product	1950	1970	Percent increase
All commodities.....	81.8	110.4	35
Farm products.....	106.7	111.0	4
Grains.....	121.3	98.8	-19
Livestock.....	110.2	116.7	6
Live poultry.....	185.7	99.6	-46
Fluid milk.....	76.5	115.3	51
Eggs.....	134.5	126.8	-6
Other products:			
Cotton products.....	109.5	105.6	-4
Manmade fiber products.....	135.8	102.1	-25
Apparel.....	90.5	110.0	22
Footwear.....	70.2	113.0	61
Electric power (1960).....	101.2	104.8	4
Petroleum products.....	85.1	101.1	18
Industrial chemicals.....	84.0	100.9	21
Tires and tubes.....	79.5	109.0	37
Lumber.....	86.6	113.7	31
Agricultural machinery.....	65.2	113.0	73
Household furniture.....	75.6	111.6	48
Motor vehicles.....	77.9	107.4	38

Source: Statistical Abstract of United States 1971, table 531, p. 335.

Farm income

As might be expected, farm income declined sharply during the Great Depression. Gross farm income stood at \$13.8 billion in 1929 and dropped to \$6.4 billion in 1932. Thereafter a slow increase was recorded, the 1939 income having reached \$9.7 billion or \$10.5 billion including government payments, still short of the 1929 level. By 1945 the total receipts had reached \$24.5 billion including government payments of \$700 million. (Stat. Abst., U.S. 1947, Table 669, p. 609).

The income continued upward, reaching \$32.1 billion (gross) in 1950, \$38.0 billion in 1960 and \$56.1 billion in 1970. (Stat. Abst., 1971, Table 944, p. 581).

Trends in number of farms, farm size, farm population, etc.

Number of farms

Either as a result of the farm program or as a concomitant, the number of farms declined steadily. In 1930 the number was 6.54 million. By 1950 the number was 5.64 million; by 1960 it had fallen to 3.96 million and to 2.92 million in 1970 or distinctly less than half the number in 1930. (Ibid., 1971, Table 924, p. 573).

Farm size

Meantime farm size increased, moving upward from 151 acres per farm in 1930 to 389 acres in 1970, or well over twice the earlier size. (Ibid.)

This trend was, of course, greatly stimulated by the cost of farm machinery and equipment, outlays for fertilizer, pesticides, herbicides, etc., all of which were a part of farm technology but represented heavy overhead, thus calling for larger acreage to absorb it.

Farm population

During the same period, 1930-70, farm population shrank even more sharply than the size of farms increased. In 1930 farm population was 30.5 million or 24.9% of the

population. By 1970 this number was 9.7 million, or 4.8% of the population, representing a shrinkage of more than ½. (Ibid, Table 922 p. 572).

Farm labor

In 1932 the number of farm workers was 11.06 million. This was followed by a gradual decline, the number reaching 10.74 million in 1939, and 9.84 million in 1945. (Ibid, 1947, Table 212, p. 198). In 1950 the number was 9.92 million, and by 1960 the number had declined to 7.06 million and in 1970 to 4.52 million (Ibid, 1971, Table 367, p. 232).

In twenty years over 5 million workers lost their moorings. Yet the persistent cry of critics of our weak competitive position in the world is for greater efficiency! No thought is given to the consequences of such efficiency to employment such as accompanied increased agricultural efficiency.

Government payments

Payments made by the Government to farmers began at \$131 million in 1933, rose to \$807 million in 1939, dropped to \$769 in 1945, and on to \$267 million in 1950. They continued relatively low until 1960, but reached \$2.4 billion in 1965, and \$3.7 billion in 1970. (Ibid., 1947, Table 670, p. 610; 1951, Table 681, p. 580, and 1971, Table 944, p. 580).

Acreage harvested

It was to be expected that the total acreage harvested would have declined as acreage control and withdrawal of acreage under the soil Conservation Act progressed.

In 1930 cropland harvested was 359 million acres. By 1940 the acreage harvested had declined to 321 million. This was followed by an upward movement. The 1950 acreage was 345 million acres, but by 1955 the downward trend resumed. In that year the acreage was 340 million, followed by 324 million in 1960. By 1965 the acreage had fallen below 300 million, or to 298 million in that year. Preliminary statistics set the total at 297 million acres for 1970.

During the forty-year period of 1930-1970 the acreage decline was in the magnitude of 17%. Volume of production by contrast had increased several fold, as detailed immediately below.

Farm productivity

Meantime our population grew by 80 million or 65%.

Crop yields per acre since 1930, however increased more steeply, especially since World War II.

The yield of corn per acre was 24.1 bu. per acre in 1931. It had increased to 31.0 bu. in 1941 and reached 37.0 bu. in 1946. By 1960 the yield had increased to 54.7 bu. and 1970 it had gone to 71.7 bu., after having reached 83.9 bu. in 1969. A blight infestation reduced the average yield in 1970. In any event, a three-fold increase in yield per acre represented a high reward for the farmer's effort.

Wheat virtually doubled its yield during the same period, moving from 16.3 bu. per acre in 1931 to 31.1 bu. in 1970. It moved up 5 bu. during the 1960-70 decade.

Soybeans, now a leading farm crop, were in their infancy in the first half of the 1930-40 decade. Average yield per acre during 1931-

35 was 15.4 bu. per acre. In 1941 the yield had risen to 18.0 bu. It moved upward to 23.5 bu. in 1960 and to 26.8 bu. in 1970. The increase in output per acre was a little less than 75%.

Irish potatoes also enjoyed a doubling in the yield per acre, moving from 110.1 bu. in 1931 to 131.2 in 1941. In 1960 the yield had risen to 185 bu. and in 1970 to 228 bu.

Cotton yielded 211.5 lbs. per acre in 1931, rose to only 231.9 lbs. in 1941, on to 284.0 lbs. in 1948 and up to 446 lbs. in 1960. The 1970 yield was 441 lbs., although 527 lbs. had been reached in 1965. Output per acre had more than doubled.

Tobacco enjoyed a yield of 808 lbs. per acre in the 1931-35 period. This had risen to 966 lbs. in 1941 while the 1950 yield moved up to 1277 lbs. In 1960 a further gain up to 1,703 lbs. was achieved, while by 1970 the yield had moved to 2,120 lbs. or 2½ fold that of 1931-35.

Rice in 1931 yielded 2,079 lbs. per acre but dropped to 1,903 lbs. in 1941. In 1950 the yield had risen to 2,362 lbs. By 1960 an additional 1,000 lbs. per acre had been reached at 3,423 lbs., and in 1970 yet another 1,000 lbs. had been added, at 4,566 lbs. per acre. The yield had more than doubled since 1931.

(For yields per acre see Stat. Abst. 1947, Table 703, pp. 638-641; Ibid, 1951, Table 710, pp 604-607, and 1971 Table 965, pp. 592-2).

MAN-HOUR PER UNIT OF PRODUCTION—OUTPUT OF FARM LABOR

Crop	1935-39	1945-49	1955-59	1965-69
Corn: man-hours per 100 bushels.....	108	53	20	7
Wheat: man-hours per 100 bushels.....	67	34	17	11
Potatoes: man-hours per short ton.....	20	12	6	4
Cotton: man-hours per bale.....	209	146	74	30
Tobacco: man-hours per 100 pounds.....	47	39	31	25
Milk cows: man-hours per hundredweight of milk.....	3.4	2.6	1.7	.9
Cattle other than dairy: man-hours per hundredweight of beef.....	4.2	4.0	3.2	2.1
Hogs: man-hours per hundredweight.....	3.2	3.0	2.4	1.4
Chickens (egg production): man-hours per 100 eggs.....	1.7	1.5	.9	.4
Chickens (broilers): man-hours per hundredweight.....	8.5	5.1	1.3	.5
Turkeys: man-hours per hundredweight.....	23.7	13.1	4.4	1.9

Source: (Stat. Abst., 1971, table 954 p. 587).

This table shows the increased productivity per farm worker, but the table begins with the 1935-39 period and ends with the 1965-69 period. Thus is lost the increase that took place before 1935 and after 1969. Nevertheless the reduction in man-hours required per unit of production is exceptionally sharp in some instances, such as in corn production and in the production of chickens (broilers) and turkeys.

The next table shows by index numbers,

where 1947-49 equals 100, the output per man-hour on farms from 1930-1970:

FARM OUTPUT PER MAN-HOUR—INDEX WHERE 1947-49=100

	1930	1940	1950	1960	1965	1970
Total farm products.....	53	67	112	206	290	357
All livestock and products.....	76	80	107	159	257	337
All crops.....	50	67	114	220	267	317

Note: Statistical Abstract 1961, table 885, p. 644 and 1971; table 953, p. 586. For the years 1965 and 1970 it was necessary to convert the 1967 base of 100 to the 1947-59 base.

From the preceding table we see that the output per man-hour moved up sharply decade after decade from 1930 to 1970. Productivity per man-hour in All Farm Products increased 6.7-fold from 1930-1970; it increased 4.4-fold for All Livestock and Products, and 6.3-fold for All Crops.

The slowest increase was in the first decade (1930-40) during which the first category (All Farm Products) increased only 26%, the second (Livestock) only 5% and the third (All Crops) only 34%.

In the second decade (1940-50) the first category increased 67%, the second 34% and the third 70%. In the third decade (1950-60) the increase was sharper, increasing by 84% in the first category, 48% in the second and 93% in the third. In the most recent decade (1960-70) the increase in productivity continued at a high level. The first category rose 73%, the second (Livestock) 112% and the third, less sharply at 44%.

This record of performance vastly outdistanced that of American industry.

Unfortunately available statistics do not permit a complete comparison of productivity in the manufacturing industries with that recorded in agriculture. With respect to manufacturing as a whole the statistics do not go backward beyond 1950.

The following table shows the increase in productivity in manufacturing industry from 1950-70 in terms of index numbers with 1967 as the base.

Output per man-hour in manufacturing—Index of productivity Manufacturing (1967=100)

Year:	1950	1955	1960	1965	1970
.....	64.4	73.7	79.9	98.3	108.1

(Stat. Abst., 1971, Table 350, p. 224.)

Compared with the increase in farm productivity per man-hour the progress in manufacturing industry was pedestrian. Since 1950 farm output per man-hour tripled while its counterpart in manufacturing fell distinctly short of doubling.

We have scattered statistics on the man-hour output by some industries from 1935 to 1969, measured by the 1947 base. In a few instances we have the productivity from 1950 to 1969, where the base of 100 is 1967. The table follows:

OUTPUT PER MAN-HOUR—SELECTED INDUSTRIES

Industry	1935	1939	1950	1955	1960	1969
Steel:						
1947=100.....	62.9	79.3	111.9	129.4	136.7	104.8
1967=100.....			78.3		82.3	
Petroleum refining:						
1967=100.....			39.4		68.4	111.7
Flour:						
1947=100.....	99.5	109.5	100.0	127.1		109.3
1967=100.....			54.7		78.0	
Paper:						
1947=100.....	95.5	109.2	118.9	137.5		109.5
1967=100.....			56.4		74.7	
Tobacco products:						
1947=100.....	69.4	80.0	119.3	126.2		
1967=100.....			59.6		82.2	103.6

Industry	1935	1939	1950	1955	1960	1969
Man-made fibers:						
1947=100.....	31.8	46.9	151.6	224.8		110.9
1967=100.....				71.8		
Cement:						
1947=100.....	72.6	89.7	116.0	150.7		109.4
1967=100.....			47.3		71.5	
Hosiery:						
1947=100.....		87.0	115.4	126.0		105.9
1967=100.....			40.1		58.6	
Confectionery:						
1947=100.....	79.2	89.4	102.5	127.0		
1967=100.....			51.2		78.3	97.8

Source: (Stat. Abst., 1961, table 292, p. 218; Ibid, 1971, table 351, p. 224.)

II

Results and effects of the farm program

Benefits

Measured by the increase in productivity (1) by the acre and (2) by the output per man-hour, the Farm Program exceeded all expectations. It has been hailed as a "miracle" of production. No single factor can be credited with the phenomenal rise in productivity or the increase in total farm output on lesser total acreage. Unquestionably price incentive and the removal of the harassing uncertainty that was the woe of individualistic farming, which is to say, setting of a guaranteed price at or near the parity level, represented a strong motivation.

The imposition of import quotas to prevent the break in prices that increasing imports, attracted by higher price levels would have generated, represented the removal of another negative factor. *Contrary to the theory that import quotas and a guaranteed market at a good price lead to complacency, indolence and inefficiency, the agricultural community of this country proved the opposite.*

Production control, though never perfect, nevertheless reduced one of the other principal curses of unplanned acreage planting and harvesting. Centralized planning under the aegis of the Department of Agriculture brought into farming and made possible the type of control that is much more easily exercised in manufacturing because of the concentration of production in plants and factories where thousands of operatives and management work together.

Yet, without the increased use of fertilizer, pesticides and herbicides, the development of improved strains of crops, soil conservation plus intensive mechanization, the amazing increased productivity that crowned the Program would not have been achieved. It was therefore the combination of contributory elements, energetically pursued, that brought the results that were actually achieved.

Side Effects on Trade

Interference with the free flow of trade was considered an unfortunate but necessary effort to prevent the Program's undermining from abroad. As an example, before the importation of cheese was strictly limited, the higher market price assured by the dairy program attracted heavy imports of cheese with the unhappy result of surplus accumulation of domestic cheese in our warehouses and the consequent drain on the Treasury which paid the farmer the guaranteed price for his production. Imports of raw cotton, wheat and wheat flour, other dairy products, peanuts and a few other items were also held to a minimal level as a means of avoiding surplus accumulation and the loss to the Treasury that would thus result when the surplus could not be disposed of.

In the case of cotton a very embarrassing competitive boomerang developed in time. Domestic mills paid the higher American price while foreign countries could buy our cotton at world prices. Since these were some 25%-30% below the American price, foreign textile mills began invading our market with textiles that enjoyed this added competitive advantage. Legislation to make good the differential from which the domestic mills suffered, was passed, with the Treasury paying out to the cotton mills the make-up that eliminated the foreign competitive advantage from this source.

Exports of farm products represented an important means of removing surplus crops which continued to accumulate despite acreage control. While output per acre was climbing rapidly, the lower production costs did not lead to higher consumption beyond population increase because of the inelasticity of the demand for most farm products. Withdrawal of land from cultivation also did not assure an "ever normal granary"

because a high yield might undo the acreage cutback. Surpluses continued to embarrass the Government—not so much the farmer since he was assured of his income in any event.

Since exports were sold at world prices and since these were usually below the domestic level of supported prices, our exports became a source of the cost of the Program. Payments to farmers covered their total production of the crops subject to price support, and the higher the export volume and the lower the world price compared with the domestic support price, the higher the cost to the Treasury.

Thus while the Government stimulated exports in many instances, depending on its degree of success, it increased its own out-payments from the Treasury.

The highly restrictive import quotas, such as those relating to raw cotton, wheat, flour, peanuts, dairy products, naturally discouraged the growth of imports. Yet this fact did not, to repeat, lead to a lag in productivity. Quite the contrary. Many of our other agricultural imports were, of course, free of duty since they did not compete with domestic production, such as coffee (the principal item), bananas, tea, cacao-beans, crude rubber.

Our imports of agricultural products have declined sharply over the years in terms of percentage of total imports. In the 1932-36 period 50.9% of our total imports were agricultural. A high point of 1937 when 53.1% of all imports were of that origin. A decline in the proportion set in after World War II. The percentage was 46 during the 1942-46 period. By 1952-56 this had declined to 39%; by 1957-61, to 28%; by 1962-66, to 22% and in 1969-70 to the low level of 14%.

This does not mean that total agricultural imports declined but that other imports, particularly of manufactured goods, grew very much more. Our agricultural imports were \$3.37 billion in the 1947-51 period, and \$5.48 billion in 1970. This slow growth was not attributable wholly to our import quotas, because our imports of duty-free items did no better. The consumption of food products is limited by the population. Coffee imports, duty-free, increased only 7% in pounds from 1950-70. Tea imports increased 21% or one per cent per year.

Exports of Agricultural products also lagged in relation to other exports. During the 1932-36 period they were 36.4% of our total exports, compared with the 50.9% for imports, already mentioned. During the War period (1942-46) exports dropped to 19% of total exports. During 1947-51 the level was 28%, a quite considerable increase; but that level has not again been recaptured. By 1960 the share was down to 26%. There followed a rapid slide which in both 1969 and 1970 reached the level of 16% and 17% respectively. Again, this decline did not mean that there was no growth in these exports but simply that they lagged far behind the growth in our other exports, particularly that of machinery and aircraft. Indeed the exports of these two items alone in 1971 were 2½ times as high as total agricultural exports. (Stat. Abs., 1947, Table 697, p. 632; Ibid, 1971, Table 959, p. 589; Survey of Current Business, Dec. 1971).

Exports of agricultural products would have been on an even lower level had they not been boosted by certain governmental programs through subsidy or outright gifts. These were principally Public Law 480 exports and those that moved under A.I.D. (Act for International Development), Food for Peace, etc. Such exports were at the level of \$835 million in 1955; \$1.28 billion in 1960; \$1.59 billion in 1965 and \$1.01 billion in 1970. Beyond that, certain so-called "commercial" shipments of wheat, cotton, etc., were made at world prices where our Government made up the difference in the form of a subsidy.

In 1970, for example, such "commercial"

exports, i.e., supported by export payments, totaled \$1.17 billion, over and above "Exports under Governmentally-financed programs", which in 1970 were \$1.01 billion, as just noted. Between the two classifications 32.3% of our agricultural exports, or \$2.18 billion, moved in 1970. (Foreign Agricultural Trade of the United States, Monthly of the Economic Research Service, U.S. Dept. of Agri., April 1971, Table 2, p. 8.).

It has been the uninterrupted practice of the Department of Commerce to treat these agricultural exports as true exports and using them in striking a trade balance each month, each quarter and year. *The resulting trade surplus has been used improperly as evidence of the competitive prowess of this country.* Had our "give-away" programs been in the magnitude of \$5 or \$10 billion our competitive position in the world could, of course, have been made to appear in an even more favorable light; but such a showing would not have reflected a stronger competitive position for us.

Import Quotas and Prices

It seems safe to say that but for the import restrictions in the form of import quotas during these many years, based principally on Section 22 of the Agricultural Act of 1935, our wheat, cotton, dairy, beet sugar and farmers of other crops would have ruined by the unimpeded competition from other countries. The object of the quotas was not to raise the prices of these crops (that was done by legislation) but to prevent their falling again to disastrously low levels.

Indeed the prices of the commodities that were placed under import quota protection, with one exception, lagged behind the general price level in 1970. *The record of the price trend in these instances overwhelmingly contradicts the popular impression that import quotas lift prices to the consumers above the level of the prices of products that are not under import restriction, and that the sole purpose of quotas is to raise prices.*

The quota protection unquestionably released the energy of farmers to increase output per acre under a guaranteed price, with the assurance that they would not be deprived of the fruits of their efforts by imports which had the *unearned competitive advantage* that comes from the very low wages paid abroad.

Unfortunate Fall-Out of the Agricultural Program

One of the side effects of the great surge in agricultural efficiency was the displacement of farm workers as well as farmers themselves. Also, stream pollution by hydrogenous and phosphate materials used as fertilizers has aroused the fear of ecologists. The decline in the number of farm workers, noted earlier, was precipitate and massive. Greater efficiency, meaning higher output per man-hour, can indeed only be achieved in any meaningful degree by heavy displacement of workers, either in agriculture, industry or mining. From 1955 to 1970 employment in agriculture declined 48%. (Stat. Abs. 1971, Table 349, p. 223).

These evicted workers, over 5 million from 1950 to 1970, in great numbers crowded into our cities and added to the intractable urban problems of the last decade, including the crowding in the ghettos.

Inelasticity of Demand for Farm Products

Much of the product of farms and grasslands caters to human necessities, particularly in the form of food. The great preponderance of acres is devoted to crops that directly or indirectly go to fill the human stomach. Examples of leading acreage crops are corn (57 million acres of the 1970 300 million-acre total), wheat (44 million acres 1970), hay (63.2 million acres); and soybeans (42 million acres). Other acres of less impressive magnitude were barley (9 million acres), fruits and nuts (4.4 million), vege-

tables for sale (3.3 million), potatoes (1.4 million), beans (1.4 million), rice (1.8 million), peanuts (1.4 million), sugar (2 million). Cotton and tobacco acreage (nonfood items) is small comparatively (11.1 million and 899 thousand acres respectively). Cotton products in general, contrasted to food, enjoy a relatively elastic demand. The amount the consumer may spend on clothing is not limited as is the consumption of food.

Some of the crops mentioned only serve as human food indirectly, as the corn fed to cattle, hogs and poultry, hay for cattle and dairy cows. Some serve nonfood purposes but these are of a smaller magnitude.

It should be recalled that the total potential demand for food products is limited by the number of stomachs to be filled. The demand for these products is therefore quite *inelastic*, even with respect to the luxuries such as Russian caviar. Therefore a lower price will not greatly increase the demand. Whether wheat is a dollar or two dollars per bushel does not shrink or distend the human stomach. Consumption remains quite stable. Per capita wheat consumption has fallen in this country, but for other reasons than price, which today is moderate, i.e., 33% below the 1951-55 price despite the highly restrictive import quota.

Because lower prices do not stimulate demand in this field overproduction quickly threatens a surplus in farm products.

Many products of *industry* are of a different character. If a product is useful, a pleasure to possess, caters to comfort or convenience or to personal social prestige, it may be consumed in multiple units, depending on its price. Milady may have a dozen pairs of shoes when only one pair is needed to avoid going barefooted. A household may have a number of radio and TV sets. If the price is high in relation to consumer income, sales of such products will be limited accordingly. As the price is reduced because of lowered production cost and competition, more consumer pocketbooks are opened. The demand, in other words, is *elastic*. It expands as the price declines but shrinks when the price rises. There are, of course, different degrees of elasticity.

The great objective of American industry the past half century and more has been to find products, principally nonessentials, that cater to consumer desires, and then to bring down the cost of production through increased productivity. If the mass pocketbook could be tapped a bonanza awaited the patent-holders. Examples were the automobile, radio, television, telephones, household appliances, certain chemical products, finery and style goods, etc. It is precisely because such products are nonessential to human subsistence that the demand for them is elastic. The price then becomes important. If this is lowered more people with lower incomes can buy. The purchase of nonessentials can be postponed or curtailed depending on the conditions of the consumer's income, his outlook for employment, etc. For this reason an economy that caters to production of nonessential goods, is quite sensitive to psychological factors, such as the uncertainty caused by rising imports.

The more units that our industries could produce the more could be sold because mass production meant lower costs. Such was the basis for our "growth industries", electronics, chemicals, etc. There was little danger then of a surplus—the exact opposite of the farmers' dilemma. When the latter produce beyond the stomach capacity of the country they quickly accumulate a surplus that must be exported or stored by the Government. However, those who produce nonessential goods also face excess inventories from time to time but for different reasons, such as consumer hesitancy for a variety of reasons to buy what they do not really need.

While the farm program was a phenomenal success as a provider of human necessities,

the price exacted was also high. The striking success in raising productivity levels meant self-displacement by the farmers. *Agricultural efficiency is not a royal road to an everexpanding market. Not at all!* The market responds only marginally. A substitute, such as oleomargarine for butter, which makes an acceptable article, distinctly cheaper, by not expanding the human stomach, simply displaces butter in the family budget. What one product gains in human consumption the other loses. Growth then depends principally on population growth.

This difference between products that enjoy an elastic demand and those that do not has far-reaching production-policy implications. The farm workers who are displaced by machinery stay displaced. If they are to be re-employed they must go elsewhere. This fact, though highly significant, has not been adequately assessed.

Implications for Our Trade Policy

The unique American productive system became possible because of our rejection of the British colonial purpose of maintaining the colonies as agrarian producers of raw materials and as a market for manufactured goods. No agrarian economy can hope to achieve living standards such as are made possible by pointing industry toward the production of nonessential goods. We opened this route to new dimensions before the turn of the last century. We had glimpsed the possibilities of technology in the field of production and prepared the ground legislatively by restraints of monopoly (Sherman Anti-Trust Act 1890, followed later by other anti-monopoly measures). If production of scale was possible because of technological progress it would be of little avail to embark on mass production if monopoly could prevent the passing of savings on costs to the ultimate consumer. (It is doubtful that recognition of this sequence was the basis for anti-monopolistic sentiment. The latter probably arose more from the producers who were squeezed by monopoly power held by their competitors than from public concern.)

When we adopted our Constitution someone had undoubtedly read Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, and in keeping with his philosophy wrote into the Constitution a provision that prohibited the laying of tariffs on goods moving in interstate commerce. This prohibition laid the foundation for a national market in time—precisely what was needed if mass production was to become economically no less than technologically viable when the time for it arrived much later.

As we moved to the status of an independent nation and undertook to develop an industrial base, so sadly and visibly lacking during the War of 1812, we adopted an external tariff. This was necessary to give us a start as an industrial nation.

Yet none of these combined favorable elements would have carried us to a new level, away from the European system, if the role of consumer purchasing power had not been perceived subsequently as an indispensable partner of mass production.

We did indeed embark on a course that in time left behind our inherited attitude toward wages, an attitude that outside this country (except Canada) has persisted. British economists (Ricardo and others) looked upon wages as a necessary evil and held that they should be held at a level that would least burden cost of production. This philosophy, of course, suited the factory owners. They had not perceived employee compensation as the principal component of the market for goods. This vision was left to their American cousins who came up with the interdependence between mass-production and mass-consumption and built an industrial empire on it, as exemplified by the automobile industry.

Elasticity of demand for nonessential goods that would bring moderate or great

satisfaction to the consumer, if he was paid enough as a worker (an objective of organized labor) to buy more goods as the cost was brought down to his income level: that was the twin force that carried us to the pinnacle of industrial development, i.e., lower costs (representing increased productivity) met by rising income (higher wages) in the hands of the consumers.

This scaling of the heights obviously could not have been accomplished through agriculture alone, as already indicated. The demand was not sufficiently elastic for farm products. It was through *industrial* development that we moved far afield from our sister industrial nations. Had these other nations perceived as clearly as our unsung industrial economists (some of them academic) the dependence of production on a mass market they might have accompanied us on the upward escalator from the outset; and we could have had free trade among the nations as among our States. Instead they were skeptical and clung to the old attitude toward wages and thus cramped their market outlet. They stayed far behind us both in productivity and in wage levels until very recent times; and they are still behind in point of wages. Thus was laid the groundwork for the competitive discomfiture of this country during the past decade by the sudden technological catch-up activity of our foreign competitors.

After this country's final demonstration in World War II of what our industrial strength meant, the other capitalistic countries fell in line in pursuit of technological progress. Before long they came indeed to appreciate the need for a more massive market than their current territorial and population limits permitted; and they formed trading blocs (E.E.C. and E.F.T.A. in Europe) to broaden their market. They might have accomplished an interim enlargement of their still small markets by taking a more generous view of wages.

Fifty million Frenchmen could offer a very handsome market if their wages were doubled as their productivity moved upward in a like curve, and likewise the British, the German and the Japanese. The chicken-or-egg sequence, however, presents a stumbling block in all such instances. Which comes first, the higher output with its lower cost, or higher wages with their higher purchasing power? The puzzle can only be broken by the entrepreneur who takes the risk of committing his capital on the basis of confidence. The consumer cannot take the lead toward higher consumption because the price of the goods has not been brought down far enough to attract lower layers of income, and he is not the one who reduces the cost. If he stretches his credit too far he is soon cut off.

Therefore the first step in progress devolves on the enterpriser who must take the lead by increasing his output to gain lower costs, in the fervent hope that the consumers will fall into line when he is able to lay before them the goods they would like to buy if the price should come within their reach. If he is economically wise he will at the same time increase wages to assure higher purchasing power. He can do this because of the increased productivity of the workers using machines. Such was the story of Henry Ford, and he begot followers. It was he who introduced the \$5 per day wage in appreciation of what makes a market.

This forward position taken by one who can sense and anticipate popular demand, who is also a bold risk-taker, indeed represents the entrepreneur's principal function in the capitalistic system. The failures, numerous as they are, are soon forgotten. If the investment climate appears favorable venture capital will soon again lead forth. That, at its best, has been the American experience of the twentieth century until the decade of 1960. The vision of a vast na-

tional market has been the supreme motivation toward cost-reduction by the managerial forces, and this course, prodded by labor pressure, seeking the enlargement of consumer purchasing power through higher wages, not always in keeping with higher productivity, has by and large, been the balancing factor between the two sides of the mass-production, mass-consumption equation.

Mention should perhaps be made of farmer cooperatives as an exception to the usual form of capital formation and entrepreneurial activity in this country; but the cooperatives have been confined principally to the production and marketing of food or other agricultural products, and their success has not invalidated the observations made here about the development and production of nonessential goods.

Lesson from agriculture, industry, and labor

The treatment of all products as if the demand for them were the same or subject to the same influences represents an abysmal error. During the past few decades economists have repeatedly but erroneously equated import competition and the upsets it may produce with both domestic competition and with the disruption that may be caused by invention and development of new products on the domestic scene.

No effort has been made by them to take into account the economic effects of a differential in (1) demand elasticity, (2) divergent competitive levels or (3) the time needed for adjustment. Yet, as we have seen, these differences may be far-reaching and may produce unfortunate consequences in policy decisions if they are not understood, or are ignored.

It is one thing when the automobile replaces the horse and buggy. It is critically different in its consequences when the invention of the harvester combine and the tractor displaces farm workers. Again it is different when development of the television set reduced radio listening and motion-picture attendance.

Those replaced by the harvester combine, the tractor, the cottonpicking machines, etc., remain displaced because the lower costs brought about by the introduction of the machines does not mean greater consumption of the product, such as wheat, as it would if the demand for the product were elastic. Inelasticity of demand locks the door, so to speak, to expanding employment within the immediate field of its displacement. When the cost and the price of the automobile were brought down by mass production and met at the potential-consumer end by people who earned enough money to buy the lower-priced car we had a new industry and it soon employed many more workers than the displaced industry had employed. The new industry was protected by patents and had adequate time to demonstrate its acceptability, usefulness, and economy to the interested consumers, unchallenged by imports enjoying the advantage of yet lower costs. It needed to import competition to prod it in the first place and indeed there was none at that time to disrupt or halt its progress.

This is not to say that the demand for all nonagricultural products is elastic and that therefore consumption will increase handsomely as prices are reduced. There are many exceptions. There are products for which the demand depends not on the product itself but on outside developments. Fuels, steel, construction materials are examples. They are not bought for themselves.

One exception was impressed on us by the recent experience with coal mining. The industry was faced early in the 1950's with extinction by competition from diesel oil, im-

ported residual fuel oil, and natural gas. With great effort the coal industry mechanized itself over a period of 15 years. It achieved a new competitive position, even to the extent of shipping large tonnages to Japan and Italy. Recently, to be sure, the price of coal has risen beyond the general price level, the rise having been aggravated by the high export tonnage, but the effect of maximized productivity for years was to keep the price low while the price of other products rose.

The process of salvation through higher productivity unfortunately displaced from $\frac{2}{3}$ to $\frac{3}{4}$ of our coal miners—over 300 thousand—and gave us the distress of Appalachia. The lower price of coal achieved before other factors raised the level, did not, however, lead to enough additional coal consumption to rehire the displaced miners, much less additional workers. The number of coal miners has declined from 480,000 to about 125,000. The reason for this negative result lay in the relative inelasticity of the demand for coal, totally different from the demand for automobiles.

As in the achievement of greater agricultural efficiency, coal mining also paid another efficiency penalty. A part of the increase in productivity came from the spread of strip-mining that has lately so greatly aroused the ecologists.

Foreign vs. domestic competition

Different as are the effects of cost-reduction among domestic products subject to a different character of demand (in point of elasticity), the effect is not as great as is experienced from import competition such as many industries face today. The disruptive effects of adjustment to domestic competition are often spread over years. The automobile did not replace the horse overnight. It needed a generation or two of time.

On the domestic scene, moreover, there may be no wage differential, or if one exists, as that between the North and the South which motivated the shift of our textile industry, it is not as wide as the differentials separating our wages from those paid by some of our principal foreign competitors. Also, the shift of the cotton textile industry to the South spanned over fifty years of time. Even so the distress in New England was acute. The rise of sharp import competition since World War II has been precipitate by comparison, coming up overnight, so to speak. There was little time for adjustment.

In the past it was often said with some proximity to the truth that our higher wages were offset by our higher productivity compared with that of our foreign competitors. Today the wide diffusion of our technology no longer sustains such a contention. Foreign wages have indeed risen sharply and in many instances proportionately more than our wages, but a 10% increase on our base is equal to a 100% increase in what were the wage levels of some of our leading competitors. Also, in the past we levied a tariff that averaged in the magnitude of 50% ad valorem on imports, whereas today it averages less than 10% on dutiable items, imports of which represent about 65% of total imports.

The importance of the wage differential between the domestic and foreign levels, hand in hand with relative productivity, cannot be ignored without courting false conclusions. In this country employee compensation represents approximately 80% of corporate costs of output. (See Stat. Abs. 1971, Table 493, p. 310). To be properly treated as a cost element labor outlay must be traced from the first steps of production, to this agricultural, extractive or whatever, and then taken through all the steps of processing, refinement, purification or fabrication, all involving their share of employment; picking up transportation charges, insurance, financing and the appropriate share

of interest, plus warehousing, on the way, all of which also call for paid employment, and finally assembling (if it is involved) and finishing.

We have been badly albeit unwittingly misled by the practice of the Bureau of the Census in its definition of industry. What it calls the "automobile industry," for example, incorporates hardly more than one-fifth of the productive activity performed before reaching Detroit, from the iron ore mines to the steel mills, to the coal pits, and all else involved in producing components for an automobile, to the point of making it ready for delivery to the customer. According to the census reports labor costs are only some 15-20% of the value of the automobiles shipped. The error lies in regarding the operation of the four or five companies that merely assemble the final product in Detroit and elsewhere as the "automobile industry." Actually the share of all employee compensation measured against the final f.o.b. Detroit price, we may be sure, is over 75% when all the pre-Detroit operations are taken into account.

The nomenclature of the Census Bureau is a cardinal-error because it conceals the extremely crucial part played by employee compensation (particularly wages) in the capacity of the market to consume agricultural, mineral and industrial output. Nothing measures the market, actual or potential, more accurately than the number of workers employed and the actual or potential level of their compensation. To minimize this, even unintentionally, as is accomplished by the Census Bureau, inhibits the perception of the relation between wages and the market, and understanding its meaning.

Odd consequences of current import competition

Import competition such as has developed during the past decade for American industry has the power to convert the cost-reduction accomplished by industries dedicated to the production of nonessential consumer goods (perhaps over 90% of the total) into the sterile job-generating condition characteristic of producers of essential goods when the cost of the latter is reduced. Like these, the cost-reductions effected by the producers of nonessential goods when they are faced with virtually unimpeded low-cost import competition, result in nearly zero increase in consumption of the American-made product in response to the lower prices, if not actual reduction. New jobs are not generated; they are lost, and the displaced workers are not rehired.

The radio and television workers in producing plants who were dismissed in order to reduce costs remained laid off when improved production methods made it possible for fewer hands to do the work of more, or when segments of the industry moved abroad. The domestic industry does not then achieve larger sales because imports meet the increased demand with yet lower prices. This sterility has resulted from the persistence of a wide wage-gap and the enhanced productivity of foreign industry, whether it be native or American-owned or whether it utilizes foreign patents or works American patents under license. The effect is the same.

The increased employment that would have greeted our household electronic goods industry, as the prices were lowered in response to improved technology in the absence of lethal import competition, took place in other countries. So far as increased employment in the home market was concerned the product, instead of being radio or television receiving sets, or recorders or record players, might as well have been wheat or corn, so far as job-generation was concerned.

So long as foreign producers can challenge our manufacturers or venture capital and virtually pre-empt the mass market or

broad mass market they seek through radical innovations, the outlook for expanded employment from these sources will be dim indeed.

Where else then is expanded employment to arise? Certainly not from increasing agricultural exports! Farm employment is already down to 2.86 million (1970). The only hope lies in the shift to the "service" industries, unless other measures are taken. A heavy movement toward service employment has been underway over several decades. (More on that later).

If our inventive genius and our productive and managerial energies are to be sterilized so far as their capacity to increase employment is concerned, we will be back to a pedestrian economy, and the zero-growth advocates can be happy.

For a time in recent years we were able to increase our exports precisely because the trek overseas by our private direct investors in foreign plants and subsidiaries after 1955 or thereabouts pulled with it much American machinery, equipment and materials in the form of exports. These investments snowballed. The great surplus in machinery and aircraft export that developed in a decade incidentally thoroughly concealed the gaping deficit that was developing in our trade in nearly all other manufactured products. Our 1971 exports of machinery, aircraft and automotive products were 46% of our total exports and over twice as high as our exports of all other manufactured goods, and the deficit of several billion dollars in our trade in these other products was lost to sight. Beyond that the statistical practices of the Department of Commerce had the effect of making our merchandise trade balance look better by some \$5-\$6 billion annually than it actually was in terms of competitive trade.

The export of machinery and modern equipment incidentally helped greatly in building the foreign competitive capacity. The foreign demand generated by our foreign investments, however, was neither self-perpetrating nor permanently wedded to American sources. Now after a decade or more even our machinery manufacturers are being hard pressed by imports of foreign-made machinery.

This means that the high hopes reposed in the increasing export of "high technology" goods as an escape hatch are also being dashed. Machinery and high-technology goods are no more immune to import competition than are other goods. The source of the foreign competitive advantage in the other goods applies as surely to high-technology goods. We have no technological skills superior to those of our competitors. Our producers in the early years of this century merely had higher motivation than their foreign counterparts.

The labor legislation that followed the new farm laws in the 30's was as clear a setting aside of the laissez-faire philosophy or free enterprise as was the farm-price and production-control legislation.

Child labor was outlawed as representing unfair competition. Minimum wages were set for two purposes: to increase labor income and to prevent "cut-throat competition" from "ruthless" employers from undermining the "fair" employers—provided, of course, that the outlawed producers operated in this and not a foreign country.

For some reason foreign wages, though even then far below ours, were not regarded as so much of a menace to our "fair" employers as were the low wages of some employers in this country.

We even encouraged the foreign producers to enter our market by launching a far-reaching tariff-cutting program, thus in-

stituting increasing degrees of laissez-faire in this sector while squeezing it out in nearly all else.

Apparently we loved agriculture more than we loved industry, since we threw import quotas around the most important crops, forgetting or not knowing that industrial employment is much greater and that agricultural employment was destined to shrink greatly under the farm program for reasons that are now chillingly clear.

One prime result of the labor legislation was virtually to take domestic wages out of competition, as was indeed the intent. In other words, approximately 80% of the cost of production was put out of reach of the manufacturers as a competitive defense. This meant highly inflexible costs except those that could be achieved through labor displacement or greater efficiency, which is the same thing.

Thus was American industry left with only one weapon of any consequence, and this was a weapon that at one time did indeed lead to greater employment, as we have seen. Now, however, the scene has so greatly changed that it is no weapon at all other than one of self-destruction, since imports now hold the position of the "sweatshop operators" and unfair employers in this country against whom we legislated so vigorously and with such great popular support as evidenced by the heavy legislative majorities by which the measures carried. The policy even today is to open the door still wider to the foreign producers who are free to exploit our market to their benefit and thus prevent our labor from benefitting from the legislation that was designed to bring us full employment at wages high enough to buy our increasing output.

Foreign entrepreneurs now have the same strong motivation to invade our mass market as our own entrepreneurs harbored when the market was still theirs to develop and supply. The American mass market acts as a magnet and fuels the same tireless efforts abroad aimed at its conquest as its earlier promise fanned the flames of industrial empire-building in this country during the first half of this century.

The invasion cannot be halted and the scene cannot be restored to its earlier attraction for the American entrepreneur unless the unearned competitive advantage held by foreign industries is appropriately moderated, tamed and contained. No more than Henry Ford needed a prod from import competition to create a market for his product does the present-day industrialist depend on a spur from foreign competition to do his best. In contradiction of this view it is necessary only to note that he is active and doing quite well overseas. The same one who is flourishing overseas because of his motivation from that source cannot be called lazy and will become no less active at home if his incentive is returned to him. If the home market re-offers him the incentive it gave him in the past he will reassert his former vigor. The American entrepreneur or industrialist has not thrown up the sponge. If he had done so he would not have invested \$80 billion in foreign enterprise where the grass is greener. We may also reflect that if Henry Ford had faced the investment climate by American producers today in the face of imports, his enterprise would never have been promoted or, having been promoted, would have withered on the vine, or moved abroad.

Negative employment

Meantime the workers who are not employed by industry in this country because of heavy import competition remain among the unemployed or displace others who are still employed. During the decade of 1960-70 four industries that experienced growing im-

port competition, namely, steel, textiles and apparel, leather footwear, and stone, clay and glass, recorded a lag of 427,000 workers behind the growth of employment in all manufacturing industries. If the supplying industries such as coal, cotton, leather, etc. were taken into account the lag was at least double, or some 850,000 workers.

In other words, it is a deceptive practice to measure the effect of imports on employment by simply calculating the number of workers who would have been required to produce the increase in imports. Those who are not hired because of import competition suffer from the dampening of venture capital and the failure of investment to increase as it would in the absence of the strong import-pressure.

Conclusion and remedy

We may let imports share equitably in our market and permit them to grow as our market expands, but we should not sterilize our entrepreneurs by rendering barren their efforts to build a mass market for good, useful and acceptable products.

Since we cannot reach foreign producers to place on them the same restraints, controls and burdens that we have placed on American industry with the effect of rendering it competitively virtually helpless except through the displacement of workers by greater output per man-hour, a course now all but rendered sterile for reasons already elaborated, we face the choice of stagnation or limiting imports in an equitable manner.

The shift of employment from physical production in plants, in mines and on the farms, to the service industries does not invalidate or devalue the function of venture capital. Movement back to an agrarian economy would not, economically speaking, be possible without pulling down the house that American industry built, on the heads of us all. The importers, packagers, transporters, wholesalers, retailers, bankers, insurers, real estate operators, teachers, doctors, lawyers, cannot, by taking in the wash from each other, sustain the industrial system built in this country since 1900. There are still 20 million industrial and mine workers in this country and some 3 million farm workers. They produce over 95% of all the goods that over 200 million of us consume. It is their productivity and not imports that moved us toward the high employment that has been our goal. Imports in many instances have become counterproductive in this respect. It is our productivity in physical goods that we look to for support and sustenance of our tax base, to which in turn, we look as the source of progress in our general welfare.

If we learn from the perceptions, visions, processes and practical application of principles that marked our productive course during the past seventy or eighty years and brought us to world industrial leadership, we will shape our trade policy accordingly.

We will then re-create a climate that will reopen to capital investment at home the opportunities to which it was accustomed until recently; and rising employment will respond even as workers are displaced by more productive machinery. It will be unnecessary to halt foreign investment if we but limit imports from whatever source to a defined share of our market.

Withdrawing from imports the unearned competitive advantage conferred on them by the diffusion of our technology and the failure of our competitors to adopt a wage policy which would soon expand their home market, would return to our industries the climate in which they made their way to the forefront in industrial development and in the standard of living of the American people.

MANDATORY RETIREMENT FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that would prohibit any Member of Congress from taking office after his 65th year. If adopted, it would mean that eventually no Member of the House would be over 67 years of age and no Member of the Senate would be over 71 years of age.

The amendment would, however, permit any older Member of Congress to complete the term of office he or she held at the time the amendment is ratified.

Finally, the amendment would require all Federal judges, including Justices of the Supreme Court, to retire before the end of their 70th year of age, but would allow them to continue to function in an advisory capacity.

It is no coincidence that practically every business corporation in the United States has adopted compulsory retirement for its officers and employees. The retirement age usually is 65 years.

It is not that boards of directors have concluded that all older executives are inefficient or lacking in judgment. Many employees, in fact, continue their vital powers through their 70's and into their 80's. What business has found is that, without mandatory retirement of older employees, it is extremely difficult for a business to attract and hold the able younger men needed to keep the business vigorous and progressive. In short, compulsory retirement is an important way of insuring a continuous flow of life-giving "new blood" to a business organization.

I remember very well when, in the late 1950's, the company for which I worked, one of the largest in the country, adopted a mandatory retirement plan. The chief executive officer of the company was then in his 80's. The effect of the mandatory retirement plan was to retire some 1,200 of the company's executives within a single year. When all of them had retired, a committee of the board of directors called on the octogenarian head of the company for the ostensible purpose of "making a report on the retirement plan." When they had completed their report, the chief executive with a twinkle in his eye said, "Well, I suppose what you really came to tell me was that the plan applies to me too." The committee admitted they had that in mind. The chief executive, who was still a man of exceptional vigor and acumen, promptly announced his retirement.

I submit that Congress is now in a position similar to that top executive. The Congress has established a retirement age for those in Government civil service. Through social security legislation, the Congress has encouraged the movement by business to retire people in their 65th year. Hardly a week passes but what some senior citizen says to me, "When

are they going to make Members of Congress retire like everyone else?" Gentlemen, I think these people have a point.

Some of you may say, "but do not older people have a right to be represented in Congress?" Mr. Speaker, each Member of Congress represents all the people in his district. His age has nothing to do with it. The fact is that most older people with whom I have discussed this subject think that if Members of Congress had to retire like everyone else, the Members would appreciate even more the problems of retirees and prospective retirees.

In the past, several distinguished Members of the House and Senate have faced up to this fact and have introduced bills that would require Members of Congress to retire at a certain age—the maximum age limit varying in different bills between the ages of 60 and 70 years.

The Honorable JOHN J. WILLIAMS, the former senior Senator from Delaware comes most readily to mind. In the final days of the 91st Congress, the Senator proposed a bill similar to the one I am introducing, requiring a compulsory retirement age. It was one of the Senator's final acts before he himself retired. His retirement, I might add, was self-imposed.

I respect Senator Williams for living according to his convictions. And I urge Congress to consider the basic argument in support of his proposal. He believed, as I do, that a compulsory retirement age would make Congress a more efficient, active body that would be more responsive to the increasingly difficult demands that are placed upon it.

Never before, it seems to me, has this argument had as much weight.

Each year as the median age of this country decreases, as we become younger as a Nation, the difference in median ages between the people and their representatives becomes greater. Currently, the median age in this country is about 27 years while the overall median age of Members in Congress is almost twice that—or 52 years.

In my year and 4 months in office, I have discovered how difficult and physically taxing a job in Congress can be. The hours are long; the pressures are great; the problems are complicated.

This is a job for a mature young man or woman, but not for the aged. And yet those in the most powerful positions in Congress tend to be the oldest as well. In the last session, for example, the median age of chairmen of the House standing committees was 68—an age at which most men have left their jobs and have been in retirement for 3 years.

A compulsory age for retirement in Congress would be a significant step toward making our Government more responsive to current needs and overcoming the crisis of confidence that now exists among a great number of our people, young and old alike.

The same basic considerations that indicate the desirability of mandatory retirement for Members of Congress do likewise for members of the Judiciary. Many States, including my own State of Ohio, require judges to retire when they

reach their 70th year. We should apply the same rule to the Federal judiciary.

A copy of my proposed amendment follows:

H.J. RES. 1177

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for mandatory retirement of Members of Congress after the age of sixty-five.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to be valid only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years after the date of final passage of this joint resolution.

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. No person shall be a Member of Congress who at the time of taking office shall have attained the age of 66 years.

SEC. 2. This article shall not affect the eligibility of any Member of Congress to complete the term of office which he or she occupied at the time of ratification of this article.

SEC. 3. No justice of the Supreme Court or judge or magistrate in any lower court of the United States shall continue in such office after he or she shall have attained the age of 71 years."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ESCH (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business as member of Committee on Science and Astronautics.

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. McFALL), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. HAGAN (at the request of Mr. McFALL), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. CASEY of Texas), until May 6, on account of illness.

Mr. WINN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business as member of Committee on Science and Astronautics.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHMITZ) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOGAN, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. DERWINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KEMP, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LINK) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ for 10 minutes today.
 Mr. ROSENTHAL for 30 minutes today.
 Mr. ASPIN for 10 minutes today.
 Mr. KASTENMEIER for 5 minutes today.
 Mr. MURPHY of New York for 5 minutes today.
 Mr. HENDERSON for 5 minutes today.
 Mrs. ABZUG for 60 minutes on May 2.
 Mr. RYAN for 60 minutes on May 3 and May 4.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ROONEY of New York to revise and extend his remarks and to include an address by Honorable Abba Eban, Foreign Minister of State of Israel.

Mr. McCORMACK and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHMITZ) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. WHALEN.
 Mr. SCHERLE in 10 instances.
 Mr. MILLS of Maryland.
 Mr. FISH.
 Mr. ESCH.
 Mr. RIEGLE in two instances.
 Mr. PELLY in two instances.
 Mr. SCHMITZ in two instances.
 Mr. HALPERN in three instances.
 Mr. SANDMAN.
 Mr. SHOUP in two instances.
 Mr. VEYSEY.
 Mr. ZWACH.
 Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
 Mr. FRENZEL.
 Mr. McCLOSKEY.
 Mr. HUNT.
 Mr. GROVER.
 Mr. KEMP in two instances.
 Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.
 Mr. DERWINSKI.
 Mr. BRAY in two instances.
 Mr. RAILSBACK in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LINK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. ABZUG in 10 instances.
 Mr. MONTGOMERY.
 Mr. BEGICH in eight instances.
 Mr. MILLER of California in five instances.
 Mr. LONG of Maryland in two instances.
 Mr. BADILLO in five instances.
 Mr. ROY.
 Mr. HARRINGTON in three instances.
 Mr. DIGGS in six instances.
 Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.
 Mr. ROSENTHAL in five instances.
 Mr. VANIK in two instances.
 Mr. RANGEL in three instances.
 Mr. ALEXANDER in five instances.
 Mr. JAMES V. STANTON in two instances.
 Mr. EDWARDS of California in three instances.
 Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in three instances.
 Mr. HAMILTON.
 Mr. HALEY in two instances.
 Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.

Mr. ZABLOCKI in three instances.
 Mr. ROONEY of New York.
 Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 218. Joint resolution to amend the authority conferred by the Export Administration Act of 1949.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LINK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 26, 1972, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1903. A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting proposed amendments to the Rules of Criminal Procedure for the U.S. District Courts and to the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, adopted by the Supreme Court pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 3771 and 3772, together with the report of the Judicial Conference of the United States submitted to the Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 331 (H. Doc. No. 92-285); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1904. A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, Department of the Army, transmitting a report on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment covering the quarter ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HOLIFIELD: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 4383. A bill to authorize the Office of Management and Budget to establish a system governing the creation and operation of advisory committees throughout the Federal Government which are created to advise officers and agencies of the Federal Government; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-1017). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:
 H.R. 14583. A bill making appropriations for the Bureau of Customs for fiscal year

ending June 30, 1973; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BADILLO (for himself, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Mr. PEPPER):

H.R. 14584. A bill to assure opportunities for employment to unemployed and underemployed persons, to assist States and local communities in providing needed public services, to provide job training and guidance when necessary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 14585. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the expeditious naturalization of certain former alien employees of the United States who have been admitted to the United States for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 14586. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the prevention of Cooley's anemia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. WILLIAM

D. FORD, and Mr. MOSS):

H.R. 14587. A bill to prohibit the leasing or rental of public lands of the United States except on condition that free public access thereto be provided; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DUNCAN (for himself and Mr. SHOUP):

H.R. 14588. A bill to amend section 120 of title 23, United States Code, to provide that the Federal share payable for Interstate System projects shall be 100 percent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DU PONT:

H.R. 14589. A bill to amend section 610 of title 18, United States Code, to clarify the prohibition against political contributions or expenditures by national banks, corporations, or labor organizations; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 14590. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that no deduction shall be allowable for certain amounts expended for advertising in a national political convention program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 14591. A bill establishing a commission to develop a realistic plan leading to the conquest of multiple sclerosis at the earliest possible date; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (for herself and Mr. WYATT):

H.R. 14592. A bill to provide congressional due process in questions of war powers as required by the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 14593. A bill to amend the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 to provide for minimum Federal payments after July 1, 1972, for relocation assistance made available under federally assisted programs; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 14594. A bill to improve the quality of child development programs by attracting and training personnel for those programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 14595. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for educational expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENT:

H.R. 14596. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in or near

Yaphank, N.Y.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McKEVITT (for himself, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. BROZMAN, and Mr. EVANS of Colorado):

H.R. 14597. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the planning, design, and construction of outdoor recreational facilities in connection with the 1976 winter Olympic games; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MELCHER:

H.R. 14598. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to require the Secretary of Labor to recognize the difference in hazards to employees between small employers and other employers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 14599. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefit of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; and to remove rate inequities for married persons where both are employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 14600. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to transfer barbiturates from schedule III to schedule II of such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 14601. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to include drugs requiring a physician's prescription among the items and services covered under the hospital insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 14602. A bill to amend section 607(k) (8) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 14603. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 14604. A bill to exempt citizens of the United States who are 65 years of age or older from paying entrance or admission fees for certain recreational areas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 14605. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit any married individual or head of a household who is not covered by an employers pension plan to establish a qualified pension plan for himself in the same manner as if he were a self-employed individual earning \$13,000 per year (reduced by the amount of his earnings from self-employment); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BURTON, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DOW, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts):

H.R. 14606. A bill to provide for the establishment of an Older Workers Conservation Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FISH, Mr. FREY, Mr. GALLAGHER, M. HECHLER

of West Virginia, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. VEYSEY, and Mr. VIGORITO):

H.R. 14607. A bill to provide for the establishment of an Older Workers Conservation Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TERNAN, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. WINN, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 14608. A bill to provide for the establishment of an Older Workers Conservation Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 14609. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 14610. A bill to allow a credit of not more than \$300 against Federal income tax for State and local real property taxes (or an equivalent portion of rent) and for home repair and improvement expenses paid by individuals who have attained age 65 with respect to their residences; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 14611. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of certain motor vehicle license tags, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 14612. A bill to amend section 715 of title 32 of the United States Code to provide that claims for damage or injury caused by members of the Army or Air National Guard shall be allowed under such section notwithstanding the availability of remedies against the States for such damage or injury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona (for himself and Mr. RHODES):

H.R. 14613. A bill to amend the Taylor Grazing Act to increase the amount of certain revenue returned to the State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 14614. A bill to protect the public interest in the field of professional team spectator sports; to provide for financial stability among professional sports franchises; to protect the interests of professional athletes; to improve the relationship between professional and amateur sports; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 14615. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for tuition paid for the elementary or secondary education of dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASEY of Texas:

H.J. Res. 1175. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating July 20 as "National Moon Walk Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.J. Res. 1176. Joint resolution to establish a permanent Commission on United States Participation in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

H.J. Res. 1177. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for mandatory re-

tirement of Members of Congress after the age of 65; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.J. Res. 1178. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the nomination of individuals for election to the offices of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ANDREWS of Alabama:

H. Con. Res. 591. Concurrent resolution to urge each American family to plant a vegetable garden; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina:

H. Res. 942. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that the full amount appropriated for fiscal year 1972 for the Farmers Home Administration's farm operating loan program and waste facility grant program authorized by the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, be released and made available by the Administration to carry out the objectives of these programs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

377. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

378. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROZMAN:

H.R. 14616. A bill for the relief of Edson K. Hartzell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 14617. A bill for the relief of Lester H. Kroll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H. Res. 943. Resolution to refer the bill (H.R. 3462) entitled "A bill for the relief of Seaview Electric Company" to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause I of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

218. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the 23d Saipan Legislature, Saipan, Mariana Islands, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, relative to Micronesian claims arising as a result of World War II; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

219. Also, petition of Gov. Patrick Lucey and 31 members of the Wisconsin legislature, Madison, Wis., relative to the war in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

220. Also, petition of Lily B. Sullivan, Los Angeles, Calif., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.