

much to help the U.S. farmer in many ways, and to assist in showing a hefty surplus to our balance of payments.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Salem, Oreg., May 12, 1972.
Hon. MARK O. HATFIELD,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: It has been called to our attention that Senate Bill 3526 dealing with 10% reduction in overseas personnel of the U.S. Government, except State Department, is out of committee.

We seek your concern as to the effect this has on agriculture, particularly at a time when we are in the process of recovering from the effects of a nearly disastrous dock strike.

As a result of this past dock strike it is now more important than ever that we maintain a man-to-man and day-to-day contact with our major overseas customers. The Agricultural Attache and Foreign Agricultural Service provide that necessary liaison for overseas agricultural market development.

Soon we will be into the harvest of a new crop with the potential, as in wheat, of being of bumper proportions, which must be moved in an orderly manner or will be subject to costly delays in export supply and deterioration of quality.

This crop, for instance, represents a \$65 million farm value in Oregon alone, of which 85% is traditionally sold into export.

We bring this to your attention because of your concern in export markets both when you were Governor and now as Senator.

We appreciate your attention to this Senate Bill as it is vitally important that overseas agricultural personnel be maintained.

Sincerely,

JAY GLATT,
Administrator, Agricultural Development
Division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, what is the pending question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN).

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the program for tomorrow is as follows:

The Senate will convene at 12 o'clock noon. After the two leaders or their assistants have been recognized under the standing order the distinguished Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Brock) will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, after which there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 30 minutes, with statements limited therein to 3 minutes. At the conclusion of the period for the transaction of routine morning business, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill, on which there is a time limitation of not to exceed 1 hour. The unfinished business, S. 3526, in the meantime will be temporarily laid aside. Upon the disposition of the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill the Senate will return to the consideration of the unfinished business, S. 3526.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I thank the Presiding Officer.

I wish to state that there could be a rollcall vote on the adoption of the conference report tomorrow. I have no indication of such at the moment, but Senators should be alerted to the possibility thereof.

Moreover, there could be rollcall votes on amendments to S. 3526, the unfinished business, during the afternoon tomorrow; and Senators understand that tabling motions are in order at any time and that a vote on a tabling motion with respect to any amendment can be had quickly, tabling motions being nondebatable. Senators, I repeat, ought to be alerted to the possibility of rollcall votes tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 5:05 p.m., the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 18, 1972, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 17, 1972:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

George P. Shultz, of Illinois, to be Secretary of the Treasury.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Robert E. Adamson, Jr., U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Vice Adm. Frederick H. Schneider, Jr., U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral, when retired, pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Vice Adm. Nels C. Johnson, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral, when retired, pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Vice Adm. Evan P. Aurand, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral, when retired, pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Thomas Patrick Melady, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Uganda.

Robert L. Yost, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Burundi.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 17, 1972:

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

The following-named persons to be members of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs for terms expiring May 11, 1975:

David R. Derge, of Indiana.
Jewel LaFontant, of Illinois.
William C. Turner, of Arizona.

IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Nominations beginning Richard J. Bloomfield, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 1, and ending John Stern Wolf, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 7, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 4, 1972.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, May 17, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Merrill W. Drennan, Metropolitan Memorial United Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, come nearer to us than we have ever known and stay with us through the deliberations of this day.

In these days when men freely judge and condemn each other, remind us of the words:

Judge not that you be not judged; for with the judgment you pronounce, you will be judged, and the measure you give will be the measure you get.

You, our Father, will know whether at the end of this day we will have been merely echoes, whether we will have done Your will or our own, or, worse still, have done nothing.

Hear us, our Father, as we pray for a

freshness of spirit to renew our faith and to brighten our hopes. 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.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOSEPH M. BOWMAN, JR.

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

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret and personal sorrow that I announce to the House the sudden death last night, May 16, 1972, of the Honorable Joseph Merrill Bowman, Jr., of Georgia, a former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and in late 1968 and early 1969 Acting Under Secretary of the Treasury.

In his official capacity as a senior official of the Treasury Department, as well as a personal friend, Joseph Bowman was well known to and highly respected by many Members of the House of Representatives.

A lawyer by profession, both prior to entering and after leaving Government service, he was a capable and effective lawyer and advocate. A member of the bar of Georgia and of the District of Columbia, he was a partner of the firm of Corcoran, Foley, Youngman, and Rowe, of Washington, D.C. He was actively engaged in the practice of his profession until the close of business yesterday afternoon. While walking from his office to his automobile, he was suddenly stricken and died shortly thereafter at George Washington University Hospital.

Joe was born in Valdosta, Ga., June 23, 1931. He was the son of Mrs. Martha Stanley Bowman and the late Joseph Merrill Bowman, Sr., of Quitman, Ga. He attended the public schools of Quitman and the school of arts and sciences and the Lamar School of Law, both of Emory University, Georgia. He was a member of Phi Delta Theta Fraternity and Phi Delta Phi honorary legal fraternity, and a cadet in the Air Force ROTC at Emory University. During and after the Korean conflict, he served with distinction in the U.S. Air Force, leaving active duty and returning to the practice of law in 1956. He was a partner in the law firm of Kennedy, Kennedy, Seay, and Bowman in Barnesville, Ga.

In 1957 he became my legislative assistant and served in this capacity until he returned to Georgia to reenter the practice of law. During the time that he served as a member of my staff he proved himself to be an outstanding and valuable congressional staff member as well as a warm and close personal friend of mine.

In 1961 he returned to Washington to become Assistant to the Secretary of Labor in the Office of Legislative Affairs. Almost immediately thereafter he was appointed assistant to the then Secretary of the Treasury, C. Douglas Dillon, and was assigned to the Office of Legislative Affairs in the Treasury Department.

In this capacity as well as when he later served as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury he served as a White House liaison officer and frequently participated in prelegislative conferences on tax legislation and other major administration measures.

During this time he became a close associate of the then Secretary of the

Treasury, Henry H. Fowler, and was appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. When Secretary Fowler resigned and Under Secretary of the Treasury Joseph W. Barr became Secretary, Mr. Bowman became Acting Under Secretary of the Treasury and served in that capacity until January 20, 1969.

He received the Alexander Hamilton Award, the highest award which can be given to an official of the Treasury Department.

Joe Bowman was an able lawyer and a dedicated and trusted public official. He was my devoted personal friend, and I shall miss him very much.

Mr. Bowman is survived by his widow, the former Isabella Nichols, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. C. B. Nichols of Griffin, Ga., and by three children, Joseph Nichols, Mary Bayne, and Henry Fowler.

Patty and our children extend to Sissy, Joe, Mary, and Henry and to the other members of Joe's family our love and heartfelt sympathy.

PASSING OF STRICTER GUN CONTROL LAWS IS FALLACIOUS THINKING

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the terrible incident earlier this week in which George Wallace was struck down by a would-be assassin is stimulating some to suggest that stricter gun laws be passed as a cure for such incidents. This thinking is a fallacy. The man who committed the crime was in violation of both Federal and State gun control laws before he committed his crime. He was subject to arrest before he pulled the trigger. The answer to the problem quite obviously is law enforcement.

A man pulled the trigger. It was the befuddled logic of a human being which brought on this tragedy. Stricter legislation would not have prevented that man from getting a gun. In fact, he once had been arrested on a weapons charge and yet, despite existing law, he managed to get another gun, transport it across State lines, and gun down a candidate for President. Again, it is law enforcement that is needed.

Congress has enacted far-reaching crime curbs and has appropriated millions upon millions of dollars to implement crime control. Before we go overboard in the clamor for new legislation which would deprive law-abiding Americans of the right to own weapons to protect themselves, their homes, and their families, let us calmly consider the facts. Passing laws does not get to the heart of the problem. Federal and State gun control laws already in being should have prevented the attack on Governor Wallace, but criminals will get guns despite laws, whether they be existing laws or new laws.

GOV. GEORGE C. WALLACE

(Mr. BIAGGI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

ute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Nation was shocked once again with yet another political shooting. I am sure that my colleagues join with me in praying for the speedy recovery of Gov. George C. Wallace.

Indeed, whether we agree or disagree with the political philosophy of the Governor, we all must band together in condemning this senseless act of violence. What is at stake here is the right of every American to seek the highest office in the land without risking his life, to be able to speak out on the issues of the day without being cut down by a bullet.

Yesterday's tragic events brought back the chilling memories of previous political assassinations of the recent past. The assassinations of our President, John F. Kennedy, his brother Robert, and the Rev. Martin Luther King. Now, in this presidential campaign year, we once again face the ominous nightmare of political assassination attempts. A cloud hangs over the entire country since we never know if this senseless act will be repeated. Indeed, to allow such shootings and killings to continue can only result in anarchy in our society.

Let us not stand idly by and wait for yet another assassination or assault on a President or candidate for that Office to take place.

We must take action to control the violence within our society. To neglect this issue is to invite future tragedy.

I would like to extend my sympathies to Governor Wallace's family in this moment of crises, and pray that the Governor recovers quickly.

DISILLUSIONMENT OF OUR PEOPLE

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

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, much of the discussion in the political arena, both among the participants and the pundits, centers around the disillusionment of our people. Certainly, it is clear to all of us who have been back in our districts that there is some, if not a great deal, of truth in this allegation. Many of our people are extremely disenchanted with their Government at all levels, particularly because they feel a deep lack of responsiveness to their needs.

A case in point recently occurred in my district. More than 8,000 employees of the National Cash Register Co. in Dayton had a collective bargaining agreement pending before the Pay Board. The contract was submitted to the Board on January 31, 1972. Only after much prodding by me did the Board render a decision late in April. Then, compounding the tardiness of its action, the Board misrepresented its own decision. First, I was advised that the entire package had been approved. Over a week later, the determination was made that only a portion of the fringe benefits was being permitted. Thus, not only was the manner in which the Pay Board handled the case inept, but it was totally irresponsible in interpreting its own action. Without a doubt, this situation is a shining example of administrative inefficiency.

While I am very disappointed by the decision because I do not believe that the package was inflationary, what disturbs me most is the lack of confidence which the Board's handling of the matter helps engender.

RULES GOVERNING THE INSERTION OF EXTRANEAN PRINTED MATTER INTO THE RECORD

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the "boxed" notice which appears on page 1 of this morning's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. (The box referred to not printed in Bound volume.)

I commend and thank the Joint Committee on Printing, for setting the record straight as to the rules which govern the insertion of extraneous printed matter into the RECORD, which is separate from the chronicling of debate and procedure.

However, Mr. Speaker, this action does not in any way negate the need for our colleagues to exercise restraint and good judgment as they participate in the daily meetings of this body. I recognize that part of the process of constituent representation is the need to enlighten the Members and constituent public to one's point of view, but let it be done within the framework under which this House works best; that is, the law of the land, knowing always that if need be we alone are the proper resort for change.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 14582, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 14582) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of May 11, 1972.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement is under the budget requests by about \$518 million. It is under the Senate-passed bill by about \$715 million. It is over the House-passed bill by about \$393 million.

The budget estimates considered by the House were about \$4.7 billion.

The budget estimates considered by the Senate were about \$4.8 billion.

The bill as passed by the House totaled about \$3.9 billion.

As passed by the Senate, the bill totaled about \$5 billion.

The Senate version of the bill was over the budget by \$197 million net, and over the House version by a net of about \$1.1 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the major items that were the subject of conference are the following:

The Senate version of the bill provided \$320 million for a subscription payment to the International Development Association. The House took the position that this proposal could better be handled in the regular foreign aid appropriation bill, and the conference report states that it is the intention of the conferees to provide these funds at a subsequent date for the fiscal year 1973.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman speaking about the funds that take care of the "short fall" in international accounts? Are those the funds to which he is alluding?

Mr. MAHON. No; I was referring to the International Development Association item. We have by action of the Congress in authorizing legislation, and on recommendation of the administration, subscribed \$320 million a year for a period of 3 years. The law requires that these installments be provided on an annual basis, but it was the thought of the conference—certainly of the House conferees—that this amount should not be in this supplemental appropriation bill but should be in the regular bill for the fiscal year 1973 and again for the fiscal year 1974 and again for the fiscal year 1975.

Mr. GROSS. Then the "short fall" funds are not involved in any way by the language in this bill?

Mr. MAHON. No, they are not in any way involved.

Mr. GROSS. It does not in any way involve or change the \$1.6 billion that was approved by the House not too long ago. So that is not affected by this bill?

Mr. MAHON. The \$1.6 billion has already been provided by the Congress on account of the devaluation of the dollar.

Mr. GROSS. That was an outright appropriation.

Mr. MAHON. That was an outright appropriation brought about by the devaluation of the dollar by our Government in which the legislative branch concurred.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield for another question.

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

Mr. GROSS. Are there any funds in this bill for Amtrak?

Mr. MAHON. Yes, the original bill as reported to the House, contained \$170 million for Amtrak. This was stricken out, as the gentleman will recall, on a point of order from the floor because the authorizing bill had not been enacted into law.

The other body put in the sum of \$270 million for Amtrak. The House conferees thought that this was an indefensible escalation of a program that was unauthorized to the House conferees on this bill. We were able to secure an agreement with the conferees of the other body that the figure, as approved in the Senate, would be reduced by \$100 million.

So the figure in the conference agreement is \$170 million.

Mr. GROSS. Is that \$107 million or \$170 million?

Mr. MAHON. The figure is \$170 million.

Continuing, the Senate added, for helium procurement, \$45.3 million. We agreed to this with certain restrictions.

Then, for the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer jobs program, the other body added \$152 million above the budget estimate and above the House bill. In conference that increase was reduced from \$152 million to \$61 million plus, with the budget estimate of \$95 million, that makes a total in the bill of \$156.550 million.

The cancer training and research program was placed in the bill in the other body and agreed to by the House, at \$40 million—the budget figure.

For the Followthrough program in education, which is very important as an experimental effort on the part of the Government, the Senate added \$9 million. The House bill did not include the item although an amendment was offered. But in the other body, \$9 million was added. In conference the Senate figure of \$9 million was reduced to \$3 million. Twenty-six projects in a number of States were reduced. The managers on the part of the House and the Senate agreed that the amount provided is to continue in operation those Followthrough projects—currently scheduled for discontinuance—of the highest priority for 1 year.

Then for educational opportunity grants and college work study programs and the national defense education student loans program, there was included by the other body \$300 million—\$257.7 million above the request. In the conference that figure of \$300 million was scaled down to \$100 million.

For the OEO emergency food and medical program, the other body added \$30 million—not budgeted. The House agreed to a figure of \$20 million in lieu of the \$30 million.

Then with respect to aid to impacted school areas, in which many of our congressional districts and States are interested, the Senate added language to provide additional expenditure authority, but that language was stricken from the bill in conference.

The other body added about \$3.9 million above the House bill for the International Labor Organization, but that figure was also deleted in conference.

I have already discussed the \$170 million Amtrak provision with the gentleman from Iowa.

Then there was a restoration of funds for certain building projects, which the Senate had deleted, of about \$37.2 million.

That about covers the major items that were in conference on this bill, the totality of which is \$4,347,698,270 as agreed to.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a tabular summary of the conference agreement by chapters, with comparisons:

SUMMARY ACTION OF CONFERENCE ACTION ON THE SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1972 (H.R. 14582)

Chapter No.		Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Recommended in Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared to—		
						Budget	House	Senate
TITLE I—GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS								
I	Agriculture—Environmental and Consumer Protection:							
	New budget (obligational) authority	\$4,604,000	\$4,604,000	\$14,704,000	\$4,604,000			—\$10,100,000
	By transfer	(1,061,000)	(1,061,000)	(1,061,000)	(1,061,000)			
II	Defense	154,312,000	154,312,000	144,312,000	144,312,000	—\$10,000,000	—\$10,000,000	
III	District of Columbia:							
	Federal funds: New budget (obligational) authority	7,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	—4,000,000		
	District of Columbia funds:							
	New budget (obligational) authority	(91,246,000)	(76,928,000)	(74,604,000)	(74,439,000)	(—16,807,000)	(—2,489,000)	(—165,000)
IV	Foreign Operations	320,320,000	320,000	320,320,000	320,000	—320,000,000		—320,000,000
V	Housing and Urban Development, Space, Science, and Veterans:							
	New budget (obligational) authority	40,645,000	40,645,000	42,569,000	40,645,000			—1,924,000
	By transfer	(1,924,000)	(1,924,000)		(1,924,000)			(+1,924,000)
VI	Interior and related agencies:							
	New budget (obligational) authority	174,626,000	130,816,000	176,619,000	176,619,000	+1,993,000	+45,803,000	
	By transfer	(1,340,000)				(—1,340,000)		
	Appropriation to liquidate contract authority	(13,000,000)	(13,000,000)	(13,000,000)	(13,000,000)			
VII	Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare:							
	New budget (obligational) authority	1,061,601,000	978,901,000	1,510,413,000	1,203,451,000	+141,850,000	+224,550,000	—306,962,000
	By transfer	(573,000)	(573,000)	(573,000)	(573,000)			
	Limitations on administrative and nonadministrative expenses	(20,420,000)	(20,420,000)	(20,420,000)				
VIII	Legislative branch	2,371,000	2,051,000	2,831,000	2,831,000	+460,000	+780,000	
IX	Public Works:							
	New budget (obligational) authority	320,000		320,000		—320,000		—320,000
	By transfer	(180,000)		(180,000)	(180,000)		(+180,000)	
X	State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary:							
	New budget (obligational) authority	95,377,529	90,336,110	94,244,279	90,336,110	—5,041,419		—3,908,169
	By transfer	(582,000)	(582,000)	(582,000)				
XI	Transportation:							
	New budget (obligational) authority	173,500,000	1,140,000	273,540,000	173,540,000	+40,000	+172,400,000	—100,000,000
	Appropriation to liquidate contract authority	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)			
XII	Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government	189,101,400	162,337,400	123,593,400	162,337,400	—26,764,000		+38,744,000
XIII	Claims and judgments	5,508,032		5,508,032	5,508,032		+5,508,032	
	Total, title I—General supplementals:							
	New budget (obligational) authority	2,229,285,961	1,568,462,510	2,711,973,711	2,007,503,542	—221,782,419	+439,041,032	—704,470,169
	By transfer	(5,660,000)	(4,140,000)	(2,396,000)	(4,320,000)	(—1,340,000)	(+180,000)	(+1,924,000)
	Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses	(20,420,000)	(20,420,000)	(20,420,000)	(20,420,000)			
	Appropriations to liquidate contract authority	(33,000,000)	(33,000,000)	(33,000,000)	(33,000,000)			
TITLE II—INCREASED PAY COSTS								
	New budget (obligational) authority	2,636,657,428	2,385,990,848	2,351,543,728	2,340,194,728	—296,462,700	—45,796,120	—11,349,000
	By transfer	(47,496,959)	(94,505,959)	(94,505,959)	(94,505,959)	(+47,009,000)		
	Limitations on administrative and nonadministrative expenses	(24,277,000)	(24,277,000)	(24,277,000)	(24,277,000)			
GRAND TOTAL—TITLES I AND II:								
	New budget (obligational) authority	4,865,943,389	3,954,453,358	5,063,517,439	4,347,698,270	—518,245,119	+393,244,912	—715,819,169
	By transfer	(53,156,959)	(98,645,959)	(96,901,959)	(98,825,959)	(+45,669,000)	(+180,000)	(+1,924,000)
	Limitations on administrative and nonadministrative expenses	(44,697,000)	(44,697,000)	(44,697,000)	(44,697,000)			
	Appropriations to liquidate contract authority	(33,000,000)	(33,000,000)	(33,000,000)	(33,000,000)			

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman again yield briefly?

Mr. MAHON. I am delighted to yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What we did not previously discuss in connection with Amtrak was the fact that, apparently, it was only because an authorization bill had not been passed that the House conferees did not agree to \$100 million more for Amtrak. Can this be so?

Mr. MAHON. I yield, for response, to the chairman of the subcommittee handling the Department of Transportation appropriations, the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL).

Mr. McFALL. My reply to the gentleman from Iowa is that, no, that is not the reason. There are two main reasons: One, there was a letter from John Volpe, Secretary of Transportation, stating that the administration would not utilize more than \$170 million; second, the committee is opposed to the expenditure of more than \$170 million. We felt that if they needed more than \$170 million for Amtrak, they should come back and justify it before the committee and before the House of Representatives.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, let me read one sentence in the report which states:

Since the authorizing legislation for this

program has not been enacted into law, the conferees are in agreement that action on the additional \$100,000,000 included by the Senate has been deferred without prejudice to future consideration.

Mr. McFALL. That would be also another reason, but the main reasons are the ones I have stated.

Mr. MAHON. I would point out to the gentleman from Iowa that there are some of us who take a rather dim view of Amtrak. We would all like to see the railroads revived. We believe there is a place for rail transportation that will be utilized by the public in certain areas of the United States. But we think in certain other areas it is a more or less hopeless endeavor. I would not like to see a lot of money poured down the rathole, so to speak, of this program. What we stated, as has been pointed out—and this was agreed to—is as follows:

Since the authorizing legislation for this program has not been enacted into law, the conferees are in agreement that action on the additional \$100,000,000 included by the Senate has been deferred without prejudice to future consideration.

This in no way embraces support of the additional \$100 million, and I hope that this will be placed in italics, so to speak.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, my dim view of Amtrak does not

include even the \$170 million. I simply cannot go along with an authorization on the part of the House of \$170 million for Amtrak, dim view or bright view.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. MAHON, has, I believe, made an adequate explanation of the results of the conference. It would merely encumber the record for me to add much to what he said, although I should like to add that we spent 2 days in this conference. The differences were not easily resolved. There were considerable differences of opinion which developed in the conference. It was only after extensive debate and full and mature consideration that we were able to come up with a conference agreement.

I believe the record will show that the House conferees well maintained the position of the House. We got better than a 50-50 break.

Those Members who have served on conference committees know that conferees on either side cannot always have their own way. We had some give and take, and finally were able to come up with a conference report which I believe the House will approve.

I would merely reemphasize what the gentleman from Texas has said, that the Senate-passed bill amounted to \$1.1 billion more than the House-passed bill. So we were in conference about considering a difference in excess of \$1 billion. The net result was in the end that the Senate receded on \$715 million plus and the House conferees agreed to an increase of \$393 million plus, which indicates that we did not just strike a 50-50 balance but that we worked it out on a line item basis, and finally came up with what I consider to be a reasonable compromise with the other body.

I support the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, having served as one of the House conferees I support this report.

It should be noted that with the increases in manpower training there will be 750,000 summer job slots open under the neighborhood youth corps program.

These jobs added to those that will be available because of lapsed funds in the public employment program of approximately 59,000; an expected 175,000 through the JOBS program; 161,000 through State employment security agencies; 60,000 or 65,000 that will be funded through regular salaries and expense accounts of all Federal agencies including the Defense Department; and approximately 3,000 in the Youth Conservation Corps will give us a total of around 1,200,000 summer job slots. That is the best we've ever done in this area.

We also agreed to an increase of \$2,200,000 in the summer recreation program.

Then, too, Mr. Speaker, I should mention that while the House bill had no money in it for the followthrough program, the conference report carries \$3 million to partially fund for another year the most exemplary projects among those 26 that were scheduled to be phased out. It should be emphasized that this whole program is an experimental one and those school districts that have ongoing programs should be thinking of funding this activity through title I funds to which they are entitled.

There are some good models already available for replication and that was the original intent and purpose of followthrough.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, under the higher education items, funds in this conference report we have additional money to provide a total of 323,700 educational opportunity grants, 592,000 work-study grants, and 688,000 NDEA student loans for the coming school year ending June 30, 1973.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it was my thought that this deficiency appropriation bill when it passed the House was pretty plush, in other words it was already far too rich in spending. Now we find that it is almost \$400 million more

than the \$3.9 billion bill that was approved by the House. This to me is unacceptable.

Moreover, I cannot support a bill with \$170 million in it for Amtrak. I appreciate the reservations on the part of the distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. MAHON, but I cannot support it.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I believe the record should show that while we are, as the gentleman says, \$390 million above the House-passed bill, the Senate considered more than \$100 million in budget requests that we did not even consider. Moreover, the \$170 million Amtrak item was not in the bill when it left the House. These two items account for \$270 million of the increases over the House-passed bill.

I yield such time as he may need to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, all I can say is I associate myself with the remarks of the chairman and the ranking minority member.

It was a very difficult issue which we wrestled with in conference. The Senate conferees were most adamant. They wanted the extra \$100 million. I joined Congressman McFALL in opposing it. I believe Senator CASE led the fight along with Senator MAGNUSON, and we debated this matter for 3 hours. I believe we won a good fight, and the House should go along and accept it.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I will only add one other thing.

In addition to the more than \$100 million that was first presented by the Bureau of the Budget to the Senate, the \$170 million was knocked out on a point of order, and that was included in the \$390 million, too.

I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this second supplemental appropriation bill involves all of the members of the 55-member Appropriations Committee. Hearings were held before the House considered the bill and there was wide participation on the part of this largest committee of the House in the writing of this bill and in the conference with the Senate. I would point out that the House conferees, while not completely unanimous in their views, worked together to try to secure a conference agreement which would be reasonably acceptable. Some subcommittees were more heavily involved than others.

I list again for the RECORD at this point the identity of the House conferees and commend each of them for contributions made: Messrs. MAHON, WHITTEN, ROONEY of New York, PASSMAN, EVINS of Tennessee, BOLAND, NATCHER, FLOOD, STEED, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Messrs. McFALL, BOW, JONAS, CEDERBERG, MICHEL, CONTE, SHRIVER, and McDADE.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as one of the conferees on H.R. 14582, I wish to express my support of the conference report on

that measure. We engaged in spirited debate concerning several items in the bill and, though I am not completely satisfied with all the decisions that we ultimately reached, I want to commend my fellow conferees for the tone of compromise and openmindedness that generally prevailed.

I was particularly concerned about the funds for the Office of Education Followthrough projects. The Senate included \$9 million to bring funding for the program up to the 1971 level of \$69 million. These funds were to provide support for 26 projects which otherwise would have been terminated this summer.

After vigorous discussion, the conference committee finally agreed on a compromise figure of \$3 million. This will allow those Followthrough projects of the highest priority to continue operation for 1 year. I have checked with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and preliminary indications are that this \$3 million will allow 17 of the 26 projects to continue. One of the affected projects is in my hometown of Pittsfield and I am hopeful it will be permitted to proceed with its fine work.

It was my hope that the conference could have approved sufficient funds to allow the continuance of all 26 projects. However, I intend to take an active role in the Labor-HEW appropriations subcommittee to provide adequate Federal support for Followthrough.

I wish also to voice my support for the \$400,000 approved by the conferees to re-commission two cutters for the augmentation of Coast Guard fishery patrols in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. I have long been concerned about the encroachment of foreign vessels into our territorial waters and the resultant threat this poses to our domestic fishing industry. The money we are providing will enable the Coast Guard to add an additional vessel in the Atlantic and the Pacific and thus effectively reduce harassment and loss of income to our fishermen.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of interest among our colleges and universities in the funds contained in the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1972 (H.R. 14582), for student assistance programs for the coming academic year. In order to set the record straight, and so that the students and the institutions can make their plans for next fall, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point a table showing the amounts provided by the conferees on the second supplemental appropriation bill for educational opportunity grants, work-study grants, and national defense student loans. The table also shows the estimated number of individual grants or loans which will be supported by this appropriation, the average amount of the grant or loan, and the comparable figures for the current—1971-72—school year. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the conference agreement provides for expansion of all three of the student assistance programs in the coming academic year.

The table follows:

EFFECT OF ACTION OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 14582, SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1972, ON STUDENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

	1972-73 school year			Total available
	1971-72 school year	Presently available	Supplemental appropriation (H.R. 14582)	
Educational opportunity grants:				
Appropriation.....	\$177,700,000	\$165,300,000	\$45,000,000	\$210,300,000
Number of grants.....	(297,300)	(251,000)	(72,700)	(323,700)
Average grant.....	\$580	\$631	\$631	\$631
College work-study grants:				
Appropriation.....	\$237,400,000	\$244,600,000	\$25,600,000	\$270,200,000
Number of grants.....	(545,000)	(536,000)	(56,000)	(592,000)
Average grant.....	\$525	\$550	\$550	\$550
National defense student loans:				
Appropriation.....	\$286,000,000	\$286,000,000	\$23,600,000	\$309,600,000
Number of loans.....	(648,900)	(649,000)	(39,000)	(688,000)
Average loan.....	\$670	\$690	\$690	\$690

¹ Included in fiscal year 1973 budget request, which has not yet been acted upon by Congress.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. I wish to take only a few moments to discuss the student-aid aspects of the bill.

We all know that one measure of the degree of unmet need for student assistance is the gap between available funding and the amounts that colleges consider essential to meet the requirements of their students. According to information I have, college and university requests for EOG's, work study, and NDEA student loans for the next academic year total approximately \$1.4 billion—more than double the amount appropriated or budgeted for 1972-73.

The gap is greatest with the EOG program which is, as my colleagues know, the program for qualified high school graduates of exceptional need. It was designed to lower the most persistent barrier to higher education for the poor—lack of money. Yet, of all the student-aid programs EOG has been the most consistently underfunded. But for provisions in this supplemental appropriation, only \$165 million would have been available for next year; \$125 million is needed alone just for renewal grants. That would leave only \$40 million for initial awards, which is sufficient to fund only 58,000 new students. By contrast, institutions have submitted requests for initial awards totaling \$273 million, which would fund approximately 435,000 students. Without the supplemental, 377,000 students deemed eligible would be denied EOG's during 1972-73. Assuming an average grant of \$600, the \$45 million contained in the conference report today will help an additional 75,000 students.

I wish to make two points. I join with American higher education in appreciation for having this additional \$45 million. At the same time we should recognize that we are still failing to serve 302,000 students deemed eligible.

Allocations to participating institutions have been announced during the last few days, and already I have heard from college officials throughout my district about the unmet needs.

Apparently the Office of Education has, in making these allocations, given major emphasis to renewal grants. This

means that many fewer new grants can be made to entering students this year. And that simply means that many students just will not be able to go to college this fall.

A similar story could be told about college work study and the national defense student loan program. Small fund increases for those programs in the past must be measured against increases in college costs and enrollments. It is increasingly clear that funding levels even for those two programs have fallen far short of actual need.

I am likewise appreciative of the additional amounts provided for student loans and work study but I should again like to stress one point. While our approval here today is necessary and praiseworthy we must recognize the inadequacies and gaps which still remain.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the action of the conferees on the second supplemental appropriations bill of 1972, for the \$61,550,000 increase for the Neighborhood Youth Corps and the recreation support program. This additional money will provide approximately 100,000 vitally needed summer jobs for our Nation's urban youth.

In my city of Chicago alone, this increase could mean an additional 2,700 jobs for the summer of 1972. The additional amount of \$2,200,000 for the recreation support program will insure that the RSP, the only federally subsidized urban recreation program, will be able to more adequately provide for our cities increasing demands for summer recreation and facilities.

Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the administration may be considering a change in the service area format as originally designed for the recreation support program. The change as I understand it, would incorporate specified rural areas into the RSP along with the 113 major cities now being served by the program. To do this would be a grave error. The recreation support program was originated to provide recreation facilities for urban youths who otherwise would have no means to experience the benefits of meaningful, qual-

ity recreation during the summer months. To divert any funds from the cities would be costly and could cause great detriment to existing city programs. The extra funding that has been granted for the summer of 1972 is desperately needed in our urban areas.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, item 13 in the second supplemental appropriation bill includes funds for the helium conservation program. I rise in support of this item and urge that the Department of the Interior reach promptly a solution to the financial crisis in this program so that this vital natural resource will not be wasted. Because of the role helium will play in the new technology required to solve our energy crisis, I am greatly concerned that this Nation not waste its helium.

The largest known recoverable supply of helium in the world is the natural gas currently being produced and depleted in the Hugoton-Panhandle gas fields. Unless the helium is extracted before the natural gas is delivered to the consumer, it will, being noncombustible, simply flow through the burner into the atmosphere without benefit to anyone. To prevent the continued wasting of this unique and highly useful natural resource as the gas was produced from the Hugoton-Panhandle fields, Congress had the foresight in 1960 to establish the helium conservation program. This program operated as intended until it encountered financial problems which have threatened closing the helium plants and destroying this essential conservation program.

At the time Congress enacted legislation to establish this helium conservation program, the U.S. Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior Helium Activity, had predicted annual helium requirements would reach 2 billion cubic feet by the year 2000. The January 1971 commodity data summaries—page 67—published by the Interior Department, now predicts an even greater future helium demand. That publication states:

It is predicted that the relatively low level of helium usage will continue through 1971; thereafter, usage should increase as new programs, now in the conceptual stage, enter developmental and operational phases. In the long-term, it is anticipated that helium usage will reach 3-5 billion cubic feet annually by the turn of the century.

It is acknowledged today that the United States faces a potential future energy shortage. Future helium use in the generation and transmission of electric energy could alone justify the entire helium conservation program. For example, one 20-inch underground pipeline containing three superconducting cables cooled with liquid helium could carry a power load equivalent to the total power requirements of New York City, at the same time avoiding the impact on our scenic environment of overhead electric lines.

Because of the future benefits to be derived from helium, I believe that we must see that this Nation's largest and richest helium resources are conserved. It is incontrovertible that the reasons

for conserving helium are more pressing and essential today than when this conservation program was established. Therefore, I urge the administration to solve the financial crisis of this program in a way that will continue conservation of this helium.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize my support for that provision of H.R. 14582 which would provide an additional \$3 million for the Follow Through program in fiscal year 1972. I commend the conferees for restoring this amount for funding projects of the highest priority.

Mr. Speaker, Follow Through is a program designed to assure equality of educational opportunity for underprivileged children. One of the most successful projects has been conducted for the past 2 years in my district, at the Carman School in Waukegan, Ill. The sponsor, Donald Bushell, Jr., of the University of Kansas, evaluated the effort at Carman School in these words:

From our experience with Follow Through projects throughout the nation during the past four years, it is possible to say that few have fulfilled the intent and spirit of this legislation as effectively as Waukegan.

Because of budget cutbacks, however, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare felt compelled to deny funds under this appropriation for this project for the next fiscal year. In my opinion, eliminating the Carman School effort—which has been judged outstanding by a nationwide analysis of Follow Through projects—would have denied to these highly motivated minority group children educational opportunities not otherwise available to them. This would have been extremely unfortunate—and I say this notwithstanding the declared intention to fund this project as part of the emergency school aid or other program.

Mr. Speaker, by favoring the conference committee's recommendation that \$3 million be added to the Follow Through appropriation for fiscal year 1972, it is my expectation that the Waukegan effort—and other worthy projects—will be continued. I am glad to add my support to this vital program.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, no more money should be spent to continue the Amtrak experiment. It is now clear beyond a doubt that the concept is not working, will get worse, and additional outlays will be lost revenue with no substantial benefit to the public.

Losses from Amtrak in 1972 will be \$152 million and by 1973 they anticipate a \$123 million loss. These anticipated losses, together with the corporation's planned capital program, establish an estimated funding requirement of \$170 million if Amtrak is to meet its statutory responsibilities prescribed in the Rail Passenger Service Act.

This program is "Vietnam on rails"—this is not efficient transportation—this is nonsense.

A case can be made for inter-city rail transportation between points in high-density corridors. I would support this kind of a program in preference to the present national plan of Amtrak which

was engineered to get votes rather than to provide effective use of transportation dollars.

This experiment has already demonstrated its failure. The public has not provided any convincing interest in utilizing rail transportation except for commuter services in large metropolitan areas. A regional mass transit system or rapid rail system in high-density corridors can provide a substantial cost-benefit ratio. A national system such as Amtrak is totally indefensible. The Federal Government cannot afford massive contributions to a nationwide system. An inadequate, infrequent, unreliable rail system for a small group of passengers will constitute an abyss of waste.

Retired railroad employees have pass privileges on the Amtrak system. These citizens earned the right of free railroad travel as a condition and fringe benefit of their labor contracts. They should not be deprived of this earned privilege. Nor should the taxpayers of the Nation be called upon to subsidize hundreds of millions of dollars to maintain a railroad passenger system in order to meet the obligation of the railroads to their former employees.

I am preparing legislation to increase railroad retirement benefits to include reimbursement in lieu of the retirement right of free-subsidized-rail travel. This would be infinitely less expensive to the general taxpayer and more tangible to the retired employee.

The shift of Amtrak support to regional or corridor programs which have a reasonable prospect of success would receive more adequate funding to insure their success. I expect to support mass transit extensions in urban areas and corridors.

Federal expenditures in these times in particular must face the extreme test of need and propriety. Amtrak appears to be a patient in terminal illness—we cannot postpone an inevitable demise.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. 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. 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 339, nays 33, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 155]
YEAS—339

Abbott
Abernethy
Abourezk
Abzug
Adams
Addabbo
Alexander

Anderson,
Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews,
N. Dak.
Annunzio

Arends
Ashley
Aspin
Aspinall
Badillo
Barling
Barrett

Begich
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Bergland
Betts
Bevill
Blaggi
Blester
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Mass.
Burlison, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Byron
Cabell
Caffery
Carey, N.Y.
Carlson
Carney
Carter
Casey, Tex.
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chappell
Clark
Clausen,
Don H.
Clawson, Del.
Clay
Cleveland
Collins, Ill.
Conable
Conte
Corman
Cotter
Coughlin
Culver
Curlin
Daniel, Va.
Danielson
Davis, Ga.
Davis, S.C.
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Dellenback
Dent
Derwinski
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Downing
Drinan
Dulski
Duncan
du Pont
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Ellberg
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Fascell
Findley
Flood
Flowers
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford,
William D.
Forsythe
Fountain
Fraser
Frenzel
Frey
Fulton
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gaydos
Gettys
Gialmo

Gibbons
Gonzalez
Grasso
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gubser
Gude
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammer-
schmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harrington
Harsha
Harvey
Hastings
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Heinz
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks, Mass.
Hicks, Wash.
Hillis
Hogan
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hunt
Ichord
Jacobs
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
Kastenmeier
Keating
Kee
Keith
Kemp
Kluczynski
Koch
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Leggett
Lent
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McClary
McCloskey
McClure
McCollister
McCulloch
McDade
McFall
McKevitt
McKinney
McMillan
Madden
Mahon
Mallard
Mallory
Mann
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathis, Ga.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Mazzoli
Meeds
Melcher
Michel
Mikva
Miller, Ohio
Mills, Ark.
Mills, Md.
Minish
Minshall
Mizell
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols

Nix
Obey
O'Hara
O'Rourke
O'Neill
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Pettis
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Podell
Poff
Powell
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Rallsback
Randall
Rangel
Rees
Rhodes
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Robison, N.Y.
Roe
Rogers
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roy
Roybal
Runnels
Ruppe
Ruth
Ryan
St Germain
Sandman
Saylor
Scherle
Schwengel
Scott
Seiberling
Shipley
Shoup
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Spence
Staggers
Stanton,
J. William
Stanton,
James V.
Steed
Steele
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stokes
Stratton
Stuckey
Sullivan
Symington
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Wis.
Tiernan
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Veysey
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Wampler
Ware
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Wildall
Williams
Wilson, Bob

Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wolff
Wyatt
Wydler

Wyllie
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Young, Fla.
Young, Tex.

Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—33

Archer
Ashbrook
Baker
Clancy
Collins, Tex.
Crane
Dennis
Devine
Dickinson
Flynt
Goodling

Gross
Grover
Haley
Hall
Hutchinson
King
Landgrebe
Landrum
Latta
Montgomery
Rarick

Reuss
Riegle
Rousselot
Satterfield
Schmitz
Schneebeli
Sebellius
Steiger, Ariz.
Terry
Thompson, Ga.
Vanik

NOT VOTING—59

Anderson, Tenn.
Blackburn
Bow
Burke, Fla.
Camp
Chisholm
Collier
Colmer
Conyers
Daniels, N.J.
de la Garza
Dellums
Denholm
Diggs
Dowdy
Esch
Eshleman
Evins, Tenn.
Fish
Fisher
Frelinghuysen

Galifianakis
Gallagher
Goldwater
Gray
Hagan
Hébert
Hollifield
Hungate
Karth
Kazen
Lennon
Link
Long, La.
Lujan
McCormack
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McKay
Macdonald, Mass.
Metcalfe

Miller, Calif.
Mink
Mitchell
Mollohan
Pepper
Peyser
Price, Tex.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Reid
Rodino
Sarbanes
Scheuer
Springer
Stubblefield
Thone
Wiggins
Wright

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Daniels of New Jersey with Mr. Eshleman.
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. McCormack with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Peyser.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Denholm with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Kazen with Mr. Price of Texas.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Thone.
Mr. Pucinski with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Pryor of Arkansas.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. McKay.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Lennon.
Mr. Link with Mr. Hungate.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mrs. Mink.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Mitchell.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Sarbanes.
Mr. Galifianakis with Mr. Dellums.
Mr. Metcalfe with Mr. Scheuer.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Conyers.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 5, line 3: Strike out "\$69,955,000" and insert "\$68,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$67,835,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 6: Page 5, line 4, strike out "\$6,500,000" and insert "\$4,454,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$4,380,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: Page 7, line 1, strike out "and shall remain available until June 30, 1973,".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 10: Page 7, line 18, insert:

CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE

For an additional amount for "Construction and maintenance", \$200,000, to remain available until expended.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 12: Page 8, line 21, insert: "Provided, That there shall be advanced to each regional association the sum of \$1,000,000 in fiscal year 1972 which shall be used solely for organization of the regional corporations and village corporations within each region and to identify land for such corporations pursuant to the Act of December 18, 1971; that such advance shall be credited against the first moneys due to such corporations under this Act and shall first be used to repay any loans advanced to such corporations by any financial organization after December 14, 1971; and that no funds may be advanced by any regional association to any village corporation unless the village for which such corporation was organized is determined by the Bureau of

the Census to have had twenty-five or more Native residents living within such village according to the 1970 census."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "Provided, That there shall be advanced in fiscal year 1972, upon request of the board of directors of any regional corporation established pursuant to section 7 of said Act, \$500,000 for any one regional corporation, which the Secretary of the Interior shall determine to be necessary for the organization of such regional corporation and the village corporations within such region, and to identify land for such corporations previously incurred for such purposes: *Provided further*, That such advances shall not be subject to the provisions of section 7(j) of said Act, but shall be charged to and accounted for by such regional and village corporations in computing the distributions pursuant to section 7(j) required after the first regular receipt of monies from the Alaska Native Fund under section 6 of said Act: *Provided further*, That no part of the money so advanced shall be used for the organization of a village corporation that had less than twenty-five Native residents living within such village according to the 1970 census."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 14: Page 11, line 1, insert the following:

CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION

For an additional amount for "Construction and land acquisition", \$170,000, to remain available until expended.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 17: Page 12, line 6, insert the following: "to remain available until September 30, 1972: *Provided*,".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19: Page 13, line 16, insert the following:

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

For an additional amount for the "National Cancer Institute," \$40,000,000, to remain available through June 30, 1973.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 22: Page 14, line 6, insert the following:

HIGHER EDUCATION

For an additional amount for "Higher Education," \$300,400,000, including \$130,200,000 for educational opportunity grants, \$75,400,000 for college work-study programs, and \$89,000,000 for student loans under the National Defense Education Act: Provided, That the funds appropriated herein shall remain available until June 30, 1973.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

HIGHER EDUCATION

For an additional amount for "Higher Education," \$100,000,000, including \$45,000,000 for educational opportunity grants, \$25,600,000 for college work-study programs, and \$23,600,000 for student loans under the National Defense Education Act: Provided, That the funds appropriated herein shall remain available until June 30, 1973.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to speak on this motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the other body considered a supplemental budget estimate for these educational programs in the sum of \$42.7 million, but the other body inserted in the bill the sum of \$300 million, or about \$257.7 million over the budget.

The House felt that these additional funds were not justified under all of the circumstances, as you cannot meet all of the needs, especially when we are faced with a current year Federal funds budget deficit of about \$40 billion or so.

So, the House conferees were able to come to an agreement with the other body by agreeing to the sum of \$100 million.

Mr. Speaker, the bill provides more in all of these categories than were provided in the previous year. This is the best possible agreement that we were able to work out.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Texas whether the committee did take into consideration in making this particular appropriation the highly accelerating rate of defaults on student loans, and the scandal that seems to be developing with respect to those defaults?

Mr. MAHON. These appropriations proposed here do not involve the defaults to which the gentleman from Iowa makes reference.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman from Iowa, I am sure, recalls that I raised this question originally when we first had the bill before the House, and the gentleman and I discussed this. Since then it has developed—and the gentleman will recall that I raised the question and used the term "bankruptcy"—but since that time I have discovered that these loans without any doubt are the most successful and the best kind of Federal loans that we have, and my use of that term as a scare headline was only with respect to less than 4 percent.

I can assure the gentleman, after my investigation, that there is no scandal, there is nothing to fear as to the potential liquidation of these loans; they are among the best loans of any Federal loans that we have, and as I say, there was only a fraction under 4 percent in that category.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman is right.

Mr. FLOOD. You can be sure I am.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23: Page 15, line 1, insert:

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

For an additional amount for the "Economic Opportunity Program", \$30,000,000, to carry out a program of emergency food and medical services, as authorized by section 222(a)(5) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended: Provided, That funds appropriated herein shall remain available until September 30, 1972.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$20,000,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 25: Page 16, line 4, insert:

JOINT ITEMS

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE JOINT COMMITTEE ON INAUGURAL CEREMONIES OF 1973

For construction of platform and seating stands and for salaries and expenses of conducting the inaugural ceremonies of the President and Vice President of the United States, January 20, 1973, in accordance with such program as may be adopted by the joint committee authorized by concurrent resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives, \$650,000, to remain available through June 30, 1973.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 26: Page 16, line 17, insert:

Capitol Grounds

For an additional amount for "Capitol Grounds" to enable the Architect of the Capitol to convert square 721 North and square 721 South and the roadway between such squares, now a part of the United States Capitol Grounds, for use for temporary parking facilities for the United States Senate, \$130,000, to remain available until June 30, 1973.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 27: On page 17, line 4, insert:

CHAPTER IX PUBLIC WORKS

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance", \$500,000, of which \$180,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Construction," Southwestern Power Administration.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following:

CHAPTER IX PUBLIC WORKS

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance", \$180,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Construction," Southwestern Power Administration.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 33: On page 22, line 1, insert:

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION GRANTS TO NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

To enable the Secretary of Transportation to make grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, as authorized by section 601 of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970, as amended, \$270,000,000 to remain available

until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available only upon the enactment into law of authorizing legislation by the Ninety-second Congress.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of sum named in said amendment, insert "\$170,000,000".

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

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this amendment and to the motion; and 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. 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 301, nays 69, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 156]

YEAS—301

Abourezk	Chappell	Gonzalez
Abzug	Clark	Grasso
Adams	Clausen,	Green, Oreg.
Addabbo	Don H.	Green, Pa.
Anderson, Ill.	Clay	Griffin
Andrews, Ala.	Cleveland	Grover
Andrews,	Collins, Ill.	Gubser
N. Dak.	Conable	Gude
Annunzio	Conte	Halpern
Arends	Corman	Hamilton
Ashley	Cotter	Hanley
Aspin	Coughlin	Hanna
Aspinall	Culver	Hansen, Wash.
Badillo	Curlin	Harrington
Baring	Danielson	Harvey
Barrett	Davis, Ga.	Hathaway
Begich	Davis, S.C.	Hawkins
Belcher	Davis, Wis.	Hebert
Bell	Delaney	Heckler, Mass.
Bennett	Dellenback	Heinz
Bergland	Dellums	Helstoski
Betts	Dent	Hicks, Mass.
Bevill	Derwinski	Hicks, Wash.
Blaggi	Devine	Hillis
Blester	Dickinson	Hogan
Bingham	Dingell	Horton
Blanton	Donohue	Hosmer
Boggs	Dorn	Howard
Boland	Dow	Hull
Bolling	Downing	Hunt
Brademas	Drinan	Ichord
Brasco	Dulski	Jarman
Bray	du Pont	Johnson, Calif.
Brinkley	Eckhardt	Johnson, Pa.
Brooks	Edmondson	Jonas
Broomfield	Edwards, Ala.	Jones, Ala.
Brotzman	Ellberg	Jones, Tenn.
Brown, Mich.	Erlenborn	Karth
Brown, Ohio	Esch	Kastenmeier
Broyhill, N.C.	Evans, Colo.	Keating
Broyhill, Va.	Fascell	Kee
Buchanan	Findley	Keith
Burke, Mass.	Flood	Kemp
Burison, Mo.	Flowers	King
Burton	Foley	Kluczynski
Byrne, Pa.	Ford, Gerald R.	Koch
Byrnes, Wis.	Forsythe	Kyl
Byron	Fountain	Kyros
Cabell	Fraser	Lent
Caffery	Frenzel	Lloyd
Carey, N.Y.	Frey	McCollister
Carlson	Fulton	McCulloch
Carter	Garmatz	McDade
Casey, Tex.	Gaydos	McDonald,
Cederberg	Gettys	Mich.
Celler	Giarno	McFall
Chamberlain	Gibbons	McKevitt

McKinney	Podell	Steiger, Wis.
McMillan	Powell	Stevens
Madden	Preyer, N.C.	Stokes
Mahon	Price, Ill.	Stratton
Malliard	Purcell	Stuckey
Mallory	Quie	Sullivan
Mann	Railsback	Talcott
Martin	Randall	Teague, Calif.
Mathias, Calif.	Rangel	Teague, Tex.
Mathis, Ga.	Rees	Thompson, Ga.
Matsunaga	Reuss	Thompson, N.J.
Mayne	Rhodes	Thomson, Wis.
Meeds	Riegle	Tiernan
Melcher	Robison, N.Y.	Udall
Michel	Roe	Ullman
Mikva	Rogers	Van Deerlin
Mills, Md.	Rooney, N.Y.	Vander Jagt
Minish	Rooney, Pa.	Veysey
Mink	Rosenthal	Vigorito
Minshall	Rostenkowski	Waggonner
Mizell	Roush	Waldie
Monagan	Roy	Ware
Moorhead	Roybal	Whalen
Morgan	Ruppe	Whalley
Mosher	Ruth	White
Murphy, Ill.	Ryan	Whitehurst
Murphy, N.Y.	St Germain	Whitten
Myers	Sandman	Widnall
Natcher	Saylor	Williams
Nedzi	Schneebeli	Wilson, Bob
Nichols	Schwengel	Winn
Nix	Sebelius	Wolf
Obey	Shipley	Wyatt
O'Konski	Shriver	Wyder
O'Neill	Sisk	Wylie
Passman	Skubitz	Wyman
Patman	Slack	Yates
Patten	Smith, Calif.	Yatron
Pelly	Smith, Iowa	Young, Fla.
Perkins	Smith, N.Y.	Young, Tex.
Pettis	Spence	Zablocki
Pickle	Staggers	Zion
Pike	Steed	Zwach
Pirnie	Steele	
Poage	Steiger, Ariz.	

NAYS—69

Abbott	Hall	Quillen
Abbethy	Hammer-	Rarick
Alexander	schmidt	Roberts
Anderson,	Hansen, Idaho	Robinson, Va.
Calif.	Harsha	Roncallo
Archer	Hastings	Rousselot
Ashbrook	Hays	Runnels
Baker	Hechler, W. Va.	Satterfield
Burleson, Tex.	Henderson	Scherle
Carney	Hutchinson	Schmitz
Clancy	Jacobs	Scott
Clawson, Del.	Jones, N.C.	Selberling
Collins, Tex.	Landgrebe	Sikes
Colmer	Landrum	Snyder
Conyers	Latta	Stanton,
Crane	Long, Md.	J. William
Daniel, Va.	McCloskey	Stanton,
Duncan	Mazzoli	James V.
Edwards, Calif.	Miller, Ohio	Taylor
Flynt	Mills, Ark.	Terry
Fuqua	Montgomery	Vanik
Gooding	Moss	Wampler
Griffiths	O'Hara	Wilson,
Gross	Poff	Charles H.
Haley	Price, Tex.	

NOT VOTING—61

Anderson,	Frelinghuysen	Metcalfe
Tenn.	Galifianakis	Miller, Calif.
Blackburn	Gallagher	Mitchell
Blatnik	Goldwater	Mollohan
Bow	Gray	Nelsen
Burke, Fla.	Hagan	Pepper
Camp	Hollifield	Peyser
Chisholm	Hungate	Pryor, Ark.
Collier	Kazen	Pucinski
Daniels, N.J.	Kuykendall	Reid
de la Garza	Leggett	Rodino
Denholm	Lennon	Sarbanes
Dennis	Link	Scheuer
Diggs	Long, La.	Shoup
Dowdy	Lujan	Springer
Dwyer	McClary	Stubblefield
Eshleman	McClure	Symington
Evins, Tenn.	McCormack	Thone
Fish	McEwen	Wiggins
Fisher	McKay	Wright
Ford,	Macdonald,	
William D.	Mass.	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Fish.

Mr. Daniels of New Jersey with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Shoup.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Goldwater.

Mr. Rodino with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Gray with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Blackburn.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Sarbanes.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Scheuer.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Eshleman.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Mitchell.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Peyser.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. McCormack with Mr. McClary.
Mr. Denholm with Mr. Dennis.
Mr. Galifianakis with Mr. Metcalfe.
Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Link with Mr. McClure.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Thone.
Mr. Kazen with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. McKay with Mr. Pepper.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Symington.

Mr. Hungate with Mr. Gallagher.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS and Mr. TERRY changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

MESSRS. NIX, HOWARD, HORTON, and COLLINS of Illinois changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 38: Page 24, line 13, insert: "*Provided further*, That the appropriation for the Federal office building (superstructure), Chicago, Illinois, shall be available only upon the approval of the revised prospectus by the Committees on Public Works of the Congress."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following: "*Provided further*, That the appropriations for the Federal office building (superstructure), Chicago, Illinois; the Courthouse and the Federal office building (superstructure), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and the Federal Bureau of Investigation building (superstructure), Washington, D.C., shall be available only upon the approval of the revised prospectuses by the Committee on Public Works of the Congress."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 40: Page 25, after line 4, insert the following:

CHAPTER XIII

CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

For payment of claims settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law and judgments rendered against the United States by the United States Court of Claims and United States district courts, as set forth in Senate Document Numbered 71, Ninety-second Congress, \$5,508,032, together with such amounts as

may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judgments or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That unless otherwise specifically required by law or by judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than thirty days after the date of approval of the Act.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in connection with the conference report considered by the House today.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND FOR THE U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 984 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

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. 14734) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and for the United States Information Agency, and all points of order against section 6 of said bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI are hereby waived. 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 Foreign Affairs, 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. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule providing for 1 hour of general debate.

The unusual feature of the rule is the waiver of points of order against section 6 of the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, Rule XXI. That is the clause that deals with appropriations on a legislative bill. Any Members who care to read section 6 will find it is a rather intricate section with reference to another law. If they then are concerned about it, they can check the Ramseyer Rule in the committee report and they will find that this is merely a waiver on matters that has been enacted a number of times before, and it is not, in my opinion—at least I am not aware of its being a controversial provision on which the waiver is made.

I know of no opposition to the rule. Therefore, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I concur in the statements made by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING). I am not certain that we actually had to waive points of order. There is a new provision in lines 20 through 23 on page 3. In order that we could bring this bill to the House we did waive points of order.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, this is the first time we have had this particular approach. Up to this time most of these provisions, as set forth in the appropriation bill which we will have later today or tomorrow, have been continuing authorizations over the years. As I recall, last year we made certain changes whereby the House Committee on Foreign Affairs now does have control over some of these matters as to authorization. I believe this is the first bill from that particular approach.

I urge the adoption of the rule so that we may consider the bill before us, H.R. 14734, under a 1-hour open rule.

Mr. BOLLING. 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. HAYS. 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. 14734) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and for the U.S. Information Agency.

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

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. 14734, with Mr. ROONEY of New York 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 Ohio (Mr. HAYS) will

be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. THOMSON) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in the 16 years that I have been chairman of the subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations I have brought to the floor any number of bills dealing with the Department of State and the U.S. Information Agency. Some of these have been of very limited scope, such as the adjustment of annuities for widows of retired Foreign Service officers. Others have dealt with personnel problems and practices or with some particular program such as educational and cultural exchanges.

This is the first time, however, that the committee has presented to the House an authorization bill for the entire range of operations and activities of the Department of State and the U.S. Information Agency. This change results from an amendment inserted in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1971 that repealed the existing permanent authorizations that these two agencies heretofore enjoyed. The law now requires "periodic" authorizations for each of them. The word "periodic" is a bit unusual in legislation. It may mean an annual authorization or one of longer duration.

Since we are plowing new ground with this approach, the subcommittee and the committee decided this year to limit the authorizations to a single year. It may be that in a year or two we will decide on a 2- or even 3-year authorization such as is made for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

This bill is limited to authorizations. It does not contain a lot of extraneous language or amendments that would make it a disposal. If there are legislative proposals that merit consideration in the work of these two agencies, they should be considered on their merits after we have had ample testimony.

For fiscal year 1973 the committee recommends \$648,354,000 for the Department of State and \$200,249,000 for the U.S. Information Agency. The subcommittee added \$85 million to the item on migration and refugee assistance.

This additional sum is intended for assistance to Israel in the settlement of Jewish refugees from the Soviet Union.

Over the years the Appropriations Committee has given careful consideration to the fiscal details of these two agencies. This subcommittee, as you know, is chaired by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) and has scrutinized these requests, I think, with a fine-tooth comb. This is a proper and necessary responsibility. My subcommittee decided that we would take advantage of this occasion, since we rely upon Mr. ROONEY thoroughly to inquire less into the actual dollars requested, although we did go into that item by item, and to give more attention to the policies, operations, and personnel for which the Department of State and USIA are responsible.

In the course of our hearings one point

emerged very early—and I think this is important—and that is that most of the U.S. Government civilian personnel overseas are not on the payroll of either the Department of State or the USIA. In fact, they have been actively engaged in reducing their presence abroad to a point where some of us were of the opinion it was not in our best interests. To mention only the Department of State, it has less than 15 percent of U.S. personnel stationed abroad, and that excludes civilians from the Department of Defense and other elements the public disclosure of which is prohibited.

What I am saying here is, leave out the Department of Defense, and only 15 percent of the rest of the people abroad are from the State Department. The fact of the matter is that practically every branch of Government has its own foreign service. The Department of Commerce has people abroad, the Department of Agriculture has people abroad, and, as a matter of fact, there are people stationed abroad to mail out social security checks just as though there was not an international mail service.

I would hope sometimes, somehow the proper committees would take care of this situation and reduce it.

I can say to you that the State Department has, on their own volition, with some prodding from us and the executive branch, reduced their people abroad significantly over the past few years.

Mr. Chairman, as the hearings make clear, most of the testimony taken by the subcommittee was from officers who head up the geographic and some of the functional bureaus of the Department. Some of the more revealing parts have been deleted for security reasons, but enough remains to permit some public judgments on some issues.

One matter that proved particularly bothersome to the subcommittee—

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 3 minutes.

One matter that proved particularly bothersome to the subcommittee was that of assessments and memberships in a variety of international organizations. We are members of these by Acts of Congress or by treaties. I concede as members we should pay our share of the expenses of these organizations, but the question is what should our share be. It is evident that these organizations have no magical yardstick to make objective judgments. It is a matter of haggling and bargaining. They have a lot of theories they apply, such as gross national product, population, or gold reserves. Using any one or a combination of these you can make a pretty good case for a large U.S. assessment, but I think you can make an equally good case for a smaller U.S. assessment if you used the national debt or the balance-of-payments figures.

I was especially disturbed when I learned that, to use a new appellation, the People's Republic of China, with a population of about 750 million, inherited the 4-percent assessment of the Republic of China, with a population of 14 million. That was one of the reasons why I

thought we could reduce the more than \$60 million in this bill for the United Nations by the modest sum of \$4 million.

The subcommittee supported this view, but the full committee, by the narrowest of margins, did not. I intend, of course, to support the full committee's recommendation because that is my obligation and I respect it. I lost the battle, but I intend to continue the war.

So, I just want to say further that I shall extend the rest of my remarks, but I have some interest in the educational and cultural programs. My opinion is that they are moving in the right direction. They return large dividends at relatively low cost.

I think one area where more could be done is in the use of distinctively American musical groups. I do not mean exclusively rock and roll or country music. I am thinking of choral groups, collegiate marching bands and glee clubs.

Such organizations would not only give foreigners an insight into a rather unique type of musical presentations, but also provide our young people with an opportunity to serve as cultural ambassadors at home and abroad.

In the case of USIA, the subcommittee within the past year and a half has gone into its various functional programs such as the Voice of America, press and publications, motion pictures, and cultural work. There have been a few motion picture productions whose worth I would question. On the other hand, some have been outstanding.

The subcommittee heard from the assistant directors of the seven geographic areas. Their testimony complemented that that we took from the State Department witnesses. I think many of us recognize that in a troubled world with rapidly changing values and attitudes it is difficult to hold a steady course in communicating with people particularly in the less developed parts of the world. I am of the opinion that what our Government does or does not do is more important in determining attitudes toward us than what USIA says to them. Actions speak louder than words.

We have gone into the USIA in depth, and I can assure the House that this bill has no built-in deluxe features. The small increments over the past year's appropriations arise in part from increases that Congress has authorized such as salary increases and from inflationary pressures which in many parts of the world are more excessive than those at home.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending legislation.

I think the subcommittee was impressed with the conservative nature of the request for financing the operations provided for in this bill. I believe the subcommittee had the feeling that they had justified a greater expense in some areas like the USIA and the equipment that they are now operating; that there is a definite need for improvement and replacement of much of that equipment. The committee took the position that this was really a bare bones budget bill

to a department—to an administration—that was reducing its employees at home and abroad and making every effort they could to live within a minimum budget.

So, the committee voted the bill out as I recall with two dissenting votes.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of passing the legislation in the form in which the committee presented it. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 14734.

This legislation would authorize appropriations for the Department of State and the U.S. Information Agency for fiscal year 1973. It would provide funds for the operation of both agencies, including salaries.

An authorization of \$648,354,000 is recommended for the Department of State. This money would be spent for the direction and conduct of the Department's operations, including the conduct of diplomatic relations with other countries and international organizations.

As noted in the committee report, the authorization would provide funds to meet U.S. assessments in international organizations, and finance participation in international commissions that deal with U.S. boundaries with Mexico and Canada. This legislation also authorizes funds for educational and cultural exchanges, and for migration and refugee assistance. The funds provided for refugee assistance include \$85 million to assist in the resettlement of Soviet Jewish refugees in Israel.

USIA

The bill would authorize \$22,249,000 for USIA, in fiscal year 1973. Of this amount, \$194 million is for salaries and expenses, including the funding of various media programs. The remaining funds are largely for international exhibitions.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the funds requested in this authorization bill are essential to the operation of the Department of State and USIA. These are, in fact, operating funds... funds needed to provide for the day-to-day operation of these agencies in their programs in fiscal year 1973.

I urge your support of this legislation.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH).

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time. I should like to ask a question concerning the USIA and make a short statement preparatory to that question. Over the past year a number of Members have been meeting and corresponding with Mr. Frank Shakespeare of the USIA urging that the Voice of America include in its broadcasts to the U.S.S.R. a regular program in the Yiddish language. The Director of the USIA to date has rejected the proposal.

In the last Soviet census, the U.S.S.R. determined that the Jewish population exceeded 2 million in number. Those who are familiar with the plight of Soviet Jewry estimate the number to be close to 3 million. Since 1935, the Soviet Union has forbidden the teaching of Yiddish in Soviet schools whereas every other ethnic or national group is not only permitted but encouraged to maintain schools in

their national language. Surprisingly, 17 percent of the Jews recorded in the Soviet census indicated that their mother tongue was Yiddish and those who are familiar with that people know that an overwhelming number, while having Russian as their mother tongue, understand and speak Yiddish. One of the charges made by the supporters of Soviet Jews is that the U.S.S.R. is engaging in cultural genocide against the Jewish people and they believe that it would be a great moral booster to that persecuted minority to have the United States show its concern by beaming broadcasts to them in the Yiddish language. It will come as a surprise to the Members I am sure to learn that of the 120 national groups recognized in the Soviet Union the Jews rank as the 12th largest.

I would ask the distinguished chairman whether the committee in considering the authorization for the USIA went into this question of VOA's including a Yiddish language broadcasts and if it did not would the chairman consider holding hearings on that subject?

Mr. HAYS. May I say, if the gentleman will yield, in answer to the gentleman's question, I queried the department on this, and they have come up with some arguments against it. I must say that I do not know very much about the pros and cons, and I think perhaps a hearing would be in order. I can say to the gentleman that as soon as we can conveniently get some of the business before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which is pressing, disposed of, I will be glad to have a hearing in which the gentleman from New York can testify, and the department can give their views.

Mr. KOCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time for two purposes. First of all, to make inquiry of my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) who has been the prime moving spirit behind the additional money for refugee work in Israel. So if I could have the attention of the gentleman from New York, can the gentleman give us any assurance that the extra money provided in this bill beyond the executive requests for refugee work in Israel will in fact be an additional expenditure for refugee work? I ask the question because of the possibility that it may instead be more in the nature of general budget support rather than an add-on item toward refugee purposes. I am sure that there would be broader support in the Congress as well as among the public generally if there could be some assurance that this extra item has been worked out with the Government of Israel so that there are assurances that the refugee activity will be expanded by the amount of money provided in this bill.

Can the gentleman from New York give us any assurances on that?

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Certainly.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Illinois does misunderstand the purpose of the \$85 million. It is for the purpose of meeting part of the expense of an ongoing program; that is to say, it is not the intention of the committee to propose that additional efforts be undertaken on behalf of those refugees that would not otherwise be undertaken. It is rather the purpose of the committee that the United States would share in the cost of refugee resettlement, along with the other bodies that are contributing to this purpose, notably the very large contributions, much larger than this, coming from the Jewish community in the United States and other countries.

So that these funds would be used, as the committee report says, for assistance to Israel, such as assistance for housing, clothes, food, medical care, education, and training for the resettlement in Israel of the Jewish refugees from the U.S.S.R. That is the purpose of the assistance.

Mr. FINDLEY. If I understand the gentleman from New York correctly, then, if the Congress should see fit not to provide the \$85 million extra embodied in the bill now before us, the refugee work would continue at the planned level anyway. Is that correct? Is that a fair assumption?

Mr. BINGHAM. I do not know if that is a fair assumption at all. That might not be possible. What I wanted to say was that there is no thought here that there would be more generous programs for the refugees or greater expenditures on their behalf because of this proposal. This proposal is in the nature of a contribution to a very expensive program which will cost at least four times this amount for just 1 year, a contribution which seemed appropriate to the committee.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman for his clarification.

Just to summarize the point—it would seem from this colloquy that the inclusion of \$85 million extra for refugee work in Israel will not alter the level of refugee work in that country.

Is that a fair assumption?

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

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BINGHAM. I would like to repeat—I think if this money is not authorized and appropriated there is a grave question as to whether the funds can be found to carry on the program at the level that is anticipated. There is a grave question about that, and I want to emphasize that this is not money for an additional program not presently contemplated.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Another point I want to call to the attention of the committee is the relationship of this bill to the Federal budget for the fiscal year 1973.

As we all know, the President sent forward the budget earlier this year which was \$25 billion in the red. In that budget he included a request for \$763 million for the purposes encompassed by the legislation before us today.

Recognizing that the budget presented by the President was already \$25 billion in the red, the budget request that he made for this purpose also must be assumed to have a good bit of red ink in it—in fact, 14 percent.

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

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. So in order to balance the budget by across-the-board reduction of each authorization and appropriation would require a 14 percent reduction from what the President requested. A balanced budget authorization for these purposes would have had not \$763 million in it but \$656 million.

But in spite of that, the committee is asking for \$848 million.

Now if we would embark upon a program, as I wish we would, of trimming each authorization and appropriation request, item by item as they come forward to the House floor, and thus got to a balanced budget with outgo equal the expected revenue for the next fiscal year—then this request now before us ought to be reduced by \$191,904,420.

In other words, I think it is fair to say that the bill now pending is 21 percent red ink.

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

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. I would just say to the gentleman that nobody has watched the State Department over the years with a more eagle eye than I have. I really watch them with the same degree of care as to their budget. They have cut more people and more money than any department of Government. It is the rest of the departments—instead of sending more people abroad and adding more people on the payroll—had they cut down the number of employees the way the State Department has, then the budget would be very close to being balanced.

So you know I really think it is unfair to pick on this one particular Department and say that they are way out of line because you have to go back the last 4 or 5 years. They have had mandatory cuts of 15 percent and 10 percent—and they have cut it and they are living within it.

You ought to be talking about some of these other swollen departments.

Mr. FINDLEY. I certainly concur in the gentleman's remarks. I am glad that he gives credit where credit is due.

The point is that we are confronted with a presidential budget that is 14 percent out of balance and as we turn on the faucet this year authorizing and appropriating money beyond the President's budget, we are really spilling a lot of red ink.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute merely to say to the gentleman that apparently he has a lot of complaints about this President's budget. If he will help some of us out, we may be able to get a President next year who will balance it.

I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee whatever time he might consume.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14734, which authorizes funds to finance the operations of the Department of State and of the U.S. Information Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973.

The authorization for the Department of State is \$648,354,000 and for the U.S. Information Agency is \$200,249,000. These are large amounts, but they are large because they reflect the magnitude and the complexity of the operations and the programs which they finance.

The United States maintains 126 embassies abroad. The Department employs 13,451 individuals of which 3,792 are Americans serving abroad and 5,120 are foreign nationals working in our overseas missions.

In addition to providing authorization of the funds to finance the operation and maintenance of our embassies and consulates, together with the operation of the State Department here in the United States, this bill authorizes the money for our share of the cost of the United Nations and of other international organizations to which we belong, as well as the operation of the educational exchange program and our contributions to certain programs of refugee assistance.

Although the magnitude of the operations for which authorization is provided in this bill is imposing and, to anyone not familiar with the nature of our overseas operations, surprising, I should point out that the State Department budget is smaller than that of any other Cabinet level department. Furthermore, with the exception of the Departments of Labor and of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of State has the smallest number of people.

Mr. Chairman, let me emphasize that this authorization provides for 241 fewer positions than are in existence in the current fiscal year. Rather than expanding, the State Department has been contracting in size and has in the last few years cut its personnel by almost one-fifth.

Mr. Chairman, it is important also for us to recognize the significance of the work of the U.S. Information Agency. This bill includes an authorization of \$200,249,000 for this program.

The USIA maintains 192 posts in 109 countries and has 9,855 employees. The USIA has also been cutting back its operations. Four years ago, the Agency had almost 12,000 people on its payroll.

Even though all of us recognize that this is a large expenditure and that there are a good many people on the payroll, we must take into account the realities of the world we live in.

There are many important nations of the world that maintain strict censorship over the dissemination of news and information to their people. There are also important nations that continue to beam, not only to their own people but to the people of other nations all over the world, distortions of fact concerning the United States and even vicious attacks on our Government and our policies.

Most Americans, I feel confident, believe that we have an obligation to try to pierce the veil of censorship and to bring to people more accurate informa-

tion about the United States and its policies than would otherwise be available to them.

Furthermore, it is in our interest to try to counteract the adverse propaganda beamed to nations not subject to censorship by governments which misrepresent and distort the U.S. Government, our people, and our policies.

Mr. Chairman, we need the U.S. Information Agency.

I want to say a word also about the provision in the bill for the resettlement in Israel of Jewish refugees from the Soviet Union. The committee increased the authorization for migration and refugee assistance by \$85 million for this purpose.

The United States has a long tradition of assistance to refugees. Most of us, I feel sure, agree that it is particularly important that everything possible to facilitate the exit of those Jews whom the Soviet authorities are willing to release should be done.

The State of Israel is most generously and at considerable sacrifice holding its doors open to these people. Israel needs and deserves our help.

The Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations, of which our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) is chairman, has held detailed hearings on the operations of the Department of State and of the U.S. Information Agency. After a careful and critical review of these operations by the subcommittee, the Committee on Foreign Affairs has recommended the authorizations in this bill.

In the consideration of these authorizations, the subcommittee and the full committee have tried to avoid duplicating the work the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, which under the able and distinguished chairmanship of the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) has always gone over these appropriation requests with a fine tooth comb.

We have been concerned primarily with matters of policy—what are we trying to do and why—rather than questions involving cost analysis. We have tried to recommend the limits of expenditure, not determine absolute or final figures.

Mr. Chairman, the Department of State and the U.S. Information Agency are vital to our national interest and our national security. We should provide them with funds to finance their continued operation. I urge the approval of these authorizations.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending legislation, and most particularly I rise in support of the amendment contained in the legislation sponsored by our distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. BINGHAM). I think this assistance to enable the resettlement of the Jews who have left the religious oppression that confronts them in the Soviet Union is in the finest American tradition, and it is typical of the universal concern expressed by our colleague from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) in lend-

ing a helping hand to the poor and the dispossessed, not only here at home, but also abroad.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the distinguished members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for including in H.R. 14734 an authorization for \$85 million to assist Soviet Jewish refugees in Israel. The tiny nation of Israel is providing a measure of humanitarianism of which we can all be proud by opening its doors to those members of the oppressed Soviet Jewish minority who are permitted to leave the Soviet Union. It is only appropriate that the United States, with its long standing compassion for oppressed peoples assist the Israeli Government in discharging the important obligation it has voluntarily undertaken. I only wish, Mr. Chairman, that the Soviet Government would allow all of the Jews who wish to leave its confines to do so.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, recently the Senate of the United States by a vote of 57 to 15, restored the full amount of funds requested for USIA, thus giving an overwhelming defeat to Senator FULBRIGHT and some of his colleagues on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee who had slashed the agency's budget by nearly a fourth.

This Nation and the free world are fortunate that those with "eyes to see and ears to hear" restored these funds on the Senate floor, for the cut reportedly would have forced USIA to shut its doors in 30 countries.

Has the struggle for men's minds ended? The Soviet Union and mainland China do not believe so. At its present broadcast level of 780 hours weekly in 35 languages, the Voice badly trails the Soviet Union, which broadcasts 1,903 hours in 84 languages. Even Communist China broadcasts 1,304 hours in 33 languages and Egypt 1,022 hours in 33 languages.

It is important to the security of this country that the United States be able to tell its story effectively. I urge that we approve the full authorization for USIA.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, the authorization of appropriations for State Department and U.S. Information Agency is a most important bill because it is the best means in which the Congress can express its will and exercise its important role in formulating and implementing foreign policy.

I strongly believe that certain provisions of this bill present a realistic as well as an enlightened perspective of American foreign policy goals. I have followed this bill closely because I know of its far-reaching importance to the future course of U.S. policies abroad.

One provision which I am most concerned with is the \$85 million appropriation to the State Department, which administers refugee assistance programs abroad, for "assistance to Israel including assistance, for housing, clothes, food, medical care, education, and training, for the resettlement in Israel of Jewish refugees from the Soviet Union."

In February of this year, I introduced this legislation because in recent months there has been a surprising new development in Soviet policy. The motivations

remain obscure, but the results are heartening and dramatic—a sudden increase in the number of Soviet Jews allowed to emigrate to Israel. In 1 month, December 1971, three times as many Jews emigrated from the Soviet Union as in all of 1970.

Today more than 25,000 Soviet Jews live in Israel. They constitute the largest group of refugees from the U.S.S.R. since the end of World War II. Since January of this year, nearly 2,000 per month have left Russia and the increased rate is continuing in 1972. It is now anticipated that between 40,000 and 60,000 Soviet Jewish immigrants will arrive in Israel this year.

Last month, my colleague, JONATHAN BINGHAM and I returned from a special study mission to Israel where we gathered important information for the House Foreign Affairs Committee which was considering the \$85 million appropriation to aid Soviet refugees settling in Israel.

Our mission to Israel convinced me that the dramatic increase of Jewish refugees from the Soviet Union has placed an awesome financial burden on Israel.

This tiny but brave nation is attempting to absorb the wave of thousands of refugees and provide food, clothing, shelter, job and language training to those who seek spiritual and cultural freedom. The cost, nearly \$10,000 per refugee, has become astronomical and has caused a serious diversion of Israel's economic resources from defense and other vitally needed services.

This assistance is the least the American people can do to spur this encouraging breakthrough in Soviet Jewish policy and to carry out our historic humanitarian traditions.

Because of our tradition of assisting refugees—particularly those fleeing from religious persecutions—and because of our clear self-interest in the health and well-being of Israel, it is incumbent upon us to aid in the resettlement of these homeless—but now free—people who wish to start a new life in Israel. The only way this can be done is for Congress to authorize appropriate funds for this purpose.

Since World War II, the United States, in keeping with our humanitarian policy, has contributed more than \$2.8 billion to refugee assistance, directly and through intergovernmental organizations. We spent close to \$600 million to assist Cuban refugees. From 1947 to 1951, we contributed \$237 million to the International Refugee Organization. In the early 1950's we contributed almost \$85 million to aid Korean refugees. As for Arab refugees, we have contributed more than \$500 million. We have never forgotten that we were founded and populated by the refugees of an earlier world. Our commitment to this cause is inscribed on the base of the Statue of Liberty.

There is also the long history of our concern with persecution on account of religion, and, in the last half century, particularly with the persecution of Jews. Beginning in the early 1900's, our national leaders have fought for the freedom and dignity of the world's Jewish community. We played a major role in

the creation of Israel; we have been its firm defender ever since.

Beyond humanitarian concerns, however, there is our clear self-interest in the health and well-being of Israel. War is not the only danger to a healthy Israel. Economic disaster can accomplish what war could not, if we let it. A country the size of Israel, with its heavy defense burdens, cannot afford the several hundred million dollars that will be required for the anticipated influx of Soviet Jews over and above Israel's normal budget for immigrants—and Israel has already spent enormous sums receiving and integrating hundreds of thousands of Jewish refugees from Middle Eastern countries. For all these reasons, therefore, we must be prepared to help Israel cope with the hoped for emigration from the Soviet Union.

Our factfinding mission to Israel underscored the basic need for immediate U.S. assistance to this courageous nation.

We observed firsthand the arrival of hundreds of Jews from the Soviet Union in Vienna en route to the State of Israel. We saw them as they arrived. We met with them, talked with them, and witnessed their reactions as they stepped off planes and trains and touched, for the first time, land other than their native Russian soil. We saw the look in their eyes and could sense the joy in their hearts. But we could also sense their apprehension. Nevertheless, their determination to face the challenges of their new life was most apparent. It was without doubt the most moving experience in my life.

The day after these emigrants arrived, we visited them at a temporary shelter where we sat in groups, and through interpreters, talked informally about their plight in the Soviet Union. If ever anyone had doubt of the suppression of freedoms in the Soviet Union, I only wish he could have listened to these refugees. Among them were doctors, shoemakers, farmers, housewives, elderly men and women, children and young couples. They all came with but one goal: to find new life within the concepts of their spiritual and moral beliefs and to be free of repression and fear.

We also visited an absorption center in Israel where highly sophisticated programs were planned for the constructive readjustment of Israel's newest citizens. We saw typical housing units for Russian refugees and we spoke to many of the residents. Not all were newcomers. Some had lived there for months; others for years.

Later on in our mission we were privileged to be on hand at the airport in Tel Aviv to meet the plane which carried the same groups we met at the train station, at the airport in Vienna and at their temporary residence there before they embarked for Israel.

Several of the refugees recognized us as they stepped off the plane with their bright eyes and broad smiles—surely more outgoing than when they arrived in Europe—more confident and more determined. We exchanged hearty "shaloms" and warm handshakes. This was a touching scene, one that I wish every Member of this House could have experienced.

Our hearts were lightened by what we saw, what we learned and what we experienced. This experience evidenced the great hope ahead for people who wish to be free.

The Russian Jews we met were the fortunate ones, for their applications were approved by Soviet officials, based on supporting affidavits from relatives in Israel. There have been an average of 2,000 such emigrants a month coming to Israel since the beginning of this year.

But out of 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union this number is small indeed, yet it is a good beginning and points to the effectiveness of responsible action. The consensus of all of those to whom we spoke is that responsible U.S. attitudes and world opinion have helped motivate the Soviet Union to relax its policy toward and allow these numbers to migrate.

Clearly though, this is not enough. We must not rest until all those who seek religious and cultural freedom are able to achieve it.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Chairman, that I wholeheartedly support this provision of the authorization bill and urge my colleagues to join with me in extending our country's strong tradition of providing humanitarian relief consistent with the principles of justice and freedom.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14734 and the funds it authorizes for the Department of State and the U.S. Information Agency.

There has been much criticism of the Department of State and, in recent months, the charge has often been raised that the Department's role in foreign policy at the decisionmaking level has been substantially diminished.

Since it is my judgment that cream by nature rises and that a strong wind automatically moves into a vacuum, if the Department of State can find ways to unleash and encourage its own talent and expertise toward a more creative and constructive role in foreign policy and thus demonstrate it has something significant to give, I am confident any administration will gladly receive and use that contribution.

Such a change is under way at this time. Under the guidance of Deputy Under Secretary William Macomber, a reorganization is taking place at the State Department which seeks to reward and encourage initiative and is calculated to do a better job of bringing good ideas and bright individuals to the forefront.

As you know, a number of changes were recommended in the internal operations of the State Department and many of these have taken place.

While I do support this legislation, I note that one portion provides the full \$60.1 million for the United States' contribution to the United Nations. It is my feeling that our contribution should be reduced to a share proportional to our population, which works out to approximately 25 percent.

The second portion of this legislation provides some \$200.2 million for the U.S. Information Agency which, of course, includes the Voice of America. I am impressed, Mr. Chairman, with the work the Agency and VOA are doing and it merits the full support of the Congress.

Through the Voice of America, our neighbors throughout the world, particularly those behind the Iron Curtain, can obtain objective news reports of world events and a more complete picture of the American people and our way of life.

News by nature tends toward the spectacular and the atypical. Citizens of foreign countries cannot get a truly valid picture of the United States without efforts by the U.S. Information Agency to show the positive but not unusual aspects of American life.

It is not my desire that the USIA become an agency of propaganda in the normal American definition of that term, but that it continue and increase its efforts to tell it like it really is about our country including the many normal, everyday aspects of the rightness of our way of freedom and the goodness which has made our country great.

Mr. Chairman, the funds authorized in this legislation will be utilized for some very necessary functions of this government and I urge the enactment of H.R. 14734 by this body.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state my enthusiastic support for the authorization of the USIA appropriation as stipulated in H.R. 14734. I had originally intended to amend page 2, line 4, by adding: (b) information on heroin addiction in the United States.

It is the sense of the Congress that the President should instruct the Voice of America and the U.S. Information Service libraries overseas to broadcast and exhibit information about the dread plague of heroin addiction in the United States to those countries which are involved in the production or processing of, or trafficking in, opium.

However, since committee policy has been to avoid any direct influence on the content of USIA programing, I have decided to pursue this matter at the administrative level.

As I am sure my colleagues are aware, the farming populations of such countries as Turkey—where heroin addiction is unheard of and where poppy is a staple cash crop—have no idea of the deadly worldwide effects of their production. I personally experienced this information gap last year, in the course of my 11-nation study mission on the international narcotics trade and its relation to the United States. The USIA has up to now been virtually untapped in the struggle to halt the flow of illicit narcotics. It is my feeling that an all-out information campaign, such as is called for in the above amendment, would be a most appropriate complement to the control efforts already being made on bilateral and multilateral levels. I fully intend to work toward this goal, in the near future, with USIA officials.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to note the provision in this bill for aid to help resettle Soviet Jews who are emigrating to Israel. These people, after considerable delay and harassment in obtaining exit visas from the Soviet Union, usually are divested of what funds they have when they depart; consequently, they arrive in Israel without funds, placing a strain on the Israeli economy in addition to the great bur-

den of providing for its defense against hostile neighbors.

As our Nation and its people press for the right of these people to emigrate to Israel, so must we do what we can to facilitate their settlement once they are able to get there. I congratulate the Committee on Foreign Affairs for having the wisdom to include this item in the bill, and I urge my colleagues to give it their full support.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, the legislation currently before the House, the State Department authorization bill, is of special interest to me not just as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, but particularly because it contains a provision, for which I organized and led support in the House, to make available \$85 million for the difficult but urgent task of resettling in Israel the wave of Jewish refugees now being released from the Soviet Union.

The release of 2,000 to 3,000 Jews each month from the Soviet Union, most of them destined for Israel, is a thrilling and historic development. It represents a most encouraging victory for freedom and humanitarianism over oppression. It must be nurtured and encouraged to continue by all freedom-loving people throughout the world, Jewish and non-Jewish alike.

When this relatively large-scale migration from the Soviet Union began toward the end of 1971, Mr. Chairman, it became clear to me that in addition to being a great boost for Israel, it would impose severe problems and burdens. The costs of resettlement are considerable, especially for a small nation like Israel with heavy defense and other expenses. In view of that, and in view of our Nation's historic concern and aid for refugees and for Soviet Jewry, I introduced a bill along with my colleague from New York (Mr. HALPERN). Similar legislation was introduced in the Senate by Senators MUSKIE and JAVITS.

My legislation proposed providing \$85 million from the Government and people of the United States to help with the resettlement of Soviet Jews reaching Israel. That figure is based on about \$2,000 for each of the refugees expected to emigrate to Israel this year based on current migration levels—only a fraction of the total cost to Israel for resettlement.

Mr. Chairman, since introduction of that legislation, I have had the memorable opportunity to inspect and observe first-hand, as head of an official Foreign Affairs Committee mission, the emigration—the aliyah—of these refugees. First we observed them in Vienna, where they arrive from Russia by train, and are housed a day or two while basic information is obtained and cabled to Israel. Then we observed their resettlement in Israel itself. In the course of that mission my predictions and expectations of heavy economic and social burdens for Israel were more than confirmed. But the dedication, warmth, and skill with which the Israeli's are tackling the resettlement burden was inspiring. As one of my constituents remarked regarding my report of the migration and resettlement of these Jews in Israel, it is as if

we were witnessing in our time the parting of the Red Sea and the escape of the ancient Israelites. The migration of Jews from the Soviet Union is certainly an event of similar moment.

Mr. Chairman, I am gratified that my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee have recognized the justification and need for the \$85 million in special Soviet Jewish refugee assistance I proposed, and that it is included in this legislation. And I am hopeful that the full House will similarly support this legislation. Its passage by the House will provide a constructive and concrete means of relief for Soviet Jewry and for Israel. It is a fitting follow-up to efforts by many of us over the years to bring pressure to bear upon the Soviet Union to release these brave people—pressure which has now resulted in their release in increasing numbers. I therefore urge the House to vote for this legislation, as I intend to do, and there continue and enhance the proud tradition of concern on the part of the Congress and the American people for refugees and oppressed peoples everywhere.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct my remarks to two provisions of the State Department-USIA authorization bill for fiscal year 1973 which is currently under consideration.

First, let me say that I am very pleased that the committee has authorized \$85 million to aid in the resettlement of Soviet Jews in Israel. The harsh plight of the Jews in the Soviet Union is well-known. They are being denied fundamental freedoms to which all men are entitled—the free expression of ideas and exercise of religion. Because they are unable to maintain their religious and cultural identities in the Soviet Union, thousands of Jews have attempted to obtain permission to emigrate to lands where they would be able to practice freely their religion and preserve their rich cultural heritage.

The Soviet Union has compounded its offense against its Jewish minority, however, by prohibiting most Soviet Jews from emigrating. In an attempt to alter this intolerable situation, on April 17, the House passed House Concurrent Resolution 471 calling upon the President to request of the Soviet Union that it grant its citizens the right to emigrate to the countries of their choice, as affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights.

However, there are some Soviet Jews who have been fortunate enough to receive permission to emigrate from the Soviet Union. While in 1970, less than 1,000 Jews emigrated from Russia, and in 1971, 13,000 emigrated, it is estimated that, if the current rate of emigration is maintained, 30,000 Jews will be permitted to leave the Soviet Union this year.

Most Soviet Jews who have indicated that they wish to emigrate have expressed their strong desire to settle in a land where they are truly welcomed—the State of Israel. Consequently, Israel now faces the problem of absorbing the large numbers of Soviet Jews who have chosen to settle there.

And there are many problems to be overcome. Many of the immigrants lack

skills and occupations. Most need intensive instruction in the Hebrew language which they were forbidden to learn in the Soviet Union. Even professionals sometimes face numerous difficulties in adjusting to life in Israel. Doctors, for example, have to learn not only Hebrew but also English which is the principal scientific language of Israel. Many require retraining to meet the standards in effect in Israel.

The costs of the programs to overcome these problems and to successfully assimilate these refugees is estimated to be \$35,000 per family. Yet, because so many of Israel's resources must go for her defense, she is sorely in need of financial assistance to comprehensively deal with this large influx of people. Israel's defense budget amounts to slightly over \$1 billion, approximately one-quarter to one-third of the country's gross national product, and approximately 40 to 50 percent of the country's budget. Due to these defense expenditures, for the past 10 years, Israel has owed more in external debt, on a per capita basis, than any other country.

Therefore, on February 8 of this year, I joined with several of my colleagues in introducing a bill, H.R. 13030, to provide \$85 million in aid to Israel to assist in this resettlement process. I want to commend the members of the committee for so promptly providing this sum of money in this authorization bill.

I would like to address my remaining comments to the authorization for the U.S. Information Agency, and once again voice my strong protest against the intransigent position of the USIA with regard to Voice of America broadcasts in Yiddish to the Soviet Union.

On May 26 of last year, I introduced a resolution in the House, House Resolution 454, which calls upon the Voice of America to institute Yiddish broadcasts to the Soviet Union. Over 100 of my colleagues joined in cosponsoring this measure. I have repeatedly contacted the USIA and have urged the Agency's Director, through correspondence and numerous meetings with USIA officials, to begin Yiddish broadcasts. Yet, we have been unable to persuade the USIA of the urgency of this request.

Soviet Jews are in need of every type of assistance we can give them as they struggle to maintain their religious and cultural identities. The bill we are now considering would provide assistance in the resettlement of those Soviet Jews who are granted permission to emigrate and who choose to settle in Israel. But what of the 3 million Soviet Jews who have not been granted permission to leave a country which is stifling them, and which is denying them basic rights? What of the 3 million Soviet Jews who are desperately in need of some sign of hope, of a sign that Americans are aware of the severity of their situation?

After I introduced my resolution, and following a meeting I arranged between concerned Congressmen and State Department and USIA officials, the USIA decided to broadcast, twice a week, a 10-minute Russian language program of "news of particular interest to Jews in the Soviet Union." However, not only is the allotted time inadequate, but these

broadcasts are not in the Yiddish language.

I have previously cited, on the floor of the House, the precedents that exist for Yiddish language broadcasts, but I feel that these facts bear repeating. The Voice of America currently broadcasts to several population groups within the Soviet Union whose numbers are less than the total of Soviet Jewry.

Reliable estimates place the number of Soviet Jews at 3 million and Yiddish-speaking Jews at 1.25 to 1.75 million. Yet, whereas only about 20 minutes a week is broadcast to Soviet Jews, the VOA allocates 7 hours a week in each of Estonian, 1.4 million population; Latvian, 1.43 million; Lithuanian, 2.1665 million, Georgian, 3.245 million, and Armenian, 3.559 million. There can be no justification for this misguided set of priorities.

We must give those Soviet Jews who are forced to remain in the Soviet Union some tangible sign of our concern for them. We must provide them with what can only be a major and powerful psychological uplift—broadcasts in their mother tongue. I again urge the USIA to immediately institute Yiddish-language broadcasts to the Soviet Union which will serve as a concrete indication of our determination to assist the oppressed Jewish minority of the Soviet Union.

In view of the fact that some 100 Members of the House have joined me in support of my resolution, House Resolution 454, I urge the subcommittee to hold full hearings as promptly as possible.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Department of State and United States Information Agency Appropriations Authorization Act of 1972".

Sec. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated for the Department of State for the fiscal year 1973, to carry out authorities, functions, duties, and responsibilities in the conduct of the foreign affairs of the United States, and other purposes authorized by law, the following amounts:

- (1) Under the heading "Administration of Foreign Affairs", \$289,453,000.
- (2) Under the heading "International Organizations and Conferences", \$188,263,000.
- (3) Under the heading "International Commissions", \$18,226,000.
- (4) Under the heading "Educational Exchange", \$59,200,000.
- (5) Under the heading "Migration and Refugee Assistance", \$93,212,000.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to join the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) some of the questions he has raised and to protest \$85 million in this bill for relief for Israel. This bill contained \$8,212,000 for migration and refugee assistance in all areas of the world. (Mr. BINGHAM) offered an amendment adding \$85 million—\$85 million that is completely unbudgeted, as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) ob-

served. If you want to increase deficit spending and spill red ink there is no better way to do it. It is unconscionable to provide \$8,212,000 for refugees and migrants elsewhere around the world, and then earmark \$85 million for just one country, Israel, which is already doing very well in terms of American dollars for support of its educational institutions and various other institutions and facilities.

For years there has been a refugee camp in the Middle East with hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children living in the worst kind of squalor. You talk about ghettos. These people have been living in less than ghettos, if there is such a thing. They are Arabs, most of them, who were tossed out of their homes and off their properties in the Middle East. Through the years they have been supported at a bare subsistence level and the United States has provided most of that support.

As I previously stated, there is \$8,212,000 in this bill for these outcasts and all other refugees and migrants in the world except those in Israel. I would be willing to provide a reasonable amount for Israel's refugees and migrants, but \$85,000,000 is unconscionable and unjustified.

How the gentleman from New York arrived at that huge sum is not clear. Moreover, he was asked the question by the gentleman from Illinois as to whether the \$85,000,000 would be used for refugees and migrants or for some other purpose. The answer was not at all assuring.

I am opposed to this bill, not only because of this \$85,000,000 of unbudgeted and discriminatory spending, but also because the bill contains no cut in the amount of American tax dollars that are annually dished out to the United Nations.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to compliment the distinguished gentleman from New York, our able colleague (Mr. BINGHAM) for his persevering and determined role in developing this issue into legislative action. I am privileged to have been the original cosponsor, with the gentleman, of this provision to provide this economic assistance to Israel in order to assist the resettlement of Soviet Jewish refugees.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that 61 of our colleagues have joined in the sponsorship of this provision in the bill before us today.

I also had the privilege of being with the gentleman from New York on an on-the-scene, fact-finding study of the Soviet Jewish refugee situation and had the rare opportunity of having met at least 200 of these refugees personally—refugees representing every walk of Soviet life, doctors, lawyers, teachers, shoemakers, tailors and so forth.

We learned firsthand of their experiences, of their trials and tribulations in the Soviet Union, their way of life and their oppressions merely because they were Jews—how they had been downgraded in their work and in their community life, how so many had been fired outright and penalized in one form or another merely because they were Jews

and because they were determined to adhere to their heritage and traditions.

The gentleman from New York presented so ably a case for this provision that it would be redundant for me to go into further detail. But I do want to emphasize that this legislation is in keeping with our country's humanitarian policy. It is in keeping with our refugee assistance policy. It is in keeping with our aims to make a breakthrough in oppression behind the Iron Curtain. It certainly is consistent with our support of Israel. And it definitely is in line with our often expressed desire to help people break through the Communist yoke.

Mr. Chairman, we provided arms to Israel; we support Israel in other ways because we believe in its goals and we respect the viability of its government and its role as a bastion of freedom in this world. We do so not only because of philosophical reasons. Let us face it. We also do it because it is in our own national interest to have a secure, free, viable Israel. The refugees which we would be aiding through this legislation in the long run will contribute immeasurably to Israel's viability—and that is a very important point—to assist in assuring Israel's viability as a nation.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, this provision to authorize \$85 million for the purpose so convincingly stated by our colleague, Mr. BINGHAM, and with which I fully associate, is in our own national interest.

And I repeat, it is completely consistent with our own humanitarian policy, our refugee assistance policy and our own national policy toward assisting to assure Israel's viability, that this provision be included in this legislation and I trust it will win the full approval of this House.

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

Sec. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated for the United States Information Agency for the fiscal year 1973, to carry out international informational activities and programs under the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, and Reorganization Plan Numbered 8 of 1953, and other purposes authorized by law, the following amounts:

(1) \$194,213,000 for "Salaries and expenses" and "Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program)": *Provided*, That so much of such amount as may be appropriated for "Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program)" may be appropriated without fiscal year limitation.

(2) \$5,036,000 for "Special international exhibitions" and "Special international exhibitions (special foreign currency program)".

(3) \$1,000,000 for "Acquisition and construction of radio facilities".

Sec. 4. In addition to such amounts as are authorized by sections 2 and 3 of this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated for the Department of State and for the United States Information Agency for fiscal year 1973 such additional or supplemental amounts as may be necessary for increases in salary, pay, retirement, or other employee benefits authorized by law, or other nondiscretionary costs.

Sec. 5. Except as provided in paragraph (1) of section 3 of this Act, appropriations made under sections 2 and 3 of this Act are authorized to remain available until expended.

Sec. 6. (a) Section 15(a) of the Act en-

titled "An Act to provide certain basic authority for the Department of State", approved August 1, 1956, as amended by section 407 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1971 (22 U.S.C. 2680), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to, or affect in any manner, permanent appropriations, trust funds, and other similar accounts administered by the Department as authorized by law."

(b) Section 701 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U.S.C. 1476) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The provisions of this section shall not apply to, or affect in any manner, permanent appropriations, trust funds, and other similar accounts administered by the Secretary or such agency as authorized by law."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROONEY of New York, 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. 14734) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and for the U.S. Information Agency, pursuant to House Resolution 984, he reported the bill back to the House.

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

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

Mr. HALL. 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. 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 305, nays 65, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 157]

YEAS—305

Abourezk	Betts	Cederberg
Abzug	Biaggi	Celler
Adams	Bieber	Chamberlain
Addabbo	Bingham	Clancy
Alexander	Bianton	Clark
Anderson,	Biatnik	Clausen,
Calif.	Boggs	Don H.
Anderson, Ill.	Bolling	Clay
Anderson,	Brademas	Cleveland
Tenn.	Brasco	Collier
Andrews,	Bray	Collins, Ill.
N. Dak.	Brooks	Conable
Annunzio	Brotzman	Conte
Arends	Brown, Mich.	Conyers
Ashley	Brown, Ohio	Corman
Aspin	Broyhill, N.C.	Cotter
Aspinall	Broyhill, Va.	Coughlin
Badillo	Buchanan	Culver
Baker	Burke, Mass.	Curlin
Baring	Burton	Daniel, Va.
Barrett	Byrne, Pa.	Danielson
Begich	Byrnes, Wis.	Davis, Ga.
Belcher	Caffery	Davis, S.C.
Bell	Carlson	Davis, Wis.
Bennett	Carney	Delaney
Bergland	Casey, Tex.	Dellenback

Dellums	Keith	Rogers
Dennis	Kemp	Roncalio
Dent	King	Rooney, N.Y.
Derwinski	Kluczynski	Rooney, Pa.
Dingell	Koch	Rosenthal
Donohue	Kuykendall	Rostenkowski
Dow	Kyl	Roush
Downing	Kyros	Roy
Drinan	Landrum	Roybal
Dulski	Latta	Ruppe
du Pont	Lent	Ruth
Dwyer	Lloyd	Ryan
Eckhardt	Long, Md.	St Germain
Edmondson	McClary	Sandman
Edwards, Ala.	McCloskey	Saylor
Edwards, Calif.	McCulloch	Schneebell
Ellberg	McDade	Schwengel
Erlenborn	McDonald,	Scott
Evans, Colo.	Mich.	Seiberling
Fascell	McFall	Shipley
Flowers	McKevitt	Shriver
Foley	McKinney	Sikes
Ford, Gerald R.	Madden	Sisk
Ford,	Mailliard	Slack
William D.	Mallary	Smith, Iowa
Forsythe	Mathias, Calif.	Smith, N.Y.
Fountain	Matsumaga	Spence
Fraser	Mayne	Staggers
Frenzel	Meeds	Stanton,
Frey	Melcher	J. William
Fulton	Mikva	Stanton,
Fuqua	Mills, Ark.	James V.
Garmatz	Minish	Steed
Gettys	Mink	Steele
Gialmo	Minshall	Steiger, Ariz.
Gibbons	Mizell	Steiger, Wis.
Gonzalez	Monagan	Stephens
Grasso	Montgomery	Stratton
Gray	Moorhead	Stuckey
Green, Oreg.	Morgan	Sullivan
Green, Pa.	Mosher	Symington
Griffiths	Moss	Talcott
Grover	Murphy, Ill.	Taylor
Gubser	Murphy, N.Y.	Teague, Calif.
Gude	Myers	Teague, Tex.
Halpern	Natcher	Thompson, Ga.
Hamilton	Nedzi	Thompson, N.J.
Hammer-	Nelsen	Thomson, Wis.
schmidt	Nichols	Tiernan
Hanley	Nix	Ullman
Hanna	Obey	Van Deulin
Hansen, Idaho	O'Hara	Vanik
Hansen, Wash.	O'Konski	Veysey
Harrington	O'Neill	Vigorito
Harvey	Passman	Waggoner
Hastings	Patten	Waldie
Hathaway	Pelly	Wampler
Hays	Pepper	Ware
Hechler, W. Va.	Perkins	Whalen
Heckler, Mass.	Pettis	Whalley
Heinz	Pickle	White
Helstoski	Pike	Whitehurst
Hicks, Mass.	Pirnie	Widnall
Hicks, Wash.	Podell	Williams
Hillis	Poff	Wilson, Bob
Hogan	Powell	Wilson,
Horton	Preyer, N.C.	Charles H.
Howard	Price, Ill.	Winn
Hunt	Quie	Wolf
Jacobs	Rallsback	Wyatt
Jarman	Randall	Wyder
Johnson, Calif.	Rangel	Wyman
Johnson, Pa.	Rees	Yates
Jones, Ala.	Reuss	Yatron
Jones, Tenn.	Rhodes	Young, Fla.
Karh	Riegle	Young, Tex.
Kastenmeier	Robinson, Va.	Zablocki
Keating	Robison, N.Y.	Zion
Kee	Roe	Zwach

NAYS—65

Abbit	Gaydos	Michel
Abernethy	Goodling	Miller, Ohio
Andrews, Ala.	Griffin	Mills, Md.
Archer	Gross	Poage
Ashbrook	Haley	Price, Tex.
Bevill	Hall	Purcell
Brinkley	Harsha	Quillen
Burleson, Tex.	Henderson	Rarick
Burlison, Mo.	Hull	Roberts
Byron	Hutchinson	Rousselot
Cabell	Ichord	Runnels
Carter	Jonas	Satterfield
Chappell	Jones, N.C.	Scherle
Clawson, Del	Landgrebe	Schmitz
Collins, Tex.	McClure	Sebelius
Colmer	McCollister	Shoup
Crane	McMillan	Skubitz
Devine	Mahon	Smith, Calif.
Dickinson	Mann	Snyder
Dorn	Martin	Whitten
Duncan	Mathis, Ga.	Wylie
Findley	Mazzoli	

NOT VOTING—61

Blackburn	Gallifanakis	Miller, Calif.
Boland	Gallagher	Mitchell
Bow	Goldwater	Mollohan
Broomfield	Hagan	Patman
Burke, Fla.	Hawkins	Peyser
Camp	Hébert	Pryor, Ark.
Carey, N.Y.	Hollifield	Pucinski
Chisholm	Hosmer	Reid
Daniels, N.J.	Hungate	Rodino
de la Garza	Kazen	Sarbanes
Denholm	Leggett	Scheuer
Diggs	Lennon	Springer
Dowdy	Link	Stokes
Esch	Long, La.	Stubblefield
Eshleman	Lujan	Terry
Evins, Tenn.	McCormack	Thone
Fish	McEwen	Udall
Fisher	McKay	Vander Jagt
Flood	Macdonald,	Wiggins
Flynt	Mass.	Wright
Frelinghuysen	Metcalfe	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Vander Jagt.
 Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Goldwater.
 Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Lujan.
 Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Bow.
 Mr. Rodino with Mr. Fish.
 Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Esch.
 Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Broomfield.
 Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Gallifanakis.
 Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Gallagher.
 Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. McEwen.
 Mr. Boland with Mr. Peyser.
 Mr. Link with Mr. Springer.
 Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Mitchell.
 Mr. Reid with Mr. Metcalfe.
 Mr. Diggs with Mr. Udall.
 Mr. Daniels of New Jersey with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
 Mr. Flood with Mr. Eshleman.
 Mr. Hagan with Mr. Blackburn.
 Mr. Denholm with Mr. Camp.
 Mr. Kazen with Mr. Terry.
 Mr. McCormack with Mr. Thone.
 Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Burke of Florida.
 Mr. Stokes with Mr. Scheuer.
 Mr. Leggett with Mr. Hosmer.
 Mr. Flynt with Mr. Wiggins.
 Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Pryor of Arkansas.
 Mr. Lennon with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
 Mr. Hungate with Mr. Wright.
 Mr. McKay with Mr. Patman.
 Mr. Fisher with Mr. Sarbanes.

Messrs. HARSHA, CARTER, and BEVILL changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. BARING, JONES of Tennessee, and KUYKENDALL changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, H.R. 14734.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I

call up House Resolution 983 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14989) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes, the provisions of clause 2, rule XXI are hereby waived with respect to any appropriation contained in such bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 983 provides that during the consideration of H.R. 14989, the State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies appropriations for fiscal year 1973, points of order are waived for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The reason for the waiver is that a number of the appropriations contained in the bill are subject to legislative authorizations which have not been enacted into law. They include the Department of State and the USIA, Radio Free Europe and Radio Free Liberty, the Maritime Administration, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Commission on Civil Rights, the export program in the Department of Commerce, and several minor programs in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the National Bureau of Standards. A majority of these authorization bills have passed the House but have not been acted on in the Senate.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, is this the beginning of a long series of appropriation bills that we are going to bring up without action of the legislating committees with reference to their prerogative of authorizations?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman from Missouri, I do not have that information.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. The authorization bill for this particular bill just passed the House 3 or 4 minutes ago, H.R. 14734.

I understand that it is ready to come up in the other body and I, for one, am ready to go to conference.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I understand it insofar as the Department of State and the U.S. Information Agency is concerned, but I do not recall hearing anything mentioned about the Departments of Justice, Commerce, or Judiciary.

Furthermore, as the gentleman well knows any time that a bill passes the House it does not become an act of law until it passes the other body and is signed into law by the President.

Therefore, my question is this: Is this

the beginning of a long series of waiving points of order, in order to expedite the business of the House or for any other purpose in an election year?

I simply want to know if we are going to fragment all of the rules of the Reorganization Act of 1970 this year, as the majority party did last year?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY), a member of the Committee on Appropriations, to answer that question.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I venture to say that if we waited until the other body acts with regard to most of these authorizations, we are going to be here until Christmas before these appropriation bills are passed.

Mr. HALL. My good friend from New York knows that there is nothing new about that in this body in recent years.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished gentleman from Texas will yield further, we are trying to get out ahead of that time. This is a presidential election year.

With respect to the Department of Commerce, we have no authorization for export control; we have no authorization for NOAA salaries and expenses, fish protein plant or the fishermen's protective funds as well as the National Bureau of Standards items in the Department of Commerce, for research and technical services, standard reference data, fire research and safety, flammable fabrics, and the Maritime Administration.

Then we have some related agencies, for which there are no authorizations. Many of these authorizations have already passed the House, but they are hung up in the other body, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. There are no authorizations for radio broadcasting, to wit: Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty directed behind the Iron Curtain, and all the appropriations for the U.S. Information Agency amounting to over \$205 million.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York has proved my point better than I could phrase it myself, the point being that the lack of authorizing legislation by the legislative committees simply eliminates the intended line item review by which we can exercise purse-string control in these areas, and I will always object to such a resolution.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I do not always disagree with my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Missouri, but in this case the committee has, in the printed hearings which you have before you, examined every single line item and has ascertained and set forth the amounts that would be appropriate for each of these items.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York has been here much longer than I, and he is an astute observer of the parliamentary process, and he knows well that one of the built-in systems of checks and balances are the rules of procedure established by

Thomas Jefferson and reviewed down through the years in each subsequent Congress, which establish that we should have both authorizing and appropriating legislation. I simply point out that we are being denied that privilege. The gentleman from New York has been of invaluable assistance in helping me, but I say that we are negating that very important function, and also the Reorganization Act, by waiving such prerogatives.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 983 simply waives points of order from the standpoint that an authorization bill has not been enacted into law. A year or so ago, Mr. Speaker, when we did this on the first occasion, I complimented the Committee on Appropriations, and I would like to again compliment them today for their efforts, because a year ago they came in with a schedule in an effort to try to program bills so that we would know when they would be considered in an effort to expedite the business of the Congress, and for eventual adjournment.

I have a copy of the letter dated May 4, 1972, which has a schedule of the Committee on Appropriations, and if it can complete this schedule as slated we will have passed all of the appropriation bills, ending with the Department of Defense, and the Treasury-Postal Service-General Government during the week of June 26.

I certainly think that they are doing a marvelous job, and I do not know how they could possibly do so unless the Committee on Rules keeps on waiving points of order on authorizations. I do not wish to be unfair in my statement here on the floor of the House that would in any way affect the distinguished body on the other side of the Capitol, but we do have scores of bills over there, Mr. Speaker, which have passed this House, and they are just sitting over there, and we may never get them out. So if we are going to do our share, then I think we should proceed along this way, and not be handicapped or handcuffed because the distinguished other body does not keep up with the work of the House of Representatives.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to support every request we get from the Committee on Appropriations to waive points of order on the authorizing legislation, so that the appropriation bills can be handled.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. 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. ROONEY of New York. 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. 14989) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the

fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) and myself.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would propose a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, is it true that it would require a two-thirds vote on the motion that the gentleman from New York has stated in order to bring this bill up under the present parliamentary situation?

The SPEAKER. It requires a majority vote.

Mr. HALL. I thank the Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

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. 14989, with Mr. HAYS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) will be recognized for one-half hour, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) will be recognized for one-half hour.

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, this bill contains a total of \$4,585,054,350—as shown in the table set forth on page 2 of the committee report.

There is included \$523,792,750 for the Department of State; \$1,764,561,000 for the Department of Justice; \$1,309,074,000 for the Department of Commerce; \$186,753,600 for the Federal judiciary; and \$800,873,000 for the related agencies.

I should first like to point out that this committee has made a reduction in the total amounts requested to the extent of \$102,934,250.

The total amount recommended for the Department of State is \$523,792,750. This is a decrease of \$46,055,250 below the total amount of the budget estimates, and an increase of \$12,990,390 over the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year.

Under the general heading of "Administration of Foreign Affairs" a total of \$300,050,000 is recommended. For "International Organizations and Conferences" the bill includes \$158,584,250. The total recommended for "International Commissions" is \$18,342,500 and a total of \$46,816,000 is provided for "Educational Exchange."

Proceeding to the item called Contributions to International Organizations, the committee has placed in this bill a proviso limiting the annual U.S. contribution to the United Nations and affiliated agencies to 25 percent, except for the joint financing program of the organization known as ICAO, International Civil Aviation Organization. As a result of this proviso contained in the pending bill, a reduction of \$25,103,500 has been effectuated.

Much has been said and written by officials of the executive and the legislative branches of the Government relative to the necessity for reductions in our contributions to these international organizations, but to date little has been accomplished. This recommended reduction serves notice that the Congress means what it has been saying in this regard.

The committee has provided \$4 million for the International Labor Organization, which, together with the \$7,692,580 contained in the second supplemental appropriation bill, the conference report which was adopted today here in the House, will provide a total of \$11,692,580 to be made available for that organization. While this total is not the full amount requested, it represents a payment of dues far in excess of 1½ years.

With regard to the Department of Justice, the total amount contained in the bill for that Department is \$1,764,561,000. This is an increase of \$189,959,000 over the total appropriated for this Department for the current fiscal year.

The committee has again recommended the appropriation of the full amounts of the budget estimates for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, and the Antitrust Division. The funds requested for the new drug abuse law enforcement program have also been approved.

Continuing along in the bill, I should like to refer to the summary with regard to the Department of Commerce. The budget requests for that Department for the fiscal year 1973 total \$1,332,925,000 in new budget authority, for which the committee recommends, in the accompanying bill, a total of \$1,309,074,000. In addition, \$233,312,000, the amount of the budget estimate, is included for liquidation of contract authority.

With regard to the Economic Development Administration, a very essential operation and part of the Department of Commerce, the total request for fiscal year 1973 is \$245,731,000. The committee has recommended in the accompanying bill \$255,731,000, an increase of \$10 million over the total requested. This is for the reason that the committee has disallowed the requested use of a revolving fund.

With regard to the Regional Action Planning Commissions, the sum of \$39,072,000, the full amount of the budget request, is included in the accompanying bill to provide for the development programs and administrative expenses of

the regional commissions and for regional research and coordination.

The committee has included \$63,934,000, the full amount of the budget estimates for necessary expenses of the Department of Commerce in fostering, promoting, and developing minority business enterprise.

With regard to NOAA, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, a total of \$357,293,000 in new budget authority is included in the bill in the appropriation items under the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. This is \$26,782,000 more than the total appropriated for fiscal year 1972.

The amount allowed by the committee will provide increases for air pollution and air quality monitoring, agriculture weather forecasts, and warnings, river, and flood forecasts and warnings, improvements in the basic observation and communications networks, repair and maintenance of equipment, marine mapping, and charting, and improved fisheries resources assessment and management, including the monitoring of foreign fishing activities in waters adjacent to the United States.

This amount will also include increases for sea grant research, for observations and studies of the Great Lakes, and for equipment and facilities for hurricane and tornado warnings, weather and marine forecasting, including improvements in the basic observation network, air quality observations, river and flood warnings, coastal zone mapping, and pollution control systems on ships and facilities.

Now, continuing to the Maritime Administration, the committee recommends a total of \$575,534,000 for the six appropriation items which make up the total for the Maritime Administration. This total includes \$342,222,000 in new budget authority and \$233,312,000 for the liquidation of contract authority. The new budget authority recommended is

\$57,735,000 more than the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year.

In connection with ship construction, the sum of \$280 million is included in the bill, which is \$50,313,000 over the 1972 appropriation and is \$30 million more than the budget request. This increase of \$30 million is for the purchase of modern break-bulk type U.S.-flag vessels for layup in the national defense reserve fleet as authorized in the bill recently passed by the House.

There is also included an increase of \$100 per cadet for uniform and textbook allowances for each of the cadets at the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N.Y.

Now, as to the Federal judiciary, the total amount of the estimates as presented to the committee was \$199,531,600. The committee has allowed a total of \$186,753,600, which is a reduction of \$12,778,000 in the total amount requested and is an increase of \$10,648,850 over the appropriations for the current fiscal year.

Now, as to the Supreme Court of the United States, the committee has allowed a total of \$5,617,600. However, the funds requested for the hire of eight automobiles for the Associate Justices, whose salaries are \$60,000 per annum, have been denied once again by the committee.

Continuing, it will be noted at pages 20 and 21 of the committee report the action of the committee with regard to salaries of supporting personnel and other miscellaneous expenses of the courts.

Finally, the committee has recommended a total of \$800,873,000 in new obligatory authority for the 15 agencies included in this title. This amount is a reduction of \$8,586,000 from the budget estimates and is an increase of \$47,001,000 over the total appropriated for the current fiscal year.

The following table is a summary of the amounts recommended in this bill in comparison with the budget estimates for fiscal year 1973 and the appropriations for fiscal year 1972:

Department or agency (1)	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1972 (en- acted to date) ¹ (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1972 (5)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973 (6)
Department of State.....	\$510,802,360	\$569,848,000	\$523,792,750	+\$12,990,390	-\$46,055,250
Department of Justice.....	1,574,602,000	1,776,225,000	1,764,561,000	+189,959,000	-11,664,000
Department of Commerce.....	1,274,609,000	1,332,925,000	1,309,074,000	+34,465,000	-23,851,000
The Judiciary.....	176,104,750	199,531,600	186,753,600	+10,648,850	-12,778,000
Related agencies.....	753,872,000	809,459,000	800,873,000	+47,001,000	-8,586,000
Total.....	4,289,990,110	4,687,988,600	4,585,054,350	+295,064,240	-102,934,250

¹ Includes amounts in 2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1972, as passed the House.

This, generally speaking, is a summary of what is contained in this bill. I would at this point be glad to attempt to answer any questions that may be asked, and I shall now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The committee has cut down the amount of contributions to international organizations to a percentage of 25 percent. Can the gentleman inform the House as to whether this has the approval of the administration?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Well, I shall tell the gentleman from Illinois that this committee does not make such an inquiry of any administration, whether it is Democrat or Republican. If they want to get in touch with us, that is their privilege. We will be receptive to what they have to say. But in this particular instance no one has advised the committee that there is any exception to a reduction to 25 percent in the assessed contributions to the United Nations and affiliated agencies such as has been recommended, No. 1, by the President of

the United States and, No. 2, in a report by our former Ambassador to the United Nations, the Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge.

Have I satisfactorily answered the gentleman?

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield further.

Mr. YATES. Did the representative of the administration who presented the request for funds to the committee request the full amount of funds or an amount equal to 25 percent?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman representing the administration is Assistant Secretary of State De Palma, a very fine gentleman, who came before the committee and requested the larger amount.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. But, of course, he did the same with regard to the International Labor Organization, and this House and the other body backed up the committee in its action in cutting the requested funds for the ILO.

Mr. YATES. Then, I take it from the gentleman's answer he has heard nothing from the administration since their report was filed.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is correct.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman from New York and the members of the committee. I think they have been more than generous with the United Nations under the circumstances, and it is my hope they would peel a little bit more of the bark off the U.N. and apply it to the taxpayers around the country who have been supporting so generously this outfit in New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman expresses my very views on this subject. Of course, I would have liked to have cut it further than down to 25 percent, but we have to be realistic about this. The League of Women Voters, I understand, has been enlisted to do some lobbying on this subject. I do not know how effective they might be, but I think that the Members here can stand up and be counted when we get to this item and see whether or not we are really going to make some economies in the United Nations or are they going to approve a pension check of \$30,000 a year to Mr. U Thant, who was a \$6,500 a year civil servant of Burma before he became the Secretary General and who never contributed 15 cents toward his pension, such as the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from New York have to do.

Mr. GROSS. That is exactly right. And the gentleman, of course, is aware, as all Members of the House should be, that there are millions of taxpayers in this country who have no lobby representing them in Washington, D.C., and it is presumed that we in the Congress of the United States will well and faithfully represent them. We are not well and faithfully representing them if we give to this debating society in New York otherwise known as the United Nations—if we give to them 31-plus percent of all

it takes to keep them living high on the hog.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am in thorough agreement with the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MIKVA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield.

Mr. MIKVA. I would like to direct the distinguished chairman's attention to the portion of the bill that deals with the appropriation for the judiciary and particularly to that part referred to on page 21 of the report dealing with probation officers in which the committee made reference to the fact that the appropriation allowed for an additional 100 probation officers. Am I correct that when representatives of the Probation Officers Association were before my Committee on the Judiciary they assured us that in an effort to make the probation service function better, because it has not been functioning very well, they were going to seek a request for some 300 additional persons that they felt were needed properly to supervise those people who are released on probation?

As the chairman knows, we have had a great deal of recidivism and crime committed by people who are out on probation, and the probation officers association and the judges representatives association expressed the hope that they were going to need help in order to remedy that problem by putting more personnel in the field.

Would the distinguished chairman advise as to the committee's attitude toward that problem?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Most certainly—most certainly.

Does the gentleman realize that all the requested appropriations for the Federal Judiciary are not examined by the Office of Management and Budget because of the comity between the three branches of Government, the legislative, executive, and judicial? They are just lumped into a budget request.

So, here we had a request for an increase of 50 percent.

The committee was more than generous and as a matter of fact surprised the chairman in their generosity in allowing 170 additional employees in the probation system, to wit, 100 additional probation officers, 20 probational officer assistants, and 50 probation clerk-stenographers.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I do not think the committee was generous at all because if approval was given, I assume it was on the basis of a problem.

If the committee is satisfied that the current crime problem is under sufficient control in this country that an additional 100 probation officers will make our big cities safe, I would be very surprised.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I shall tell the distinguished gentleman from Illinois that this year we thought we did do something good with regard to the serious crime problem which still exists.

We allowed the full amount for the FBI, we allowed the full amount for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, we allowed the full amount for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, the huge amount of \$850,597,000, and

the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs was also allowed the full amount as well as the request for the new drug abuse law enforcement program. We were convinced that this was necessary and proper and recommend in this bill the full amount for these agencies. However, we also had some very expert advice, I might say, on the items for the judiciary. We have been overly generous, I assure the gentleman.

Mr. MIKVA. If the gentleman will yield further, the Probation Service happens to be under the judiciary, and some of us think that maybe that is a part of the problem.

Of course, probation officers, as the gentleman knows—

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am well acquainted with that contention and first heard of it about 25 years ago.

Mr. MIKVA. They are the most important part of law enforcement because they are the people who decide which ones go to jail or get probation and which ones require supervision when they are out of prison.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I hope the distinguished gentleman realizes that the gentleman from New York understands exactly what the probation system is. The gentleman from New York spent 4½ years of his life as a prosecutor in Brooklyn, N.Y. at a time when we uncovered Murder, Inc. and sent Lepke and many other characters to the electric chair in Sing Sing.

Mr. MIKVA. I must say to the distinguished chairman that I cannot understand how, knowing what the function of the probation officer is, and that they are failing to meet the problem of crime as it exists today in many of our big cities—

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I will say to the gentleman that I can appreciate that.

Mr. MIKVA. I do not see how the gentleman can appreciate it when I have not finished my question.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Please do not give me any more appreciation. We have amply covered this matter at pages 145 through 149 of part 1 of the printed hearings.

Are there any further questions?

Mr. MIKVA. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Not at this time. We have spent more than enough time on this one subject.

I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding.

I would like to ask the chairman a question with reference to the subject matter of minority business enterprises referred to in your committee report on page 16 in your appropriation for the Department of Commerce.

As I understand it this bill would raise the amount appropriated for this particular activity by \$20,266,000.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is correct.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I feel impelled to ask questions and raise issues because I spoke out recently, less than 10 days ago, as to a very disturbing development with regard to these minority business enter-

prise activities. I want to ask if the \$20 million or a substantial portion of that increase, or of the total budget request for this enterprise, will go toward the further development of the so-called private corporation that has been concocted in order to do the job that the Small Business Administration is supposed to be doing.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I think I can best answer that by giving the gentleman from Texas a breakdown of the \$63,934,000 to which he refers. When we add the \$33 million plus for community investment, the \$11 million plus for private investment, the \$3 million plus for Government investment, the \$3 million plus for business management development, the \$2 million plus for experiment and demonstration and the \$10 million plus for program development and management, the total is \$63,597,000.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman. It confirms my suspicion, and I must ask other questions following this statement that I would like to make to the distinguished chairman.

As I said, less than 10 days ago I addressed the House, and I have brought this matter to the attention of the Small Business Administration, the Director, and the Secretary of the Department of Commerce, and to the respective substantive committee chairmen because, in setting up these organizations, one of them, with the best of intentions—now, let me say that I am one of those who believes that this program as developed by the Department of Commerce in conjunction with the Small Business Administration, is very sound in purpose. I think it was worthwhile and meritorious, but abuses have crept in of the worst kind that this committee ought to know about. I think even at this late point something should be done by this committee, if nothing more than directing the Secretary and the administrators to make sure that these abuses are ruled out, and prevented.

Here is what has come up—

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am convinced, and I am a Democrat, that former Secretary of Commerce Stans and the present Secretary of Commerce Peterson would not stand for any abuses in this program. The facts should most certainly be brought to the attention of the present Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. GONZALEZ. They have been, but I think it is incumbent upon this committee, and it is their responsibility to do something about it. I know how it is, Mr. Chairman, an ordinary Member of the House may not be listened to too carefully, but there has been a specific instance which I have documented showing that one of these private corporations which was financed through these moneys and based in Los Angeles, Calif., and which is primarily intended to do work among the minority group labeled as "The Spanish-Speaking or the Mexican Americans" was formed. Since then the organizer of this corporation has traveled extensively throughout the Nation attracting groups and forming private business groups in order to obtain charters and petition for charters for savings and loan associations on the Fed-

eral level, applications for banking charters and related types of charter requests.

Now, he in turn has then communicated to these groups that if they wish to present the proper application that will result in success then they must come to his private consulting business which he has set up. This group has taken in \$5,000 in one specific instance from a businessman in my own district in exchange for obtaining a federally granted savings and loan charter.

He has also taken this type of fee as a consultant. He wears two hats as a private consultant and as head of a corporation funded by the U.S. taxpayers.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. If the gentleman is expecting an answer from the gentleman from New York, he had better conclude his statement because there will not be any time left to answer the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. There will be plenty of time.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman is presently using all of the time allotted me.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Knowing the zeal with which this chairman works, there will be plenty of time to root out this evil.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I want to be fair and I appreciate the deplorable situation such as the gentleman describes. I would, if I were he, report this to the present Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I have done so.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Well, it is too bad the gentleman did not take the time to send a copy of his letter to the gentleman from New York or to one of the members of the subcommittee.

Mr. GONZALEZ. We did, but that was done less than 36 hours ago when we received the first answer from the Department of Commerce.

May I ask this question and then that is it.

Will the gentleman sustain an effort to caution administrators in the formation of these private corporations that they will be closely monitored in their administration of these tax funds?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I most certainly will.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I hope his letter arrives.

Mr. GONZALEZ. It will be there—in fact, it should be.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Very good.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) has gone through the bill in great detail and, therefore, it is my intention to take very little time.

We have held very detailed hearings on all of the subjects that come before this subcommittee and they are available to everyone and the report is also available.

I would just like to make this one comment and I am sure this expresses the

sentiments of all the committee. We are going to miss one of the outstanding witnesses who always yearly came before this subcommittee. That is Mr. J. Edgar Hoover who was Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The late Mr. Hoover was before our subcommittee in March. He was in his usual good form and presented his budget in his usual great fashion.

We shall miss him. He was always a very expert and outstanding witness.

I do want to make just this one brief comment. I share the position of the subcommittee on the question of the United Nations and affiliated agencies and the idea of trying to get our assessed contribution down to 25 percent. I have to express some concern about whether or not we were wise in doing it exactly this way. Maybe this is the shock treatment that will be necessary to try to get the United Nations people, as they develop their budget for these agencies, to cut it down to 25 percent which is the goal of the administration and I think the goal of all of us.

But it is another thing to reach a goal in an orderly way, and I am not sure that we have really made the right decision in this particular instance.

My mind is open on the question, but I do not want anyone in any way to infer that I do not believe that is a legitimate goal that we should try to achieve.

The chairman made mention of the fact that so far as the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is concerned—that they have had another huge request this year for additional funds and we decided, after our hearings and after an investigative report on this agency which is in the RECORD for anyone to read—that it would be better this year to hold them at last year's figure plus annualization and Pay Act costs because they have been going through growing pains and have not even been able to fill all the positions we gave them last year.

I should also point out to the committee, however, that as a result of recent legislation approved by the Congress and which is now the law, amendments of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act, there is a supplemental request pending downtown in the amount of approximately \$17 million, which we will probably be requested to consider before too long.

It seems the wisest course to take is to hold the Commission at the present level and take a look at what the needs are going to be as this new supplemental request comes along. We do not want to infer that we are minimizing the importance of equal opportunities. That is not the position at all. The position is that we think this agency needs to be given an opportunity to absorb some of the rapid growth that it has had over the past number of years.

I think it is also interesting and should be pointed out that every agency of Government, not only this Commission, has its own equal opportunities group within the agency, and so we are getting a little bit, shall we say, topheavy in some of these kinds of activities, and I think it is

time to hold out until we can see that the money is being wisely spent.

I shall not take any further time on this measure. I think the chairman did refer to the fact that we did not give any automobiles to the Justices of the Supreme Court. I also add that we did not give them any buses either.

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

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

Mr. YATES. I should like to ask the same question that I addressed to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. Has the gentleman heard from any of the high officials of the administration respecting its approval or disapproval of the action taken by the committee in cutting the funds for international organizations to 25 percent?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I will have to say that the Ambassador at the United Nations called me and expressed some concern about it.

Mr. YATES. Was no concern expressed by the Secretary of State?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Not to me.

Mr. YATES. Or by anybody in the President's office?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Not to me.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. MIKVA. Does the gentleman share agreement in the committee's cuts of the requests made by the Bureau of Prisons and the Probationary Service of the Judiciary?

Mr. CEDERBERG. We always go through this every year. We try to use the best judgment we have, taking workload statistics into consideration. The judges always ask for more than they expect they are going to get. This is the history of the appropriation. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee consults with other Members as well, and they take a real hard look. We have very serious discussions with the people who are going to administer these programs, and I believe it is safe to say the figure we came out with is one that they will not be too unhappy with.

Mr. MIKVA. Is this true also of the cut made in the Bureau of Prisons' request for appropriations?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Yes, I think that is true.

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

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

Mr. DENNIS. I happen to be the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Judiciary Committee, and as such I would like to take this occasion to commend the committee for having allowed the full \$135 million to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which I know is a \$4 million increase.

I also note, however, in the report that this increase is primarily to cover Pay Act costs. I was wondering whether the gentleman could tell me whether or not anything is left to provide any additional personnel in that increase.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I do not think so, and I do not think there was any request.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The answer is no. The Office of Management and Budget, the President of the United States, the Attorney General and the other responsible officials, have not requested any more than the committee has appropriated.

Mr. CEDERBERG. You will recall the President some time ago directed a 5 percent cut on most of the agencies of the Government. Only a few exceptions have been allowed. We are trying to hold personnel down. I will have to say this: I think the Immigration and Naturalization Service does a tremendous job with the personnel they have to work with.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. DENNIS. I would concur in that statement, and I would merely like to

submit to the favorable consideration of the committee in the future the possibility of some additional personnel here, particularly in the border patrol, because the extensive hearings we have been having in our subcommittee on the subject of illegal aliens have convinced me that while they are doing a very commendable job, they are trying to stem the dike, in a very difficult situation, with probably an inadequate number of personnel for the job.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The following tables will indicate the activities of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and their workload:

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate		1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
INSPECTION FOR ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES				BORDER PATROL			
Aliens admitted with documents.....	4,774,239	5,000,000	5,250,000	Deportable aliens.....	300,424	361,000	366,000
Stowaways found on arrival.....	282	320	350	Smugglers of aliens.....	3,814	4,200	4,600
Citizens arrived.....	7,636,925	8,600,000	10,000,000	Other law violators.....	1,664	2,000	2,400
Alien crewmen examined on arrival.....	2,359,551	2,390,000	2,400,000	Persons apprehended.....	305,902	367,200	373,000
Entries over land boundaries.....	220,364,917	222,200,000	223,400,000	INVESTIGATING ALIENS' STATUS			
Aliens denied entry on primary inspection.....	297,425	308,000	325,000	Pending, start of year.....	28,862	35,641	39,641
Aliens admitted as immigrants.....	370,478	380,000	385,000	Received.....	173,775	189,000	200,000
DETENTION AND DEPORTATION				Terminated.....	166,996	185,000	206,000
Orders to show cause.....	33,643	35,000	37,000	Pending, end of year.....	35,641	39,641	33,641
Hearings.....	30,805	33,000	36,000	IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION RECORDS			
Aliens expelled.....	387,713	430,000	435,000	New files prepared.....	871,909	900,000	920,000
Average number of aliens held in detention per day.....	2,853	3,000	3,200	Index searches.....	4,249,731	4,500,000	5,000,000
NATURALIZATION				Alien address reports.....	4,227,219	4,400,000	4,600,000
Applications, petitions for naturalization.....	147,320	155,000	160,000				
Applications, derivative citizenship.....	37,851	42,000	44,000				
Applications for new papers.....	11,271	12,000	13,000				
Recommendations to courts.....	111,590	115,000	120,000				

Mr. CEDERBERG. We are not unmindful of the problem. This is one of the difficulties the Appropriations Committee has. We have budgets to live with and to try to be fiscally responsible.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I think it is not in the best interests of the United States that our Government, through its State Department, often fails to take a firm position in its dealings with other nations. To put it mildly, we let ourselves be pushed around. Whether this is out of the goodness of our hearts or because we seek to avoid confrontation is beside the point.

A prime example has been our relations with the Japanese, particularly in recent months on the question of reversion of Okinawa and the positioning of U.S. weapons on Japanese territory. No other nation in the world would have been as charitable as the United States in its dealings with the Japanese. We won Okinawa at great cost in lives and treasure in 1945. The struggle for control extended over many weeks and represented some of the bitterest fighting in the war. Okinawa has greatest strategic importance for the defense of the Pacific. Now we have returned it carte blanche to the Japanese. There have been no thoughts of reparations such as all other nations extract and which the Japanese would have claimed in fearful amounts had they won. We have even allowed the Japanese to tell us what weapons to use in Japan and on Okinawa. At their demand we have withdrawn nuclear and chemical weapons, even though they may

be extremely important at some time to the defense of Japan itself. In fact we provide Japan's defense while they turn their efforts to supplanting us in world trade and even to capturing the U.S. market in some commodities. Their drive for trade has been made possible by U.S. know-how and U.S. economic assistance, both of which were given to Japan in full measure.

This is not the only example in our dealings with other nations where we have allowed America's own best interest to be shunted aside in order to placate other people or to obtain doubtful friendships. The economic aspects of this policy are due more concern than they have received in the past. We simply do not have the money to pay the bills which rightfully should be paid by other people as their share in the partnership for the preservation of the free world.

As part of the concern for the American economy, there is also the matter of world markets for American products. Other nations engage in vigorous programs to stimulate foreign sales and, in part, this is demonstrated in the balance of payments figures of the United States, which show we are being outstripped by foreign competition.

This fact is dramatically demonstrated when one considers the sales of American-made defense products abroad. Many nations that have cash on hand seek to buy American weapons. When we sell American weapons to foreign nations, American industry and American workmen benefit. Equally important is the fact that American technicians go abroad with those weapons as ambassadors of good will. Yet, because of U.S. policy in

some instances and congressional limitations in others, many friendly foreign nations are unable to buy U.S. weapons. Regardless of the reason advanced for the limitation on sales, the foreign governments are going to buy weapons if they feel they are needed for their countries' military forces. When they cannot buy from us they turn to other countries. France is a chief beneficiary. As a result of this short-sighted American policy, the French have been able to boost their defense industry to third place in the world, most of it from foreign sales.

I continue to receive reports from American businessmen and others that in contrast with the policies of foreign governments our own State Department shows very little interest in helping U.S. business to gain a foothold or strengthen its transactions in foreign markets. Certainly all of this is contrary to the best interests of the U.S. economy and the U.S. workingmen, who are dependent upon increasing markets, both at home and abroad if we are to retain economic stability.

There is also mounting evidence that U.S. prestige and diplomatic influence is dwindling in too many parts of the world. This is especially true in the Asian subcontinent, the perimeter of the Indian Ocean, and in Africa, where Soviet influence is mounting, where Russian base rights are being obtained. In too many areas we are becoming persona non grata, while Soviet diplomatic and military power is becoming more and more evident. We have even joined forces to seek the reopening of the Suez Canal, the principal beneficiary of which will be Russia which will gain access to the east-

ern Mediterranean and the approaches to the Indian Ocean, and through its influence on Egypt will control shipping which flows through the Suez. This includes oil which is increasingly important in world trade.

One has only to look at a map to see that Russian influence now extends from the mainland of Asia, down through Vietnam, into India, through the Indian Ocean, and up into the Mediterranean Sea. If ever Russia is successful in breaking Greece and Spain from the friendly ties those nations now maintain with the United States—and propaganda directed from our own shores against these friendly governments is not helping our own cause—then Russia will be in position to exercise virtual control of most of the shipping lanes of the world. The United States will be in danger of being shut out from much of the world, both as a military defender of freedom and as a factor in world trade.

We cannot allow these things to happen. Surely those nations and governments which now are openly doing business with Russia are not doing so out of consuming admiration for and trust in the Communists. There must be more to it than that and I suspect it is because they are failing to receive satisfactory indications of a strong and positive U.S. policy in world trade and world affairs. There has to be a better way to accomplish America's objectives and it is not something that can be accomplished by increased expenditures.

Now let me comment on U.S. contributions to the U.N.

Mr. Chairman, when the amendment stage is reached it is anticipated an amendment will be offered which proposes a continuation of the sad old refrain that only the United States must insure the continued operations, however expensive, of the United Nations. We have always paid a disproportionate share of the cost even when those costs included glorified junkets to Africa and exorbitantly high pensions and salaries. The U.N. can operate for less. Now let's face the fact that the cut which is proposed by your committee is a very modest cut. It is proposed in this bill that we continue to pay 25 percent of the cost. Even that is far too much. No one else even approaches payments as large as that. Instead of an amendment to increase the American contribution, we should cut the bill even further. The taxpayers would appreciate that additional measure of consideration.

The amendment will be supported on the ground that if the American taxpayer does not pay the cost of the United Nations, no one else will. Is it our fault if other nations do not consider the United Nations an organization worth supporting even in the minute amounts which those nations have agreed to contribute? The same reasoning would have us believe that because France and Russia do not support the United Nations, it would be our fault if the world body goes broke. That does not make much sense either.

All of this is absurdly to the extreme. Since the inception of the United Nations, Americans have paid far more than

they should have and far more than has been required even under the extremely generous standards which our country agreed to accept. The only relief the American taxpayer is going to get from excessive payments is from this body, the U.S. House of Representatives.

Our representatives in the U.N. do not want cuts. They enjoy their status as generous patrons in a free-spending institution. It is disappointing that they have not shown concern about the extravagant standards at which we support the United Nations. Certainly the U.N. will not work for cuts. The U.N. delegates enjoy the high and extravagant living which the U.S. payments provide.

Certainly 25 percent must be considered a payment which is more than fair. It is far more than anyone else pays. I do not know by what logic we can be asked to pay more. We do not gain that much from being a member of the United Nations. Only a few of its agencies can point to creditable accomplishments. The United Nations itself is of a very doubtful value in world councils. It does nothing about the war in Indochina. In the one decision it has made which materially affected the United States and world history in recent years, the United Nations roundly scored the United States, ousted our friend the Republic of China, embraced Red China, then staged a wild celebration, in part at our expense.

The cut in funds recommended by the Appropriations Committee is very reasonable. It does show that we expect results from the United Nations that we are not satisfied with its current policies and its lack of accomplishment.

Finally, present policies would have us violate a specific legal limitation passed by both the House and Senate and signed by the President. Those who want us to continue supporting the United Nations out of all reasonable proportion never mention the fact that there is now on the law books a strict limitation as to how much the United States shall contribute in support of international organizations. I refer to 22 U.S.C. 262b which states that it shall be illegal for the United States to pay a share of more than one-third of the budget of any international body. Yet, Mr. Chairman, the United States has paid a total of about 41 percent of the total U.N. outlays since 1946. In calendar year 1970 as an example, the United States contributed 38 percent of the total cost of operating U.N. Headquarters and the Secretariat. This is in direct violation of the law—a law, incidentally, which was first proposed by the Senate, the same body which ratified the U.N. Charter. Obviously, the Senate saw no conflict between the Charter and the language of 22 U.S.C. 262b.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN).

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank the gentleman from Michigan very much for yielding.

I had hoped to have a few minutes while the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) had the floor, but perhaps we can achieve the same purpose at this point.

I want to speak briefly about the recommended appropriation of funds for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. As the gentleman from New York said, the full amount requested, \$850.5 million, which represents an increase over last year of \$151,678,000, has been granted by the committee.

In view of some of the recently completed studies which the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, which I head has made of this agency, I want to say that I have very strong doubts about the need for this increase and the desirability of spending more money on this program in this period of fiscal stringency.

I do not oppose the bill, and I am not going to offer an amendment to cut this appropriation back to last year's figure. In fact, I am pleased that the committee has taken two areas as the basis for its increase, even though I feel the total increase to be unnecessary.

The first is in the part E corrections program. Our committee found in the State of Arkansas that 37 percent of the grant funds had been used for two-way radio communications and only 7 percent for corrections even though the penal system in that particular State had been found to be so archaic as to be unconstitutional.

The second relates to the granting of 94 additional auditors and grant administrators. Only three out of 55 State programs over the period of 3 years since the beginning of this program have been audited by LEAA, and judging by the results of the audits, this function is absolutely vital. The complaint was made by the agency that there were not sufficient personnel to do this. I am sure all of us who are familiar with this problem are pleased that the attention of this committee has been turned to this situation and that it has taken the action which OMB has refused to do.

Mr. ROONEY of New York, Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut yield?

Mr. MONAGAN. I certainly yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I believe the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN) is entitled to substantial commendation for his work and the work of his subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations in uncovering the waste that they did with regard to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. There is no question about it. They did a valuable public service. This committee respects them for it, and to that extent has allowed the full 94 additional positions requested by LEAA with the direction that they be used primarily to strengthen grant administration and for an audit section which would be sufficient to prevent such waste as was uncovered by the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut and his committee.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank the gentleman for his words of commendation.

I want to make my own position clear, and that of the subcommittee which I head, we are not for killing LEAA, as some people have suggested. We are in

favor of safe streets. We are in favor of crime control. We only want to make the program work as its legislative creators, of whom I was one, wanted it to work.

I believe that no one who has studied LEAA, including the administrators themselves, would deny there have been substantial failures in performance. And we must remember that we were talking about an appropriation last year of \$698 million and this year of over \$850 million. Clearly some committee of the Congress should feel a responsibility to look into this, without any suggestion that its members are soft on crime. Since our subcommittee has this responsibility by law, we have undertaken this job.

What will our forthcoming report show? There has been misuse of funds. A major portion of the funds appropriated to SPAS by LEAA have not been allotted to the local agencies by the States. Only 25 percent of the \$552 million appropriated in the first 3 years for ACTION grant programs has gone down to the localities.

As has been said, there have not been sufficient auditors or evaluators. A large portion of the funds allocated have gone beyond the criminal justice system and have been used in vague projects or those duplicating existing Federal programs in other agencies.

There has been no measurable effect of these funds upon the incidence of crime.

Many consultants have been grossly and unnecessarily overpaid. There have been premature drawdowns of funds costing more than \$4.4 million so that the taxpayer has been paying interest on money borrowed to give to the agency but it has either not been used by the agency or has been placed in banks to earn money or even invested in Federal bonds paying interest to the holder.

Finally there has been a failure of the agency to evaluate its programs and determine their value and achievement.

For these reasons, we must continue to monitor this program and assay its value, and even though these tremendous sums are made available this year because of the urgent demands of today's average citizen for protection, this act must not be considered a condonation of inefficiency not an excuse for waste or ineptitude.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time so that I might announce to the chairman and the ranking Member and the House that when the bill is read I propose to offer an amendment to strike lines 11 through 16 on page 51 of the bill.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Is that the same amendment the gentleman offered in the committee and that was defeated?

Mr. YATES. That is correct. And I hope for a different decision from the House.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the annual consideration of an appropriation for the State Department would not be

complete without having inquired of the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) about the \$993,000 representation allowance or the tools of the trade in the State Department. How are they faring this year with respect to the tools of the trade?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Well, I think they have been sufficiently taken care of in the present year, and I am informed that in the coming year, although there will be some price and wage increases for local alien employees abroad who serve the lunches or dinners or cocktails, they will see to it that no one puts more than a 1-ounce shot in any cocktail or highball. If they do this, they will be able to meet the price and wage increases.

Mr. GROSS. Is this by reason of an order from the officials in striped pants over in Foggy Bottom, or is this because of—

Mr. ROONEY of New York. No. This is a deduction that the gentleman from New York has made after a discussion with some Foreign Service officer friends.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Can the distinguished former Ambassador to the United Nations make a contribution to this cause?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes. I would merely say the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Iowa show great diplomatic foresight and legitimate concern in questioning things like the representation allowance, but from my personal experience in the world of diplomacy I believe that the subcommittee has been a little too tight in cutting that phase of the budget. Quite frankly, the art of diplomacy, like the art of salesmanship, requires a representation allowance equal to the stature of the country. I am sympathetic to our poor diplomats who, I feel, have been overly restricted by this subcommittee.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Will the distinguished gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. Mr. ROONEY of New York. Of course, the gentleman diplomat from Illinois would not understand that the committee and the Congress have given the diplomats, if you want to call them that, every nickel that was asked of the committee in the past 8 years.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes. Mr. ROONEY of New York. So the gentleman's complaint is without merit.

Mr. DERWINSKI. No. May I pay a sort of indirect compliment to the gentleman from New York. I wish to advise the gentleman from Iowa that it is my experience that many people in Foggy Bottom are scared to death of the gentleman from New York, so they asked for less than they might if they were not in such fear of the chairman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Would the gentleman mind if I ask him a confidential question?

Mr. GROSS. Not at all. Mr. ROONEY of New York. Which we can strike from the record later on.

When he was up in the United Nations in New York as a so-called delegate or ambassador—did the gentleman from

Illinois find that he got more than a 1-ounce shot?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I happen to be a man who practices great sobriety, but I did find that many small countries were able to do more entertaining than the mission of the United States of America.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I did not realize that the question of sobriety entered into the size of the country involved.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI), by what yardstick he measures the stature of a country, but I doubt that I ought to do so because my time is running out and I have a few other questions to ask.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I plan to take some time at a later point during the debate and I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me additional time.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. One of the grave mistakes that has been made is that the gentleman from Iowa did not accept the position as the ambassador to the U.N., as a special delegate, and I hope the gentleman will reconsider taking it, because I think he could be very helpful.

Mr. GROSS. My declination was prompted by the fact that I wanted to see the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) fill that position this year. I am sure the gentleman is very well rounded out by that experience.

Mr. Chairman, I really rose to ask a few questions of the chairman of the committee concerning the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission which as far as I can tell from reading the committee hearings has got to be one of the most incredible wastes and completely mismanaged boondoggles Congress has created in a long, long time.

I understand that this outfit has been characterized by the Civil Service Commission as "chaotic"; that section heads hired their own personnel without consulting the personnel office, and if an individual had been active in the civil rights movement, he was almost a cinch to be hired whether or not he had any ability to do the job.

Can this be true, I would ask the gentleman?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I must say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that I am presently confronted with some cockroach troubles in a New York primary election and I could not be present and chair the committee at the time that they were scheduled to appear. The hearing was conducted under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. SLACK). I have read the testimony, including the story about the special assistant to the chairman of the Commission who was attired in odd fashion to receive the public in a gov-

ernment office and who when he was interviewed had a bottle of soda pop in one hand and a bag of potato chips in the other which he munched and drank during the interview by members of the surveys and investigation staff of the House Appropriations Committee.

Mr. GROSS. According to your hearings, the EEOC also made a number of contracts with former employees and one of those contracts was with its acting general counsel. This man refused to resign unless the EEOC gave him a contract that would pay him \$20,500 to write a manual or handbook.

Does the gentleman know anything about this individual or the contract?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I know nothing about it other than what is set forth in the printed hearings.

Mr. GROSS. According to your hearings it was stated that the EEOC had doled out \$2 million and could not show any results for the \$2 million that was doled out.

Are Members of the House to believe that \$2 million appropriated to this outfit could just disappear, or vanish into thin air?

And the chairman of this outfit, according to the hearing record, is so inept that he could not remember the last-minute spending to keep money from going back to the Treasury, of some \$316,000, as I remember the hearings. I do not know whether the investigators' report was printed by the committee in whole or in part—

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The report was published in toto.

Mr. GROSS. The investigators' report says that he did not know anything about the memorandum covering the spending of some \$316,000. Yet this same inept official drives around in a chauffeur-piloted automobile because the hearing records show that he requested money to buy uniforms for a driver.

What in the world goes on in this Government?

I should like to read a few sentences from the hearing record, and the investigators' report on this subject:

The top management officials of EEOC did not understand or had failed to insist that the requirements of the Federal personnel system, including applicable laws and Civil Service Commission regulations, be uniformly applied to all phases of personnel management.

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The report continues:

For example, it was found that many officials in the operating offices of EEOC hired their own personnel without consulting with the personnel office.

And it continues:

Discussions with officials at headquarters and in the field offices visited disclosed that many top officials of EEOC have been oriented toward hiring individuals who were involved in civil rights movements rather than hiring individuals based on their ability to perform the job for which hired regardless of any prior civil rights experience. Some officials believe that many of the EEOC morale and employee problems stem from the fact that this

type of individual frequently disrupts the operation of the Commission.

I have seldom read a more serious indictment of management in Government, and I am surprised, I will say to my friend, the gentleman from New York, that this outfit, in the light of the testimony and the hearings, was given an additional \$7.5 million.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we did not give them any increase in personnel in this, but we allowed increases for the pay costs, and so forth, that are involved.

Mr. GROSS. I understand, but in the light—

Mr. CEDERBERG. I think the gentleman from Iowa makes a very good case, but in the light of some of the other lights I think we did very well under the circumstances.

Mr. GROSS. I can commend the gentleman, but I still think we ought not to provide for a \$7.5 million increase on the basis of the incompetence of the chairman and the other top layer officials in the EEOC. Their incompetence is so evident by the testimony before your committee that there ought to have been an axing of some of these officials. That is where the saving should be made.

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, it is the firm intention of the United States to obtain a reduction of the U.S. assessment rate in the United Nations to 25 percent at the earliest possible opportunity consistent with the international obligations of the United States. This would mean using the existing procedures of the United Nations: First, to persuade the next General Assembly to adopt a 25-percent ceiling; and second, to give us the main benefit of increased contributions by present members and of additional contributions by new members in order to bring the U.S. share down to 25 percent.

Existing procedures of the United Nations require that the criteria determining the assessment rates of members be set by the General Assembly of the United Nations. The next meeting of the General Assembly will take place in the fall of this year. This means that the soonest a new criterion establishing a 25-percent ceiling could be adopted would be November or December 1972. Such a ceiling would constitute an instruction to the Assembly's Committee on Contributions.

In the spring of 1973 the U.N.'s Committee on Contributions will meet to set assessment rates for the next 3 years. If the U.S. position is successful at the 1972 General Assembly, the committee will at that time recommend a scale for the years 1974-76 which will set the U.S. assessment at 25 percent. This scale will then be adopted by the General Assembly in the fall of 1973 and will begin to take effect as of January 1, 1974.

The present U.S. assessment rate and the current United Nations scale of assessments were drawn up by the Committee on Contributions on the basis of

existing criteria during the spring of 1970 and were approved by the General Assembly in the fall of 1970 to have effect from 1971 through 1973. There is no provision for altering a scale of assessments between the 3-year assessment periods unless it is clear that there have been substantial changes in relative capacities to pay. Since the United States is—and always has been—under-assessed according to comparative national income statistics, this exception could not be invoked. There is no provision for changing scales already set on grounds of political equity, which is essentially the contention we are now making.

A unilateral reduction in the U.S. assessment percentage would place the United States among the defaulting U.N. members. It would be in violation of our international obligations and could cut the ground from under the effort we are now making to persuade others to honor their international obligations. At a time when, after so much delay, we see some prospect of constructive action to deal with the U.N. deficit, it would be incomprehensible if we were to join the list of defaulters.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) had raised a question over what was the administration position. I would wish to quote from a transcript of a news briefing by the Department of State on Tuesday afternoon, and I quote from Mr. BRAY's statement:

Mr. BRAY. We are deeply disturbed by the action taken yesterday by the House Appropriations Committee which would have the effect of reducing our contributions to the United Nations and certain other international organizations.

The Administration is determined to negotiate reductions in our assessment rates to 25 percent where they are higher than that figure in the UN system. But, as President Nixon said in February, "We must proceed in an orderly way in reaching this goal. It is unrealistic to expect that it can be done immediately."

We do not consider it—and these are my words again—either orderly or in accordance with the legal membership obligations of the United States suddenly and precipitantly to cut our contributions to budgets already voted by each of the organizations affected and on which payments are already due.

Each of the seven organizations affected budget in the expectation that the United States and other members would discharge by the Committee's action had voted its their membership obligations in accordance with established procedures.

The Committee's action, if approved by the Congress, would violate our international obligations.

We earnestly hope that the House of Representatives will reverse this action and that it will vote to fulfill our obligations of membership in these seven organizations.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this time to comment briefly on the bill making appropriations for fiscal year 1973 for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce.

I am basically pleased with the general tenor of the bill as approved by the Appropriations Committee. It closely follows the President's budget request but with a total reduction of over \$10 million.

While I clearly realize the limitations of the overall budgetary situation, I regret that the requested fiscal year 1973

obligational authority for the Economic Development Administration's development facilities program is \$30 million less than for fiscal year 1972. These grants and loans have done a great deal to improve the economy in areas where economic improvement is most needed.

I note that only two of the 112 items in the measure are amounts greater than recommended by the President's budget. One of these two increases, in particular, has my full support. This is the Economic Development Administration's industrial development loans and guarantees program.

This activity provides an effective means to assist the private sector in providing long-term employment opportunities at relatively little cost to the taxpayer but with great benefit to the potential employee and to the local area.

Industrial development loans and guarantees encourage private investment by providing low-interest, long-term loans to help businesses expand or establish plants in economically depressed areas where the projects cannot be financed through banks or other private lending institutions.

While there may exist situations in which a program of public employment is the most effective means to reduce short-term unemployment, I remain firmly convinced that only through assistance and encouragement for the private sector can we finally and successfully solve our unemployment problems and move toward a strong and stable economy.

EDA's action programs have effectively increased job opportunities in hundreds of areas which would otherwise be unable to meet their economic potential. The bill before us today will permit the agency to continue to fulfill its mission of more jobs for more people.

AMENDMENTS TO BE OFFERED TO JUSTICE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION (H.R. 14989)

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time during the consideration of H.R. 14989, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and the related agencies for fiscal year 1973, I intend to offer the following four amendments:

1. Page 19, line 17, strike out "\$114,400,000:" and insert in lieu thereof "\$115,417,000:".
2. Page 20, line 6, strike out "\$42,616,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$48,899,000:".
3. Page 20, line 16, strike out "\$17,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$18,090,000:".
4. Page 40, beginning in line 15, strike out "\$75,663,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$84,153,000:".

The first three amendments would restore \$8,390,000 which was cut by the Appropriations Committee from the budget request for the Federal prison system. The first amendment relates to salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Prisons. The second amendment involves funds for buildings and facilities. The third deals with support of United States prisoners in non-federal institutions.

The fourth amendment would reinstate the full budget request of the United States probation office and would fund

a total of 348 additional federal probation officers. The Appropriations Committee bill (H.R. 14989) provides funds for only an additional 100 probation officers. The need for these additional 348 positions was the subject of extensive testimony before the House Judiciary Committee by officials of the U.S. Probation Office and by numerous people working in the field of probation.

We ought to be increasing our commitment to the probation system and the prison system when the public safety and the very viability of our criminal justice system are at stake.

I hope my colleagues will support these four amendments when H.R. 14989 comes to the floor.

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 the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes, namely:

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. HAYS, 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. 14989) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on H.R. 14989 considered in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE "INSPIRED" RESPONSE TO THE PRESIDENT'S DECISION TO MINE THE PORTS OF NORTH VIETNAM

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, a couple of days ago I addressed the House on the question of how my constituent mail and telephone and telegraph communications were running in connection with the President's action in ordering the mining of the ports of North Vietnam. I reported that, as of that date, over 600 such communications had been received by me and they were running 31 to 1 against the President's decision. I indicated some surprise at reports emanating from the White House to the effect that telegrams to the President were

running substantially in support of his position.

I received a letter a couple of days ago from a constituent which perhaps sheds a little light on this question, and while I do not want to embarrass the writer, who is a Republican of long standing, by disclosing his name, I think it will be of interest to the Members of the House if I would just read it. It is very short. He says—

As a registered Republican, I am very much against the move of accelerating the Vietnam war. It is obvious that if we swallow our false pride and withdraw our help from South Vietnam, our prisoners will be released.

I have just returned from the Far East and they don't need us.

He put his postscript at the end: Mr.—

I will not reveal his name, but he is a prominent Republican leader in our community—

had a call from the White House to call all his friends to wire Nixon favoring his actions.

My Republican friend's letter is dated May 10, 2 days after the President's speech. I think it perhaps explains how it came about that the President received the amount of telegrams favoring his action that the White House has indicated.

CONGRESSIONAL MAIL ON THE MINING OF HAIPHONG HARBOR

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

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say to Members, in response to my friends from Ohio, that most of the mail I get against the action of the President on this subject is on obviously prepared mimeographed or typewritten prepared sheets, or is otherwise clearly the result of an organized effort by the opposition.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, let me say that none of the mail that I have received on this subject has been obviously organized. They have been individual letters and telegrams, and individual telephone calls, many from people I know, and many from people I have never met before.

Mr. DENNIS. I have not seen the gentleman's questionnaire, of course, but sometimes that makes a difference, too, the way you ask the question.

Mr. SEIBERLING. I am not referring to questionnaires. I am referring to unsolicited communications. I will be glad to make them available to the gentleman if he would like to peruse them.

Mr. DENNIS. I think I have enough communications, both ways, from my own constituents, but, as I have said, most of them in opposition are obviously prepared or inspired by organized groups of people who think like the gentleman thinks.

ATTEMPTED ASSASSINATION OF GOV. GEORGE C. WALLACE

(Mr. BURLISON of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and

extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the attempted assassination of Gov. George C. Wallace, a leading contender for the Democratic nomination for President, marks a turning back of the clock in a most tragic fashion. We have all prayed that the loss of the Kennedys and Martin Luther King, Jr., to the assassin's bullet in the 1960's marked the end of a chaotic and murderous political epidemic in American political life. We had hopes of a more healthful climate for the decade of the 1970's. Apparently, this was not to be.

All decent people mourn this tragedy. Not only do we sympathize with the Kennedys, Kings, and Wallaces. The real concern must be for the very spirit and moral fiber of our system. It epitomizes the decay of our system, or our people, or both.

It is difficult to prescribe a remedy inasmuch as the cause remains so elusive. Is the problem connected with a breakdown in our legal system and more specifically that of criminal law? Our Constitution is said to call for "speedy justice." Yet it can be convincingly argued on the basis of past examples that this murder or attempt thereof will not be prosecuted, tried, and appealed with either speed or justice to society. It might be argued perhaps with equal sincerity and rationale that the cause is more intangible and lies in our refusal to give necessary attention to the sociological components of our society.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose here, nor is there time, to explore the reason for our sickness. Suffice it to say that it is absolutely essential that we recognize that the sickness, indeed, does exist. Let us not pause nor rest until we have found the cause or causes and then call upon all the scientific, social, and political ingenuity at our disposal to apply the remedies. If each of us will accept such a commitment, I can then see a bright and shining national future emerging from the dawn. But if we refuse the commitment, it is my fear that our Nation may be in its twilight, slowly submerging into darkness that signals the end.

THOUSANDS OF FARMERS AND SMALL BUSINESSES ARE BEING LIQUIDATED BECAUSE OF HIGH FEDERAL ESTATE TAXES

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

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, thousands of farmers are being forced off their lands and small businesses are being liquidated because of high Federal estate taxes, which require valuation of such properties, on the death of the owner, at current market value rather than with reference to the income-producing value of the property as farmland or as a going business operation. This type of liquidation is a blow at the very basis of our American free enterprise system.

With other Members I am cosponsor with the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SEBELIUS) of H.R. 8341 which is designed

to remedy this situation, by permitting a valuation at death based upon the reasonable earning power of the farm or business. I urge the Committee on Ways and Means to give early and favorable consideration to this measure; and I include and insert in my remarks a timely news item on this subject which was printed in the Richmond, Va., Times-Dispatch of May 14, 1972:

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, May 14, 1972]

FARMERS FORCED OFF LAND

NEW YORK.—Thousands of American farmers are being driven off their lands, forced to sell their farms to real estate speculators, some of them say, because of the method used by the Internal Revenue Service to assess inheritance taxes.

Such taxes are assessed on what the land could be sold for, rather than what it is worth as farmland. Thus, many people who have inherited farms have had to sell them to developers simply to pay the taxes.

As a result, the IRS is being termed partly responsible for destroying a segment of American agriculture and, at the same time, accelerating the spread of the suburbs.

PAST DECADE

Over the past decade, the value of agricultural lands within easy access to metropolitan areas has skyrocketed as land speculators have bought up every available piece of property. The value of this land for agriculture, however, has largely remained constant or has declined.

The IRS insists on assessing all agricultural land at the "price at which property would change hands between a willing buyer and a willing seller."

The result has been that farmers holding property whose value for development is five to 10 times its agricultural worth, have been forced to sell to the waiting speculators simply to pay their inheritance taxes, which run as high as 25 per cent.

That the situation became most acute very recently is largely attributable to the developing pattern of change in suburban America.

1970 CENSUS

The 1970 census disclosed that the fastest growing segment of the United States is the suburbs and the fastest shrinking is the rural areas. But of even greater significance is the evidence that the fastest growing segment of the suburban population is in the so-called "exurban areas"—those counties between suburbs and countryside.

It is here that the real estate speculators are most busily at work.

A spokesman for the IRS said, "We've been aware of the problem really for several years and, of course, what it boils down to is that under the law we have no alternative but to set the tax on the value the land sells for rather than on the value the property would be used for. It would take legislation to change the practice."

There have been numerous attempts at reform. Rep. Graham Purcell, D-Texas, on the House Agriculture Committee, has introduced each year for the last four a bill providing for a change of the valuation criterion.

At last count, there were six bills before the House Ways and Means Committee and one in the Senate, all waiting for action.

The extent of the problem and the concern it has aroused in agricultural America are indicated by the search for methods to circumvent the regulations.

In the Dade County area surrounding Miami, almost all farms have by now been incorporated. The corporate farmer is able each year to transfer a small amount of stock to his children as gifts, easing the final impact of inheritance taxes when he dies.

A few states have set up agricultural land

use districts. They require farmland under regulation to remain in farming for a certain period of years.

In California, the Land Conservation Act of 1965 enables a farmer to contract with the county government not to put farmland up for sale for at least 10 years, enabling the state to assess the land at agricultural rates.

But a new and more recent law may change this. It provides that if not enough of this restricted land is sold, the county assessor may use the income of the land to determine its value for assessment.

Joseph A. Janelli, governmental affairs specialist of the California Farm Bureau Federation, is concerned that "the IRS just might say this new law is a temporary expedient and we do not have the right to do it this way."

Mr. Speaker, action is needed to save the family farm and the family business from taxation which in this field is too often literally a "death tax" to these private enterprises.

WHEN?

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

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, the Secret Service and the FBI have a suspect in the shooting of Governor Wallace and they have the handgun they think he used. Unfortunately, they cannot do anything about the spectre of violence that the man and the weapon represent. The Secret Service has increased their protection of presidential candidates and potential candidates, but even if there were 100 agents for each candidate, they would not be able to prevent the kind of tragedy that occurred Monday in Laurel, Md. It is simply too easy to get close to a candidate, and it is too easy to get hold of a handgun.

While we condemn the attempt at assassination, while we increase the protection for candidates, while we deplore the atmosphere of violence in this country, we might also consider doing something besides wringing our hands. What happened to Governor Wallace happens with unbelievable frequency on the streets of every big city in this country every night and day. Many of the victims are not as fortunate as the Governor. Last year, more than 10,000 Americans were killed with handguns—by murderers and robbers and just plain people who happened to have a handgun nearby when they got into an argument with a friend.

We cannot eliminate the threat of political assassination. We cannot eliminate the kind of handgun crime that threatens to tear our big cities apart, but we can stop encouraging it with indifference. We can stop listening to the people who loudly complain that stopping the national traffic in handguns will "inconvenience" them because they won't be able to buy guns to shoot at targets. It might be time to listen to the complaints of the victims—who have been cut down with a weapon that has only one useful function—killing other human beings. Most of the people in this country want tough handgun control. They think that there are too many handguns in this country now, that we have enough handguns and enough

crime. They realize the two go together. It is unfortunate that, as the Congress, we have not come to the same realization.

The U.S. Treasury Department said yesterday that it took only 10 minutes to trace the handgun used in the attempted assassination of Governor Wallace. A Treasury spokesman said:

The trace was possible, because of the 1968 federal gun control law.

The handgun by the way is known as the "Undercover 2," a .38-caliber model manufactured by the Charter Arms Corp. of Bridgeport, Conn. The steel pistol has a barrel of 1½ inches, weighs 16 ounces and measures 6¼ inches in length. The handgun is good for shooting people at close range, and Monday it performed beautifully for the person who shot Governor Wallace.

That Gun Control Act of 1968 which was responsible for the quick trace is the same law that has been denounced and ridiculed so often by the people opposed to handgun control legislation. No doubt their criticism will be muted for several weeks now. No one argues that the Gun Control Act is a model law. It has been diluted and undermined by Congress almost from the day it was enacted, but the law does work. It is better than nothing. The Gun Control Act of 1968 enabled law enforcement officials to trace that .38 caliber revolver. Now, Congress has a responsibility to enact legislation that would prevent the sale and manufacture of handguns.

I have proposed legislation (H.R. 915) which would ban the sale and manufacture of handguns, except for the police, the military, and licensed gun clubs which keep the weapons locked up on their premises. It is strong legislation, but with the number of people who are killed and wounded with handguns each year, we need nothing less. I would hope that Congress will consider the shooting of Governor Wallace and consider what can be done to prevent it from happening again. I would hope that my colleagues take the opportunity to look at legislation that has been proposed to stop the sale and manufacture of this deadly weapon. As a nation, we cannot go on like this much longer.

I would like to insert several newspaper articles in the RECORD to give my colleagues an indication of some of the reaction to the Wallace shooting.

[From the Christian Monitor,
May 17, 1972]

GUN CONTROL—AND BEYOND

In the wake of the unconscionable shooting of Gov. George Wallace, for whom one prays a swift recovery, there are at least two constructive public things the American people can do.

The first is resolving to come to grips with the symbol and instrument of assassination and violence in America—the handgun. There are now probably 30 million handguns in the United States, and that total is being swelled by another 2.5 million each year. This is enough for every other household in the country to have such a weapon.

One can concede that stricter national gun control would not of itself disarm criminals nor thwart the would-be political assassin. It is true that it is people's thought, not a piece of metal, that harbors or releases murderous intent.

And yet, given the staggering totals of weapons in private hands in America, and the totals of aggression involving those weapons, in good conscience one can only conclude that strict and effective gun control laws must be adopted forthwith. We would like to see the recall of all handguns, the melting down of most of them, and the use of the remainder only for special purposes and by special permit.

We believe that this is politically attainable, despite the pessimism of skeptics. Therefore, we urge that such stern control measures be pushed. Even differences in ethnic makeup cannot account for the discrepancy between American gun-crime levels and those of other nations. Britain, for instance, a year ago had only 1/300th as many gun-murders as the U.S., with one fourth the U.S. population. A return to saner levels of social conduct can only come about when the number of arms in private hands is drastically reduced. If citizens would only match the pressures brought on Congress by firearms proponents, by writing letters to their legislators, this lamentably tardy gun control could be won.

The second constructive step the people can take following the Wallace shooting is to consider the full range of violence-inciting aspects of modern life. Movies which glorify cruelty, television violence, magazines whose editorial lenses distort all events into strife—these daily poison the social climate. More basically, Americans should expose old myths about the legacy of frontier life and every-man-for-himself lawlessness. The opposite of violence is humane, honest, and democratic dealing. If one looks to a higher power for guidance in private and national affairs, having obeyed all moral and legal responsibilities, he is acting to replace violence by peace and decency.

A final point is to stress again the hopes and prayers of citizens for Mr. Wallace's swift recovery. His political viewpoint has a right to representation in national affairs. To attempt to remove him from the campaign is to infringe not only on the Governor's right to seek office, but on the rights of his supporters. This is an injustice to them and a threat to the democratic political system, which must register all views to function truly.

It would be premature to say with any certainty what the effect of the shooting incident will have on the Democratic nomination or Governor Wallace's role in it. All that can be said is that the dark cloud of violence of the past decade has appeared again, and profoundly resolute prayer and action are needed to dispel it.

[From the Washington Post, May 17, 1972]

THE 1968 LAW AIDED TRACING OF GUN (By Carl Bernstein)

Ten minutes after Gov. George C. Wallace was shot, the Treasury Department had traced ownership of the gun used in the murder attempt to Arthur Herman Bremer—the Milwaukee loner accused of trying to assassinate the Alabama governor.

"The trace was possible," a Treasury spokesman said yesterday, "because of the 1968 federal gun control law"—passed in the aftermath of the assassinations of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and Robert F. Kennedy.

The attempt to identify the owner of the gun began seconds after Wallace was shot, as Bremer was being wrestled to the ground and a Secret Service agent grabbed the pistol.

The gun, agents of the Treasury's Division of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms Division confirmed yesterday, was a .38-caliber model manufactured by the Charter Arms Corp., of Bridgeport, Conn.

Known as the Charter Arms "Undercover-

2," the steel pistol has a barrel of 1½ inches, weighs 16 ounces and measures 6¼ inches in length.

The weapon, which sells for \$80 to \$85, was described by one gun expert yesterday as "one of the smallest, lightest .38 special steel frame revolvers made." He added: "A gun this length can't be used for any purpose but shooting people."

After the Secret Service agent had recovered the weapon at the Laurel Plaza Shopping Center, its serial number was telephoned to the headquarters of the Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms Division in Washington.

Agents of the division immediately contacted the manufacturer, which under the 1968 gun control law is required to keep records of all firearms it distributes to wholesale and retail outlets.

From Charter Arms, Treasury agents learned that the pistol recovered in Laurel had been part of a shipment sold to a Milwaukee gun shop, which the department refused to identify "for legal reasons."

However, spokesmen confirmed that agents were told by the retailer that the pistol had been purchased on Jan. 13 by a man who identified himself as Arthur Herman Bremer.

Under the 1968 federal law, retail firearms dealers must be licensed and must require gun purchasers to fill out a form listing name, address, height, and weight.

The law also requires the purchaser to sign the form and answer such questions as whether he is a convicted felon, a fugitive, a narcotics user or mental patient.

"It was an effective search," a Treasury spokesman said yesterday, "because of that law. Without it we might have been able to make the trace but it would have been very difficult."

Under three new gun control bills now being considered by the Congress, the sale of the weapon used in the Wallace assassination attempt would be illegal because of its short barrel length.

The bills, now pending before the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, would ban the sale of all firearms with barrels of 1½ inches or less. Sponsors of the legislation maintain such short-barreled weapons are useful only for shooting people at close range.

[From the Washington Post, May 17, 1972]

GUNS, THE GOVERNOR AND THE CONGRESS

As Governor George Corley Wallace lay under the scalpels of a team of this area's finest surgeons Monday night, candidates for President, statesmen and politicians of all stripes took to the television stump to deplore "senseless violence" in our society, to wonder about the health of the body politic and to raise deep questions about the strong current of violence running just millimeters under the surface in our country. Too little is known at this point, it seems to us, about the suspect in the Wallace shooting to draw any sweeping conclusions as to whether this act illuminates dark recesses in all the rest of us or indeed as to what this all means or will come to mean in the political processes of the United States.

We do know a few things, though. First, Governor Wallace was shot with a handgun. Second, the man whom federal and state authorities have identified as the suspect in the shooting was arrested last October in Wisconsin on a concealed weapons charge. Finally, we know that gun control legislation has been dragged before an unwilling Congress year after year—to no avail.

Yet, there we all were, on Monday, May 16, 1972 with a presidential candidate cut open on an operating table, with our leaders crying about his spilt blood and with the memories of Friday, November 22, 1963, Thursday, April 4, 1968 and Wednesday, June 5, 1968, etched indelibly in our minds and upon our collective spirits. And still, through all the days of all those years of

grief for our honored public men, for peace officers by the score and for unnamed and little noted private citizens, murdered, maimed and accidentally killed by private weapons in unlicensed hands, we have not been able to pass the sort of gun control legislation that would make these grievous public and private events much less likely to occur.

Today, May 17, 1972, the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee can and should seize the occasion to bring us out of our national delinquency. The committee meets this morning to consider various proposals for regulating the use and circulation of guns in our society. This newspaper has long advocated strong gun control legislation and we see no earthly reason to urge any less today. We believe that handguns should be available only to authorized military and law enforcement personnel and to others only upon the most carefully circumscribed showing of need or in gun clubs where their use is strictly limited to sporting purposes. All long guns should be registered and their owners licensed to use them. Such legislation has long seemed reasonable, necessary and even urgent to us. Nothing underscores the urgency of such legislation more than the lifelong paralysis now predicted for Governor Wallace.

We do not argue that the passage of such legislation will make every presidential candidate safe from attack or that it will eliminate gunplay from our national life. We recognize that there are millions of guns in private hands all over the nation and that even after the passage of strong regulatory legislation, there will be a virulent black market in illegal weapons. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that strong regulatory legislation strictly enforced might have made it harder for a man picked up on a weapons charge last October to acquire a snub-nosed 38 in January—as the suspect in the Wallace shooting is said to have done. And it might make it harder for a lot of other people to acquire weapons too, thereby saving the lives and health of a number of politicians, wives, mothers, policemen, lovers, strangers. The passage of such legislation would do much to change the atmosphere in this country at a time when our doubts about violence in our national life trouble us deeply.

Finally, it seems to us that our leaders—all of those presidential candidates, including the President himself—who were so fulsome in their denunciation of violence two days ago might strike a more positive note by setting forth clear positions favoring strong gun control legislation. Governor Wallace, himself, could do the nation a great service by reconsidering his strong position in opposition to gun laws. For in the end, it is useless to deplore "senseless violence," no matter how passionately and eloquently, while doing nothing about it, just as it is senseless to ignore a practical opportunity right at hand to begin to curb that violence.

Strong and sensible gun control legislation should be passed by the Congress now.

[From the New York Times, May 17, 1972]

SHOOTING OF WALLACE SPURS A NEW EFFORT TO TIGHTEN GUN CONTROL

(By Ben A. Franklin)

WASHINGTON, May 16.—The attempted assassination of Gov. George C. Wallace of Alabama with an American-made, \$80 bargain revolver of a type that has been barred as an import since 1968 spurred anew here today the periodic and usually unsuccessful efforts of gun law reformers to tighten Federal firearms legislation.

A test vote was scheduled tomorrow in a Senate subcommittee on a proposal to prohibit the sale to anyone but law enforcement officers of snub-nosed, readily concealable weapons with little or no sporting value,

such as the revolver used in the attack on Governor Wallace.

Treasury Department law enforcement aides said that the pistol used by Arthur Herman Bremer, the 21-year-old suspect who is accused of shooting four persons yesterday, was a .38-caliber snubnosed revolver manufactured by the Charter Arms Corporation of Bridgeport, Conn.

Wounded along with Governor Wallace were one of his Alabama State Police bodyguards, a Secret Service agent and a woman bystander.

It was learned today that this was the second Charter Arms so-called Undercover 2 owned by Mr. Bremer.

Federal law enforcement officials said that the same model revolver caused Mr. Bremer's one known previous brush with the law, an arrest in the Milwaukee suburb of Fox Point, last November for carrying a concealed weapon.

The charge was later reduced to disorderly conduct, a misdemeanor, and he was convicted. Under normal police routine that gun was formally confiscated on Dec. 8, 1971.

Five weeks later he bought another.

COULD NOT BE IMPORTED

In an interview today, Douglas S. McClanahan, the 39-year-old founder and board chairman of Charter Arms, acknowledged that under the Federal Gun Control Act of 1968 his company's five-shot revolver with a "two-inch barrel"—it is actually one and seven-eighths inches long, he said—could not be legally imported.

He noted that the same revolver with a 3-inch barrel, also manufactured by Charter Arms, would be a legal import under the Federal law.

The 1968 act was supposed to end the importation each year of 20,000 to 30,000 cheaply made "Saturday night special" handguns, and thus reduce the rapid rise in crimes of violence committed with "junk guns" selling for \$15 to \$30.

But it imposed no standards of concealability on American-made handguns, and a loophole in the law has permitted the continued importation of unassembled foreign parts that are put together by 23 companies in this country for legal sale.

Both Government and private firearms specialists said in interviews today that Charter Arms's \$80 revolver could not be classified as a Saturday night special. The .38-caliber snub-nosed revolver is a standard law enforcement officer's sidearm. The Charter Arms version sells for \$12 to \$16 less than the similar but more widely known Smith & Wesson and Colt Revolvers.

SALES TO CIVILIANS

But Mr. McClanahan said that on the advice of his lawyer he would not disclose what proportion of Charter Arms sales of the snub-nose gun were to policemen.

"Our competitors would really like that information," he said. There seemed little doubt, however, that many sales were to civilians.

The revolver that shot Mr. Wallace was purchased by the suspect last Jan. 13 at Casanova Guns in Milwaukee, according to Treasury spokesmen. Under the Gun Control Act of 1968, a revolver purchaser and the gun dealer must fill out a Form 4473—Firearms Transactions Record, listing the buyer's name, height, weight, race, address and date and place of birth.

The form, kept on file by the dealer requires the buyer to swear that he is not under indictment for or convicted of a felony, that he is not a fugitive from justice, that he is not a drug addict or "adjudicated" as a mental incompetent, that he has not been dishonorably discharged from the armed forces and that he is not an illegal alien or a United States citizen who has renounced his citizenship.

PROOF OF AGE NEEDED

The sale may then be legally completed if the purchaser can offer proof that he is over 21 years of age and is a resident of the state in which the gun is bought, the two other chief criteria in the 1968 act.

Martin Polner, the Treasury Department's Director of Law Enforcement, said today that detailed sales records, including weapons' serial numbers, required to be maintained under the act, had enabled Treasury agents to trace the revolver "within 10 to 15 minutes after we got the information on the gun."

Charter Arms was asked by telephone to whom it had wholesaled the weapon and the point of sale was traced by phone to Casanova Guns in Milwaukee.

Mr. Polner would not say whether Mr. Bremer or the Milwaukee gun dealer were under investigation for possible violations of the 1968 act.

But critics of the act, including Senator Birch Bayh, Democrat of Indiana, have intended that the mere recognition of such sales does nothing to control the distribution of "these vicious weapons which have no legitimate use" in civilian hands. Most sporting and target pistols, for ballistic reasons have longer barrels of 5 to 6 inches in length.

TEST VOTE SCHEDULED

Mr. Bayh is chairman of the subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Senate Judiciary Committee—a panel that has struggled to strengthen the Federal gun laws for years because no other committee would tackle the problem—and it is before this subcommittee that the test vote will come tomorrow.

Senator Bayh hoped that the eight-member panel would improve his proposed amendment to the 1968 act, which would ban the sale or transfer of a handgun to anyone but a law enforcement officer unless the Secretary of the Treasury determined, after tests, that the weapon was suitable for "lawful sporting purposes."

The effect of the Bayh Amendment would apparently be to forbid the general sale of almost all pocket sidearms—those with 2-inch and 3-inch barrels, or with an overall length of 7 or 7 and one-half inches. The 1968 law already effectively prohibits the transportation of most such weapons.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, May 17, 1972]

THE WEASEL'S TWIST

There was a recent time when one might have thought that the terrible toll of leaders and those who sought to be leaders in the decade of 1960s was an aberration, that somehow now the American nation was restored to sanity. The attempted assassination of Gov. George C. Wallace of Alabama has dispelled that error, and it has been replaced with the sad relearning that running for public office—high or low—is still so risky that the office seeker must be more stringently protected against the people he seeks to lead.

To Wallace and his family, as well as to the other victims of Monday's shooting, we extend sympathy and all wishes for an early recovery. The specter of disability hangs over the governor; we would remind him that Franklin Delano Roosevelt was not deterred by physical disability from running for office, and Wallace has the same right to be heard.

What a terrible blow is this latest manifestation of political violence to our tightly held beliefs in how the process of election should be conducted! Are candidates and officeholders alike to be as Nero was in the last years of his reign, fearful to go anywhere but the most secure areas? Must "public appearances" be limited to television studios which are themselves the centers of armed camps? These things, we used to believe, happened only in faraway places, or to gangsters in our own land.

The roster of the last decade is horrendous.

There is the official violence of Orangeburg, Kent State, Jackson State and Attica. There is the individual violence which has brought down John and Robert Kennedy, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., Malcolm X, and now Wallace. Even George Lincoln Rockwell had the right to a reasonable expectation that he would die in bed.

We live in a climate of violence. A century away from the frontier, we rejoice in violence. An "action-packed" television drama is followed by the real life picture of a presidential candidate surrounded by police and Secret Service agents, their eyes sweeping like lighthouse beams to spot the threat before it strikes. A century away from the frontier, we still have men riding shotgun. What William Butler Yeats said of his native Ireland in 1919 is applicable today:

We who seven years ago
Talked of honor and of truth,
Shriek with pleasure when we show
The weasel's twist, the weasel's tooth.

As government becomes more authoritarian, and parties more inclined towards self-justification than seeking honor and truth, the rest of the nation becomes polarized, inflamed. If the examples of the past were not enough, the incidents of Monday afternoon in Maryland should teach us that anyone—anyone—who attempts for his own vainglory or political purposes to divide and segment America must share the responsibility for the public climate in which madmen feel they can act.

Moreover, the list on which Wallace's name now appears is swelled a thousandfold by victims whose names are not as famous. This latest act of mindlessness should carry one message: If we as a nation act like vicious children, our lives must be stricured as are those of vicious children. Strict controls over the manufacture and sales of handguns—these children's toys—are more vital than ever. As Tom Wicker put it in Tuesday's New York Times: "The blatant availability of guns in America simply cannot be set aside or discounted as a major source of violent crime."

There is good draft legislation before the Congress on handguns (we have long since lost faith in Illinois legislators to acquit themselves like responsible human beings in this regard). It must be passed before our national preoccupation with violence thrusts more weapons into the hands of those who would seek the bubble reputation by shooting down those with whom they disagree.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, May 17, 1972]

GUNS—WHEN WILL WE EVER LEARN?

(By Jack Griffin)

The madness of man, the utter insanity sometimes of his reasoning, can stretch from a parking lot in Laurel, Md., to an L train on Chicago's South Side.

Last Saturday, a young man, Michael Kulis, a student who really cared for those who lived around him, was shot to death for a handful of nickels and dimes he might have been carrying on his person.

Two days later, in the soft sunlight of Maryland, Gov. George Wallace of Alabama, Democratic candidate for the presidential nomination, was gunned down for his political beliefs.

When in the hell are we ever going to learn?

Hate, an animal insensitivity to another man, these may have been the driving forces. But the instrument was a gun. Kulis and Wallace were poles apart in philosophy, shot for different reasons, but they were victims of the same thing. A gun.

Oh, all right. I know the venom that will be spit my way by the National Rifle Assn. and the Illinois Rifle Assn., and all those others who find in the gun a sense of superiority.

I know all their tired and useless, but unfortunately overwhelming arguments. I've been smothered with them before. I even know the threats of some of them.

THE USUAL BOGEYMEN

Take away our guns, they wall, and when the Russians come, or the Red Chinese, or the North Vietnamese, or the Martians invade us we will be able to fight them only with pitchforks.

Oh, for God's sake, I can just picture the local gun club down at the seashore driving off tanks with No. 6 birdshot.

Yeah, I know the one, the argument that guns don't kill. That it's the man, not the weapon. The hell guns don't kill. They damn sure do, because that's their primary function.

Now, we get to the one about a pistol in the house keeps the burglars away. That one is beautiful. I want to cry when I hear that one ring across the land.

A loaded pistol around the house is an open invitation for a 4-year-old kid to blow his head off when his mother isn't looking. The NRA itself in previous literature preaches that a gun and its ammunition should be kept apart when children are in the house.

That being the case, you're going to have to have one helluva obliging burglar in the house. You're going to have to ask the burglar to wait downstairs while you find the bullets to load your gun.

And, of course, I know that people die every day from a knife or an auto, or a bar of soap in the bathtub. And these are not outlawed. But I'll tell you something, I'd a damn sight rather face a man with a sling-shot than a .38 caliber pistol.

TO KNOW IS TO FEAR

Look, baby, I know about guns. Maybe more than a lot of nuts who think I should be deported. I grew up on guns, hunted with them when I was a kid and fought two wars with them. And maybe that's why they scare the hell out of me now, and I don't want any part of them.

Nobody has ever seriously suggested that all the guns be confiscated in this country, that the hunter be denied his sport. Just a uniform federal law that will make it difficult to buy a piece of machinery designed to kill another person.

Sure, I know that criminals and idiots and flaming nitwits are able to get a gun illegally, but that's largely because there are so damn many guns available.

Local, statewide gun laws are admirable, but ineffective. What does it matter if a man is denied a gun in one state, and has only to walk across the line to buy it in another?

A man bought a rifle from a mail-order house to kill a President, another got his at a sporting goods store and assassinated one of this country's finest black leaders. A senator died from a madman's pistol.

How much longer are we going to make it easy for a man to shoot a governor, or kill a kid riding home on an L train?

[From the Chicago Tribune, May 17, 1972]

AMERICA AND THE HANDGUN

The shooting of Gov. George Wallace raises once again the question whether new laws are necessary to restrict the manufacture, import, purchase, and use of handguns in the United States.

This was to be expected. A similar cry for gun control followed the assassinations of Dr. Martin Luther King and Sen. Robert Kennedy in 1968. In the emotionalism of that time, America as characterized as a sick, violence-prone, gun-toting society which needed to be protected against itself. The same is being repeated now.

We don't think America is sick. We don't think we are any more violence-prone than most countries, or that political assassinations are more characteristic of this country than of most others. What does distinguish

this country, however, is the case with which almost anybody can locate and acquire a gun.

The nation's gunowners (often referred to as "the gun lobby") make a cogent argument in opposition to controls. The second amendment to the federal Constitution states: "A well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." Thus, they claim, gun control is unconstitutional.

The majority of gun owners are law-abiding farmers, sportsmen, and private citizens who do not commit crimes. After all, it is criminals, not guns, who kill people.

There are more than 20,000 gun control laws on the books in this country (including Chicago and Illinois statutes), but they have failed to work because criminals do not obey them. Gun control laws are effective only after the fact, their opponents say, and there are so many illegal guns already in circulation that a ban on them would be next to useless in terms of reducing crime. Political assassins, they add, are mentally unbalanced fanatics who are impossible to stop with or without gun control laws.

All this is largely true, but the Constitution was written at a time when police were all but nonexistent and men carried swords and saddle pistols as a matter of course. Times have considerably changed. Does the Constitution require that everyone have free access to handguns as well as rifles? Do farmers and sportsmen really need handguns? As a hunting weapon, a handgun is next to useless. It is designed for the killing of men at close range, and for little else.

True, gun control laws have been relatively ineffective. But if they were combined with sterner stop and frisk measures and harsher penalties for the commission of crimes with a gun, would they not then work? Would not control on the manufacture and importation of hand guns eventually dry up the supply?

Pistols are involved in some 92 per cent of the homicides committed in this country every year. They are used in 96 per cent of the robberies. Must it be so easy for criminals to obtain them?

Many citizens in high-crime areas say they need guns for self defense. But for every incident in which a grocer or homeowner shoots a robber in self-defense, there are several in which a grocer or homeowner is shot reaching for his gun, and countless more in which innocent persons are shot either by accident or in a trivial quarrel. Of more than 20,000 persons shot to death in the United States every year, many die in crimes of passion or in accidents which would not have occurred if a gun had not been handy.

In short, political assassinations, tragic and conspicuous as they are, are only part of the problem. It would be illusory to think that measures such as we now feel may be advisable for the control of handguns will bring any immediate relief from assassinations or other crime. But they would quickly reduce the number of unpremeditated killings and would ultimately reduce the number of others as well.

Tho we hate to see further incursions on state sovereignty, federal legislation may be the best answer. Southern and western states would balk at stricter gun control laws as, apparently, would Illinois, where both Gov. Ogilvie and his opponent, Daniel Walker, oppose them. Nor are States in a position to control the importation and interstate commerce in handguns. In any event, we no longer feel that the right to own a .45 automatic should have priority over the chance of saving lives.

[From the Chicago Daily News, May 17, 1972]

GUNS VERSUS DEMOCRACY

This newspaper has fought for effective gun controls over a good many years. It has seemed to us that the series of assassina-

tions of public leaders begun with the murder of President Kennedy has provided the strongest possible argument for such controls. And it seems to us now that the brutal and crippling attack on Gov. George C. Wallace provides one more powerful thrust to the argument.

For the man who witnesses say shot Wallace could not have owned his .38 caliber pistol, for example, under Illinois Rep. Abner Mikva's bill prohibiting handgun ownership by any except members of the police, and military, and recognized pistol clubs.

Mikva's is one of the more stringent of many federal gun control proposals. The reason there is no effective federal control is that the opposition is well-organized and politically powerful. The Nixon administration itself has been acutely mindful of this power, opposing "tough" controls and hedging even on tame measures. Wallace himself has opposed gun controls.

So we hope the President, his Justice Department, and Congress will now take another reading of the issue.

For the persistence of the wave of assassinations and attempted assassinations from the murder of President Kennedy to the assault on Wallace poses a threat to the fabric of this democracy.

If our society is to spawn such megalomaniacs, and if their guns are to be used to deprive Americans of their freedom of political choice, then curbing them is a matter of urgent national priority.

The prevalence of guns in the hands of criminals has long posed a threat to the freedom of American citizens in the exercise of their right to be secure in their persons. Perhaps this latest in a series of assassinations attempts will help to bring the injustice home to our political leaders in a more personal way.

PROPOSED 37,000-ACRE SNOW MOUNTAIN WILDERNESS AREA IN NORTHERN LAKE COUNTY, CALIF.

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to establish a 37,000-acre Snow Mountain Wilderness Area in northern Lake County, Calif.

My introduction of this bill is both in response to the views of the people of Lake County as expressed formally through the endorsement of their board of supervisors for this proposal and in response to similar resolutions from two other affected California counties, Glenn and Colusa.

The Snow Mountain region is a beautiful, unspoiled area that is highly deserving of the national statute it would be afforded following its designation as a wilderness area. And, the Snow Mountain forests would surely benefit from the land use management practices that are required to be followed under the Wilderness Act of 1964.

Wilderness status permits usage of the area for activities that are compatible with retention of a primitive condition. Protecting the primeval environment of the Snow Mountain area includes the implementation of congressionally enacted prohibitions against the construction of permanent roads and the use of motorized vehicles in the area.

Under legislation adopted by the Con-

gress, private landowners within areas given wilderness designations are fully protected in their access to their property and, in addition, may have the right to exchange their lands for other public lands outside the wilderness area.

As is the case with any proposal of this nature that comes within the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, public hearings will have to be held in the local area to insure that the views of those most directly concerned can be taken into consideration before any final decisions are made.

I, personally, shall be soliciting continued local input on this question in order to refine fully the details of this proposal to make certain it meets the needs and wishes of the people who live and work in the area.

EDUCATION FOR THE SEVERELY AND PROFOUNDLY RETARDED

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill, H.R. —, to provide comprehensive education programs for a particularly neglected segment of our population—the severely and profoundly retarded. I am pleased that the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS), who is chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education, is joining with me in sponsoring this bill.

Today the severely and profoundly retarded are being excluded from almost all public education programs. And yet they, too, need and can benefit from education training. In recent years it has been demonstrated that even the most profoundly retarded respond to comprehensive education programs if reached early in their childhood. As with normal children, early cognitive stimulation is critical to intellectual development in the retarded child. Early training can make the difference between an existence of incontinence and immobility or a life of basic self-care and in some cases, work.

The bill I am introducing today would help to correct the present omission in our education system by providing comprehensive education programs specifically directed to the severely and profoundly retarded—those whose IQ level is 35 or less. The bill amends the Education of the Handicapped Act and authorizes the Commissioner of Education to make grants to public or private nonprofit institutions and community service centers working with severely or profoundly retarded children. Generally, the funds authorized under this program would finance—

Innovative model programs for the education of the profoundly and severely retarded children—programs that are designed to enable these children to develop as many independent skills as possible and to reach their maximum potential;

Comprehensive education programs that will include access to various therapies and the development of self-help skills;

Inservice training for parents and teachers playing a direct role in the lives of the severely and profoundly retarded.

The bill acknowledges that most children who are severely or profoundly retarded have other disabilities, and provides that no child shall be precluded from participating in a program funded under this bill because of additional disabling conditions.

In recent months the public's attention has been directed to the conditions that exist in the institutions for the retarded. Most brutal have been the television reports of the conditions in Willowbrook, a State institution for the retarded in New York City. The conditions of Willowbrook are the product of neglect—today's neglect and that of the past. In many of its wards, the smothering smell of filth and death hangs in the air and children are left to lie naked in their own excrement. These children are immobile, often grotesquely distorted because their muscles have atrophied. Many are incontinent and are often not clothed or clothed in filth because staffing shortages make it difficult to keep them clean. In January, ABC-TV did a documentary on Willowbrook. Geraldo Rivera, the commentator has written a book on the filming of this documentary. Entitled, "Willowbrook," the book begins:

When Dr. Wilkins slid back the heavy metal door of B Ward, building No. 6, the horrible smell of the place staggered me. It was so wretched that my first thought was that the air was poisonous and would kill me. I looked down to steady myself and I saw a freak: a grotesque caricature of a person, lying under a sink on an incredibly filthy tile floor in an incredibly filthy bathroom. It was wearing trousers, but they were pulled down around the ankles. It was skinny. It was twisted. It was lying in its own feces. And it wasn't alone. Sitting next to this thing was another freak. In a parody of human emotion, they were holding hands. They were making a noise. It was a wailing sound that I still hear and that I will never forget. I said out loud, but to nobody in particular, "My God, they're children."

Wilkins looked at me and said, "Welcome to Willowbrook."

The conditions do not have to be this way. Even the most profoundly retarded can be taught to dress, tie their shoes, and perform simple tasks. Very few need remain incontinent. It must be recognized that the retarded are members of our society too and deserve to share in its benefits and privileges and be given the services they need. If we provide education for normal children, we have the obligation to provide education for the retarded. This is not always being done, however, particularly in the case of the severely and profoundly retarded. The National Association of Retarded Children conducted a survey in 1971 and found that at best the States are educating only 36 percent of the retarded who are school age. I was not able to find any statistics for just the severely and profoundly retarded because the programs for them are so few. In New York City, for instance, a child under 5 who is not continent nor ambulatory—which is the case with most severely and profoundly retarded at that age—is not eligible for community services for the re-

tarded. While the severely and profoundly retarded now make up almost half of the Nation's institutionalized retarded population—in New York the profoundly retarded alone are 40.7 percent of the population—less than 10 percent on a countrywide basis are being given anything more than custodial care.

In a number of States suits have been filed in the Federal courts on behalf of the constitutional rights of the retarded to adequate care and education. On April 13, a Federal court in Alabama set down a number of minimum requirements for the State's institutions for the retarded—including a minimum of 6 hours of education daily for each child. Similarly, a court in Pennsylvania has ruled that the States must provide educational training for every mentally retarded child.

In addition to expanding the role of public education to include severely and profoundly retarded children, this bill will provide some timely and needed assistance to the States that are now being pressed by the courts and the public to upgrade their educational programs for the retarded.

Mr. Speaker, I have visited some of the smaller institutions for the retarded in New York. The doctor in charge of one of the hospitals told me that if he had people who could provide education services, and if the children could be trained when they are first institutionalized, they could be made ambulatory and taught to care of their personal needs instead of spending the rest of their lives in cribs.

Every retarded child has some learning potential. It is our responsibility to help them develop this potential. For too long we have been blinded by the disabilities of the retarded. Just as we look to the aptitudes of the normal child, it is time that we focus on the abilities of the retardate and direct curriculums and teaching methods to develop their capacities.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to support this legislation, for as I have already indicated, it fills a terrible void in our education system.

The text of H.R. 15034 follows:

H.R. 15034

A bill to amend the Education of the Handicapped Act to provide for comprehensive education programs for severely and profoundly mentally retarded children

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Education of the Handicapped Act (20 U.S.C. 1421–1426) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new part H as follows:

"PART H—COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR SEVERELY AND PROFOUNDLY MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN

"AUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAMS

"SEC. 671. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to public or private nonprofit institutions which work with, or propose to work with, severely and profoundly mentally retarded children, and to public or private nonprofit community based centers for such children, in order to develop and carry out—

"(1) innovative model programs for the development or demonstration of new or improved teaching methods, approaches, or techniques and school curriculum which will enable severely and profoundly mentally re-

tarded children to develop as many independent living skills as possible and to reach their maximum potential,

"(2) model comprehensive education programs for severely and profoundly mentally retarded children, particularly in their earliest years, which shall include access to speech, occupational, and physical therapy, and training in motor, communication, and self-help skills, and

"(3) inservice training programs for those teachers and other personnel, and training programs for those parents, who play a direct role in the lives of severely and profoundly mentally retarded children which will enable them to employ techniques which have been successful in the education of such children.

"(b) In determining whether to make a grant under subsection (a), the Commissioner shall give priority to programs which propose the education of severely and profoundly mentally retarded children in institutions so as to improve their capacities and reduce their dependence on custodial care, or which propose the education of such children in noninstitutional settings.

"(c) A grant pursuant to subsection (a) shall be made for a program only if the Commissioner determines that—

"(1) there are no requirements that the severely and profoundly mentally retarded children who participate in a program for such children be ambulatory, toilet-trained, or in possession of communication or self-help skills,

"(2) no severely and profoundly mentally retarded child will be excluded from participating in a program for such children because such child has, in addition to mental retardation, one or more other handicapping conditions,

"(3) there are no standard training accreditation requirements governing the selection and training of personnel in a program who will play a direct role in lives of severely and profoundly mentally retarded children,

"(4) in programs involving the teaching of severely and profoundly mentally retarded children, the ratio of teachers and teachers' aides to such children shall be no less than one teacher and one aide for every six children, and

"(5) Federal funds made available under this part will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of State, local, and private funds expended for the education of severely and profoundly mentally retarded children, and in no case to supplant such State, local, and private funds.

"(d) The Commissioner shall keep State educational agencies fully informed about—

"(1) the various programs for the education of severely and profoundly mentally retarded children developed and carried out pursuant to this part, in order to encourage the establishment or expansion, within such State educational agencies, of offices for the education of the retarded which shall extend education programs to retarded children, including severely and profoundly mentally retarded children, within the States, and

"(2) grants made by the Commissioner under subsection (a) to institutions or centers located within their State, in order that such State educational agencies may coordinate their efforts with respect to the education of severely and profoundly mentally retarded children with such grants.

"(e) In making grants under subsection (a), the Commissioner shall seek to achieve an equitable geographical distribution of programs for the education of severely and profoundly mentally retarded children throughout the Nation.

"APPLICATION

"SEC. 672. The Commissioner shall make grants under this part to institutions and centers on the merits of their proposals to him which shall be submitted on such appli-

cation forms and under such guidelines as he shall prescribe."

Sec. 2. Section 601 of the Education of the Handicapped Act (20 U.S.C. 1401) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(16) the term 'severely and profoundly mentally retarded children' means those children whose I.Q. level is 35 or less. These children frequently have more than one handicapping condition, i.e. retardation and blindness, retardation and deafness, retardation and cerebral palsy."

THE CONTINUING EFFORT TO CIRCUMVENT THE CROSS-FLORIDA BARGE CANAL

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I must point to a continuing effort on the part of Federal officials to circumvent the construction of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal without reference to laws approved by Congress on the canal or consultation with the Public Works and Appropriations Committees of Congress and the members of the Florida delegation. I am disappointed that the administrative branch of the Government has so completely ignored the legislative branch and I charge again that there is a distinct likelihood that these administrative actions are in violation of the Constitution.

It will be recalled that 18 months ago environmental pressure groups persuaded President Nixon to issue a press release which had the effect of stopping work on the \$200 million project which has been years in the making and was more than one-third complete. This was done without consultation with the Florida delegation or any of the committees of Congress. The President's action disregarded the fact that the Cross-Florida Barge Canal had been authorized by Congress; that Congress had appropriated \$54.6 million in Federal funds for construction; that the people of Florida had invested \$14 million of their tax money on this project. No steps have since been taken to show justification for this procedure. At no time has there been an environmental impact study made in compliance with section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act on the many aspects of the canal construction project, which should be clarified before a final decision is made on the desirability or need for the canal. I am advised that an environmental impact report is now hurriedly under preparation. It reflects only the viewpoint of the administrative agencies. No other agencies or interests have been consulted. It cannot be considered a meaningful study.

This very unusual procedure apparently is now to be further aggravated by unilateral announcement of the proposal to include lands purchased by the State of Florida for the canal in the Ocala National Forest. Again, this is without reference to the legislative branch of the Federal Government or consultation with the State government which purchased the land in question. In effect, this action could also circumvent the pending legal suits on the constitu-

tional questions involved in the present status of the canal. This is highly irregular.

It is far past time for the administration to take Congress into its confidence on the important questions which are involved in the Cross-Florida Barge Canal and to proceed in an orderly way to obtain a dependable environmental impact study.

Let me reiterate that the future of the canal project can be properly determined only after an orderly and considered study under the impartial ground rules of a statutory environmental impact statement has been completed. This we are requesting through the direction and support of the Appropriations Committees of the Congress.

Since last year's hearings of the Public Works Subcommittee of the House, I have closely followed the continuing efforts of environmental pressure groups to bury the Cross-Florida Barge Canal project. The issue of the constitutionality of the President's halt of this project is currently before the U.S. District Court in Jacksonville. This case has been consolidated with one originally filed here in Washington by the Environmental Defense Fund, a New York corporation, whose primary activities have been directed at stopping water resource projects throughout the country. In addition three other suits brought by citizens of Florida who allege injury or damages from the halt, have been consolidated for trial.

As I stated previously, the President in an unprecedented action halted the project by issuing a press release. At the time of the halt the Corps of Engineers was engaged in preparing an environmental impact statement in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. At the hearing last summer, General Free advised this subcommittee that this effort had been suspended after the President's halt order was received.

A specially appointed senior U.S. circuit judge, Judge Harvey M. Johnsen, who has been assigned these cases, has denied a Department of Justice motion to dismiss the suit involving the constitutional issue. In his order he interpreted the President's press release as calling for an environmental impact study in compliance with National Environmental Policy Act.

A Government witness testified in the suit that the only studies that are presently in progress are to determine what to do with the project now that it has been halted. This is in clear contravention of the National Environmental Policy Act as well as of the spirit and intent of Congress in enacting this legislation.

The Congress which has appropriated \$54,600,000 of construction money and the people of Florida who have invested \$14 million of its tax money in this project are entitled to know the true, unbiased economic and environmental facts including all reasonable alternatives available and the impact thereof.

I was disturbed to learn that the Department of Justice urged upon the court that the Congress had concurred in and endorsed the halt of the project by an

appropriation last year of funds to terminate the partially completed Dunnellon railroad contract. In rejecting that proposition, the court relied primarily on the chairman's assurance to me on the floor of the House last year that such was not the intent of the committee.

I am requesting the Appropriations Committee to reaffirm that position this year and to include in its appropriation sufficient funds for the Corps of Engineers to continue and complete an environmental impact study in compliance with section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act together with directions to the corps that such study be impartial and factual.

I am further concerned that employees of the Department of the Interior together with representatives of the Environmental Defense Fund and the Council on Environmental Quality have been jointly engaged in a program to drain one of the canal reservoirs known as Lake Oklawaha. This lake has already attracted over 750,000 visitors and is one of the only benefits thus far derived from the project. Apparently this will be attempted under the guise of designating Lake Oklawaha as a part of a national park or a wilderness area. The court has twice enjoined the Government from changing the status quo of this lake. This maneuver by canal opponents is obviously an attempt to circumvent the jurisdiction of the court and to further insure the permanent demise of the project before a complete study is made. I would question closely who authorized the Department of Interior to expend funds for this purpose and what funds are being used. I further request the Appropriations Committees of Congress include sufficient operations and maintenance money specifically requiring the Corps of Engineers to maintain this lake as a recreation, navigation and water resources asset until the court decides the cases pending before it and until the Congress acts in furtherance of this matter.

THE TRADE/ENVIRONMENT DILEMMA

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, grim warnings issued by the world's foremost scientists testify to the appalling speed with which the interacting forces of population growth, technology, and demand for resources are jeopardizing the earth's chances for survival. There is great hope, however, that mankind—now that the dimensions of the international environmental threat are coming to be known—will not allow this process to continue unchecked.

The U.N. Conference on the Human Environment, which will convene in Stockholm this June is the first step in what promises to be a worldwide effort to reverse the trend toward self-destruction. In all probability, the next few years will see many false starts at the international level. But it seems clear there are no real alternatives to a concerted and cooperative effort to correct and re-

verse the destructive effects of man's activities on the world's commons—the oceans and the atmosphere.

The effort promises to be even more actively pursued at national levels. The vigorous environmental program inaugurated in the United States in the past few years seems likely to be duplicated in most of the world's developed countries in the near future. It may seem ironic, but in these vigorous national environmental efforts lie the seeds of yet another serious dilemma—the impact of environmental measures on world trade and investment.

Although the goal of environmental quality is being rapidly adopted by nation after nation, man is still impelled toward the pursuit of economic goals to satisfy his life's needs. His most highly organized institutions are geared to economic growth, as they have been for several hundred years, and there is little evidence that this will change very much. In fact, for most of the new populations of the world in the coming century, economic goals will be even more actively pursued than they are now.

One of the first results of stringent national environmental policies has been an increase in costs for a number of enterprises. And to the extent to which the products of these enterprises are traded in world markets, increased production costs may cause a diminishing of exports, and, sooner or later, of imports. The ultimate effect, especially for those countries enforcing the highest standards of environmental quality, could be an adverse turn in their balance of payments.

This whole train of events would be mitigated to the degree that trading nations harmonize their environmental policies. But, given the differences in priorities among even the world's most advanced nations, such harmony will not be easily achieved. What is more likely to happen—and this must be avoided at all costs—is that when the balance of payments of the more environmentally ambitious nation is adversely affected, that country will find it necessary to offset its deteriorating trade position through the enforcement of protectionist import restrictions which will succeed only in inhibiting trade on the one hand and deterring pollution abatement efforts on the other.

Further economic complications arise in the case of, first, those countries known as pollution havens which are taking advantage of the trend toward environmental protection by permitting international production enterprises to operate under few or no environmental restraints; and second, the developing countries, many of which resent what appears to them to be an attempt to arrest their vital progress toward industrialization.

Those who take the long view may consider the consequences of national environmental policies on trade as temporary dislocations that would eventually be resolved through the reallocation of resources or the reordering of national priorities. But political processes are required to be responsive to the more immediate problem. Governments faced with the severe economic consequences

of stringent environmental policies may well make the unfortunate choice of waiving critical environmental goals in favor of short-term economic stability.

While I have said that it would be difficult to coordinate national policies to reduce the adverse effects of economic dislocation, there appears to be no real alternative to seeking just such harmonization. It is in the forum of the upcoming Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment—a conference whose agenda has been prepared and refined over a period of 4 years—that the world community will have an excellent opportunity to confront, among other problems, the unfortunate conflict between world environmental control and international trade stability.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. VEYSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, I recently sponsored a conference of California youth legislators at the University of California at Riverside. This conference and other official business made it impossible for me to be present for two roll-call votes.

On February 17, rollcall No. 46, I would have voted "nay" on H.R. 12350 which sought to provide for continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. On rollcall No. 45 I would have voted "aye" to reject a substitute to the committee amendment that sought to provide a straight 2-year extension of present OEO programs.

On March 2, rollcall No. 60, I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 11384 to remove the ceiling and termination date on authorizations for research and development in the field of high speed ground transportation.

On March 6, rollcall No. 62, I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 2589 to amend section 1869 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the information required by a juror qualification form. On rollcall No. 63, I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 12828 to increase the rates of vocational rehabilitation educational assistance and special training allowances paid to eligible veterans and others.

On March 29, rollcall No. 100, I would have voted "aye" on an amendment to H.R. 11896, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to preserve the rights of States to control discharges from vessels.

On April 26, rollcall No. 124, I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 14582 making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972.

On April 27, rollcall No. 129, I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 12202, a bill to increase the contribution of the Federal Government to the costs of Federal employees health benefits. On rollcall No. 127 I would have voted "aye" on an amendment to H.R. 12202 that includes the Postal Service employees in the bill. On rollcall No. 128 I would have voted "no" on another amendment to H.R. 12202 that sought to reduce the Federal

Government's contribution to a straight 50 percent.

On May 1, rollcall No. 130, I would have voted "yea" on S. 2713 to authorize the Attorney General to provide care for narcotic addicts who are placed on probation, released on parole or mandatorily released. On rollcall No. 131 I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 12562 to extend the Commission on Civil Rights for 5 years and to expand the jurisdiction of the Commission to include discrimination because of sex and to authorize appropriations for the Commission. On rollcall No. 132 I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 9676 to authorize the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the State of Tennessee for the use of the University of Tennessee. Also on May 1, rollcall No. 133, I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 13334 to establish certain positions in the Department of the Treasury and to fix the compensation for those positions.

SPRINGFIELD NURSING HOME FIRE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY), is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, 11 days ago a tragic fire swept through the Carver Convalescent Home in Springfield, Ill., and snuffed out the lives of 10 elderly citizens. As of today, the origin of the fire is unknown.

The Carver Home was an old two and one-half story frame structure with a concrete block facade on two sides. Ironically, the home had been inspected by the Illinois fire marshal's office only the day before and pronounced to be in conformity with the governing fire code regulations. Whether this was so, or whether the regulations are woefully lax and inadequate, makes little difference to those Springfield citizens who died on May 6 and to their loved ones who survive.

For many others, however, the memory of being suddenly awakened in the middle of the night by the raging fire is still an ever present and gruesome reality. For them, and for the rest of us, this unspeakable tragedy will be eased only if it leads promptly to the establishment and enforcement of new safety standards in nursing homes throughout the Nation. Our whole system of Federal, State, and local safety standards for these institutions has been put into question.

According to a report by a representative of the American Nursing Home Association who flew to Springfield shortly after the fire, "certain violations of the principles of fire protection are observed" at the Carver Home.

For example, note these facts about the Carver Home:

All patient sleeping areas in the home were not separated from corridors by partitions providing a 1-hour fire resistance rating.

All hazardous areas were not separated from patient care areas by construction providing a 1-hour fire resistance rating.

Interior finish materials such as plywood paneling and cane fibered acoustical tile were used in some patient rooms.

Stairways and other vertical shafts were not enclosed with partitions and fire doors providing a 1-hour fire resistance rating.

These facts show variance from the "principles of fire protection" contained in the National Fire Protection Association's Life Safety Code. Some nursing homes—in Springfield and elsewhere—measure up. Some—like Carver—do not.

The wide disparity in safety standards which apply to nursing home facilities arises from the fact that when Congress enacted Medicare in 1967, it specifically required that skilled nursing homes meet the stringent requirements of the National Fire Protection Association's Life Safety Code, but it did not impose the same requirement on intermediate health care facilities.

There is no reason to believe that Congress intended such a distinction to be drawn. Why such an anomalous situation was permitted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop is a mystery to me. However, the Springfield fire makes it abundantly clear that this double standard must not continue and that the same fire safety standards must apply to all nursing home facilities without further delay.

Today I am introducing two bills which, if enacted, will bring some rationality into the fire safety standards applied to nursing homes and health care facilities for the aged.

The first bill amends the Social Security Act to require that by July 1, 1973, all intermediate care facilities—such as the Carver Home—receiving Medicaid funds under title XIX, comply with the provisions of the life safety code now applicable to skilled nursing homes certified under the Medicaid program.

Such a requirement for these facilities is entirely justified. Under the present Medicaid legislation, many nursing home patients who are not completely ambulatory are placed in intermediate care facilities because they do not require constant attention from professional nursing staff. The fact that they do not require constant attention, however, does not mean that they will be able to protect themselves during an emergency such as a fire.

A photograph on the front page of the May 7, Illinois State Journal Register, the morning after the Carver Home fire tells the story better than words. The picture shows the charred remains of an artificial leg and empty shoes next to a blackened chair in a patient's bedroom. The caption beneath the photo reads:

This fire destroyed items mutely show the desperation that must have prevailed as elderly residents woke up to the merciless fire.

The fact is that an elderly person with an artificial limb—entirely ambulatory during the daytime—may be virtually incapable of getting around at night after he has removed his limb.

Similarly, patients with a history of mental illness may be ambulatory most of the time but subject to periodic spells

that leave them entirely incapable of taking care of themselves. Several of those who died in the Carver Home fire were patients who had been transferred from the State mental hospital in Jacksonville.

Patients with progressive senility may also be incapable of caring for themselves at all times.

Just because one elderly patient generally requires a lesser degree of nursing care than another does not mean that he deserves a lesser degree of safety precautions or can provide for his own safety during an emergency. Every patient in every institution deserves protection from a sudden fire which may awaken him in the middle of the night. This bill will help assure that protection.

Undoubtedly, the enactment of this bill into law will cause financial problems for many nursing homes which do not presently meet the standards of the life safety code. Without financial credit assistance to help them bring their facilities up to acceptable levels of fire protection, some may close their doors.

In fact, it is probable that under this requirement some can no longer be used as intermediate care facilities. Perhaps structurally some cannot be altered to meet the life safety code. If so, I say good riddance. Such structures should never have been permitted for institutional use in the first place.

However, for others, the second bill I am introducing today will help make it financially possible for many nursing homes to install the necessary fire protection measures required by the first bill. It authorizes the Federal Housing Administration to insure loans to provide fire safety equipment for nursing homes or intermediate care facilities. It also amends section 232 of the National Housing Act to require, as a condition for eligibility for mortgage insurance, that a nursing home or intermediate care facility comply with the provisions of the life safety code.

In the coming days and months I will press at every opportunity to see that these measures I am proposing today are enacted into law. It is the responsibility of every official—Federal, State, and local—to take whatever action he can within his jurisdiction to see that the tragedy which occurred in Springfield will not be permitted to happen again. There is no better time to start than now—during the period May 14-21—which is designated National Nursing Home Week.

SOVIET INTELLECTUAL PERSECUTION CONTINUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, as President Nixon prepares for his trip to Moscow it is essential that we understand the fact that freedom of speech, expression, and thought has been denied to the people of the Soviet Union since the advent of the Russian Revolution in 1917, and is still denied to them today.

Too few seem to remember today that

during the 1930's Stalin decimated his political, intellectual, and industrial establishment. Of 1,966 delegates to the 17th Soviet Party Congress in 1934, 1,108 were arrested. Of 139 members of the Central Committee, 98 were arrested. The toll in the Red army was three Soviet marshals, including the commander in chief, Marshal Mikhail N. Tukhachevsky; every officer who commanded a military district; two of the four fleet commanders, every army corps commander, almost every division commander; half the regimental commanders; members of military councils and political commissars. One-third to one-half of the 75,000 Red army officers were arrested or shot.

The Communist view concerning freedom of speech and the free press has been made clear. Lenin maintained that a press always served the dominating class. From this sprung two ideas. One was that it was entirely justifiable after the 1917 seizure of power to deny access to the press to those elements loyal to the old order since they were no longer dominant in society; the press was to serve the victorious proletariat. The second idea was that "freedom of the press" was guaranteed not only by saying what one wanted with government protection of the right, but by public ownership of the economic structure of the press—its capital, newsprint, printing equipment, buildings, and distribution network.

Even prior to 1905 Lenin had established the concept of a centralized press whose function was to propagate a doctrine. He believed that newspapers should be adjuncts of, if not identical to, political organizations, and journalists should be political activists.

In 1923, Stalin elaborated this concept:

The organization role of the press is the most significant . . . It is not only that the press agitates and accuses, but that above all it has a large network of agents and correspondents through the country . . . The newspaper as a collective organizer in the hands of the party and Soviet state, the newspaper as the means to bind contacts with the working masses . . . and rally them around the power and the Soviet state . . . in this now lies the task of the press.

Like Lenin and Stalin, Khrushchev looked on the press as an instrument of the party. In 1959 he said:

Journalists are not only the loyal helpers of the party, but literally the apprentices of our party—the active fighters for its great causes. Why apprentices? Because you are actually always at the hand of the party. As soon as some decision must be explained and implemented, we turn to you . . . as the most trusted transmission belt, [to] take the decision and carry it to the very midst of the people.

The intent of Communist theory was to "free" the press from the alleged abuses arising from private ownership of the mass media. The result: the Communist Party became its dictatorial master. Mark W. Hopkins, Soviet expert and formerly a member of the journalism faculty at the University of Wisconsin, states:

The transformation really did not result in greater freedom of the press, but less,

whether judged by the Soviet or American interpretation of the concept.

Newspapermen became, not journalists, but simply a "transmission belt" for the party.

The same has been true with regard to other writers and intellectuals. The noted Soviet author, Valery Tarsis, broke with the Communist Party in 1960 and with the Union of Soviet Writers. He smuggled a book, "The Bluebottle," to England where it appeared in 1962 and shortly after this he was put in an insane asylum in Moscow. Tarsis wrote of this experience in his volume, "Ward 7," and among the papers found in his Moscow apartment after he came to the United States was a letter he sent on December 3, 1965, to Mikhail Sholokhov, the Soviet Nobel Prize winner.

He said:

I was astonished when I read your statement that creative liberty exists in the Soviet Union. You have always said that one must write as an honest man. I do not believe that you are such a naive child as to believe those words. You know very well that in this country one cannot be an honest writer. You know very well that thousands of honest men—scientists, philosophers, generals and party workers—have been imprisoned and sent to mental asylums because they were honest. That is their only crime.

Have things changed in the years since Stalin, something which advocates of a "rapprochement" with the Soviet Union continue to insist has occurred?

In 1966, Soviet writers Andrei D. Sinavsky and Yuli M. Daniel were convicted of the crime of slandering the Soviet Union in works of fiction smuggled to the West and published under pseudonyms. They were sentenced to 7 and 5 years hard labor respectively. The trial caused much adverse response in the West, but marked an increasing campaign against literary freedom in the Soviet Union.

In March 1966, Leonid I. Brezhnev, the party's First Secretary, opened the attack on writers in his speech at the 23d Congress of the Soviet Communist Party. He attacked "hacks who make it their business to sling mud at our system."

The newspaper *Izvestia* commented:

In what bottomless swamp of abominations must a so-called man of letters immerse himself to defile with his ruffian pen a name that is holy to us (Lenin) . . . It is impossible to reproduce here the relevant quotes . . . it is merely vicious scribbling, infuriating and filthy. These sacrilegious lines alone suffice for the diagnosis: the authors have placed themselves outside Soviet society . . . With such minions there can be no leniency . . . They are emigrants of a special kind: internal emigrants. They are enclosed within their own rotten little world.

While President Nixon prepares to visit Moscow, while the West German government speaks optimistically of an "opening to the East," while Western defenses are falling behind those of the Communist world, the suffering of intellectuals within the Soviet Union mounts in intensity.

The case of Vladimir Bukovsky provides an example of this suffering. Recently a Soviet court condemned him to 12 years in labor camps and exile for "anti-Soviet" activity. Only 29 years old, he has spent some part of each of the

last 9 years in prison camps or mental institutions for such offenses as organizing an underground literary magazine, an underground art exhibit, and a demonstration to protest the trial of other dissenters.

The primary reason for Mr. Bukovsky's imprisonment, according to New York Times Moscow correspondent Hedrick Smith, was this:

The thrust of the case indicated that the Soviet authorities were primarily angered by Mr. Bukovsky's speaking his mind about conditions in Soviet mental hospitals on the basis of his own incarceration from 1963 to 1965 and subsequently.

I wish to share Mr. Smith's report of the Bukovsky case with my colleagues. The following article appeared in the New York Times of February 13, 1972:

SOVIET UNION: THE HIGH PRICE OF DISSENT

Moscow.—Vladimir Bukovsky is not a Nobel prize-winning writer like Solzhenitsyn or a renowned scientist like Sakharov or a well-known publicist like the Medvedev brothers. Unlike these men, he does not capture wide attention at home or abroad when he speaks out as a Soviet iconoclast. There was little serious stir, therefore, when a Soviet court condemned him recently to 12 years in labor camps and exile for "anti-Soviet" activity.

To some observers, however, the case of the defiant young dissident provided a significant lesson: Mr. Bukovsky's very obscurity was a factor in the high price exacted by the state for his active dissent. More prestigious nonconformists have suffered less for sharper challenges to Soviet authority.

The transcript of his trial, circulated in Moscow last week by dissident friends, provides unusual insight into the anatomy of Soviet justice in the area of active nonconformity nearly two decades after Stalin's death.

Mr. Bukovsky's trial was rushed to completion in one day, although he was held virtually incommunicado for eight months while the prosecution prepared its case. Only in the last month did he get a defense lawyer.

Officially, his trial was an open one, but his friends were barred and only his lawyer and sister were given access. His mother was called by the prosecution as a witness, preventing her from hearing the other proceedings. Under such conditions, Mr. Bukovsky's dissident friends acknowledged omissions in the transcript they compiled. But they insist that it faithfully conveys the trial's flavor and general proceedings.

Mr. Bukovsky requested 12 defense witnesses, but was permitted none. Eight dissenters whom he wanted brought from mental hospitals to substantiate his claim that they were held because of political views were ruled ineligible—"because," the judge said, "they are insane and their testimony cannot be considered valid."

Even before the trial, Mr. Bukovsky had paid dearly for his dissent. Although only 29, he has spent some part of each of the last nine years in prison camps or mental institutions for such offenses as organizing an underground literary magazine, an underground art exhibit and a demonstration to protest the trial of other dissenters.

In his Jan. 15 trial, the charges against Mr. Bukovsky were more serious. He was accused of having talked with two acquaintances about smuggling a foreign duplicating machine through Soviet customs and of having tried to persuade two Soviet soldiers to pass information abroad by giving them the telephone number of an American correspondent.

The cross-examination revealed that an old school chum now working for the cus-

toms service at a Moscow airport had approached Mr. Bukovsky as an agent provocateur. The testimony showed that he, not Mr. Bukovsky, had initiated and pursued the talk about the duplicating machine—and had even organized a dry run through the customs shed—and that Mr. Bukovsky, after expressing some initial interest, had eventually rejected the whole scheme after suspecting his old friend of being a plant.

The soldiers claimed that Mr. Bukovsky had told them of plans to mount a demonstration against the Soviet authorities in early 1971. Mr. Bukovsky challenged this, saying that he had talked hypothetically with the soldiers, who had been in Poland during the 1970 riots in Gdansk, and told them it would be wrong for Soviet troops to fire on Soviet citizens in such a situation. The foreign correspondent's number, he said, had been produced only to prove to them that he knew foreigners when they expressed skepticism about it.

But the thrust of the case indicated that the Soviet authorities were primarily angered by Mr. Bukovsky's speaking his mind about conditions in Soviet mental hospitals on the basis of his own incarceration from 1963 to 1965 and subsequently.

Both in testimony and in the final argument, it was this, above all, that constituted "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda."

Calling Mr. Bukovsky a "vicious anti-Soviet element" who "knows with authority only the porches of the houses where Western correspondents live in Moscow," the prosecutor, Miss A. Bobrushko, said he had "invented a slanderous tale that representatives of the intelligentsia of the Soviet Union are sent, on account of their 'democratic' views, to psychiatric hospitals without a court hearing and that there inhumane treatment is applied to them."

In defense, his lawyer, V. Y. Shvelsky, accused the Government of inconsistency. He denied that Mr. Bukovsky had ever been mentally ill, but argued that since the state maintained he was ill while he was in the hospital, "then everything he recounts about the situation in the psychiatric hospitals must be explained not by a desire to subvert or weaken Soviet power, but as the consequence of an incorrect understanding of the facts which he observed at the time."

The argument carried no weight with the judge.

HEDRICK SMITH.

Although many in this country and elsewhere in the West speak as if conditions in the Soviet Union in 1972 are radically different from those of past years with regard to intellectual freedom, the available evidence tells a far different story.

Discussing conditions in Moscow at the beginning of this year, Washington Post Correspondent Robert G. Kaiser noted that:

The unseemly odor of a political police crackdown is in the frosty Moscow air this January. A series of arrests, harassments and articles in the official press have provided a steady stream of "crackdown" stories for the Western news organizations here.

While there is more dissent in the Soviet Union today than during the Stalin era, the fact remains that there is far less than under the "liberalization" of the Khrushchev period. What seems to be occurring is a trend toward "re-Stalinization." Rather than further freedom for intellectuals in the Soviet Union, that small amount of freedom which appeared after the death of Stalin seems to have been withdrawn.

Mr. Kaiser points out that:

Brezhnev and his colleagues may have achieved a new status quo—ahead of Stalin's, well behind Khrushchev's at his most liberal, and by all appearances stable. . . . The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia seems to confirm that no amount of foreign disapproval could dissuade the men in the Kremlin when they are really afraid.

Following is Mr. Kaiser's article as it appeared in the Washington Post of January 26, 1972:

VLADIMIR BUKOVSKY'S HARSH SENTENCE WAS THE FIRST SIGN OF . . . A NEW SOVIET CRACKDOWN ON POLITICAL DISSENT

(By Robert G. Kaiser)

Moscow.—The unseemly odor of a political police crackdown is in the frosty Moscow air this January. A series of arrests, harassments and articles in the official press have provided a steady stream of "crackdown" stories for the Western news organizations here—the single most attentive audience to the confusing spectacle of political dissent in the Soviet Union.

Abrupt changes in the political temperature recur periodically here. Old hands can remember dozens of them. For newer observers the process is bewildering and fascinating. Bewildering because it is so hard to know what such a crackdown really means. Fascinating because it revives one of the basic questions about this society: How does it change, and why?

By actual count, the current crackdown has directly touched less than 35 people (assuming its full dimensions are known, which is problematical.) Nineteen of these were arrested in the Ukraine on charges of nationalist agitation, perhaps in connection with the arrest of a Belgian tourist in the Ukraine at the same time.

The others affected by the crackdown are mostly Moscow dissidents, friends of Pyotr Yakir, the 43-year-old son of a Soviet general killed in a Stalin purge, and now Moscow's most active political renegade. Yakir's colleague Vladimir Bukovsky was sentenced to seven years in prison and five more in exile, a harsh punishment which was the first sign of the new crackdown. The apartments of Yakir and seven friends were searched. The Moscow correspondent of the London Times and his wife were jostled and detained by police after visiting Yakir in his flat.

Two other Soviet intellectuals identified with political non-conformity were attacked in the Soviet press, Alexander I. Solzhenitsyn, the writer, and Valery N. Chaldize, a physicist and an organizer of the unofficial Committee for Human Rights. Both attacks were unusual. Solzhenitsyn has been ignored by the Soviet press for most of a year, and Chaldize had hitherto been immune from public criticism.

All these events coincide with an increased number of supplications to the party faithful to maintain their vigilance against subversive foreign ideas. For example, an important party ideologist, V. Bolshakov, wrote recently in Pravda that "the actions of the counter-revolutionary forces in Czechoslovakia in 1968 . . . were an attempt to carry out a new tactic in the struggle of imperialism against socialism . . . a tactic known as the 'bridge-building' policy." Western bridge-builders, Bolshakov added, "hope it will be possible to export counter-revolution together with industrial commodities."

The crackdown plus the vigilance campaign as given rise to a theory, popular in several of the biggest Western chanceries in Moscow, that the Soviet leaders are reminding their people that talk of detente in foreign policy does not mean any loosening of controls at home. It is a plausible but untestable theory.

One Westerner with many years experience says it is wrong to look for such an elaborate

explanation. "Even in the freest days under Khrushchev, such things occasionally happened, just to remind people that the KGB was still in business," he said.

In the recent crackdown, only the published attacks on Solzhenitsyn and Chvaldize could have had a wide impact of this kind. Curiously, a very different signal has probably made a much greater impression on Moscow intellectuals this month—a signal from a brilliant movie called "Andrei Rublev."

This film, made six years ago by Andrei Tarkovsky, was shown with great success in Paris, but was banned here until last month. It is a dark and gloomy chronicle of the life of Rublev, an icon painter of the 15th century. In a style reminiscent of Ingmar Bergman at his best, Tarkovsky draws a vivid and woefully depressing picture of medieval Russia, its cruel princes and wild Tartar invaders.

No reason was given for banning the film, or for releasing it now. The Soviets recently refused to let the movie be exported to Yugoslavia, a hint that it still troubles them. There is much in the film that would trouble an orthodox apparatchik: its negative view of life in medieval Russia, its numerous references to the arbitrary and silly use of state power, Rublev's tormented debate with himself about an artist's role in society. Perhaps most troubling, the film is an individual and unusual work, a piece of creativity untainted by party line or official dicta. Muscovites have been flocking to see it, and the film is said to be opening all over the country.

How does one movie—or one small wave of arrests and harassments—affect the spirit of a Soviet citizen? For an outsider living here, that is the most intriguing but most unanswerable of questions. The party ideologists apparently fear something akin to the "Prague Spring" of 1968, but what could bring that sort of phenomenon to the Soviet Union? What are the signals that a Soviet intellectual feels most strongly, that can make him change his ways of thinking and living?

Recent Soviet history suggests that the one really powerful signal is terror. Stalin kept "foreign" influences out of the Soviet Union by enforcing appalling penalties on those who fell under their sway. Soviet art, music and literature shriveled to the point of death under Stalin, because artists were afraid to challenge the official standards.

The terror ended in the early 1950s, and by the late 1950s the poetry readings which gave birth to the dissident movement had begun. Pasternak finished "Doctor Zhivago," Solzhenitsyn published "One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich," Voznesensky and Yevtushenko brought life back into Russian poetry, a few directors partially revived the Russian theater and movies.

The mood has relaxed and tightened in turn, but Stalinism has not reappeared. New boundaries of permissible behavior have been drawn, far outside the tiny circle imposed by Stalin (though still woefully short of anything that would be acceptable in the West). Soviet intellectuals have occupied the new territory that has been opened to them. "Andrei Rublev" seems proof that the Russian creative impulse is alive and strong, if hidden much of the time. It is hard to see how the political police could restore the old sterility and silence—unless the Stalinist terror was restored too.

The KGB and the government can control the most obvious manifestations of intellectual life. They can ban books, movies and plays, jam foreign broadcasts. By threatening to deprive people of jobs and privileges, they can also control open expressions of unacceptable opinions. They are doing all of these regularly. But this is not the same as the complete subservience of the intellectual class, which the terror did maintain.

Without complete subservience, some de-

gree of courageous (if foolhardy) open dissidence seems inevitable. Even a foreigner can quickly learn that numerous Soviet intellectuals are frustrated by censorship and a heavy-handed bureaucracy. This correspondent has had several startling experiences with responsible Soviet officials, trusted members of the Communist Party, who indicated unhappiness with censorship or controls on foreign travel. The police are as unpopular a group among the Soviet intelligentsia as they are with the American intellectual left. If thoughts like these are widespread, a tiny fraction of those who share them are likely to act eventually on their beliefs. Such action is dissidence in the contemporary Soviet Union.

A Soviet citizen contemplating active participation in the dissident movement might well be deterred when he hears about Vladimir Bukovsky's harsh prison sentence, or the raids on the apartments of Pyotr Yakir and his friends. Probably because of arrests and stiff prison sentences in the past, the dissident movement is smaller today than it was in the mid-1960s.

At the same time some startling things have happened in this country. Jews have conducted successful sit-ins in official offices. Scientists' protests have forced the release of a prominent biologist from a mental hospital. Alexander Solzhenitsyn lives openly and is writing a new book.

The Soviet Union is not shutting itself off from the outside world. Intourist, the state tourist organization, is working hard to reverse a decline in the number of tourists here in 1971, a decline attributed to Western reaction against Soviet treatment of Jews and perhaps dissidents. The Soviet government is courting other countries ardently and shows every indication of a keen desire to be admired by outsiders. The tolerance of Solzhenitsyn and the decision to permit substantial Jewish emigration seem to be evidence that the Kremlin now responds to foreign opinion in a way Stalin would have laughed at.

None of this is liberalism. From a liberal point of view it may not even be hopeful. Soviet intellectuals may be willing to live within the current boundaries, permitted an occasional "Andrei Rublev" and their private frustrations, but nothing more. Each year, no doubt, a few will be unwilling, will join the active dissidents, and will probably end in jail. There isn't even a hint that the great mass of citizens cares about censorship, foreign travel or civil rights.

Brezhnev and his colleagues may have achieved a new status quo—ahead of Stalin's, well behind Khrushchev's at his most liberal, and by all appearances stable. Perhaps its susceptibility to foreign pressure is a weakness that will lead to change, but that is only speculation. The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia seems to confirm that no amount of foreign disapproval could dissuade the men in the Kremlin when they are really afraid.

The persecution suffered by Soviet intellectuals is particularly poignant in the case of Jewish intellectuals in the Soviet Union. Jews, in fact, lack the "privileges" that other Soviet minorities are permitted.

Other minorities, such as the Ukrainians and Armenians, have their own provinces where they can speak their language and exercise a degree of cultural autonomy. The Jew is forbidden his own schools, and he cannot learn Hebrew or Yiddish in the Government schools. They are not taught. Since the 1940's, the Hebrew and Yiddish theater has been almost completely closed down. The only Yiddish periodical that is allowed to be published is a monthly journal edited

by a Communist Party functionary. The so-called Jewish Autonomous Region of Birobidzhan, which Stalin set up as a showplace in Siberia, has only 30,000 Jews in a population of 163,000.

The Jew in the Soviet Union is also handicapped by a strict quota system in universities and higher training schools. Jews may make up only 3 percent of the total, and while that figure is twice as high as the Jewish percentage of the Soviet population, it is nonetheless impossible for many highly qualified young Jews to receive higher education.

One of the vehicles through which anti-Semitism has been carried to the people of the Soviet Union is the written word. In 1970, for example, two novels by Ivan Shevtsov, published one month apart, show how the Soviet regime is exploring for uses of fiction in promoting an anti-Semitism reminiscent of Nazi Germany.

Shevtsov's novel, "In the Name of the Father and the Son," was published in March 1970. A first edition of 65,000 was exhausted within a few days. The book equates Zionism with nazism, plays on the same themes as the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion," and updates them.

Zionism, a leading character observes, "moves under cover, secretly infiltrating all the life cells of the countries of the entire world, undermining from within all that is strong, healthy and patriotic—grasping all the important administrative, economic and spiritual life of a given country." As evidence of Zionist penetration of even the Communist Party, Shevtsov's character points to "Judas-Trotsky (Bronstein)" as "a typical agent of Zionism" and "intellectual provocateur number one."

Characteristic of Shevtsov's "updating" of myths is the following:

You undoubtedly think that international Zionism is in the service of American imperialism . . . The opposite is true . . . American imperialism is the economic and military basis of Zionism. It serves the aims of Zion.

Shevtsov's second novel, "Love and Hate," was published in April 1970, in an edition of 200,000 copies by the Ministry of Defense—a formidable and official imprimatur.

Its arch-villain is Nahum Holtzer, a pervert, sadist, drug-peddler, rapist, who kills his own mother, disembowels her and wraps her intestines around her head. A delicate, beautiful Russian teenage girl ends up in similar condition after Holtzer corrupts her by introducing her to hashish and raping her.

The book depicts two other Jews in equally savage fashion. Jacques Sidney Davey, a Western journalist, with whom Holtzer has close connections, and Samuel Peltsig, an American professor of literature, are drug peddlers. Holtzer smuggles both drugs and Zionist literature into Russia.

When Ekaterina Purtseva, Soviet Minister of Culture, was asked at a press conference in April whether the Shevtsov novels did not contradict the best traditions of Soviet literature, she replied that literary standards are a "matter of taste" and that Shevtsov was an accepted member of the Soviet literary fraternity.

This is the level of Soviet intellectual life today. The novels of Shevtsov are published by the Soviet Government with an official imprimatur. The novels of a Solzhenitsyn are banned.

The distinguished Soviet writer Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, after 9 years of refusing interviews with Western correspondents, took the risk of speaking out to defend himself against what he called an official campaign to "suffocate me." Twenty-four hours after his remarks were published in *The New York Times* and the *Washington Post*, Soviet authorities blocked his carefully laid plans to receive the Nobel Prize for Literature awarded in 1970 for his novels, "The First Circle," "Cancer Ward," and "One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich," only the last of which has been published in the Soviet Union.

In his interview, Solzhenitsyn set forth in detail the frustrations of trying to do research while barred from state archives and prevented from hiring assistants. With irony he recounted the harassment of friends and the firing of his second wife.

He surmised:

The plan is either to drive me out of society or out of the country, throw me in a ditch or send me to Siberia, or to have me dissolve in "an alien fog" as they put it.

This most recent attack upon individual freedom should come as no surprise. Charlotte Saikowski, Moscow correspondent of the *Christian Science Monitor*, writing in that paper of December 31, 1971, reported that:

Soviet authorities again are making clear that they will not tolerate a spirit of creative freedom.

Miss Saikowski reported the expulsion of two writers from local branches of the Soviet Writers' Union. One of them had recently caused a literary stir with the publication of two poems that allegorically glorified the banned novelist, Alexander Solzhenitsyn.

Following is Miss Saikowski's report:

LITERARY AUTHORITIES ON MARCH: CREATIVE FREEDOM TRAMPLED IN RUSSIA

(By Charlotte Saikowski)

Moscow.—Soviet literary authorities again are making clear they will not tolerate a spirit of creative freedom.

Two writers have been expelled from local branches of the Soviet Writers' Union, according to informed sources. One of them is Yevgeny Markin, who recently caused a literary stir with the publication of two poems that allegorically glorify the banned novelist Alexander Solzhenitsyn.

The other is Alexander Galich, a playwright and composer of popular, often politically satiric songs that are circulated privately on tape. Like Mr. Solzhenitsyn, he is reported to be a corresponding member of the small and unofficial Human Rights Committee founded by nuclear physicist Andrei Sakharov.

At this writing the expulsions must still be confirmed by the all-union writers' organization.

NO SURPRISE

In Mr. Markin's case particularly, the move comes as no surprise. Many liberal-minded Russians were startled when the daring verses of the little-known poet appeared recently in the literary journal *Novy Mir*. It had been wondered if the guardians of literary orthodoxy would let them pass unchallenged.

One of the poems, entitled "The White

Buoy," tells of an ailing man named Isaich (a shortened form of Isayevich, Mr. Solzhenitsyn's patronymic) who puts buoys in a river to warn ships of danger.

A woman, a mistress who has forsaken him (and who is thought to represent the Russian intelligentsia), watches with despair from the other shore.

The poem alludes to various "absurd" rumors that have circulated about Mr. Solzhenitsyn: "They say he is a loafer. They say he is insane. They say he has a pile of money stashed away."

"Isaich will forgive you anything, only betray he will not forgive!" the poet writes.

AN APOLOGY

The second poem is called "Weightlessness." Dated in Ryazan, it constitutes an apology to Mr. Solzhenitsyn. Mr. Markin was one of six writers who in 1969 voted for the expulsion of Mr. Solzhenitsyn from the Ryazan branch of the writers' union (although he reportedly tried to abstain).

After describing the exhilaration that wells up with literary inspiration, the poet tells of another form of "weightlessness." A visitor comes to him and pulls a document from a folder.

"And it's a denunciation!" he says remorsefully. "Libel about a friend. What are you pushing me to sign, rascal? We shall win although the friend will have hard times."

Meanwhile, Mr. Solzhenitsyn remains uncompromising in his criticism of Soviet officialdom.

Having emerged from seclusion recently to play a part in the funeral of Alexander Tvardovsky, he now has written a lament for the late poet, copies of which are being passed around privately here. It was Mr. Tvardovsky who, as editor of *Novy Mir*, published the Russian writer's shattering novel "One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich."

"There are many ways and means to kill a poet," says Mr. Solzhenitsyn. "Those chosen for Tvardovsky were to take away his favorite child, the journal for which he suffered."

BEACON OF LIBERALISM

As editor of *Novy Mir*, Mr. Tvardovsky had championed many controversial writers and become a beacon of liberalism to Russian intellectuals. Although he was forced to resign the editorship last year after a bitter literary battle, he was nonetheless too respected a poet to be ignored by the regime and, besides warm praise in recent months, was accorded a state funeral.

In his lament Mr. Solzhenitsyn disdainfully writes that Mr. Tvardovsky's guard of honor was mounted by "those unhealthy fat ones who noisily pursued him."

"This has gone on for a long time in our land—since Pushkin," he goes on. "Even dead, the poet was a tool in the hands of his foes. And they paid tributes over the corpse and dedicated lavish speeches to him. They stood around the bier in a solid group and thought now they had cornered him. They destroyed our only journal and thought they were victorious."

"Fools," the novelist warns. "When the voices of youth ring out, then you will regret that you do not have this patient critic, whose soft exhorting voice everyone heeded. You will want to grub up the earth with your hands to bring back Trifonovich [Tvardovsky's patronymic]. But it is too late."

We must not delude ourselves into thinking that the Soviet Union is anything but the repressive police state which it has always been. We must not lose faith with those brave men and women who continue to fight for freedom within that society, and by visiting and talking with their oppressors we must not give them the feeling that we have aban-

doned them and are doing business with those who have deprived them of the elementary freedoms we say we hold dear.

Those brave men and women living under communism understand the importance and value of intellectual freedom, something which many in the West seem to have forgotten. In the hope of a "generation of peace," let us not turn our backs upon those who suffer under the hand of tyranny. Such a course will never provide real peace, and rather than removing the chains from those who suffer today we may simply set in motion a course which places more of humanity under such restrictions.

HANDGUNS AND SOCIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. WYMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate shooting of another public figure, Governor Wallace, by another criminal, Arthur Bremer, with a handgun is predictably leading to a renewal of hysterical and unrealistic demands for a law requiring Federal registration of all handguns in America. Even if such a law would assure that a future day Bremer would not be able to obtain a handgun to commit a crime with—which it would not—such a proposal is an unconstitutional infringement of the right of all citizens to keep and bear arms.

This right aside, however, it must be remembered that registration of handguns would not keep them out of the hands of criminals. Honest citizens will register their guns, yes; but dishonest people will not register theirs, and there is no way to find them. Talk about prohibition and homemade gin, the search for the millions of handguns presently in the United States at this moment, hundreds of thousands of which would never be registered, would make the Volstead Act seem sensible in comparison. Moreover, almost anyone can make a lethal handgun with a few pieces of scrap metal and a handle.

People must not be rendered helpless in their homes by a Federal process of law leading to a denial of their right to have a gun in the house for personal self-defense. Compulsory registration of handguns is but the first step in a probable pattern of legislation including the establishment of criteria for qualification to possess a handgun. And who is to determine such standards, a Federal bureaucrat? Most Americans object to this.

The answer to the continuing problem of the use of firearms in the commission of crimes of violence continues to lie in a combination of improved education concerning the handling and use of guns; substantially increased minimum mandatory penalties for the use of a firearm in the commission or attempted commission of crime, and a law enforcement program with assistance from the courts that includes severe and certain punishment of those who do.

Essentially, Americans in a spirit of toleration must learn to live with dissent and controversy without resort to shooting to express disagreement. This

we can do without surrendering our constitutional rights.

KEMP SPEAKS OUT FOR THE GREAT LAKES AND WATER RESOURCE PROJECTS FOR ERIE COUNTY, N.Y.

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, today I had the opportunity to testify before two important House subcommittees concerning a number of critical water resource projects.

I know that there has been a great deal of interest among my colleagues concerning the Environmental Protection Agency's proposal for a special cleanup program for the Great Lakes. Today, in testimony presented before the Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, I again stressed the need for early action to save the Great Lakes and strongly urged that the committee appropriate \$100 million for the EPA Great Lakes cleanup program.

During my testimony I tried to clarify the issue as to whether there is existing authority for the proposed EPA Great Lakes program. I brought before the committee a discussion concerning the EPA proposal which took place during the floor debate on the House version of the Water Pollution Control Act amendments. At that time, Representative GERALD FORD in a colloquy with Representative BOB JONES, floor manager of the bill, Representative WILLIAM HARSHA, senior Republican on the House Public Works Committee, and Representative JOHN BLATNIK, committee chairman, apparently established the fact that there is ample authority in existing law and in the House bill to proceed with the Great Lakes cleanup program and all that is needed to actually start the long-awaited program is the appropriation.

During my appearance before the subcommittee today, I received a somewhat uncertain answer from the distinguished chairman, Representative JAMIE L. WHITTEN, concerning authorization of the EPA Great Lakes program. However, authorization within reason seems possible.

I very much hope that the Environmental Protection Agency will soon present justification in detail to the committee for the Great Lakes program. When they do, I feel certain that the very able and distinguished chairman, Representative JAMIE L. WHITTEN, will take appropriate action to get this much needed program started.

I also presented testimony today before the Subcommittee on Public Works of the House Committee on Appropriations regarding several additional Great Lakes projects and water resource projects of vital concern to the residents of my district in Erie County, N.Y.

Mr. D. David Brandon, representing the New York State Urban Development Corp., presented excellent and comprehensive testimony before the same subcommittee concerning the Ellicott Creek project in my district.

Mr. Speaker, because of the interest of many of my colleagues in the proposed EPA Great Lakes special cleanup program and in other water resource projects, I include in the Record at this time, Mr. D. David Brandon's testimony and my testimony before the two House subcommittees:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JACK KEMP BEFORE THE AGRICULTURE-ENVIRONMENTAL AND CONSUMER PROTECTION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee and others present, I want to thank the Committee for this opportunity to appear here today.

I will be submitting a comprehensive statement to your Committee, however, today I would like to discuss the proposed Environmental Protection Agency special cleanup program for the Great Lakes.

The pollution of the Great Lakes is not a matter of only local concern. These magnificent bodies of water represent an unparalleled natural resource of importance to all Americans.

Despite an intensive national commitment to the environment, we are losing our fight to save the Great Lakes. A recent Environmental Protection Agency report painted this gloomy picture of Lake Erie:

"A mat of algae two feet thick and a few hundred square miles in extent floats in the middle of the Lake in mid-summer, oxygen levels in areas of the Lake bottom are reduced to zero, displacement of indigenous fish populations by scavenger and trash fish is widespread. Discharge of untreated sewage from combined sewers has compelled the closing of most beaches on the Lake. The area of Lake bottom where regeneration takes place—the zone of zero oxygen—is spreading, bringing the threat that eutrophication will soon become self-sustaining, unless adequate phosphorus reduction programs can be implemented."

Late in 1971, the Environmental Protection Agency submitted to the Office of Management and Budget a comprehensive and innovative proposal which would accelerate efforts to halt the ravages of pollution in the Great Lakes. The cost figure for this accelerated program ranged from \$133 million to \$141 million. Unfortunately, the Office of Management and Budget did not approve these budget items for submission to the Congress in 1972. At that time, the Environmental Protection Agency's plan included \$100 million for the treatment of sanitary sewerage and storm water involving the Great Lakes, a \$25 million proposal for setting up a Great Lakes soil conservation program, a special \$5 million program that called for EPA to work with State and local communities on the cleanup of a selected river basin such as the Maumee River, and a \$5 million accelerated research program in Great Lakes water pollution problems. It also provided for an additional 100 personnel positions in EPA's organizational structure.

The Great Lakes have always been one of my major concerns and needless to say I was extremely disappointed by the Office of Management and Budget's rejection of the EPA special Great Lakes cleanup program.

I fully support this EPA program and I proposed legislation which would have supplied the necessary funds to EPA to enable them to carry out the Great Lakes proposal.

At the time of consideration of the House version of the Water Pollution Control Act Amendments, I was prepared to offer an amendment to that bill which would have authorized the EPA Great Lakes program. However, during the floor debate, Representative Gerald Ford in a colloquy with Representative BOB JONES, floor manager of the bill, Representative WILLIAM HARSHA, senior Republican on the House Public Works Committee, and Representative JOHN BLATNIK,

Committee chairman, apparently established the fact that there is ample authority in existing law and in the House bill to proceed with the Great Lakes crash cleanup program and all that is needed to actually start the long awaited program is the appropriation.

If this is correct, I strongly urge that your Committee appropriate \$100 million for the EPA Great Lakes cleanup program. It is my understanding that this is the amount which the Environmental Protection Agency now estimates will be needed.

In the EPA report to the President which justified its request for funds for the proposed Great Lakes program, the agency stated:

"Most of the actions called for under this proposal will be required in any event, to implement pending water pollution legislation. The difference lies in focusing priority, manpower, and management attention on the Great Lakes to assure better and quicker results. In doing so, we will be demonstrating a positive Administrative initiative, rather than allowing our actions to be dictated by events. We will also be demonstrating a positive and sensible strategy for implementing the pending water pollution legislation."

Gentlemen, you have an unparalleled opportunity to help save our Great Lakes. I respectfully urge your favorable action.

Thank you for your consideration.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JACK KEMP, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee and others present, I greatly appreciate this opportunity to testify on behalf of several projects which are of vital concern to the residents of my District in Erie County, New York.

SCAJAQUADA CREEK

Many important and worthwhile water resource projects have been included in the budget for the 1973 Fiscal Year, however; I would now like to bring to your attention a critically needed project which was not included—Scajiquada Creek.

Scajiquada Creek drains to the Black Rock Canal in the Niagara River at Buffalo, New York. It flows from east to west, and drains an area of 24.4 square miles, all in Erie County. The watershed measures about 14 miles in length east and west by about 3 miles in maximum width north and south. About 65 percent of the watershed is upstream from the city of Buffalo, mostly in the Towns of Cheektowaga and Lancaster and the village of Depew. The topography is gently rolling with elevations between 630 and 760 feet mean sea level. Just upstream from the Buffalo city line, the creek enters a covered conduit and is carried some 3.7 miles under the city to a point 3 miles upstream from the Black Rock Canal falling about 25 feet en route. Upon emerging, it falls steeply about 30 feet and then follows a relatively level course to Black Rock Canal, which is at about elevation 570 feet.

The Scajiquada watershed is located in the middle of the Buffalo urbanized area. As of 1968 the entire watershed, except for the headwater area in the Town of Lancaster, was fully developed. It is expected that the Lancaster area will be similarly developed in the near future. This development is predominately residential and commercial. Flooding occurs at some points as much as a mile from the main stem and in August 1963 approximately 132 acres in the City of Buffalo, 517 acres in Cheektowaga, 64 acres in Depew and 15 acres in the Town of Lancaster were inundated. Results of a damage survey indicated that, at July 1970 price levels and conditions of development through July 1966, recurrence of the August 1963 flooding would cause \$2,203,000 damages with \$1,904,000 occurring in the Town of Cheektowaga.

The flooding problems in this area have been known for a considerable length of time. A report indicating protective works were not economically justified was completed in November 1949. A subsequent Review of Reports was completed in September 1969 by the Buffalo District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, indicating that flood protection measures were feasible and now justifiable. This report was submitted to Congress during June 1970 and the project for Scajaquada Creek and Tributaries was authorized by the House and Senate Public Works Committees on December 15 and 17, 1970, respectively, in accordance with Section 201 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 (PL 89-298). An appropriation for advance engineering and design has never been made for the project.

The proposed plan of the improvement would eliminate 91 percent of anticipated overall annual flood damages in the Cheektowaga damage reaches. The project plan provides for: 9,100 feet of channel improvement on the main stem of Scajaquada Creek and a total of 16,800 feet of channel improvement on tributaries, all within the Town of Cheektowaga; construction of two sections of levee totaling about 3,400 feet in length; removal, replacement or enlargement of obstructive bridges, culverts, and conduits; and sealing of sanitary sewer manholes subject to submergence.

Gentlemen, the people of the Town of Cheektowaga, New York, live under the constant threat of flooding from Scajaquada Creek. Two years ago this project, which they hoped would bring assistance, was authorized. Corps and agency comments have been unanimous in recognition of the urgent need for the Scajaquada Creek project to reduce hazards of loss of life and injury, the elimination of health hazards associated with damage to water supply and waste disposal systems, improved vector control, and the prevention of other factors accompanying floods.

\$4.5 million has been budgeted for public works projects in Western New York in Fiscal Year 73, including work and planning on Cayuga Creek, Cazenovia Creek, Buffalo Creek, Cattaraugus Creek and Tonawanda Creek. The Corps of Engineers has continually warned of the catastrophic flooding potential of Scajaquada Creek, yet after two patient years of waiting nothing has been budgeted so this vital project can proceed.

The Corps of Engineers has informed me that the planning for Scajaquada Creek could be started in Fiscal Year 73 with an appropriation of \$25,000.

Gentlemen, on behalf of the residents of the Scajaquada Creek area, I urge that you include in the budget for the 1973 Fiscal Year this \$25,000 which is so critically needed to begin design work. You have the opportunity to help prevent countless tragedies which could be the result of continuing to leave the people of Cheektowaga unprotected. As their Representative, I respectfully and urgently ask your help.

I was pleased to learn that the State of New York is joining me in this important request.

I am submitting for your information: a resolution passed by the Town Board of the Town of Cheektowaga, New York; a copy of the favorable report of the Secretary of the Army; and a map and other documents which dramatize the need for early completion of the Scajaquada Creek project.

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY NAVIGATION SEASON EXTENSION

I was pleased and honored to join with the Conference of Great Lakes Congressmen, representing Members from the eight Great Lakes States, in a statement to your Subcommittee respectfully requesting that \$3,535,000 be appropriated for Fiscal Year 73, for the second year of a 3-year demonstration project extending the navigation

season on the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Seaway.

As you know, the ultimate goal of this legislation is year-round shipping—to lower the cost of U.S.-made goods abroad, to relieve chronic unemployment in the region 3 to 4 months out of the year, and to stem the export of jobs to cheaper markets abroad.

I do not wish to take up your valuable time by repeating facts which I know have already been presented to you today in a formal statement on behalf of myself and other members of the Conference of Great Lakes Congressmen. I do want to express my thanks to the Committee for seeing the need for this program and for increasing the Administration budget request for last year—from \$300,000 to \$765,000. The success of the program throughout the winter of 1971 to 1972 shows how right you were in your decision.

I would like to reiterate my strong support for this program and urge your approval of the increased budget request.

CAYUGA, CAZENOVIA AND BUFFALO CREEKS

Cayuga, Cazenovia, and Buffalo Creeks join at Buffalo to form Buffalo River, which forms part of Buffalo Harbor. There are serious flood problems in the Buffalo suburban area along Cazenovia and Cayuga Creeks and minor problems along Buffalo Creek.

The Town of West Seneca in Erie County, New York, has suffered severe flood damage from Cazenovia Creek for the second straight year. West Seneca is a highly developed residential and commercial area and is a suburb of the City of Buffalo. The cause of the flooding, which occurs almost annually during late winter or early spring thaws, is the result of snowmelt augmented by moderate amounts of runoff from precipitation. This combination produces moderate to high discharges which breaks up the creek ice cover and moves it rapidly downstream. The ice collects at restricted areas in the channel forming jams which backs up the water behind them.

The Corps of Engineers has estimated the damages in this year's flood at West Seneca to be \$90,000 to 140 residential properties and \$31,000 for miscellaneous expenditures such as rescue work. There were approximately 550 people affected, including 50-100 people that had to be evacuated. A similar type flood occurred on February 3, 1970, at which time the Governor of New York State declared a State of Emergency. Damages resulting from this flood were approximately \$70,000. Both of these floods have a recurrence interval in the order of once every five to seven years.

The Corps of Engineers has a survey under way for flood control and allied purposes on Cayuga, Buffalo and Cazenovia Creeks. This study was authorized by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works of the House and the Senate, adopted on June 13, 1956, and July 10, 1971, respectively.

The Federal Budget includes \$20,000 to continue work on the survey report for Cayuga, Buffalo and Cazenovia Creeks. Because of the serious nature of the flooding problem in this area, I respectfully urge that the appropriation for Fiscal Year 73 be increased to \$60,000. The State of New York has also requested this increase in funds. This amount would insure that an interim survey report for Cazenovia Creek could be completed within the next Fiscal Year.

In order to show the urgent need for this increased appropriation, I am submitting news accounts, photographs and other materials showing the drastic flooding which took place in West Seneca this year.

ELLICOTT CREEK

The Flood Control Act of 1970 authorized \$19.07 million for a project for flood control and other purposes on Ellicott Creek in New York State, including a dam and reservoir at Sandridge and minor channel improvements downstream.

The language of the Act, however, requires that the entire project be completely re-

studied and that all alternatives to the presently proposed project be investigated and that the findings of this study be reported back, together with recommendations, to the Congress before any work can commence on the project.

To carry out this study, the Congress appropriated \$150,000 for Fiscal Year 1972. The Corps of Engineers is presently in the process of initiating the study and expects to report back to the Congress approximately a year from now.

On February 25th of this year, I sent a letter to the Honorable John A. Blatnik, Chairman of the House Committee on Public Works, urging action by the Committee to revise the language of the Flood Control Act of 1970 to permit the Corps to begin design and construction work on the minor channel improvements portion of the project in the lower reaches of Ellicott Creek in the Town of Amherst, west of Sweethome Road.

The reasons for this are several. First, because of the configuration of the stream and terrain in this area, the channel improvements will be of the same design and nature no matter whether a dam is or is not built upstream, or if one is built, whether it is small, medium, or large in size.

Second, in the area near the lower reaches of the creek, substantial flood protection will be provided by these minor channel improvements (as were recommended by the Corps) alone—in fact, it is even more important that they be installed, if the rest of the project were delayed or not built.

Third, New York State is embarked upon State projects in this area and are vitally in need of flood protection. The State's planners need the Corps to go ahead in this area as soon as possible and they need initiation of design activity promptly so that they can design their own drainage and water and sewer systems accordingly.

In the area next to Ellicott Creek a \$650 million State University Campus is now under construction and the New York State Urban Development Corporation is undertaking a \$500 million new community development project in conjunction with the new university.

For these reasons, I have requested that the Committee add to the present language to permit the Corps to initiate design and move on to construction of this element of the Ellicott Creek project while it thoroughly re-examines the major components of the project upstream.

After consultation with the Corps of Engineers, I submitted a draft of language to the House Committee on Public Works which I believed would accomplish the necessary revision of language in the Flood Control Act of 1970.

I feel sure, since the Subcommittee has already approved this measure, that the suggested language will be included in the Rivers and Harbors authorization legislation now pending in the House Committee on Public Works.

Since the Rivers and Harbors bill is still pending, I respectfully request that if the suggested language which I submitted is included in that legislation, that your Committee appropriate funds in Fiscal Year 73 to the capability of the Corps (which is \$—) for this project of minor channel improvements.

TONAWANDA CREEK

Tonawanda Creek drains 648 square miles in western New York and empties into Niagara River about 13 miles north of Buffalo. Flood problems occur in the vicinity of Batavia and along the lower reaches of the main stream and its tributaries. I urge that \$30,000 be appropriated in Fiscal Year 73 which would be used for a feasibility study of various alternatives such as slerks and linden reservoirs and Alabama retention pools. I am submitting materials which show the serious flooding which has occurred in

the past and the critical need for completion of this project.

MISCELLANEOUS PROJECTS

There are a number of excellent water resource projects listed in the budget for Fiscal Year 73 which are not directly in my District but which I wholeheartedly support. These include the following:

Cattaraugus Harbor—\$80,000 for the completion of a phase one design memorandum and a beginning of a phase two memorandum if funds permit.

Cattaraugus Creek—\$5,000 for flood control measures.

Lake Erie Coast—\$20,000 for a study of small boat harbors.

Great Lakes, particularly Lake Ontario and Lake Erie—\$530,000 for waste water management study.

Water Levels of the Great Lakes—\$356,000 for completion during Fiscal Year 73 of a study to minimize the adverse effects of extreme high water; to provide a dependable flow of water and for navigation and hydro-power.

Niagara River, Niagara Falls—\$300,000 for the continuation of the study to preserve and enhance the American Falls.

Lake Erie—Ontario Waterway (All American Canal)—\$120,000 for completion of the study for the waterway.

I respectfully urge approval for Fiscal Year 73 of appropriations for these projects in the amounts which I have mentioned.

In conclusion, I would like to express my thanks to the members of the Committee for your thoughtful consideration of these water resource projects which are of such vital concern to the residents of the 39th District, soon to be the 38th District, of New York State.

STATEMENT OF D. DAVID BRANDON, REPRESENTING THE NEW YORK STATE URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Chairman, Subcommittee members, and others present, I am D. David Brandon Director of Program Development of the New York State Urban Development Corporation and I am here to urge favorable action by the Subcommittee on expediting the Ellicott Creek project in New York State.

The balance of my prepared statement provides detailed information and justification to support our request that the Subcommittee recommend an appropriation adequate to begin design and construction of the lower channel improvements portion of the Ellicott Creek project during fiscal year 1973. Of the total of about \$1.7 million required for this element of the project, we estimate that about \$250,000 would be needed next fiscal year.

Two major points need to be stressed at the outset.

First, alternatives to a single dam at Sandridge are currently being restudied. Public and private interest groups in the area support the lower channel improvements portion of the project. These lower channel improvements are vital and no matter what kind of dam is needed upstream at Sandridge. The need is urgent to expedite the lower channel improvements because of rapidly progressing state development programs in the area totalling over \$1 billion in public investment alone.

Second, current authorizing language in the 1970 Rivers and Harbors Act for the Ellicott Creek project requires that the whole project be completely restudied before any design or construction work could begin on any part. This language is currently in the process of being revised to permit early initiation of work on the lower channel improvements. We are assured that there is a strong likelihood that this language will be revised in any 1972 Rivers and Harbors Act. I strongly

urge the Subcommittee to approve language and funds which will allow this work to go forward during fiscal year 1973 without having to lose another whole year by taking account of the contingency that present restricting in the authorization will be modified shortly.

We are therefore requesting an appropriation of \$1.7 million for the Army Corps of Engineers for the engineering, design, administration and construction of minor lower channel improvements on the Ellicott Creek, Town of Amherst, New York. Approximately \$250,000 of this sum for engineering, design and administration would be needed during fiscal year 1973. The flood control resulting from these channel improvements is of critical importance to the Town of Amherst.

The Flood Control Act of 1970 authorized \$19.07 million for a project for flood control and other purposes on Ellicott Creek in New York State, including a dam and reservoir at Sandridge and minor channel improvements downstream.

The language of the Act, however, requires that the entire project be completely restudied and that all alternatives to the presently proposed project be investigated and that the finding of this restudy be reported back, together with recommendations, to the Congress before any work can commence on the project.

To carry out this study, the Congress appropriated \$150,000 for FY 1972. The Corps of Engineers is presently in the process of initiating the study and expects to report back to the Congress approximately a year from now.

The Committee on Public Works is very likely to recommend revisions in the language of the Flood Control Act of 1970 to permit the Corps to begin design and construction work on the minor channel improvements portion of the project in the lower reaches of Ellicott Creek in the Town of Amherst, west of Maple Road. (See attachment H.R. 13683).

The reasons for this are several.

First, because of the configuration of the stream and terrain in this area, the channel improvements will be of the same design and nature no matter whether a dam is or is not built upstream, or, if one is built, whether it is small, medium, or large in size.

Second, in the area near the lower reaches of the creek, substantial flood protection will be provided by these minor channel improvements (as were recommended by the Corps) alone—in fact, it is even more important that they be installed, even if the rest of the project is delayed or not built.

Third, New York State is embarked upon major State projects in this area and are vitally in need of flood protection. The Corps needs to initiate design activity promptly so that the state and local governments can design their own drainage and water and sewer systems accordingly. In the area next to Ellicott Creek a \$650 million State University Campus is now well under construction and the New York State Urban Development Corporation is undertaking a \$500 million new community development project in conjunction with the new university.

For these reasons, I urge that the Appropriations Committee be full cognizant of these pending probable changes in the authorization language, supported by Congressmen Barber B. Conable and Jack F. Kemp, which will enable an early start in design and construction of the lower channel improvement segment of the project. Otherwise another full year will have been lost in providing for urgently needed flood protection in Amherst.

I am sure that with a brief summary of the history of this project you will share our sense of urgency:

The Ellicott Creek has its headwaters twenty miles upstream of the Town of Amherst. The flow in this meandering stream is

quite irregular. It ranges from very low in the summer months (primarily by discharge from sewage treatment plants) to very high during times of rainfall and heavy snow melt, usually in early spring. It is these periods of high flow, which, when combined with flat topography of the Town of Amherst, create conditions leading to flooding. More specifically, the flat topography results in a condition where even slight Creek overflows quickly spread, over a rather large area. This is generally referred to as the 15-year frequency flood with four such floods being recorded by the Army Corps of Engineers in this century: March 1916, January 1929, March 1936, January 1960.

Up to 1950 this was not a cause of serious concern, the land generally was being used for agriculture with some strip residential development on built-up sites. Since then, however, agriculture has ceased to be a way of life for Amherst. Urbanization of the Buffalo Metropolitan area has reached the Town of Amherst with the Town's population virtually tripling to 93,000 (1970 census) in twenty years. This has included extensive residential and commercial development in the Ellicott Creek flood plain. Furthermore, the pressures for development in the flood plain are rapidly accelerating. This stems primarily from the decision of the State University of New York to construct a \$650 million new campus of the State University of New York at Buffalo (SUNYAB) in the Town of Amherst. This campus while south of Ellicott Creek and not in the general Ellicott Creek flood plain is now being implemented. Construction contracts, both let and in final review, indicate an expenditure through this year of some \$200 million. The first students will be in residence in 1972 with the eventual student, faculty and staff population exceeding 30,000 by 1978. Overall, this is expected to accelerate growth in the Town of Amherst with a doubling of the Town's Population by 1980-85.

At the request of Governor Rockefeller, the UDC was commissioned in 1969 to examine ways to cushion the impact on the Town of this rapid and accelerated growth. UDC's planning consultants have recommended the development of a planned new community on some 2,400 acres of land immediately north of the new campus. It was felt that a well planned community, containing housing for a full range of income groups directly keyed to the University's employment profile, would protect Amherst from falling prey to the undesirable urban sprawl and ancillary development which has plagued many other communities experiencing sudden and rapid growth. To match the construction of the University, it has been proposed that UDC initiate this development this year on the single small portion of flood free terrain within the New Community's boundaries. It should also be clear that sudden rapid growth will occur whether or not UDC is involved. It is for protection of this area, for both existing and future residents, that UDC has explored alternatives with other state and federal agencies to relieve the threat of flooding.

UDC has strongly supported therefore, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' proposal for the construction of a reservoir upstream to the Town of Amherst coupled with minor channel improvements in the Town of Amherst as was authorized in the 1970 Rivers and Harbors Act. However, due to some local controversy over the site for a large reservoir upstream, a restudy is now underway to examine other alternatives for the upstream portion of the project. It has been recognized however, that regardless of what upstream measures are taken, minor channel improvements in the Town of Amherst will be required. Moreover, one particular segment of those channel improvements would have the maximum effect toward relieving flooding conditions for those areas under-

going intense development pressure around the new SUNYAB campus. We still recognize the necessity for eventual upstream measures. Some low areas will remain for which upstream measures are the only economical alternative. In addition, low flows in Ellicott Creek are maintained primarily by effluent from a Town of Amherst sewage treatment plant, a less than desirable situation. Since for environmental reasons this plant will be phased out in the 1974-5, the low flow augmentation resulting from the reservoir is essential if a flow of water is to be maintained in Ellicott Creek during summer months. We, therefore, urge your approval of an appropriation to proceed immediately with the implementation of the channel improvement portion of the Ellicott Creek project in the Town of Amherst.

H.R. 13683

A bill to amend the Flood Control Act of 1970

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the project for the Sandridge Dam and Reservoir, Ellicott Creek, New York, for flood protection and other purposes as authorized by the Flood Control Act of December 31, 1970, is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to undertake the minor channel improvements, or portions thereof recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his report dated November 25, 1970, independently of the investigation of alternative methods called for by the Act, such work to be subject to the items of local cooperation, required for similar projects and such work to be limited to areas downstream from Maple Road in the town of Amherst, New York, and such other areas as may be deemed necessary.

DIVISIONS ARE NOT COMBAT READY

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, the United States maintains 4½ divisions designated as strategic army forces—STRAF—which are constantly available to support national commitments.

The GAO recently inspected selected units of three of the four and one-third divisions which are designated as STRAF.

Three of the units were found to be suffering from major deficiencies and one was not combat ready. A fourth division connected with STRAF is considered combat ready.

Apparently, so many tanks, radars, and rifles are defective that these three divisions are not considered ready for program combat.

This latest GAO report is just one more sign that the Pentagon's bureaucracy is so riddled with waste and mismanagement that the Army is having trouble fielding a fully combat-ready division.

After handing the Pentagon more than \$70 billion, the least the American people and the Congress can expect are a few decent fighting units.

The General Accounting Office report reveals that 83 percent of the M-60 tanks available to two of the divisions have so many deficiencies that they are considered unable to "perform effectively."

A total of 66 percent of the track vehicles which includes tanks and armored personnel carriers in one division are considered deficient.

In another division 70 percent of the recoilless rifles inspected were defective.

Overall, in the three Army divisions inspected by the GAO, 30 percent or more of the major combat equipment was defective.

In addition, the GAO discovered that many commanders are filing "misleading" reports about the readiness of their own units.

In addition, many Army officers have consciously deceived their superiors about the actual condition of their units.

The GAO recommends that either the Army reduce its number of combat divisions or reorganize them in a way that would insure combat readiness. The Army categorically refuses to consider reducing the size of forces, but says it will "study" the possibility of some sort of reorganization.

I hope the Defense Department can assure the Congress and the American people that we have properly equipped and prepared combat divisions. A careful reading of this GAO study indicates that important and major deficiencies presently exist.

It is a disgrace to the Army and the Nation to spend so much on national defense and to get so little. Clearly we are spending more and more to get less and less from our defense dollar.

Finally, the Army's bureaucracy must face up to the fact that its operation is both wasteful and ultimately dangerous to the maintenance of national security. The continuation of this pattern of deficiencies, defections, and a lack of combat readiness in the long run could make this Nation more vulnerable.

PERSECUTION OF LITHUANIAN CATHOLICS

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

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, when a country so relentlessly pursues a policy of discrimination against one group, it can only expand its activities to include many others. Many of us in Congress have expressed our sense of outrage at the religious and cultural persecution of Soviet Jewry. Now, Lithuanian Catholics, the predominant religious group in this small Republic on the Baltic Sea, are the victims of intense repression and harassment by Soviet authorities.

The following article from the Catholic Standard outlines recent developments in this matter. It is further evidence that persecution begets only persecution.

SOVIETS PERSECUTING RELIGION, CATHOLICS IN LITHUANIA CHARGE

Moscow.—More than 17,000 Lithuanian Catholics sent petitions to the United Nations accusing officials of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic of persecuting Catholics.

Copies of the petitions were made available to Western newsmen here. The petitions, bearing the signatures of more than 17,000 "believers," were sent to UN Secretary General Kurt Waldheim in February after Soviet

officials in Moscow had ignored earlier protests, according to a group of dissident Russians.

The Soviet Union annexed Lithuania, a small republic on the Baltic Sea, in 1940. Its population of more than three million is predominantly Catholic.

Last September, about 2,000 Catholics in the south central Lithuanian town of Prenai, whose population is less than 10,000, signed an open letter to the Soviet leadership charging that Prenai authorities were curbing freedom of religion.

The Prenai Catholics said that Lithuanian clergymen were being restricted in the performance of their religious duties and that the petitioners' own parish priest had been arrested for "teaching catechism to children."

The letter to Waldheim said that three other open letters, with a total of 5,000 signatures, were sent last fall to Soviet Communist party leader Leonid Brezhnev and that police in Lithuania, "using threats, arrests and handcuffs, prevented the mass collection of signatures."

"Such action by the authorities," the letter said, "prompted the conviction that the present memorandum, signed by 17,000 believers, will not attain its aim if it is sent by the same means as previous collective declarations."

The signers also said they were complaining to the United Nations because "believers in our republic cannot enjoy the rights set out in Article 12 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights." Passed by the United Nations, with the Soviet Union abstaining, the declaration calls for the recognition of religious freedom by all countries.

The constitution of the Soviet Union, while guaranteeing the "freedom to perform religious rites," also grants the right of antireligious propaganda, widely used to promote atheism.

The Lithuanians petitioning the United Nations said that Soviet officials limit the number of candidates admitted to seminaries to 10 a year and control the assignment of priests to parishes.

There are so few priests in Lithuania, they said, that one priest often has to serve two or three parishes and that "even old and sick priests have to work."

They also said that Lithuanian officials do not enforce a law requiring that those who persecute churchgoers be punished.

Lithuanian officials have not allowed Catholics to rebuild churches destroyed during World War II, the petitioners said, and have made it difficult to obtain permission for services in private homes.

The petition to the United Nations repeated charges made last fall that two parish priests had been sent to labor camps for giving religious instructions to youngsters and that two bishops had been exiled without trial.

"If in the future, the organs of the state take, the same attitude toward believers' complaints as they have until now," the petitioners said, "we will be obliged to address ourselves to international bodies, to the Pope, the head of our Church, or to the United Nations, as an authoritative institution defending human rights."

THE HONORABLE JOSHUA EILBERG RECEIVES "MAN OF THE YEAR" AWARD

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 13, I had the great pleasure of attending the annual banquet of the Third District of the American Federa-

tion of Government Employees, at which my good friend and colleague, Representative JOSHUA EILBERG, received the organization's Man of the Year award.

This award could not have gone to a more deserving individual. JOSH EILBERG, who represents the Fourth District of Pennsylvania, has worked to eliminate the abuses and inequities in Federal employment since he came to Congress 6 years ago.

At this time I enter into the RECORD Congressman EILBERG's acceptance speech:

I want to thank all of you very much for this honor.

Although legislatively I do not sit on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House, which handles much of the legislation which affects you as Government workers, I am very much concerned that you get a square deal from your boss, Uncle Sam.

For some reason our Government, which is continuously administering laws designed to help workers in private industry, repeatedly turns around and tries to treat its own employees like laborers in a 19th century sweat shop.

For this reason I believe that we must have a specific set of guidelines to govern the employment of all Federal workers.

Fairness and equity, spelled out in the law, are far preferable, to my way of thinking, than having to rely on the good faith of the administration.

For this reason I was pleased to sponsor a proposal similar to H.R. 9092, the wage board pay bill, which was approved by the House last July.

The major purpose of the measure, as you know, is to provide a statutory basis for the coordinated Federal wage system which was inaugurated by the Civil Service Commission in July 1968.

The bill also makes a number of needed changes in the system as it is currently operating.

For example, it establishes a Federal prevailing rate advisory committee to provide guidance for the prevailing rate employees pay system.

The committee would consist of 11 members, 5 from management, 5 from employee organizations, and a full-time chairman, who would be restricted from holding any other office in the Federal service, appointed by the President.

Unfortunately, this provision has been completely deleted from the version of the bill reported by the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. But, I hope that this provision can be restored in conference.

Other major changes in the coordinated Federal wage system proposed in this legislation are the provision for a 5 step wage schedule as opposed to the current 3 steps.

It calls for:

Automatic step increases after 26 weeks in step 1, 78 weeks in step 2, and 104 weeks in steps 3 and 4.

Seven and one-half to 10 percent differentials for scheduled non-overtime work during 2nd and 3rd shifts.

Saved pay for 2 years for prevailing rate employees who are reduced in grade. This is already provided for general schedule workers.

And the inclusion of some 143,000 non-appropriated fund employees of the Armed Forces and the Veterans' Canteen Service.

A similar bill passed by the House and Senate in the closing days of the 91st Congress was vetoed by President Nixon on the grounds that it was inflationary.

That objection is still being raised, although the bill approved by the Senate committee has attempted to mitigate this to some extent by delaying the implementation of the 4th and 5th steps.

Other arguments against the proposal are that it writes into the law "a rigid, cumbersome, and inflexible set of national pay setting procedures" and that nonappropriated fund employees should not be given the benefit of a standard wage structure.

To the first argument, I say that this same thing could have been said of the classified schedule for other Federal workers.

It would be still easier and more flexible if the Civil Service Commission could set its own pay structure without any interference from the Congress.

Without a statutory base, the prevailing wage rate structure affords too much leeway for administrative tinkering—to the detriment of the pay and status of the Wage Board employee.

And, secondly, if nonappropriated fund employees are indeed to be considered Federal workers, why shouldn't they be accorded at least some of the privileges granted their counterparts?

Other legislation currently under consideration by the 92nd Congress which would benefit Federal employees and which I have supported are:

An increase in the Federal share of employees' health benefits;

Realistic reform of the Hatch Act, which keeps a significant and growing percentage of our citizenry from participating actively in the political process;

And an increase in benefits for retired federal workers.

The health benefits bill, H.R. 12202, was approved by the House very recently and is currently awaiting further action by the Senate.

Under the measure as we approved it in the House, the government's contribution would be increased progressively.

From the present 40 percent of the average high option charge of 6 representative plans, it would be increased to 55 percent effective the first pay period beginning on or after 30 days following enactment.

The government's share would be further raised by 5 percent in 1973, 1974, and 1975; in 1976 and thereafter, the contribution would be 75 percent of the average charge.

Other major changes in the present health benefits system would permit pre-July 1960 annuitants (retirees) to elect coverage under the present program, and would extend coverage to certain unmarried dependent children.

It seems to me that this bill is a necessary step forward in progressive treatment of its employees by the federal government.

Finally, I favor some change in the restrictive provisions of the Hatch Act which prohibit federal employees from taking an active part in political campaigns.

As the product of a different era, the Hatch Act is what Congressman Milkv aptly called "a classic example of legislative overkill."

Testimony is now being heard in both the House and the Senate as to how the act can be amended to allow federal workers greater rights of political participation while retaining those elements which protect government workers from the misuse of official influence and political pressure from their superiors.

These measures are not a solution for all of the problems of government employees, but I feel they go a long way in that direction.

I accept this award not as an honor for past performance, but as a reminder that much more has to be done. It will stimulate me for further action.

Thank you.

HEMISPHERE ECONOMIC INTEGRATION

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Senator JACOB JAVITS, one of this country's most perceptive observers of Western Hemisphere relations, delivered a major address in New York City on the continuing importance of achieving economic integration in the Americas.

Because of the importance of Senator JAVITS' remarks, I wish to call them to the attention of all Members of the House.

THE CRISIS FACING REGIONAL INTEGRATION IN THE AMERICAS

(An address by Senator Jacob K. Javits)

I welcome this opportunity the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has provided me to talk about Western Hemisphere affairs. While the attention of our policy makers and the press is directed towards the more vivid threats to world peace, to our constitutional processes and to our system of checks and balances—it is nevertheless likely that the future shape of world society may be influenced as much by what happens in Latin America over the next decade.

The topic of my address is: The Crisis Facing Regional Integration in the Americas. I am aware that continent-wide regional economic integration for Latin America is a subject that is not being pursued actively at this time either by major Latin American governments or by the United States. By economic integration of Latin America, I mean significantly closer economic cooperation between the countries of Latin America leading to the establishment of a Latin American Common Market, actually a customs union with relatively free movement of labor and capital.

While Canada's decision of last week to join the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) is welcome, Canada continues to tip-toe around the edges of a significant involvement in matters of the hemisphere. One must note that this decision took years and also that Canada still is not a member of the Organization of American States (OAS). Canada is a productive nation—a mature democracy—and needs to play a more significant role in inter-American affairs. With British Commonwealth ties loosening as Britain joins the European Common Market, Canada could play a major and vital role in the affairs of the Western Hemisphere aside from joining the Inter-American Development Bank. A Canadian commitment to the Western Hemisphere is now needed; in bilateral U.S.-Canadian relations, revision of the safeguards in the Automotive Products Agreement and other steps to achieve a proper balance in trade agreements and monetary matters between the two countries are increasingly urgent.

As to Latin American integration, my concern is that a mood may be growing that regards the solemn commitment that the Presidents of the Americas entered into at Punta Del Este in April, 1967, "to create progressively, beginning in 1970, the Latin American Common Market, which shall be substantially in operation in a period of no more than fifteen years" as somewhat of a dead letter.

If this were to happen, it would be a most regrettable development. If this regional integration goal is not pursued at the very time that Western Europe is moving toward a strengthened Common Market and Japan into economic super power status, it is my view that Latin America will have relegated itself to an almost permanent position of economic and political weakness.

In my mind, arguments for Latin American integration remain valid. These include:

1. Integration would make Latin American industry more competitive in relation to the rest of the world, thereby strengthening the

Latin American export base for semi-manufactured and manufactured goods where world demand will be buoyant in the years ahead;

2. Integration would justify certain infrastructure projects in Latin America that otherwise would not be justified;

3. Integration would cause import substitution to be looked at on a regional basis and could lead to efficient continent-wide industrial planning which would give a considerable impulse to industrialization.

4. Integration would strengthen Latin America's bargaining power re the rest of the world;

5. Integration would permit working toward a multilateral payments union in Latin America; and

6. Integration's above mentioned economic benefits could give an impulse to job creation, political stability and social justice—problems that have plagued Latin America in the modern era.

And, of course, the summation of these preceding benefits—if successfully nurtured—could provide a giant step for Latin America in approaching its century old dream of someday achieving a Latin American political union.

For those of us interested in a broader scheme of Latin American economic integration, the evolution of the Andean Pact grouping to date, while causing some disquiet, also gives grounds for hope. I realize that in Latin America, as well as in the United States, the Andean Pact is controversial, particularly as it relates to the "code of behavior" for private foreign investment. The Andean Pact is also controversial in terms of the effect it will have on the possibility of the broader economic integration of Latin America.

Regarding this latter point, one school of thought strongly questions the economic compatibility of this grouping and is concerned that as the Pact grows and strengthens, it will be increasingly difficult to work out smooth relations between the Andean pact countries and the rest of Latin America. Concern is expressed that industries may be established that—while being optimal in terms of the economic needs of this specific regional grouping—clearly are not optimal in terms of a broader Latin American integration. In other words, it is argued that if the Andean Pact gets in the way of economies of scale, this could be a disastrous development for Latin America.

The optimists—and I include myself as one—are hopeful that Venezuela soon will accede to the Pact and that this act will soften some of the Pact's present rigidities. The accession of Venezuela could help trigger the application of Argentina. As the Pact strengthens, negotiations with the "giants" of the area—Mexico and Brazil—would become mutually desirable and mutually profitable as would negotiations with the Central American Common Market. The evolution of the Andean Pact thus could become the linchpin of a broader integration plan which would replace the relatively defunct Latin America Free Trade Area (LAFTA). This optimistic assessment is clouded by the immense political diversity of the countries making up the Andean grouping. It cannot be doubted that Chile is the present weak link.

The self-made economic problems of Chile are staggering, and the deterioration of the economic situation unfortunately does not seem to have run its course. This rapid economic deterioration is characterized by the persistent production problems in both the agricultural and manufacturing sector; accelerating inflationary pressures, mounting product scarcities including essential food items, and a serious foreign exchange crisis

aggravated by continuing labor difficulties fomented by the Marxist unions in the major Chilean copper mines. These are the kinds of problems that have political consequences.

I realize that the alleged inappropriate behavior of one major American corporation in Chile—behavior which was not supported by other American corporations in Chile or by the U.S. Government as the Anderson papers made clear—makes it all too easy for political leaders facing a difficult situation to point the finger at a foreign scapegoat. This is a favorite political tactic the world over. But, the tactic must not be allowed to obscure the root causes of the present Chilean economic, social and political problems.

Leaving aside the unique problems Chile is causing the Andean grouping, the whole question of the relationship of the Andean Pact countries to the LAFTA and the Central American Common Market—which is recovering nicely from the disastrous war between Honduras and El Salvador—is an open question. The shape of future relations first with Venezuela and then with Argentina, Mexico and Brazil is also relatively undefined. Beyond this is the question of the future of the relations of the Andean Pact countries and/or a broader economic unit with the other nations and major trading blocs of the world.

Regarding the present role of the United States, in Latin America under President Nixon's "low profile" policy, we can no longer be seen as the colossus of the North, and paradoxically, this now seems to be causing some resentment.

Over the short-term, I share the view that Dr. Joseph Grunwald puts forward in his perceptive new book, "Latin American Economic Integration and U.S. Policy," that "the United States, because of the Vietnam war and the Congress's attitude towards foreign aid, was in no position to make substantial and definite commitments in support of Latin American integration." I would add that these factors constraining U.S. policy are not likely to alter significantly over at least the short run. New bilateral and multilateral aid programs remain in deep trouble in the Congress, trade preferences remain down the road as long as the present protectionist mood persists and there is an emphasis in the Administration on bilateral relations rather than more ambitious integration plans. It would be my hope that the larger nations of Latin America—Brazil, Mexico and Argentina—would take up the slack and make a more definite commitment to a broader Latin American integration along with Canada and that these relative giants would make the concessions that would be necessary to get a broader integration movement back on the tracks.

Any speech on Latin American integration would be remiss if it did not mention the role of private foreign investment. The fear of foreign domination has had a deterrent effect on the forward movement of regional integration schemes. In my order of priorities, I feel that the protection of U.S. business interests should be subordinate to the U.S. broader economic objectives which hopefully again will include the promotion of Latin American integration as a priority objective.

In viewing the future role of private foreign investment, I think that there are some points on which almost everyone can agree. The first of these areas of agreement is that the developing world will require the transfers of technology that are an inherent element of private foreign investment for a long time to come. Increasingly, I feel the developing world is regarding such transfers

of technology as being more important than transfers of capital.

Equally acceptable I hope is the fact that the developing world will have to pay for the technology and capital they receive as these transfers will not descend on the developing world as "manna from heaven." In turn, it is incumbent on the developing world to make a better definition of the areas in which they want technological transfers—and capital transfers.

In viewing new private foreign investment, acceptance also seems to be growing that a joint venture or multinational venture arrangement in many cases is preferable to a 100 percent ownership position. A joint venture immediately creates a vital interest by nationals of the country in the project. The idea of foreign ownership extending into perpetuity is also becoming a casualty of our age. I note that the ADELA and some U.S. corporations have adopted disinvestment policies. Also, it is clear that if takeover situations stir concern in Western Europe and Canada, this concern undoubtedly is heightened in the developing world including Latin America. The recent promulgation of Canadian policy concerning takeovers will not be lost on the nations of the developing world.

Heightened American business sensitivity on matters such as these could go a long way toward alleviating tension between the foreign investor and Latin American nations.

On the legislative front, I do not feel that the broad purposes of any group have been well served by Hickenlooper-type amendments—be they tacked on to our bilateral assistance or multilateral assistance programs.

In my view, just as the Hickenlooper amendment, which affects our bilateral aid has not been an effective policy instrument in our relations with Latin America, I cannot see why the Gonzales amendment affecting our multilateral lending programs should be any more effective.

Finally, in reviewing the foreign investment area, I remain concerned that there are still too many grey areas and a lack of definition continues to lead to unnecessary conflict and at times unnecessary legislation. There are intensive discussions going forward regarding the rules of the game as regards international trade and international monetary matters but, discussions of similar intensity are not going forward—and they should be—as regards private foreign investment with the exception of the Burke-Hartke bill, and this is solely a domestic battle which must be fought and won at home.

I reiterate the suggestion I made in Mexico City approximately one year ago that the United States and Latin America should convene a high-level meeting that would look toward the evolution of a continent-wide private foreign investment policy which would safeguard the sovereign rights of each country. Perhaps such a meeting could then commission a small group of men, representative of the Western Hemisphere, thoroughly to review this matter with a view toward defining the role of private foreign investment and foreign capital and technological and managerial inputs required by Latin America over the next decade. Review of the adequacy of present institutional structures in the private foreign investment area could also fall within their mandate.

It is my view that a multilateral mechanism—a GATT for private foreign investment—to set forth guidelines of behavior both as to obligations and rights by investor and host has never been more essential if the law of the jungle is not to take over in private foreign investment matters, with all the sad consequences this would entail for international and inter-American relations. I will continue working to promote these ideas.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. BROWN of Ohio (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD) for the period May 18 through May 25, 1972, on account of official business, as U.S. congressional observer to the First Ordinary Congress of Zaire.

Mr. HOLIFIELD (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL) from May 22 through June 10, 1973, on account of official business (Commission on Government Procurement).

Mr. THONE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD) for May 17 and balance of the week on account of official business to attend the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SIKES for 15 minutes today and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENNIS) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALPERN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. VEYSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FINDLEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. CRANE, for 30 minutes, today.
Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. WYMAN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. KEMP, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SEIBERLING) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. ASPIN, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. MAHON) to extend his remarks and include a table in connection with the conference report on the bill H.R. 14582.

Mr. MAHON, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous materials and appropriate tables.

Mr. HALPERN to extend his remarks during debate on State Department and USIA authorization bills to follow Mr. GROSS during debate.

Mr. ROONEY of New York on the bill H.R. 14989, in Committee of the Whole and to include charts and miscellaneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENNIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BURKE of Florida.
Mr. HARSHA.
Mr. GUDE.
Mr. GROSS.
Mr. HALPERN in four instances.
Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.
Mr. VEYSEY in four instances.
Mr. KUYKENDALL in two instances.
Mr. MCKINNEY.

Mr. HOSMER.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. FRENZEL.

Mr. NELSEN in two instances.

Mr. PRICE of Texas in two instances.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD.

Mr. MCDADE.

Mr. TALCOTT in two instances.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. SCHMITZ in four instances.

Mr. RAILSBACK in four instances.

Mr. SANDMAN.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON.

Mr. ARENDS.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio in three instances.

Mr. BOB WILSON in two instances.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. BAKER.

Mr. KEMP.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin.

Mr. HOGAN in 10 instances.

Mr. MCCLOSKEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SEIBERLING) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WRIGHT in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. ROGERS in five instances.

Mr. HUNGATE in three instances.

Mr. HAGAN in three instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. CARNEY.

Mr. FOUNTAIN.

Mr. RARICK in six instances.

Mr. SYMINGTON in two instances.

Mr. ROE.

Mr. BADILLO.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee in six instances.

Mr. CLAY in six instances.

Mr. RYAN in three instances.

Mr. DRINAN.

Mr. CHAPPELL.

Mr. PATTEN.

Mr. HARRINGTON in two instances.

Mr. GAYDOS in 10 instances.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI.

Mr. ANNUNZIO.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN.

Mr. STOKES in two instances.

Mrs. MINK in three instances.

Mr. YATRON.

Mr. RODINO in two instances.

Mr. MIKVA in five instances.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.

Mr. CAFFERY in two instances.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 14070. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 234. Joint resolution deploring the attempted assassination of Gov. George C. Wallace of Alabama.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 14070. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 18, 1972, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 12674. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to establish a National Cemetery System within the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-1069). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1996. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Third Annual Report of the Government Comptroller for Guam, covering fiscal year 1971, pursuant to Public Law 90-497; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1997. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed grant with Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa., for a research project entitled "Thermodynamics of Oxide and Silicate Phases of Importance in Extractive Metallurgy," pursuant to Public Law 89-672; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1998. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed contract with the Bendix Corp., Ann Arbor, Mich., for a research project entitled "Standardization of Controls on Front-End Loaders," pursuant to Public Law 89-672; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

1999. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of observations on financial inventory accounting in the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2000. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on an examination of the financial statements of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing Fund for fiscal years 1970 and 1971;

to the Committee on Government Operations.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 15015. A bill to amend section 109 of title 38, United States Code, to provide benefits for members of the armed forces of nations allied with the United States in World War I or World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BADILLO (for himself, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. BINGHAM):

H.R. 15016. A bill to prohibit States and political subdivisions from discriminating against low and moderate income housing, and to give a priority in determining eligibility for assistance under various Federal programs to political subdivisions which submit plans for the inclusion of low and moderate income housing in their development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 15017. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to encourage and assist the use as a crime deterrent of identifying marks made on personal property by electric etching pencils; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, and Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts):

H.R. 15018. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide a system for the redress of law enforcement officers' grievances and to establish a law enforcement officers' bill of rights in each of the several States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 15019. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 15020. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt certain organizations from private foundation status; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of Michigan:

H.R. 15021. A bill to increase the membership of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations by two members who shall be elected town or township officials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BROWN of Michigan (by request):

H.R. 15022. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional itemized deduction of \$500 for married women who have not given birth to a child; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 15023. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to increase benefits thereunder and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ESCH, Mr. RIEGLE, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.R. 15024. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Professions Foundation to promote progress in the professions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 15025. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional itemized deduction for certain travel and communication expenses of parents of wounded servicemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 15026. A bill to designate certain lands in the State of California as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 15027. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to furnish assistance for the resettlement of Soviet Jewish refugees in Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 15028. A bill to require that certain cuts of beef sold at retail meet standards required by the Secretary of Agriculture to limit the amount of excess fat and other valueless parts of beef carcasses contained in such cuts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 15029. A bill to provide for public ownership of the bus company in the District of Columbia, to approve amendments to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 15030. A bill to amend section 232 of the National Housing Act to include fire safety equipment among the items which may be covered by an insured mortgage thereunder, to require (as a condition of eligibility for mortgage insurance) that a nursing home or intermediate care facility comply with the Life Safety Code, and to authorize insured loans to provide fire safety equipment for such a home or facility; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 15031. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that an intermediate care facility (or nursing home) must comply with the Life Safety Code, and must fully disclose all ownership and security interests therein, to qualify as a provider of services for which payment may be made under a State's approved title XIX plan (or certain other State plans), and to provide that information which an intermediate care facility or nursing home is required to furnish State agencies under the title XIX program must be made available to the public; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 15032. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to World War I veterans and their widows, subject to \$3,000 and \$4,200 annual income limitations; to provide for such veterans a certain priority in entitlement to hospitalization and medical care; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 15033. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself and Mr. BRADEMANS):

H.R. 15034. A bill to amend the Education of the Handicapped Act to provide for comprehensive education programs for severely and profoundly mentally retarded children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 15035. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to deem service as a member of the Women's Air Force Service Pilots during World War II to be active service for purposes of computing retirement and longevity benefits; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PELL (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. GOODLING):

H.R. 15036. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to prohibit during specified periods the feeding of migratory game birds and to impose penalties for such feeding, to increase the maximum fine for certain other violations of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 15037. A bill to amend section 303(a) (5) of the Social Security Act, and sections 3304(a) (4) and 3306(f) of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 15038. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 20-percent across-the-board increase in benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.R. 15039. A bill to provide that the historic property known as the Congressional Cemetery may be acquired, protected, and administered by the Secretary of the Interior as part of the park system of the National Capital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 15040. A bill to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act to extend the provisions of that act to construction materials used in the interiors of homes, offices, and other places of assembly or accommodation, and to authorize the establishment of toxicity standards; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.R. 15041. A bill to provide the death penalty for assassinating, or attempting to assassinate, Federal elective officeholders, or persons seeking election to Federal office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

H.R. 15042. A bill to establish a commission to investigate and study the practice of clearcutting of timber resources of the United States on Federal lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 15043. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that employees receiving lump sums from tax-free pension or annuity plans on account of separation from employment shall not be taxed at the time of distribution to the extent that an equivalent amount is reinvested in another such plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CABELL:

H.R. 15044. A bill to provide for public ownership of the mass transit bus system operated by D.C. Transit System, Inc., and other private bus transit companies engaged in scheduled regular route operations in the Washington metropolitan area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CONTE (for himself and Mr. KYROS):

H.R. 15045. A bill to provide for the prompt resolution of certain disputes relating to Government contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON (for himself, Mr. BELCHER, Mr. CAMP, Mr. JARMAN, and Mr. STEED):

H.R. 15046. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the State of Oklahoma for National Guard purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 15047. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 20-percent across-the-board increase in benefits thereunder, to increase the amount of earnings counted for benefit and tax purposes, and to make appropriate adjustments in social security tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARMATZ (for himself, and PELL):

H.R. 15048. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1970; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RYAN, Mr. MIKVA, and Mr. FISH):

H.R. 15049. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1970 to prohibit the States

from denying the right to vote in Federal elections to former criminal offenders who have not been convicted of any offense related to voting or elections and who are not confined in a correctional institution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN (for himself and Mr. McMillan):

H.R. 15050. A bill to eliminate the tax on premiums paid on annuities in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. LINK, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. NIX, and Mr. McCORMACK):

H.R. 15051. A bill to provide new and improved transportation programs for older persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. KEMP, Mr. STOKES, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. GUDE, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. PODELL, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. GIALMO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STEELE, and Mr. MOLLOHAN):

H.R. 15052. A bill to provide new and improved transportation programs for older persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCHMITZ:

H.R. 15053. A bill to prohibit manufacturing or publishing altered flag designs of

the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. SPRINGER):

H.R. 15054. A bill to amend the Transportation Act of 1940, as amended, to facilitate the payment of transportation charges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 15055. 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. DANIELSON:

H.J. Res. 1202. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April of each year as "National Arbor Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 1203. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating the 7-day period beginning August 28, 1972, as "All-American Family Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.J. Res. 1204. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to modify the appointment and tenure of Federal judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H. Con. Res. 617. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the withdrawal of all American forces from Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. Res. 985. Resolution authorizing additional investigative authority to the Com-

mittee on Public Works; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD (for himself and Mr. SAYLOR):

H. Res. 986. Resolution authorizing the Speaker to administer the oath of office to William S. Conover II, and referring the question of his final right to a seat in the 92d Congress to the Committee on House Administration; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LENT:

H. Res. 987. Resolution urging supplemental appropriations to implement the President's message of March 17, 1972, calling for equal educational opportunities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred to as follows:

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 15056. A bill for the relief of Leona B. Labatinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 15057. A bill for the relief of Domingos Afonso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 15058. A bill for the relief of Takehito Kobayashi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 15059. A bill for the relief of Edward M. Fleming Construction Co. Inc., a corporation in the process of liquidation represented by its surviving board of directors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS— EXPANSION AND CHANGES

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1972

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, although the House and Senate Conferees have agreed on appropriations that increase the number of available slots for the Neighborhood Youth Corps by some 140,700 slots, we are still falling dismally short of what we must do if we are to make meaningful commitments in this area and extend to our youth genuine opportunities for training and developing their potential. The yearly replay of dashed hopes and barebones offerings, which in the final analysis are viewed by the disappointed youth and communities as establishment's efforts to cool the summers, must cease. It is essential that instead we proceed with legislative remedies that will genuinely improve the employment chances of our youth—an approach, incidentally, which would in the long run do much more to deplete the welfare rolls than any so-called work incentive provisions presently advocated in conjunction with welfare reform.

In February of this year I submitted testimony urging substantial supplemental appropriations to ease the plight of our cities. As we all know, the effort to meaningfully increase appropriation levels failed in effect. The amount of sup-

plemental funds which New York City, for instance, stands to receive under the present budget provisions will not even begin to make a dent in the city's desperate needs.

Last year the city had jurisdiction over 48,000 summer job slots. At the same time it had 143,000 youngsters from families receiving public assistance for whom a summer job was considered an absolute necessity. This year there are over 350,000 youth in New York City who are eligible for the program. Their eligibility avails them little, however, since New York will be unable to reach even 2 out of every 10 of those who should and need to participate in the program.

Recreation support funds have also not been substantially increased over last year's level. This means that large numbers of 6- to 12-year-olds will once again roam the hot city streets with nothing to do and nowhere to go.

Dismal as these statistics are, they do not begin to reflect the true picture. My consultation with city officials and other experts indicates that our problem is not limited to a lack of adequate funding—catastrophic as that is—but involves also an underutilization of the potentials of the program.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps, as it is presently funded, is primarily a summer program. Because of its existing built-in restrictions it is often viewed by the community as a riot prevention program, designed to keep youth under control. This impression is fortified by the

fact that over 90 percent of the youth reached during the summer months, limited as their numbers are, do not have access to part-time employment during the school years.

Thus, the program cannot incorporate into its design an effective career ladder for the youth served. To meet minimum needs, the summer program should be substantially increased—probably tripled, with appropriate additions provided in the year-round out-of-school and in-school portions of the program. Such a setup would allow communities to develop year-round Neighborhood Youth Corps experiences for youth served who need them. Special emphasis could be placed on school dropouts and high school juniors and seniors who, because of academic or educational reasons are considering dropping out of school.

With the allocation of additional slots, a series of demonstration programs aimed at restructuring the basic mandate of the present Neighborhood Youth Corps could be undertaken. New York City is particularly concerned with the fact that present legislation does not allow officials to utilize resources of the private sector, and that there is a lack of experimentation involving both public and private institutions that could result in the development of strategies utilizing the basic Neighborhood Youth Corps concept. Consequently, the city is presently working on experimental approaches that would go a long way to rectify the situation. I find these ap-