

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, May 31, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. James P. Wesberry, pastor, Morningside Baptist Church, Atlanta, Ga., offered the following prayer:

Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God.—Matthew 5: 9.

We give Thee thanks, our Heavenly Father, for all who love this great land of ours and give themselves to the fulfillment of their longings for freedom and peace. We express to Thee our deepest gratitude for our esteemed President and for his visit to Russia and other countries in the interest of world peace.

Make our Nation, we humbly pray, a mighty factor in bringing to reality "that peace which is more than the absence of war, and which," as President Nixon has said, "enables man to pursue those higher goals that the spirit yearns for."

Should we ever become discouraged in the long, hard struggle for peace may we lift our eyes to the hills from whence cometh our help, to those invincible forces which will ultimately beat our swords into plowshares and our spears into pruninghooks.

Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 483. Concurrent resolution providing for the reprinting of a House document entitled "Report of Special Study of Securities Markets by the Securities and Exchange Commission"; and

H. Con. Res. 545. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on "American Prisoners of War in Southeast Asia, 1971—Part 2" by the Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3463. An act to amend section 906 of title 44, United States Code, to provide copies of the daily and semimonthly Congressional Record to libraries of certain U.S. courts; and

S. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate hearings entitled "Amphetamine Legislation 1971."

PROVIDING FOR A JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS TOMORROW AT 9:30 P.M.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised that the President of the United

States desires to address a joint session of the Congress tomorrow at 9:30 p.m. Accordingly, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution for that purpose and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

H. CON. RES. 625

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on June 1, 1972, at 9:30 p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS TOMORROW

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, June 1, 1972, it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time subject to the call of the Chair.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

After consultation with the majority and minority leaders and with their consent and approval, the Chair announces on tomorrow, the day set for a joint session to hear an address by the President of the United States, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those on his left and right will be open. No one will be allowed on the floor of the House of Representatives who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 1005) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1005

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

William S. Conover II, of Pennsylvania: Committee on Armed Services.

Robert B. Mathias of California: Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee

on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1973.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin reserved all points of order on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 9580, FEES FOR THE OPERATION OF CERTAIN MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 9580) to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enter into agreements with the Commonwealth of Virginia and the State of Maryland concerning the fees for the operation of certain motor vehicles, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McMILLAN, STUCKEY, NELSEN, and BROYHILL of Virginia.

TWO-PAGE AD IN NEW YORK TIMES CALLING FOR IMPEACHMENT OF PRESIDENT NIXON

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

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I have read in the New York Times today a two-page ad calling for the impeachment of President Nixon. For the record, I personally view this ad, as I am sure many Members of the House do, with the greatest contempt.

I believe the people who have chosen to be connected with it have shown a complete disregard for the well-being of our country.

The presidential election is only 5 months away. The people will have a chance to elect the man of their choice.

Today the President of the United States is in Europe on a tour for peace and prosperity for the whole world.

I think this attack is just like knifing these efforts in the back.

Hopefully, the people of the world will recognize the fact that this ad reflects the thinking of a very few people in the United States.

THE PRESIDENT'S EFFORTS TOWARD PEACE

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

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I, like many other Members of this House, have taken the mike in the past to in-

dicating my disagreement with administration policies, but I take the mike today to indicate my total support of the events which have taken place in the past week when the President traveled to Russia in an effort to establish some kind of agreement to bring about peace. It is my hope that this visit will ease tensions and will bring about a better understanding with the Russians and our allies.

The signing of two nuclear arms control agreements in Moscow represents a truly historic move toward the achievement of worldwide peace. This action demonstrates a recognition that a constantly spiraling arms race serves only to heighten the danger of nuclear war, while wasting scarce resources that would be far better devoted to improving the quality of life on earth.

By no means do these treaties solve all—or even most—of the obstacles that stand in the way of a peaceful world, but they are without question a first step of enormous importance. I hope they will be followed by an equally vigorous pursuit of equitable solutions to other international problems. And I hope, too, that the President's courageous assertion that our security is better served by seeking agreements than by escalating weaponry will serve as a foundation of our future international security policy.

President Nixon deserves our praise for taking this action, and it is my hope that the Senate will speedily endorse these efforts and that both bodies will begin to act with a sense of urgency toward solving these problems.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the President has great luck in his efforts to achieve these results.

The signing of the treaties last week is a broad start toward peace between the two nations.

PERMISSION FOR THE COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 13918, PUBLIC BROADCASTING ACT OF 1972

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 956 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 956

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. 13918) to provide for improved financing for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be

equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING), is recognized for 1 hour.

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.

Mr. Speaker, there was some controversy before the Committee on Rules on this rule, but I find it very difficult to believe that the House would not wish to consider under an open rule this very important matter.

It is my understanding that the life of the legislation that is proposed to be extended would end on the 30th of June without action by the Congress by that time. There are unquestionably very serious controversies over certain aspects of the actions of the Public Broadcasting Corporation. I believe that there will be adequate opportunity for the Members of the House to debate those controversies during the general debate which is provided for by the rule.

Therefore I urge the adoption of the rule, and reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 956 does provide for 1 hour of debate with an open rule for the consideration of the bill H.R. 13918, which has to do with the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

I supported this program in 1967 when it was first started and, very frankly, when this was brought before the Committee on Rules I did not know at that time that there was any concerted effort in opposition to it. In fact, to some extent it came as a little bit of a surprise to me.

I regret that the matter is being brought up today. I recognize that all programs cannot be scheduled so that they would be convenient to all Members. The ranking minority member, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SPRINGER) is unable to be here today, and he brought up the opposition in the Committee on Rules, but I do not know whether the gentleman ever made statements about it in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or not.

It is a little difficult to remember all the bills and all of the witnesses appearing before the Committee on Rules, but my understanding as to what the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SPRINGER) told us had to do primarily with the paragraph on page 8 of the report, which says:

A significant portion of the programming carried by public broadcasting stations can be categorized as "public affairs programming", that is programming devoted to is-

suues of public importance. The funding of public affairs programs by CPB is entirely consistent with the intent of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 so long as there is "strict adherence to objectivity and balance in all programs or series of programs".

As I understand this language, particularly the last part of it, it was placed into the bill at the determined request of the gentleman from Illinois.

Subsequent thereto of the 15 directors that were appointed, I believe only eight can be from the same party and Mr. SPRINGER indicated the President appointed some very good men and they proceeded to work in accordance with the culture, music, art, and so forth. The program was working quite well.

He then brought to our attention and mentioned one program, where a conservative, I believe he indicated Mr. BUCKLEY was on one side and a person of an opposite philosophical point of view on the other. It was balanced in accordance with the language of the law.

Then he mentioned other programs like "The Advocates," "Sesame Street," and so on which he said were very successful programs.

However, as I understand it, he then indicated some foundations, particularly the Ford Foundation I believe, had taken such an interest in this that they were apparently controlling more of what the Corporation was doing than was the intent of the original law.

He mentioned, I believe, Sandy Vanocur getting \$85,000 and Bob McNeil getting \$70,000.

When objection was made, I think by the Corporation, that these funds were being paid, then the foundation turned around and reduced some of the money to the Public Broadcasting Corporation and the Ford Foundation allegedly placed them on their payroll.

I cannot prove all of the statements that I am making, but I am trying to state as best as I can recall what Mr. SPRINGER said. He concluded by stating that he thought it should only be continued for 1 year and that he actually was opposed to a rule being granted at the time. He thought it should have more study in an effort to work out these problems so there would be a clear understanding in the future.

I believe he stated there were some 245 stations now in existence under this program, and they, of course, could get together and have quite an influential operation, if they were able to do so.

I think he also stated, if he had to have a rule, he would prefer it would be a 1-hour open rule.

Mr. Speaker, that is the best I can do in trying to explain the opposition which was expressed by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SPRINGER), which I cannot find written up any place. But that is my best understanding. I do so for the protection of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SPRINGER) and for the information of the House.

I want to state that over the years the gentleman from Illinois, in my opinion, in his presentations before the Committee on Rules, which has been, on many occasions, has been as learned and honest and knowledgeable as any other Member

who has appeared before the committee. I think the House of Representatives will miss him greatly next year when he retires.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman such time as he may consume.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, I would like to review the particular item with which the gentleman from Illinois does have concern.

Under the law which established the Public Broadcasting Corporation, there were some protections written into the act so that the functions could be expected to be: First, educational; and second, they could be expected to be fair so far as all points of view are concerned.

When a foundation—any foundation or any individual wants to create a certain kind of program on the Public Broadcasting Corporation, they can in fact go to the body and say—We will provide a number of dollars if you will broadcast a certain program—or a certain kind of program.

First, is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of California. That is my understanding of what the gentleman from Illinois said, that it has recently turned into that kind of operation so that the balance which we are supposed to have is not now taking place in accordance with the original intent of the act.

Mr. KYL. Then to pursue that one step further—if in fact the foundation or an individual or a corporation does provide the funds for certain kinds of broadcasting, the corporation or individual or the foundation that supplies the money then has more authority and more control over what is broadcast than does even the Public Broadcasting Corporation—does that follow?

Mr. SMITH of California. Apparently so.

Mr. KYL. In other words, the language which the gentleman from Illinois would seek in the bill would try to find some means of retaining in the law the same provisions of equity and education and fairness in the case when private money is utilized, as exist when Federal funds are utilized; is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of California. I would think that would be correct.

Mr. KYL. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DEVINE. 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.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll. Mr. DEVINE (during the call of the roll). Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Is this not an automatic rollcall on the rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is incorrect. It is a quorum call.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALL. Is it not true that the gentleman from Ohio objected to the vote on the ground that a quorum was not present and made a point of order that a quorum was not present, whereupon the Chair said that the rollcall was automatic?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair had previously ruled that the resolution had been agreed to and that a motion to reconsider was laid on the table. Therefore, the Chair had no alternative except to rule on the point of order that a quorum was not present and order a quorum call, in view of the fact that the gentleman's objection to the vote came too late.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet at the time the Chair made the statement that the question was on the resolution, and I raised the objection to the vote on the ground that a quorum was not present and made the point of order that a quorum was not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair was advised by the Parliamentarian that the Chair had previously ruled that the resolution had been agreed to and that a motion to reconsider had been laid on the table. The Chair had no alternative but to observe the gentleman's point of order that a quorum was not present, and a quorum call is now underway. The Clerk will continue to call the roll.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ADAMS. What the Chair has stated was not clear to the Members at the time the call was started, and I would ask the Chair, under a parliamentary inquiry, whether the Clerk will start again the quorum call. This Member answered "yea."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has ruled. The Clerk will continue the quorum call.

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

[Roll No. 174]

Abernethy	Bingham	Clawson, Del
Abourezk	Blanton	Clay
Abzug	Blatnik	Collier
Addabbo	Brown, Mich.	Colmer
Alexander	Brown, Ohio	Conover
Anderson, Ill.	Broyhill, N.C.	Conte
Anderson, Tenn.	Burton	Corman
Arend	Byrnes, Wis.	Cotter
Ashley	Caffery	Daniels, N.J.
Badillo	Celler	Davis, Ga.
Baring	Chisholm	Davis, S.C.
Barrett	Clark	Dickinson
Bell	Clausen	Diggs
	Don H.	Dorn

Dowdy	Kuykendall	Rosenthal
Drinan	Kyros	Rostenkowski
Dwyer	Landrum	Roybal
Edwards, Calif.	Long, La.	Ruppe
Eshleman	Long, Md.	St Germain
Evans, Colo.	Lujan	Sandman
Flynt	McCloskey	Sarbanes
Ford	McDonald	Satterfield
	Mich.	Scheuer
Gerald R.	McFall	Schmitz
Ford	Mann	Sebellius
Fraser	Mazzoli	Shipley
Frelinghuysen	Metcalfe	Sisk
Fulton	Michel	Smith, Iowa
Galifianakis	Mikva	Spence
Gallagher	Miller, Calif.	Springer
Gettys	Minshall	Stephens
Gibbons	Monagan	Stratton
Goldwater	Moorhead	Stubblefield
Griffin, Miss.	O'Hara	Stuckey
Hagan	Patten	Teague, Calif.
Hanna	Pelly	Teague, Tex.
Harsha	Pirnie	Terry
Harvey	Podell	Thompson, N.J.
Hawkins	Poff	Veysey
Hébert	Pryor, Ark.	Wiggins
Hogan	Pucinski	Wilson, Bob
Hollifield	Railsback	Wilson,
Hutchinson	Rangel	Charles H.
Ichord	Rees	Yatron
Jarman	Reid	Young, Tex.
Jonas	Rodino	Zablocki
Jones, Tenn.	Roncalio	
Karth	Rooney, N.Y.	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 296 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PUBLIC BROADCASTING ACT OF 1972

Mr. STAGGERS. 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. 13918) to provide for improved financing for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 13918, with Mr. GIALMO 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 West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS).

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, as reported by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, H.R. 13918—

First, authorizes the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to promote the utilization and development of telecommunications facilities for the production and distribution of educational radio and television programs.

Second, requires that at least 30 percent of the funds appropriated to CPB in each fiscal year be distributed to non-commercial educational broadcasting stations for use—in their discretion—in activities related to their local broadcast operation.

Third, authorizes an appropriation to CPB of not to exceed \$65 million for fiscal year 1973 and not to exceed \$90 million for fiscal year 1974.

Fourth, provides for inclusion on the 15-member Board of Directors of CPB of five members who are chief executive staff officers of noncommercial educational broadcasting stations. All members of the Board of Directors are, and would continue to be, appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Fifth, increases from \$15 million to \$25 million the authorization for fiscal year 1973 for grants for acquisition and installation of noncommercial educational broadcasting facilities.

Sixth, limits the compensation which may be paid to officers or employees of CPB to that prescribed for level 1 of the executive schedule—at present \$60,000 per annum.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that everyone acquainted with public broadcasting recognizes that the most important provisions of the bill are those providing authorization of appropriations for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. I also understand, Mr. Chairman, that these provisions make this legislation controversial. Why this should be, I do not know. The administration supports extending and increasing the authorization of appropriations for the Corporation. Everyone I have talked to who is acquainted with the activities of the Corporation since it became operational about 3 years ago favors extending and increasing authorizations for it. So I have to conclude that the controversy is over the 2-year authorization with a maximum of \$65 million authorized for fiscal year 1973 and \$90 million authorized for fiscal year 1974 which is in the bill as reported.

Before going on to discuss these features of the bill, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that H.R. 13918 was introduced by our colleague from Massachusetts, TORBERT MACDONALD, for himself and six members of his Subcommittee on Communications and Power, three from our side of the aisle and three from the other side. It was reported from the full committee by a nearly unanimous voice vote. Only the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COLLINS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHMITZ) have filed dissenting views. They, of course, are in the committee's report on the bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we all know that what we are dealing with here today is an authorization bill, not an appropriation. It sets a limit on what can be appropriated. We could have reported out an open-end authorization and no one would have batted an eye. But that is contrary to the policy of our committee. The amounts authorized in the bill are reasonable and prudent. How the \$65 million would be used by the Corporation if it were appropriated for fiscal year 1973 is set forth in the committee report beginning on page 12. But let me say again, Mr. Chairman, that these are authorizations and while reasonable and prudent our experience has been that they are not always the amounts appropriated.

That, of course, is the concern of our great Committee on Appropriations. So let us not fuss over something that is not all that important.

On the question of the number of years for which the bill should authorize appropriations for the CPB, the committee bill, of course, provides for 2 years. This was a compromise that was worked out in the subcommittee. I would have preferred a 3-year authorization. In fact, it is almost a policy of our committee to authorize appropriations for 3 years at a time. Yet, I understand a few Members would like to cut the bill back to 1 year. Why, I cannot understand. If they succeed, we will be back here again next year with another short-term authorization using time and effort that should be focused on the difficult problem of providing long-range financing for the Corporation. The spokesman for the administration on this legislation, Dr. Clay T. Whitehead, director of the Office of Telecommunications Policy, is working on a long-range financing plan for the Corporation and should be able to submit it to the Congress next year. It is long overdue, and I do not say that in any partisan way. The previous administration promised such a plan and failed to deliver on that promise.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members of the House to support the reported bill so that we can get on to the matter of providing long-range financing for the Corporation.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, almost 5 years ago I filed additional views on the legislation which ultimately became the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, Public Law 90-129. That legislation, of course, created the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. In my additional views I said—

This bill will make of educational television an entity unlike anything we know now. The potential good from educational TV is limitless and much to be desired, but the potential dangers are not to be ignored; we should not consider the Corporation, which we are creating, so independent an entity that at some later date the Commerce Committee may not review and reshape its form and function.

As my views, I think, made clear, I had some apprehension about the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and its activities.

Today the House is considering the Public Broadcasting Act of 1972. In the years since its creation I have watched the activities of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting quite carefully and occasionally quite critically. Like all other human undertakings, there have been some errors and the corporation has done some things with which reasonable men have disagreed. But measured in terms of the undertaking, its uniqueness, and the problems inherent in attempting to inform, enlighten, and educate a population of over 200 million people I believe that the corporation has on balance provided a most worthwhile addition to our national education effort.

Your committee has made this a public bill. Your committee offers the Nation a better broadcasting capability, and I intend to support the bill as reported by

the committee and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MACDONALD).

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS), who has been interested in this subject for so long and compliment him on his explanation of the bill, a statement which brings the bill into very clear focus.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I merely have a few things I would like to point out to the Members dealing particularly with the fact that the bill that is here before us is a compromise bill which was added to and subtracted from by the members of both the subcommittee and the committee from both sides of the aisle.

The Congress is in debt to the very hard-working members on the Republican side of the committee who came up with some very fine amendments which were adopted.

The bill itself came out of the subcommittee with only one dissenting vote.

Some of the difficulties that always accompany putting together a large enterprise such as this have been overcome. The broadcasters themselves, the station managers at one point had a bit of a misunderstanding going—although it is too strong a word to call it a trouble, but they had some difficulty with the Corporation. A proposal by a member of the subcommittee on the Republican side, which unanimously was adopted by us, stopped all that by putting five station managers or members of station management on a special board to join the 10 other members in this set up, so the five members are in a crucial position in this contemplated Board of 15. The five members which will represent the stations and station management will be in at the top rung. They will be consulted, and not only consulted but also will have voting consultation and given full faith credit before the board and with the other members of the Corporation.

So, as I say, there has been compromise all up and down the line. The station managers, and I am sure many Members of this body have received messages such as I have from their local broadcasters, and from their local stations saying they approve of this bill and hope it passes soon—and the sooner it does, the better off they will be, and the better off their communities they serve will be, and therefore the Nation as a whole.

I agree wholeheartedly with that, and I will ask permission at the proper time to insert in the RECORD a list of organizations which have by letter or wire or both indicated their approval of the bill as amended by the subcommittee and the full committee, and which is before the Members today. I will not go through the list now obviously, but I would just like to point out that the organizations range from the AFL-CIO to the National Association of Manufacturers, from the

National Audubon Society to the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the National Council of Churches of Christ, the National Council of Senior Citizens, the National Council of Women, the National Grange, and the National 4-H Club Foundation.

Mr. Chairman, the following is a complete list of the organizations I have referred to:

LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS

AFL-CIO.
Alliance for Labor Action.
American Bar Association.
American Association of University Women.
American Jewish Committee.
Associated Councils of the Arts.
Association of the Junior Leagues of America, Inc.
Boy Scouts of America.
Consumer Federation of America.
Council of State Governments.
General Federal of Women's Clubs.
Girl Scouts of the USA.
League of Women Voters.
National Association of the Advancement of Colored People.
National Association of Counties.
National Association of Manufacturers.
National Audubon Society.
National Conference of Christians and Jews.
National Congress of Parents and Teachers.
National Council of Churches of Christ.
National Council of Negro Women.
National Council of Senior Citizens.
National Council of Women.
National Education Association.
National Grange.
National 4-H Club Foundation.
National League of Cities/U.S. Conference of Mayors.
National Legal Aid and Defender Association.
National Recreation and Park Association.
National Urban League.
National Wildlife Federation.
Southern Baptist Convention.
U.S. Catholic Conference.
U.S. Jaycees.
U.S. National Student Association.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has been worked on very diligently. I think it has been refined to a point that it should be embraced wholeheartedly by the entire membership of this House, because it brings to the American public the broadcast of high quality material. The common denominator theory that commercial broadcasters work by and say they have to work by does not apply in this. This brings programming of a fine nature and of a better nature than the commercial stations can present to us.

The people within the industry are very happy with the bill. I include the commercial stations as well, who have contributed their money to see to it that this program is ongoing and keeps as forward looking as it has been.

Mr. Chairman, the bill we are considering today is the result of long and careful work by the Subcommittee on Communications and Power, going back to 1967 when we brought into being the framework of a noncommercial, educational, public broadcasting system for the United States. That Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 did give us a viable system, and brought a number of valuable programs to the American people that would not

have been presented by commercial television.

From 1967 until now, the Congress has repeatedly requested a long-range funding program from the executive branch, and that plan has not been forthcoming. Instead, we are startled to read of a speech delivered by the head of the Office of Telecommunications Policy, Dr. Whitehead, to a convention of educational broadcasters in October of last year, in which he called on them to withhold their support of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and speak out for the destruction of a national programming service. It was a speech intended to divide and conquer public broadcasting. It was a statement that revealed a deep desire on the part of the executive branch to make public broadcasting a second-class public service.

We wanted to find out if the stations really did want to do away with a strong national service, so we conducted extensive hearings in early February of this year to review the status and plans of public broadcasting.

The contribution of the White House to those hearings was a bill introduced while these hearings were actually in progress which called for another 1-year extension of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 and an increase in funds of less than 30 percent. The bill which I originally introduced called for 5-year funding at substantially higher levels, levels which both the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and representatives of noncommercial stations indicated would be satisfactory to provide the kind of quality TV and radio programming that was needed.

The subcommittee debated the provisions of these bills, and with valuable contributions from both sides, reported out H.R. 13918. This bill, which is before us today, provides for 2-year funding at \$65 and \$90 million dollars, for an additional \$10 million for station facilities, and for a minimum of 30 percent of all Federal funds to be passed through to individual stations for local activities. It also provides for representation on the board of directors of CPB of station representatives, which further insures that station voices will be heard in the decisionmaking process regarding programming and distribution of funds.

The subcommittee reported out this bill by a vote of 8 to 1. It was cosponsored by seven of the nine subcommittee members. In the full committee, only two dissents were registered.

I am convinced that this bill represents a consensus of all the elements of public broadcasting—the Corporation, the public broadcasting service which is responsible for national distribution of programs, and the 200-plus noncommercial stations around the country. The bill has been endorsed by an impressive number of national and local organizations which are interested in quality broadcasting, from the AFL-CIO to the National Congress of Parents and Teachers. I will provide a complete list of these organizations

for the record and ask unanimous consent that they be included at this point.

We have worked long and hard on this bill, and we believe it is in the public interest. It will give public broadcasting a chance to produce the kind of programs that will enrich the viewing choice of the American people, from the preschool youngsters who learn from "Sesame Street" to the adults who watch "Masterpiece Theater," "Washington Week in Review," "The Advocates," "Firing Line," and many other programs. With the guarantees written into this legislation, stations will be aided in producing quality programs for their local viewers as well. Finally we have reason to hope that the existence of a strong national and local noncommercial service will cause commercial broadcasters to upgrade the quality of their programming.

(Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FREY).

Mr. FREY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MACDONALD) for his handling of this bill. He has done an outstanding job, and he has been most fair, under his leadership the committee has come out with a bill that makes sense.

Also I would like to compliment the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH) the ranking minority member of our subcommittee. Again, not only in this bill, but also throughout the years he has provided the leadership that has allowed our subcommittee to pass outstanding legislation. It is sad, not only for our committee, but also for the Congress and Nation when the gentleman from Massachusetts retires at the end of the year. I am sure all my colleagues are deeply saddened to see him go, and we wish him Godspeed.

Mr. Chairman, I started out in the subcommittee very negative regarding the legislation. However, most of these questions have been satisfactorily answered as far as I am concerned.

One of my prime concerns was the impact of this legislation on the local stations. I did not like the idea of a few men sitting in Washington, D.C., deciding what to produce. It seemed to me this was not responsive to the needs of the people in the local communities. By adding five local station managers to the 15-man PBS board the interests of the local communities can be protected.

I am not happy about the salary paid to Sander Vanocur or John McNeill. I believe this is a mistake. But we are obligated to look at the total sum of what public television is doing, where it is going, and what it can do to help in this country.

For instance, we have increased the funding for facilities by \$10 million and

this will be of tremendous help in the local communities. To give a personal example, in my home area we have channel 24, which is in need of a larger antenna. Right now it gets to less than 25 percent of the potential audience.

Through the increase in funds for facilities they will get the needed antenna.

Questions have been raised, by me, about the influence of the Ford Foundation on public broadcasting. There is no question that they put a tremendous amount of money in. The testimony indicated that in essence they had no influence. I do not necessarily believe that. I believe that any time millions of dollars are donated there must be some influence. However, today Ford contributes \$10 million, or less than 5 percent of the total money needed. Furthermore, for those people who are worried about undue influence such as the Ford Foundation, this bill solves this problem, as it increases the funding and allows the local stations to be more autonomous than before.

Another area I have been concerned about is the public affairs and news commentaries, of public broadcasting. The majority of the funds go for cultural and performance, and children and family. Forty-six percent go for cultural and performance, and 24 percent for children and the family, and only 30 percent for public affairs. In terms of time 38 percent are used on cultural and performance and 28 percent on children and the family. Yet in my opinion there is nothing wrong with public affairs if done properly. For instance, why not more broadcasting of public affairs in terms of county commission meetings, school board meetings, and other meetings which brings government home to the people. One of the great problems of this country is that the people really do not know what their elected officials are doing.

Obviously commercial television is not going to take prime time to do that. They spend less than 2 percent of their total prime time on public affairs. They just cannot afford to do it. The only way we can enlarge public affairs support is through public broadcasting.

There is one other area I would like to discuss. How much is the Federal share? If we take the fiscal year 1971, we find that the Federal Government contributed 7 percent of the total money that went to the broadcasting companies. They spent \$9,885,460. The total station income was over \$141 million. The rest comes from the States and local governments, foundations, State universities, business and industry, and individuals.

Finally, I would say to my colleagues who question the difference between a 1-year and a 2-year authorization, the committee found itself in disagreement with the initial bill being a 5-year authorization. We felt that even if a long-range financing proposal came before us in 1973, it would take some time to enact. In order to allow the necessary planning at least 2 years is needed. If the job is not being done our committee will continue its oversight function.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of H.R. 13918.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. TIERNAN), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity first of all to congratulate the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MACDONALD). We had a difficult time in coming up with a bill that was a reasonable settlement to the areas of controversy between the minority and the majority, thanks, mostly as a result of the work of the chairman.

Also at this time I want to express my appreciation for the cooperation given by Mr. KEITH, the ranking minority Member, and also the other members of his subcommittee, who worked very diligently in preparing a bill that was finally adopted by the subcommittee by a vote of 8 to 1 and then adopted nearly unanimously by the full committee.

I want to assure all of the Members of the House that we worked very hard on this piece of legislation.

As you know, the initial proposal presented to the committee was for a 5-year authorization. It has been my position as a member of this committee that we should have long-term financing. When the Congress first set up the Public Broadcasting Corporation, it was done because of the Carnegie report which provided the background for that action by the Congress and also within that report it clearly indicated in order for the people of America to have a viable instrument such as the Public Broadcasting Corporation, it would be necessary to have long-term financing which would be insulated from all of the possibilities of political influence or changes within the administrations here in Washington.

So, since my term on the Subcommittee on Communications I have endeavored to insist upon each administration presenting to the Congress a proposal for long-term financing.

This is a very controversial area. It may require taxation and it may require certain forms of revenue-raising that would be difficult for any administration, whether it is Democrat or Republican. I think it is necessary for us as Members of the Congress to understand that we have to provide this type of financing for this corporation.

In order to come to this House on the basis of what was stated to the subcommittee by the representatives of the administration in the person of Mr. Whitehead that the administration would present to the Congress before June 30, 1973, their plan for long-term financing and we also received assurances from Mr. Macy and others in the industry that they would cooperate with Mr. Whitehead and the administration in trying to come up with a plan that would meet the objectives and the proposals in the Carnegie report.

With that kind of a background we undertook to present to the Congress a bill providing for additional funding through the appropriations of this

House and the Senate to carry the corporation in its operations through to 1974 rather than having a 1-year authorization which would end before we would have the benefit of the administration's position and their plan and an opportunity to have hearings on that plan and to have different views expressed by people interested in Public Broadcasting Corp. Therefore we have presented a bill which provides for an authorization of \$65 million for fiscal year 1973 and \$90 million for fiscal year 1974.

It is necessary that we do have this long-range leadtime, also, if it is going to be possible for this corporation to do its job in presenting to the local managers and stations the types of programs that we feel are necessary. It will take time for these preparations to be made. In order to get the quality which we need in these programs it does take considerable time.

Now, also, in the bill we provide for additional funding of \$10 million in the area of facility grants.

In the hearings it was pointed out that for this year, the fiscal year 1973, only \$15 million was provided for facility grants. Clearly, on the basis of the testimony before the subcommittee, most of the people who testified indicated the need for additional funding for local facilities and broadcasting equipment and facilities to carry on what we expect them to do in the local areas.

So, the committee has increased that authorization by another \$10 million, bringing the total authorization for these grants which are administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to \$25 million.

So, I think the changes we have made in that area of financing the corporation, along with the changes that were made in the board makeup for the Public Broadcasting Corp. itself where we provide for five members of the board to be selected by the local managers of stations throughout the country goes a long way toward having additional input into the corporate decisions that are being made with reference to the type of programs that we will see on public television.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, we have before us today in the Public Broadcasting Act of 1972, one of the most far-reaching pieces of legislation to come before the House. It involves more than the money that is authorized. It represents the Government actively entering into a system for control of public news. It is a challenge to our freedom of speech and the freedom of press.

Many of our public broadcasting facilities have outstanding records. In my own community we are fortunate in having one of the best managed and best operating facilities in America. The president of our local operation, Ralph Rogers, is not only president of the dynamic Texas Industries Co., but he also serves on the National Chamber of

Commerce Board. And everyone is impressed with the staff and operation of our local facility.

But my dissent is based on the fact that public broadcasting has changed direction from its original concept of educational television. Local communities started with enthusiasm for the need and great achievements of using television for educational strength.

Gradually, from this base the emphasis has changed to community broadcasting. This meant programming with more emphasis on cultural drama or classical music.

My wife considers the "Masterpiece Theater" on our Dallas stations to be one of TV's best shows. My daughter, Nancy, at Wellesley, impressed me last week when she told me that the Boston public station was the best in town and she mailed them \$20 as her annual subscription.

But I question whether it is the responsibility of the Government to provide entertainment facilities. Should the Government also finance pro football, baseball, and underwrite all classical theater and orchestras?

American TV is well represented today with UHF and VHF television stations. Cable television will expand tremendously in the next 5 years. In most markets five to 10 channels will be available for program selectivity.

Do we need to do more in America to encourage families to put more time into television viewing? I am told the average family spends 7 hours a day watching television. How can American families know each other when many families do not even pause to eat meals together? Reading is one of the greatest factors in building an education and yet 7 hours of television is causing America to lose its reading opportunities for broadening personal knowledge.

Public broadcasting opened the door from Federal finances 4 years ago. At that time \$5 million was granted. Since then the requests have begun to move and 4 years later we are paying \$35 million. In the bill you have before you, public broadcasting is requesting \$65 million this year and \$90 million in 1974.

Commissioner Nicholas Johnson of FCC stated in his testimony that if the United States did a comparable job to Japan in Public Broadcasting in proportion to the gross national product of Japan that Congress would budget at a level of \$1.8 billion. With a \$40-billion deficit staring America in the face, I question the wisdom of assuming added financial obligations. And I am opposed to the suggested annual tax on TV sets to pay for it.

When the Government moves into the funding of these public broadcasting stations, we will find that the Government will also move into control. Everytime Congress spends money it soon takes over full accounting and direction of the spending of this money. The greatest danger is in the field of news. Public broadcasting should not engage in the presentation of straight news programs. Locally produced newscasts can be a big

feature to a station, but can run one-third of the station's operation costs. Unless we eliminate straight news reporting, we will soon be developing a PRAVDA as an official Government TV news propaganda source.

America's news today is free and independent. It is not always right and not always factual, but it represents voices of different people. This bill gives tremendous impetus to national funding of public broadcasting, so we must be alert to the potential challenge to freedom that comes from a nationally financed and controlled news operation.

Public broadcasting has capable and aggressive management. Most communities are manned with boards of active, progressive civic leadership. They have enthusiastic, hard working staffs. With this strong, capable management, public broadcasting will expand quickly and aggressively.

I believe our concentration should be on educational television. I believe there should be more Sesame Street type shows for the Headstart group. I would like to see science subjects in high school with programs in physics, botany, and math that could be reused for years to come. I want production funds to go for educational development and not for controlled news programs.

Educational television can best be served with independent management, finance, and control. This present bill will lead to complete Federal financing, controlled Federal TV news and an annual tax on homeowners TV sets.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE).

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I believe the previous speaker, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COLLINS) has pointed out well the need for greater quality in television in general. He made the comment that the average American family spends 7 hours a day watching television. I do not think we are going to abolish television. We tried to do that with another product in this country, and did not succeed. I think that we should use the legislation before us to provide for greater quality in television.

Many people will point out that because of watching television there is less reliance on reading. Certainly this is true; television does, to an extent, draw the viewer away from the book. But at the same time, the dismaying failure to teach reading in this country, and appreciation of the good books available to us, is precisely the kind of problem which is being attacked by quality TV programming, such as that represented by the Public Broadcasting System. The fact of the matter is that millions upon millions of our children and adults in this country, despite the efforts of educators, either cannot read or cannot read well enough to function in our complex society. These functional illiterates, as the educators describe them, cannot perform such basic tasks as gaining information from a newspaper, filling out a driver's license application, or filling out a job application.

Most of my esteemed colleagues here know about the Children's Television Workshop and its most famous production "Sesame Street," which is an excellent educational television series designed for the preschool child.

The Children's Television Workshop also produces another series, titled "The Electric Company," which addresses itself straight to the problem of reading.

"The Electric Company" has been on the airwaves of our noncommercial television system for a full season now. It is directed to the child in the second, third, and fourth grades, and is designed to help teachers reinforce certain basic concepts of reading.

All the entertainment devices of commercial television—music, action, humor—are utilized in "The Electric Company" not to sell products but to interest the child in letters, words, sentences, and to help teach a child to read.

This is important work.

Preliminary studies by the Children's Television Workshop indicate that the new series is succeeding in reaching its audience, in arousing an interest in reading, and in reinforcing the skills needed to read.

I am informed that more than 18,000 schools in the country—schools with at least one television set and with access to the signals of a noncommercial, public broadcasting station—are using "The Electric Company" as part of the classroom instruction. Millions of other children watch in their own homes.

All this is occurring at a cost of about one cent per child per day. I cannot think of a better educational bargain.

The legislation we are considering would permit the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to more than double its support of the Children's Television Workshop, and, thus, the efforts of "The Electric Company" to help in this country's educational needs.

My recommendation is that the bill be passed, as submitted.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROONEY), a member of the committee.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in full support of the bill, H.R. 13918.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the very distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McDONALD) who is with us today and who has worked long and hard to bring this bill before the house today.

I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, I suppose that I come from a very unique part of the country that really utilizes and needs the use of this educational television.

I live in the greater Lehigh Valley, which includes Allentown, Bethlehem, and Easton area.

We have no locally owned television station. All the television we receive in the Lehigh Valley comes in either from New York, Philadelphia, or Wilkes-Barre or Scranton.

In the Lehigh Valley we have channel

station WLVT which does an excellent job in bringing education to the children and to the adults in my constituency.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today (H.R. 13918) would go a long way to provide a modicum of stability and importantly, increased financial support for local public radio and television stations throughout the country. In fact, one-half of the funds authorized under this bill for fiscal year 1973 would return directly to local stations. These funds include \$25 million authorized under the Educational Broadcasting Facilities program and in addition, not less than 30 percent of all funds authorized to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

This aspect of the legislation is crucially important, because of the economic pressures on local stations and the fact that many of them have been forced to work with equipment ancient in television and radio technological terms.

For example, under H.R. 13918, the Corporation would be required to distribute to local stations—using procedures worked out with representatives of the stations themselves—about \$20 million during the first year. This would be an increase of about three times the present level of general station support. And in March, when the bill was reported from subcommittee, the CPB Board announced that if funds authorized for fiscal year 1973 and fiscal year 1974 are ultimately appropriated at or near the levels indicated in the bill, it contemplates a percentage distribution greater than the 30 percent for station use mentioned in the legislation.

And this support is desperately needed at the local station level, so that these stations can serve the unique needs of their communities through local programming.

For example, tightening economic pressures on participating school districts everywhere have resulted in a curtailment and, indeed, in some areas, a complete halt in support of instructional television programming activity on local stations. Businesses and industry have tightened their own belts, and what meager funds were flowing into public television stations through underwriting and direct contribution, have seriously diminished. State governmental support of educational television has also been eroded through constantly increasing demands on its treasury.

Yet, with all this, the local noncommercial public television station, born without any visible means of support, has been called upon to serve its local constituency—and despite the adverse economics—practically all public stations have responded with new and imaginative programs for its local community.

Many station managers, I am told, spend most of their time in a relentless search for "survival funds." Instead of expending energy in the creation and development of new and imaginative programming efforts—which takes dollars—many public station managers, particularly in the smaller and medium size markets, spend most of their day in designing new and imaginative ways to seek funds to pay the telephone bill.

Enactment of H.R. 13918 would help to alleviate this situation and allow local public broadcasters to concentrate their efforts on the creation of programs of specific interest to their own communities.

The bill goes a step further in guaranteeing that local broadcasting play a more meaningful role in the community by providing that five members appointed by the 15-member board of directors of CPB be chief executive staff officers of noncommercial educational broadcasting stations.

As an example of what we have been discussing, I would like to indicate the kinds of programs serving a community in my own district even now when stations are struggling to pay that phone bill.

WLVT-TV, serving Allentown, Bethlehem, and Easton, Pa., has provided these programs during the past year:

Two weeks of continuous live local programming every night, featuring all local candidates for political office, including school board, city council, State senate and assembly, district attorney, judgeships, and U.S. Congress. Live, local election returns; public hearings, featuring the Governor; State house committees; ecology versus the environment; and fluoridation.

Monthly live city council and school board reports with telephone questions direct to city and school officials; regular weekly exchange of views by college students and community leaders of seven local universities on our "College Speak In," which recently featured the Honorable WILBUR MILLS in a special hour telecast. Programming such as this can only be done at the grassroots level and H.R. 13918 would help provide the necessary funds.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the gentleman could tell me why, since general debate on the bill is about to end and it is only 2 p.m., we cannot go on today and finish this bill. Does the gentleman have any idea about what goes on that precludes disposition of this bill today?

Mr. KEITH. No, I am not privy to the leadership thoughts in that respect.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for that inconclusive answer.

Mr. KEITH. It is a very definite answer. I do not know.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, one provision of H.R. 13918 would require that no less than 30 percent of the Federal money given to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting go directly to local stations in the form of community service grants. In addition, this bill provides that \$25 million would go to the educational broadcasting facilities program of HEW, which awards grants to stations for equipment.

The result of these provisions is to

earmark for local station use 50 percent of the funds H.R. 13918 would provide. This recognizes the worthy contribution being made by public stations throughout the country in service to their communities.

In my State, the Kentucky Authority for Educational Television has provided a model of this kind of service. Though it has been in operation only 4 years, the authority's network, which is comprised of 13 transmitters, supplements the classroom education of more than a half-million Kentucky schoolchildren. It brings them not only the traditional courses, but also such programs as "Kentucky Is My Land," a history series that fosters appreciation of the State's rich heritage.

In addition, Kentucky educational television provides televised high school classes leading to high school equivalency certificates for the State's 760,000 adults who have not completed secondary school, and it provides a closed-circuit interconnection among the State universities and to the State's community college system.

Further, Kentucky educational television, in cooperation with other State agencies, has produced programs for Kentuckians explaining such matters as motor vehicle inspection, driver's licensing, and the State's foster child situation.

The result of this system has been to bring to all Kentuckians, particularly those outside the major population centers, a service that is not available to them from any other source. Clearly, if we are to solve some of the problems of our growing society, maximum use must be made of communications for public service. This ability exists today through local public broadcasting, but it needs strengthening.

H.R. 13918 would more than triple the amount of the grants from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to local television stations, and it would almost double the total funds available from HEW for station equipment.

I am convinced that this money is needed at the local level and urge support of H.R. 13918 as the best means for accomplishing this purpose.

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation and congratulate the chairman of the committee for the work he did on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, Jacksonville, Fla., which I represent in the Congress is truly proud of its public television broadcasting facility, WJCT, channel 7. For the past several years this television station has provided our community with an invaluable public service. Channel 7 has broadcast to every home in Florida's Third District the meetings of the Duval County School Board. Channel 7 has also broadcast city council meetings on a regular basis; and has done much to keep the community informed and in touch with policymakers through programs such as their audience telephone partici-

pation program, "Feedback." In just a few short years channel 7 and other public broadcast facilities around the Nation have grown and proven themselves. These public broadcast stations have made a significant contribution to the well-being of this Nation.

Public broadcasting in the United States is now at a turning point. Stations are gearing up, preparing to expand their facilities and their programming services to local communities. Public broadcasters have developed a precious momentum and momentum is a very perishable commodity. It cannot be stored away and preserved. It must be encouraged and helped along. Through H.R. 13918 the necessary resources will be provided to preserve momentum for the public broadcasting industry in this Nation. And also, the bill opens up great new areas for local broadcast operations.

First of all, 30 percent of the funds appropriated for public broadcasting in each fiscal year will be distributed to local public broadcast stations for use as they see fit. Previously no minimum amount was fixed and last year only 17 percent of the appropriated funds made it to the local market and into the budgets of the local public broadcast operations. This 30-percent minimum will allow stations to expand their programming output and better serve the needs of the local community.

The grant-in-aid program under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would be expanded from \$15 million a year to \$25 million a year. Although the \$10 million jump does represent a great deal of money, local stations badly need television cameras, video tape recorders, and other expensive yet necessary equipment. I know one of the most serious problems that faces WJCT in Jacksonville is the lack of such equipment, and I feel sure that with the increased authorization we will see a more than comparable increase in the quality of programming.

Third, this bill would include, on the 15-member board of directors of the CPB, five members who are chief executive staff officers of noncommercial educational broadcasting stations. I can think of no better way for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to keep in touch with the needs of the local markets and the needs of the local citizens in the communities serviced by public broadcasting.

Another important section of the bill which should not be overlooked is the length of time in its appropriations. Producers both on the local and on the network level need time to write scripts, build sets, bring together the necessary talent and the technical crews to produce a program. Mr. John W. Massey, president of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, said in his remarks before the Subcommittee on Communications and Power—

As any broadcast producer will testify, a leadtime period of 18 to 24 months is imperative to the successful development and the production of original program series.

It is clear from this that the 2-year appropriation is the absolute minimum amount of time within which quality programming can be developed. If a program on the local level can be developed in 9 months, producers must be assured that they will have sufficient amount of programming time to justify the expense and the tremendous amount of work that goes into producing a television program.

Finally, H.R. 13918 authorizes an appropriation to CPB of \$65 million for fiscal year 1973 and \$90 million for fiscal year 1974. As I mentioned before, stations like WJCT in Jacksonville are geared up, are enthusiastic, and are ready to do all they can to service their communities. But it must be clear that they cannot do it without the necessary funds. They cannot continue to expand, they cannot continue to grow and they cannot continue to increase their services to the communities without additional Federal funds. Programs on the horizon like the adult learning program service, designed to assist adults who do not have a high school education, should not fall by the wayside. These and other programs which are now and will be broadcast via public television in the future, make public television more than just entertainment and an informational media. It turns the television into an instructor, a teacher and a window to the world; providing opportunities for many and making America a better place in which to live. I urge passage of this important legislation.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. VAN DEERLIN), the ranking member of the subcommittee on our side.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, the manner in which this bill comes to the floor for consideration has been in the highest tradition of committee functions in this body. Our subcommittee was surely not of any single persuasion as to the manner in which public broadcasting, both television and radio, should be continued under Government sponsorship. We had, as a matter of fact, on the final day in our subcommittee a division of opinion. Our subcommittee chairman, Mr. MACDONALD, had originally introduced a bill calling for a 5-year extension with some new departures in the manner in which funds were to be raised for public broadcasting.

A sizable number thought the administration was to be taken at its word in its assurances that there would be permanent funding proposals before Congress by the end of the fiscal year, in June of 1973. And so they argued for a 1-year limitation. We hit upon a compromise figure. We agreed that a 2-year extension, even if the administration comes up with a permanent funding plan by the time it promised, would give us some time in which to consider the plan's merits, some time in which to act in committee and bring the matter to the floor for measured debate. In any event, we agreed, the recipients of assistance under this legislation were entitled to

more than a 1-year extension, for purposes of reasonable and efficient planning.

Never have they had less than 2 years. It is the policy in most authorization bills within the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to provide 3-year authorizations.

There have been, and there will be tomorrow when we go to the 5-minute rule, some objections raised to the manner in which public broadcasting has conducted itself. And so I just want you to know that within our committee, public broadcasting or any other level of broadcasting finds no patsies.

I have not always agreed with the chairman of our full committee, Mr. STAGGERS, in his views toward broadcasting, nor he with mine, but I can tell you that nobody has HARLEY STAGGERS in his pocket.

Similarly, the chairman of our subcommittee, whom we are all so happy to see back and looking so well after a long siege of illness, is perhaps one of the most aggressive questioners of witnesses that I have seen in my 10 years in Congress. He is never impolite, but he never lets anybody get away with evasions or indirection. I can assure you that representatives of both the educational broadcast stations and the public corporation appearing before our committee have been subjected to the most rigorous cross-examination.

I do not have to tell you that men like BOB TIERNAN, FRED ROONEY, and GOODLOE BYRON are equally attentive to their responsibilities as Members of this body.

On the other side, Mr. KEITH, of Massachusetts, has provided in his first year as ranking minority member of this subcommittee a very progressive and enlightened leadership on this subject.

We have already heard from Mr. FREY, the gentleman from Florida, one of the ablest new members of this body. I am sorry the gentleman from Ohio (CLARENCE BROWN) will not be back until tomorrow. He has addressed himself with special concern to educational aspects of public broadcasting and has made sure, by a great deal of hard personal work, that those interests are protected. I do not have to tell the Members the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COLLINS) has been very attentive to the public interest as he sees it in regard to public broadcasting.

So the bill we bring before the Members from this group of men is not the bill that the public broadcasters themselves would have preferred, nor the bill perhaps that any of us individually would have preferred. It represents a working out of differences of opinion, and differences of emphasis.

There will be, and there has been today some allusion to the salary matter. This concerns principally three salaries alleged to be excessive. Two of them are paid by an independent corporation, the National Public Affairs Center for Television. This is an independent agency funded in part by public funds and up to almost 50 percent by private foundation funds. Recently combined with the Washington, D.C., public television out-

let, WETA, it is now producing public affairs programming for the Public Broadcast Service, distributed nationally.

If anyone can address himself with some objectivity to this matter of the salaries paid by NPACT to its on-the-air talent, I think I am that one. It was I who first called upon the Public Broadcasting Corporation to provide a list of those salaries; it was I who objected in this well, when they were a little slow in coming up with those figures; it was I who, upon first revelation of those salaries, expressed the view that the prime task for public broadcasting should be not to compete in the marketplace for commercial talent, but to develop its own star system. I think some mistake may have been made in hiring Sander Vanocur at \$85,000, and Robert McNeill at \$65,000, respectively. The third salary in question was authorized by the Public Broadcast Corporation for John Macy, former Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, who is the head of the Public Broadcasting Corporation and draws a salary of \$65,000.

It can be said that if we were to go into the marketplace and try to hire men with experience in network broadcasting on public affairs, we might have to pay more than \$85,000 or \$65,000.

There has been some objection to what is conceived to be the ideological slant of the men who were hired. Let me say something about the NPACT operation. The No. 3 man over there is a man I have known for a great many years, because he comes from my hometown. He was political editor of the San Diego Union. Twice he was detached from his service with the newspaper in order to assist Richard Nixon, first in his campaign to be elected Governor of California, and then in his successful quest for the Presidency. So this NPACT team has political balance.

If there is an ideological slant, in whatever their private views may be, moreover, I defy anyone to show me where that slant has shown up in any of the public affairs broadcasting that has been aired by this NPAC team—and they have been on every Tuesday night for the last 15 weeks. The job that they are doing is exactly the kind of job that has been set out for this new form of broadcasting, which is aimed to give some variation, and to breathe some new life into what is put out on television and radio.

Mr. Chairman, I know I am running out of time, but I would like to emphasize the work that is being done in public radio under this funding. We usually think of this legislation in terms of television. I should imagine if any of us can think of any part of the broadcast spectrum which needs attention, it is radio. Commercial radio has been going to pot.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. In 3 short years, the Corporation has succeeded in increas-

ing the number of full-service public radio stations from 73 to 121. Today, 62 of the Nation's 100 largest cities are served by such a station, as well as many rural communities.

More important, Corporation aid has sparked the same kind of programing improvements in radio, as it has in television. The result has been to add a new source of information and enlightenment to the American communications scene.

National Public Radio, the national interconnection agency that CPB helped create and which it funds, has been in the lead of this movement. Among its achievements have been the broadcast of almost 100 hours of hearings held by the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives; live broadcasts of more than 60 major addresses from the National Press Club, and numerous special events, such as live coverage on the United Nations debate on the admission of Red China. In addition, it has provided a broad range of cultural programs.

More than mere sentiment for an era long past prompts this redevelopment and resurgence of radio, for the medium has unique capabilities that other media lack. Being highly mobile, radio provides a sense of immediacy with which even television cannot always compete. It is also efficient, being able to provide the same kind of program as television at only one-tenth the cost.

As recently as on the day of the tragedy at Laurel, Md., in which Governor Wallace was shot, I happened on the way home that evening to hear two public radio stations in their handling of that story. I can tell the Members it was professional and first-rate in every respect.

As I remarked a moment ago to our colleague from Iowa, I am hopeful that encouragement of public radio might give us a few more broadcasters such as the old "Voice of Iowa," H. R. Gross, used to be.

I should like to point out that the increase in funds which is provided in this legislation—almost all of it—will go directly through to the local stations. If there is one thing we have set out to preserve in the public broadcast law in this Nation, it is the independence and the integrity of local management. There is going to be no network pushing anything down the throats of these independently operated stations.

We have \$10 million in the bill for facilities grants to the stations. And we have a provision that 30 percent of all the general funds will go directly through to the local stations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. The chairman has been overly generous with me, and I hope I have not abused his kindness.

If you Members have been hearing from managers of local stations, I know you have learned there are a great many things they are eager to do in local programs which they have not been able to do because of a lack of funding.

I am delighted to assure Members that under the terms of this bill, 50 cents out of every dollar we spend, if the Appropriations Committee goes along, will go directly through to the local stations—to be spent as they see fit, under the guidance of boards of prominent citizens in each community.

There are 220 of these television stations, many of them affiliated with colleges and universities in our districts, and 121 full service radio stations.

I do hope the Members will all come to the floor with open minds tomorrow, to consider what we can do to preserve and extend the benefits of a truly people's broadcasting service in the United States.

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

I want again to acknowledge the very great contribution which the modest gentleman from California (Mr. VAN DEERLIN) has made to this legislation and to the cause of public broadcasting. He has been an enlightened contributor to the deliberations of the committee, and the legislation is much improved by his contribution.

The gentleman from California suggested that there had never been any justifiable complaint as it relates to the objectivity of, as I shall call them, the Sander Vanocur programs on NPACT. It is my recollection that on at least two occasions following speeches by the President, all of those who were asked for comments were opposed to the philosophy and the content of the President's remarks. The two speeches were, on the one hand, busing, and, on the other the renewed bombing in Vietnam.

Are you aware of those programs. Have they been brought to your attention?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. If the gentleman will yield, I was referring to the regular Tuesday night "Campaign 1972" programs that have been telecast this year by NPACT.

Mr. KEITH. Yes. There were two programs produced by NPACT, which Mr. Vanocur introduced to the television audience. He admitted in his introduction, that panelists were not balanced, that they were in fact, in opposition to the President's speech.

I will say that the record does show that he made an effort to find people who could give balance to the program, but indicated he was unable to do so.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Will the gentleman yield for one moment further?

Mr. KEITH. Yes.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. When the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Dean Burch, appeared before our subcommittee on this legislation, this year, he testified in response to a question that he knew of no complaints under the Fairness Doctrine which had reached the FCC in relation to public broadcasting, as compared with the numerous complaints which come in response to programs and utterances on commercial television.

Of course, it can be argued that more people are watching commercial television, and that this would account for

a preponderance of complaints against commercial TV. But it does seem strange that there should have been at that time—and this was in the last 4 months—not one single complaint directed to the FCC on this score.

Mr. KEITH. I recall the question. I believe it was by Mr. MACDONALD of Mr. Burch and his response was, "Yes. I checked just this morning and there were none." So this morning we called his office and asked if that same condition exists today, and by and large it does. There are one or two complaints that have been filed by an organization I believe known as AIM, which protests the interconnection system. He felt these complaints that were lodged with his office were not within the jurisdiction of the FCC. The complaints should, I believe, more properly have been brought against the individual station which by choice accepted the program. One of those had to do with sex education and the other with treatment of blacks in the penal system. But he did not feel it was his responsibility to investigate the charges—and certainly those who brought the protest should have carried it, in my judgment, to the individual stations, because all of them voluntarily used these programs, as contrasted to the network approach.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Does the gentleman have time to yield for one moment further?

Mr. KEITH. I will be glad to.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I wonder if all of the Members are aware that public broadcasting operates under a stricture which is even more comprehensive than commercial broadcasting. We have in our law for public broadcasters the statement that there shall be "strict adherence to objectivity and balance," to an extent which leaves them open to challenge if there is not almost a minute-by-minute distribution of time on controversial issues. Commercial television is under a general requirement of the Fairness Doctrine which says that an effort must be made to seek out the views of opposition forces, and to give them a comparable opportunity to be heard. But it does not require anything like the language of the amendment that we put into the public broadcasting bill 3 years ago.

Mr. KEITH. I think further than that—and I would like to comment upon the observations which the gentleman has made—the charter of the private network is to make money for the stockholders and the charter of these stations and services is entirely in the public interest. They are not looking to improve their ratings and their earnings. They are charged by Congress with educating and enlightening the public and for that reason I believe that they have, in-house, a better overview of the operation. They are, therefore, more likely to be objective than are the networks.

I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MACDONALD) who has done such an extraordinary job in this field, and have his remarks as chairman of the subcommittee on this subject.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Would not the gentleman say that the most important thing here is for the Congress not to get engrossed in a swamp of detail, but to keep the Congress and other political entities out of the running of public broadcasting and to look at public broadcasting as a whole.

The No. 1 question to be answered in the mind of everyone, in my judgment, is "Is public broadcasting doing a good job in its entirety?" If the answer in your mind and if the answer in the mind of all the Members is "No," then do you not think we should avoid getting involved in the swamp of trying to run public broadcasting, and judge it by the product it produces and its effect upon the American people?

Mr. KEITH. Yes, I do, but I believe, as you indicated in your questioning of the witnesses before our committee, we, by reason of our responsibility as committee members, must respond to the questions of our colleagues in the Congress.

I think when sufficient details are furnished in answer to the questions that are asked they are going to find that the program is a lot better than has been indicated in the comments that we and others have made in the committee and on the floor of the House from time to time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH) has expired.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from West Virginia yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, public television came to southeastern Idaho for the first time 10 months ago with the inauguration of public television station KBGL-TV in Pocatello, licensed to Idaho State University.

KBGL-TV is a station serving the cultural, educational, and informational needs of southeast Idaho. The station offers solid local programming on community issues and events, supplementing this fare with a selection of programs made available by the Public Broadcasting Service, public television's national interconnection facility.

I am proud of the progress made by this station and hope that it will meet with every success in the future.

Since KBGL-TV has joined the public broadcasting community, it has met with one of the most crucial problems facing noncommercial broadcasting today—financial anemia.

Traditional sources of funding, such as community subscriptions, contributions, auctions, and State and local funding have never adequately met the costs of quality local programming production. The stations' local production units have always been restrained by subminimal budgets, which in turn have deprived local communities of additional public programming services.

In 1967, Congress enacted the Public Broadcasting Act to meet this need. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting—

CPB—was established to be a conduit organization through which Federal funds flowed to local noncommercial broadcasting stations. To distribute these Federal funds effectively and equitably to the 223 public television and 121 qualified public radio stations, the Corporation established a system of annual community service grants to help stations supplement and expand their programming and operational capability. Other programs such as fellowships, aid to nonqualified stations, production and special project grants and competitions have also been made available to these stations during the past 5 years.

Today, we are considering H.R. 13918, a 2-year authorization bill for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. There has been some talk about reducing this bill to a 1-year authorization, and I would like to take a moment to speak about this bill for I feel the future of stations such as KBGL-TV will be adversely affected should such action be taken.

Despite the administration's support for a 1-year authorization at \$45 million, the House Commerce Committee reported H.R. 13918 as a 2-year measure with authorization limits at \$65 million for fiscal year 1973 and \$90 million for fiscal year 1974. Let me assure you there is no argument over the need for such legislation. The only issue involved is how much money for how long a period of time?

I feel the 2-year authorization recommendation of H.R. 13918 is extremely important given the leadtime period of 18 to 24 months needed to successfully develop and produce original program series of high quality. This leadtime period is necessary for both national and local programming production units. "Sesame Street" was on the drawing board for 21 months before the series was even aired. Programs produced by the BBC, which have appeared on public television, such as "Civilisation," "Forsythe Saga" and "Henry VIII" have also taken over 2 years to plan and produce. How ironic it is that during the very time the United States is preparing for its bicentennial celebration, the British are filming "The Last of the Mohicans" in Scotland. We must be aware that if we want programs of similar quality produced in this country, we must be prepared to make adequate funds available over a sufficient amount of time. Annual authorizations and appropriations procedures are just not conducive to such programming objectives.

The administration testified during the House Communications and Power Subcommittee hearings 2 months ago that they will offer the subcommittee a long-range financing plan by next June. Even if the plan were ready in January, there would be little likelihood of completing the legislative process in both Houses of Congress before the end of fiscal year 1973. It will take a full 2 years to develop and implement a truly refined and workable plan, and I see no need to come back next year for another 1-year authorization while such a proposal is under consideration.

I therefore urge the support of a 2-year authorization at the levels contained in H.R. 13918 as reported almost unanimously by the committee.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, I have been very much impressed by the arguments that have been made here today. Certainly, the House owes a debt of gratitude to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MACDONALD) for his courage in being here and in handling this bill. The gentleman has been in the hospital and has just gotten out and gotten back. In fact, by being here he may be endangering his health.

I would like to compliment the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH) for his very able handling of this legislation on his side of the aisle. I would also like to compliment the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FREY) for his very effective and informative statement. I should also like to say thanks to the gentleman from California (Mr. VAN DEERLIN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDÉ) for their statements on behalf of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind the Members that for each and every dollar the Federal Government puts into public broadcasting, \$11 is contributed from other sources. I think most of the Members have heard from their people back home, from educators, and from the people who listen to the public broadcasts. They know what a good job public broadcasting is doing throughout the United States in carrying programs which inform, enlighten, and educate.

We should expand this program in order to be able to bring further education to our children and to provide programming for the elderly, which the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDÉ) referred to.

I would also like to compliment the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COLLINS) with regard to his daughter, Nancy. In contributing her personal money to the public broadcasting station in Boston, she proved herself to be not only wise but public spirited. I feel that all over our Nation young people feel that these public broadcasting stations are doing a good job, and that they are very much in favor of them.

So I wish to commend his very precocious daughter, and to say that we thoroughly appreciate what she did.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would end the general debate today, and ask that the first paragraph of the bill be read.

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 this Act may be cited as the "Public Broadcasting Act of 1972".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STAGGERS

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, on that motion I demand tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is demanding tellers on the motion that the Committee do now rise?

Mr. GROSS. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that the Chair has not yet put the motion.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia that the Committee do now rise.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman from Iowa that a quorum is not needed upon the motion that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Boggs) resumed the chair.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

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

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 175]

Abernethy	Esch	Mann
Abouzeck	Eshleman	Mazzoli
Abzug	Evans, Colo.	Metcalfe
Addabbo	Evins, Tenn.	Michel
Alexander	Fascell	Mikva
Anderson, Ill.	Flynt	Miller, Calif.
Anderson, Tenn.	Ford	Mills, Md.
Arends	Gerald R. Ford	Minshall
Ashbrook	William D. Ford	Mitchell
Badillo	Frelinghuysen	Mizell
Baring	Fulton	Murphy, N.Y.
Barrett	Gallifanakis	Nichols
Belcher	Gallagher	O'Neill
Bell	Gettys	Patten
Bingham	Gibbons	Pirnie
Blanton	Griffin	Podell
Bow	Hagan	Poff
Brown, Ohio	Halpern	Pryor, Ark.
Broyhill, N.C.	Hanna	Pucinski
Burton	Harsha	Rallsback
Byrnes, Wis.	Harvey	Rangel
Caffery	Hathaway	Reid
Carey, N.Y.	Hawkins	Rodino
Chisholm	Hébert	Roncallo
Clausen	Hogan	Rooney, N.Y.
Don H. Clawson, Del.	Hollifield	Rostenkowski
Clay	Horton	Roybal
Collier	Hutchinson	St Germain
Colmer	Ichord	Sandman
Conover	Jarman	Sarbanes
Conte	Jonas	Satterfield
Conyers	Jones, Tenn.	Scheuer
Corman	Kuykendall	Schmitz
Cotter	Kyros	Sebellus
Daniels, N.J.	Landrum	Shipley
Davis, Ga.	Leggett	Sisk
Davis, S.C.	Long, La.	Smith, Calif.
Dickinson	Long, Md.	Smith, Iowa
Diggs	Lujan	Spence
Dingell	McCloskey	Springer
Dorn	McDade	Stanton
Dowdy	McDonald	J. William Stanton
Drinan	Mich.	James V. Stephens
Dwyer	McEwen	Stokes
Edwards, Calif.	McFall	Stubblefield
	McKinney	

Stuckey	Wiggins	Wolf
Terry	Wilson, Bob	Yatron
Thompson, N.J.	Wilson,	
Veysey	Charles H.	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). On this rollcall 289 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

Mr. GIAIMO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, then reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 13918) to provide for improved financing for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

APPOINTMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE RICHARD H. POFF TO THE VIRGINIA SUPREME COURT

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

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce to the House that the Governor of Virginia, the Honorable Linwood Holton, has appointed our colleague, the Honorable RICHARD H. POFF, to the Virginia Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Governor for this action. I think this appointment is a very popular and solid one.

Mr. Speaker, I have reserved 30 minutes on tomorrow so that the Members can make whatever remarks they care to make with reference to the appointment of our colleague to the Virginia Supreme Court.

THE QUESTION OF PROHIBITING THE SALE OF HANDGUNS

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, the attempted assassination of Gov. George Wallace has revived the debate over whether or not the Congress should prohibit the sale of handguns or the so-called Saturday night special. The Saturday night special is a cheaply constructed handgun or pistol which has little or no accuracy. This type of handgun is most often used in armed robberies and murders. It has no practical application as a target pistol and is little or no use to a homeowner in protecting his property because of the lack of accuracy. These are also the types of handguns which are the hardest for the police or FBI to trace when they have been used in the commission of a crime. Criminals usually use this type of pistol because they are easy to obtain, scare the victim just as effectively as other types of guns, and can kill or wound the victim at close range.

It would be very easy to rush forward right after the shooting of Governor Wallace and start supporting tighter gun control laws. But I feel that it would also

be wrong to do so without studying the possible effects of such legislation. My greatest fear is that we would only be opening the door to even more legislation which would deny the people of America the rights of the second amendment to the Constitution which says in part:

The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

I believe the best policy would be to look into the possibility of passing stricter laws and tougher penalties for any crime committed with a handgun. There have been some proposals that there be a mandatory sentence of 50 years whenever a person is convicted of a crime with a handgun and the person would not be eligible for parole for a minimum of 25 years. If another person were killed during a criminal act with a handgun there would be a mandatory sentence of 99 years upon conviction with no chance for parole for a minimum of 50 years.

The word "mandatory" is very important since the judge and jury would not have any say-so in the length of the prison sentence. If a person were convicted of a robbery or murder with a handgun, then he would automatically be sentenced to 50 years or 99 years. I realize these would be extreme sentences, but I feel they would effectively quell the use of handguns in criminal acts. A law of this type should also satisfy those people who are opposed to capital punishment, but it would also effectively keep the gun-toting criminal off the streets.

In too many cases we have seen criminals convicted of armed robbery or murder given short sentences and returned to the streets to only kill and rob again. A tough law of this type should also serve as a deterrent to anyone who is considering the possibility of armed robbery or killing another human being with a handgun.

I have a feeling that even if the Congress were to pass a law prohibiting handguns or the Saturday night special we would not be able to stop the criminal from obtaining such pistols. There are already so many in circulation that it would still be easy to steal one. This would mean that we would only be placing the law-abiding citizens at the mercy of criminals.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that action needs to be taken to prevent future attacks on our political leaders and also prevent armed robberies and murders, but we must make certain that when we act we do not infringe upon the rights of law-abiding citizens in America. Any laws passed must be directed toward the criminal and must contain tough prison sentences.

DR. IRVING GREENBERG DELIVERS OPENING PRAYER IN THE HOUSE

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 16,

Dr. Irving Greenberg, Rabbi of the Riverdale Jewish Center, delivered the opening prayer in the House of Representatives. It was through the thoughtful invitation of our distinguished colleague JONATHAN BINGHAM that we were honored by the Rabbi's presence. Because of congressional reapportionment, the Riverdale Jewish Center is now in the 20th Congressional District of New York, and I feel very privileged in having the opportunity to serve that fine congregation. At the same time I know that Congressman BINGHAM's able representation will be greatly missed.

A summa cum laude graduate from Brooklyn College, where he was also elected to Phi Beta Kappa in 1954, Dr. Greenberg received his master's degree from Harvard University in 1954, and his Ph. D. from Harvard in 1960. He was ordained in 1953 at the Beth Joseph Rabbinical Seminary.

Dr. Greenberg served as Rabbi of the Young Israel of Brookline in Brookline, Mass., from 1956 to 1960. At the same time he was a lecturer in Near Eastern Judaic Studies at Brandeis University, and director of the Hillel Foundation at Brandeis.

From 1961 to 1962, Dr. Greenberg was a Fulbright Visiting Professor in History at Tel Aviv University in Israel under the U.S. Government educational exchange program.

In addition to his duties at the Riverdale Jewish Center, he is currently assistant professor of history at Yeshiva University, a member of the board of directors of the Religious Education Association, chairman of the advisory board of the Center for Russian Jewry, and a member of the advisory board of the Student Struggle for Soviet Jewry.

Dr. Greenberg has numerous publications to his credit, and his articles have appeared in *Commentary*, *Congress Bi-Weekly*, and *American Jewish Historical Quarterly*, among others.

The tremendous energy he brings to all of his undertakings has earned Dr. Greenberg the respect of his colleagues and the congregation he has so ably led. Beginning in September, he will take on yet an additional responsibility, for he will serve as chairman of the newly created Jewish Studies Department at the City College of New York.

I am most pleased that we had the opportunity to hear Dr. Greenberg's eloquent and thoughtful prayer. His visit to the House came on the day that the Apollo 16 astronauts were received by the House, and Dr. Greenberg appropriately took note of this event with the following words:

May our vision exploring the heavens, bringing men back safely, overcome our blindness neglecting earth, abandoning men to suffering.

CONGRATULATIONS TO PRESIDENT NIXON ON THE STRATEGIC ARMS LIMITATION AGREEMENT

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, to congratulate the President on achieving the strategic arms limitation agreement in Moscow last week. I believe it represents a historic step forward in the direction of removing the threat of nuclear war from the world, and I believe it deserves to be ratified by the other body.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, it ought to be pointed out that the Moscow agreement is actually based on three bits of important preliminary diplomatic spadework carried out by three other Presidents. First is the "open skies" proposal of President Eisenhower back in 1959, which is now incorporated in this agreement in the reconnaissance satellites being operated by both countries.

Second is the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, concluded by President Kennedy in 1963, which first demonstrated the feasibility of concluding a successful agreement relating to nuclear weapons without the necessity for on-the-site inspection.

The third is the dramatic effort by President Johnson and Defense Secretary McNamara at the Glassboro summit meeting in 1967 to convince the Soviets to halt construction of their new Moscow-based ABM system because it would only undermine the credibility of America's own deterrent offensive nuclear arsenal and thereby needlessly escalate the arms race without increasing real security on either side. The new Moscow agreement really represents a belated recognition of this truth which President Johnson and Secretary McNamara tried so hard to sell to Premier Kosygin at Glassboro. And so the Soviets have now come around after 6 years to recognizing the paradoxical principle that in the long run the best hope of avoiding nuclear war lies in leaving both countries equally exposed to a devastating nuclear "first strike" from the other.

This is precisely what this new pact does, and in so doing it merely formalizes a "nuclear stalemate" that has existed between our two countries for the past decade or so, a condition sometimes referred to as a "balance of terror." Since both countries are equally vulnerable to the other's nuclear forces, neither one can really benefit from starting a nuclear exchange.

I don't put too much stock, Mr. Speaker, in charges that this new agreement gives the Soviets some nuclear edge, especially in missile-firing submarines. This may, indeed, be the case, although we must recognize that we ourselves have some degree of our own in other areas, including our advantages in the field of MIRV'd weapons. What is important, it seems to me, is that by this treaty we have achieved some kind of halt to a nuclear arms race that had appeared to have no end. In the absence of such an agreement the Soviets would still have been free to continue their frenetic development of more and greater land-based missiles as well as their construction of increased numbers

of nuclear missile-firing Polaris-type submarines.

Mr. Speaker, let me make one other comment. In my judgment this new Moscow agreement was made possible only because Congress in past years has backed up the President's position that our best hope of achieving a satisfactory arms limitation agreement lay in maintaining our military strength rather than in disarming unilaterally. Obviously the decision of Congress to continue with development of the ABM was a very wise one. Without an American ABM there would never have been an ABM agreement with the Soviets; and, as the Moscow discussions have made clear, an ABM agreement is the key to a broader limitation on offensive weapons. Had Congress followed the recommendations of those who suggested that we never begin an ABM, or had we followed the suggestions of those who have been urging us to disarm unilaterally, this treaty would never have been concluded at all.

Mr. Speaker, I do not suggest for a moment that these new agreements are perfect or that they will remove all further need to be concerned about our security, either nuclear or nonnuclear. But they do represent a significant advance in the direction of rational restraints on military power on which we should certainly hope to be able to continue to build; and as such they deserve to be supported by this Congress and by the American people.

USHERING IN A GENERATION OF PEACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, the President of the United States spoke directly to the Russian people over television. He and the leaders of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics had just finished days of negotiations which may, indeed, as he says usher in a generation of peace.

The leaders of our two nations have agreed on joint ventures in space; they have agreed on ways of working together to protect the environment; to advance health, to cooperate in science and technology.

They have agreed on means of preventing incidents at sea and established a commission to expand trade between our two nations.

And, most important, they have taken an historic first step in the limitation of nuclear strategic arms.

We all agreed with the President, I am sure, when he said:

There is an old proverb that says: "Make peace with man and quarrel with your sin." The hardships and evils that beset all men and all nations, these and these alone, are what we should make war upon.

Our President desires peace, and has traveled thousands and thousands of miles this year to help insure that our generation and that of our children will

have a better opportunity to live in peace with the giant powers of the People's Republic of China and the U.S.S.R. These nations account for almost 1 billion of the world's 3.7 billion population.

This President has a mammoth job in winding down the war in Vietnam, in seeking to maintain peaceful relations with the world powers, in promoting economic stability among the world's peoples, and in maintaining harmony in our own country.

We should all, I feel, stand solidly behind President Nixon and prayerfully support his efforts to bring peace to a world hungering for it.

Mr. Speaker, I should like at this point to include the President's television address to the Russian people:

TRANSCRIPT OF NIXON'S TELEVISION ADDRESS TO THE SOVIET PEOPLE FROM THE GREAT KREMLIN PALACE

Following is a transcript of President Nixon's broadcast address from Moscow yesterday, as recorded by The New York Times:

Dobry vecher [Good evening]. I deeply appreciate this opportunity your government has given me to speak directly with the people of the Soviet Union to bring you a message of friendship from all the people of the United States and to share with you some of my thoughts about the relations between our two countries and about the way to peace and progress in the world.

This is my fourth visit to the Soviet Union. On these visits I have gained a great respect for the peoples of the Soviet Union. For your strength, your generosity, your determination. For the diversity and richness of your cultural heritage. For your many achievements.

In the three years I have been in office one of my principal aims has been to establish a better relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Our two countries have much in common. Most important of all, we have never fought one another in war. On the contrary, the memory of your soldiers and ours embracing at the Elbe as allies in 1945 remains strong in millions of hearts in both of our countries.

It is my hope that that memory can serve as an inspiration for the renewal of Soviet-American cooperation in the nineteen-seventies.

As great powers, we shall sometimes be competitors, but we need never be enemies.

Thirteen years ago, when I visited your country as Vice President, I addressed the people of the Soviet Union on radio and television—as I am addressing you tonight. I said then, "let us have peaceful competition not only in producing the best factories but in producing better lives for our people. Let us cooperate in our exploration of outer space. Let our aim be not victory over other peoples, but the victory of all mankind over hunger, want, misery and disease wherever it exists in the world."

In our meetings this week, we have begun to bring some of those hopes to fruition. Shortly after we arrived here on Monday afternoon, a brief rain fell on Moscow of a kind that I am told is called a "mushroom rain"—a farm rain, the sunshine breaking through, that makes the mushrooms grow, and is therefore considered a good omen.

The month of May is early for mushrooms, but as our talks progress this week, what did grow was even better—a far-reaching set of agreements that can lead to a better life for both of our peoples, to a better chance for peace in the world.

We have agreed on joint ventures in space;

we have agreed on ways of working together to protect the environment, to advance health, to cooperate in science and technology.

We have agreed on means of preventing incidents at sea; we have established a commission to expand trade between our two nations.

Most important, we have taken an historic first step in the limitation of nuclear strategic arms.

This arms control agreement is not for the purpose of giving either side an advantage over the other. Both of our nations are strong. Each respects the strength of the other. Each will maintain the strength necessary to defend its independence.

NO WINNERS, ONLY LOSERS

But in an unchecked arms race between two great nations there would be no winners, only losers. By setting this limitation together the people of both of our nations, and of all nations, can be winners.

If we continue in the spirit of serious purpose that has marked our discussions this week, these agreements can start us on a new road of cooperation for the benefit of our people, for the benefit of all peoples.

There is an old proverb that says "Make peace with man and quarrel with your sin." The hardships and evils that beset all men and all nations, these and these alone are what we should make war upon.

As we look at the prospects for peace, we see that we have made significant progress at reducing the possible sources of direct conflict between us. But history tells us that great nations have often been dragged into war without intending it by conflicts between smaller nations.

As great powers we can and should use our influence to prevent this from happening.

Our goal should be to discourage aggression in other parts of the world—and particularly among those smaller nations that look to us for leadership and example.

With great power goes great responsibility. When a man walks with a giant tread, he must be careful where he sets his feet.

There can be true peace only when the weak are as safe as the strong.

The wealthier and more powerful our own nations become, the more we have to lose from war, and the threat of war, anywhere in the world.

Speaking for the United States, I can say this: We covet no one else's territory, we seek no dominion over any other people. We seek the right to live in peace, not only for ourselves but for all the peoples of this earth.

Our power will only be used to keep the peace, never to break it. Only to defend freedom, never to destroy it.

No nation that does not threaten its neighbors has anything to fear from the United States.

Soviet citizens have often asked me, does America truly want peace? I believe that our actions answer that question far better than any words could do. If we did not want peace, we would not have reduced the size of our armed forces by a million men, by almost one-third, during the past three years.

If we did not want peace, we would not have worked so hard at reaching an agreement on the limitation of nuclear arms; at achieving a settlement of Berlin; at maintaining peace in the Middle East; at establishing better relations with the Soviet Union, with the People's Republic of China, with other nations of the world.

Mrs. Nixon and I feel very fortunate to have had the opportunity to visit the Soviet Union. To get to know the people of the Soviet Union, friendly and hospitable, cou-

rageous and strong. Most Americans will never have a chance to visit the Soviet Union. And most Soviet citizens will never have a chance to visit America.

Most of you know our country only through what you read in your newspapers and what you hear and see on radio and television and motion pictures. This is only a part of the real America.

I would like to take this opportunity to try to convey to you something of what America is really like—not in terms of its scenic beauty, its great cities, its factories, its farms or its highways, but in terms of its people.

In many ways, the people of our two countries are very much alike. Like the Soviet Union, ours is a large and diverse nation. Our people, like yours, are hardworking. Like you, we Americans have a strong spirit of competition.

But we also have a great love of music and poetry, of sports and of humor.

Above all, we, like you, are an open, natural and friendly people. We love our country. We love our children.

And we want for you, and for your children, the same peace and abundance that we want for ourselves and for our children.

We Americans are idealists, we believe deeply in our system of government. We cherish our personal liberty. We would fight to defend it if necessary, as we have done before.

But we also believe deeply in the right of each nation to choose its own system.

Therefore, however much we like our own system for ourselves, we have no desire to impose it on anyone else.

As we conclude this week of talks, there are certainly fundamental premises of the point of view which I believe deserve emphasis.

In conducting these talks, it has not been our aim to divide up the world into spheres of influence, to establish a condominium, or in any way to conspire together against the interests of any other nation.

Rather, we have sought to construct a better framework of understanding between our two nations. To make progress in our bilateral relationships. To find ways of insuring that future frictions between us would never embroil our two nations—and therefore the world—in war.

While ours are both great and powerful nations, the world is no longer dominated by two superpowers. The world is a better and safer place because its power and resources are more widely distributed.

Beyond this, since World War II, more than 70 new nations have come into being.

We cannot have true peace unless they—and all nations—can feel that they share it.

America seeks better relations not only with the Soviet Union but with all nations. The only sound basis for a peaceful and progressive international order is a sovereign equality and mutual respect.

We believe in the right of each nation to chart its own course, to choose its own system, to go its own way without interference from other nations.

STORY OF THE WOODSMAN

As we look to the longer term, peace depends also on continued progress in the developing nations. Together with other advanced industrial countries, the United States and the Soviet Union share a twofold responsibility in this regard. On the one hand, to practice restraint in those activities such as the supply of arms that might endanger the peace of developing nations. And, second, to assist them in their orderly economic and social development—without political interference.

Some of you may have heard an old story told in Russia of a traveler who was walk-

ing to another village. He knew the way but not the distance. Finally, he came upon a woodsman chopping wood by the side of the road.

And he asked the woodsman: How long will it take to reach the village? The woodsman replied, "I don't know." The traveler was angry because he was sure the woodsman was from the village and therefore knew how far it was.

And so he started off down the road again. After he had gone a few steps, the woodsman called out: "Stop. It will take you about 15 minutes." The traveler turned and demanded, "Why didn't you tell me that in the first place?"

The woodsman replied, "Because then I didn't know the length of your stride."

In our talks this week with the leaders of the Soviet Union, both sides have had a chance to measure the length of our strides toward peace and security.

I believe that those strides have been substantial. And that now we have well begun the long journey which will lead us to a new age in the relations between our two countries.

It is important to both of our peoples that we continue those strides.

HELP FOR THE SICK

As our two countries learn to work together, our people will be able to get to know one another better. Greater cooperation can also mean a great deal in our daily lives.

As we learn to cooperate in space, in health, in the environment, in science and technology, our cooperation can help sick people get well. It can help industries produce more consumer goods. It can help all of us enjoy the cleaner air and water. It can increase our knowledge of the world around us.

As we expand our trade, each of our countries can buy more of the other's goods and market more of our own. As we gain experience with arms control, we can bring closer the day when further agreements can lessen the arms burden of our two nations, and lessen the threat of war in the world.

Through all the pages of history, through all the centuries, the world's people have struggled to be free from fear. Whether fear of the elements, or hunger, or fear of their own rulers, or fear of their neighbors in other countries.

And yet time and again people have vanquished the source of one fear only to fall prey to another. Let our goal now be a world free of fear.

A world in which nation will no longer prey upon nation. In which human energies will be turned away from production for war, and toward more production for peace. Away from conquest and toward invention, development, creation. A world in which, together, we can establish that peace which is more than the absence of war. Which enables man to pursue those higher goals that the spirit yearns for.

Yesterday, I laid a wreath at the cemetery which commemorates the brave people who died during the siege of Leningrad in World War II. At the cemetery, I saw the picture of a 12-year-old girl. She was a beautiful child. Her name was Tanya. The pages of her diary tell the terrible story of war.

In the simple words of a child she wrote of the deaths of the members of her family. Zhenya in December. Granle in January. Then Leka. Then Uncle Vasya. Then Uncle Lyosha. Then Mama. Then the Savichevs.

And then, finally, these words, the last words in her diary:

"All are dead. Only Tanya is left."

As we work toward a more peaceful world, let us think of Tanya and of other Tanyas and their brothers and sisters everywhere.

Let us do all that we can to insure that no

other children will have to endure what Tanya did and that your children and ours and all the children of the world can live their full lives together in friendship and in peace.

Spasibo i do svidaniya [Thank you and good-by.]

FEDERAL FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Esch) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, the following is a white paper prepared through research conducted in the past few weeks by members of my staff and with the assistance of the Congressional Research Service.

The white paper details several reasons why I believe that enactment of the Federal Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1972 would move our Nation to greater responsibility in fiscal and budgetary matters. In line with my concern for Federal fiscal responsibility, I am including an estimate by the Acting Public Printer of the cost of printing this manuscript in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In a letter to me the Acting Public Printer stated that my white paper will cost an estimated \$1,645 and will cover 11¾ pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In recent years Congress has abdicated its role in the budgetary process to a minimum level of policy assent. If Congress is to reassert its role in the process it must move to modernize its appropriations procedures. Senator WARREN MAGNUSON put it this way last year in hearings on the budgetary process:

Congress is attempting literally to run a business ten times as large as A.T. & T. or GM combined or 50 corporations combined with machinery as obsolete as a quill pen and a slanting bookkeeper's desk.

Enactment of the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1972, which I introduced on March 23, will make a major contribution toward helping Congress to improve its planning process and increase its oversight capabilities for Federal programs.

In these days of \$246 billion budgets, it has become obvious that Congress lacks the capability for comprehensive consideration of the budget. Since 1956 the budget has increased by over 300 percent. Yet in the best of years the Congress has less than 6 months to review the 1,100-page budget document before the beginning of the fiscal year.

In order to present a complete picture of Federal spending, President Nixon forwarded his first budget in a unified format which included all trust funds. While this innovation has helped Congress see the total budgeting picture, it does not assure that Congress considers the budget from this comprehensive perspective.

The tremendous growth of Federal budgets is best illustrated by the following charts. Chart 1 compares budget estimates and appropriations since fiscal year 1946. Chart 2 compares budget data since 1954 on a Federal funds and unified-budget basis.

CHART 1.—COMPARISON OF BUDGET ESTIMATES AND APPROPRIATIONS BY SESSIONS OF CONGRESS

Congress and session	Budget estimates	Appropriations	Increase (+) or decrease (—), appropriations compared with estimates	Congress and session	Budget estimates	Appropriations	Increase (+) or decrease (—), appropriations compared with estimates
79th Cong., 1st sess., fiscal year 1946 and prior fiscal years.....	\$68,941,364,648	\$67,545,660,880	—\$1,395,703,768	86th Cong., 2d sess., fiscal year 1961 and prior fiscal years.....	\$84,010,398,836	\$83,799,241,957	—\$211,156,879
79th Cong., 2d sess., fiscal year 1947 and prior fiscal years.....	35,153,239,093	33,571,494,011	—1,581,745,082	87th Cong., 1st sess., fiscal year 1962 and prior fiscal years.....	101,185,574,673	96,194,946,610	—4,990,628,063
80th Cong., 1st sess., fiscal year 1948 and prior fiscal years.....	36,725,853,652	34,159,097,708	—2,566,655,944	87th Cong., 2d sess., fiscal year 1963 and prior fiscal years.....	107,203,876,735	102,661,536,812	—4,542,339,923
80th Cong., 2d sess., fiscal year 1949 and prior fiscal years.....	41,053,346,713	38,282,717,957	—2,770,628,756	88th Cong., 1st sess., fiscal year 1964 and prior fiscal years.....	110,270,774,856	103,798,631,671	—6,472,140,185
81st Cong., 1st sess., fiscal year 1950 and prior fiscal years.....	45,524,384,067	43,708,265,798	—1,816,118,269	88th Cong., 2d sess., fiscal year 1965 and prior fiscal years.....	110,204,088,176	106,070,110,056	—4,133,978,120
81st Cong., 2d sess., fiscal year 1951 and prior fiscal years.....	80,172,585,565	72,200,190,841	—1,972,394,724	89th Cong., 1st sess., fiscal year 1966 and prior fiscal years.....	121,719,754,896	119,310,113,527	—2,409,641,369
82d Cong., 1st sess., fiscal year 1952 and prior fiscal years.....	102,449,917,037	97,729,806,397	—4,720,110,640	89th Cong., 2d sess., fiscal year 1967 and prior fiscal years.....	144,812,809,086	143,883,626,282	—929,182,804
82d Cong., 2d sess., fiscal year 1953 and prior fiscal years.....	91,205,894,252	82,596,777,411	—8,609,116,841	90th Cong., 1st sess., fiscal year 1968 and prior fiscal years.....	162,988,905,929	156,917,115,912	—6,071,790,017
83d Cong., 1st sess., fiscal year 1954 and prior fiscal years.....	73,976,821,699	61,942,992,897	—12,033,828,802	90th Cong., 2d sess., fiscal year 1969 and prior fiscal years.....	209,439,260,996	196,537,244,324	—12,902,016,672
83d Cong., 2d sess., fiscal year 1955 and prior fiscal years.....	57,422,327,386	54,812,457,263	—2,609,870,123	Consisting of:			
84th Cong., 1st sess., fiscal year 1956 and prior fiscal years.....	62,030,092,195	59,954,284,321	—2,075,807,874	Trust funds.....	(54,012,887,000)	(54,012,887,000)	
84th Cong., 2d sess., fiscal year 1957 and prior fiscal years.....	68,587,724,820	68,330,229,608	—257,495,212	All other (Federal funds).....	(155,426,373,996)	(142,524,357,324)	—12,902,016,672
85th Cong., 1st sess., fiscal year 1958 and prior fiscal years.....	73,113,555,340	68,070,096,556	—5,043,458,784	91st Cong., 1st sess., fiscal year 1970 and prior fiscal years.....	210,843,237,215	207,248,470,494	—3,594,755,721
85th Cong., 2d sess., fiscal year 1959 and prior fiscal years.....	81,737,060,999	81,119,818,276	—617,242,723	Consisting of:			
86th Cong., 1st sess., fiscal year 1960 and prior fiscal years.....	83,452,687,259	81,572,357,732	—1,880,329,527	Trust funds.....	(60,619,823,000)	(60,619,823,000)	
				All other (Federal funds).....	(150,223,414,215)	(146,628,658,494)	—3,594,755,721
				91st Cong., 2d sess., fiscal year 1971 and prior fiscal years.....	217,605,978,434	232,139,894,882	+14,533,916,448
				Consisting of:			
				Trust funds.....	(65,381,174,000)	(65,381,174,000)	
				All other (Federal funds).....	(152,224,804,434)	(166,758,720,882)	+14,533,916,448

¹ Includes \$225,000,000 requested in 1965 for fiscal year 1966.

² Includes \$75,000,000 appropriated in 1965 for fiscal year 1966.

³ Includes \$937,500,000 requested in 1966 for fiscal year 1967.

⁴ Includes \$926,000,000 appropriated in 1966 for fiscal year 1967.

⁵ Includes \$900,000,000 requested in 1967 for fiscal year 1968.

⁶ Includes \$875,000,000 appropriated in 1967 for fiscal year 1968.

⁷ Includes \$1,055,000,000 requested in 1968 for 1969.

⁸ Includes \$995,000,000 appropriated in 1968 for fiscal year 1969.

⁹ Does not reflect additional reductions in controllable obligations effected pursuant to Public Law 90-218 (H.J. Res. 888) estimated at \$3,400,617,000 on June 30, 1968. Reserves established \$6,075,520,000; reserves subsequently released, \$2,674,903,000; reserves remaining \$3,400,617,000. (See pp. 278-282 for detail.)

¹⁰ As in tables IV and IVa, VIIIA, and VIIIB, these totals are adjusted to exclude \$12,800,000,000 of interfund and intergovernmental transactions—see par. 4, "Compilers' Notes", p. 3. Budget estimates include \$2,895,000,000 requested in 1969 for 1970.

¹¹ As in tables IV and IVa, VIIIA and VIIIB, these totals are adjusted to exclude \$12,800,000,000 of interfund and intergovernmental transactions—see par. 4, "Compilers' Notes", p. 3. Appropriations include \$1,965,814,300 appropriated in 1969 for 1970.

¹² Totals adjusted to exclude \$13,915,525,000 of interfund and intergovernmental transactions—see par. 4, "Compilers' Notes", p. 3. Budget estimates include \$1,651,000 requested in 1970 for 1971.

¹³ Totals adjusted to exclude \$13,915,525,000 of interfund and intergovernmental transactions—see par. 4, "Compilers' Notes", p. 3. Appropriations include \$214,000,000 appropriated in 1970 for 1971.

¹⁴ Totals adjusted to exclude \$18,232,767,000 of interfund and intergovernmental transactions—see par. 4, "Compilers' Notes", p. 3. Budget estimates include \$188,011,000 requested in 1971 for 1972.

¹⁵ Totals adjusted to exclude \$18,232,767,000 of interfund and intergovernmental transactions—see par. 4, "Compilers' Notes", p. 3. Appropriations include \$150,000,000 appropriated in 1971 for 1972.

Note: Concept of "budget estimates" and "appropriations" as used in the above tabulations, beginning with the 90th Cong., 2d sess., differs to some limited general extent from previous tabulations, and significantly differs in respect to inclusion of trust fund appropriation amounts not included in this tabulation prior to the 90th Cong., 2d sess. See explanation, par. 4, "Compilers' Notes", p. 3. Also, beginning with the 85th Cong., 2d sess. (fiscal year 1959), figures exclude amounts relating to refunding Internal Revenue collections and sinking fund and other debt retirement funds.

Source: S. Doc. 91-122

CHART 2.—COMPARISON OF U.S. GOVERNMENT ANNUAL BUDGET DATA ON THE UNIFIED BUDGET CONCEPT AND THE FEDERAL FUNDS BASIS AND PUBLIC DEBT OUTSTANDING AT FISCAL YEAR END, 1954-73

(In million of dollars)

Unified budget concept ¹				Federal funds budget basis ¹				U.S. Government public debt ²	Unified budget concept ¹				Federal funds budget basis ¹				U.S. Government public debt ²
Fiscal year	Receipts	Outlays	Surplus or deficit (—)	Receipts	Outlays	Surplus or deficit (—)			Fiscal year	Receipts	Outlays	Surplus or deficit (—)	Receipts	Outlays	Surplus or deficit (—)		
1954-----	67,719	70,890	—1,170	62,790	65,924	—3,134	270,790	1967-----	149,552	158,254	—8,702	111,835	126,779	—14,944	326,471		
1955-----	65,479	68,509	—3,031	58,112	62,279	—4,167	273,915	1968-----	153,671	178,833	—25,161	114,726	143,105	—28,379	350,743		
1956-----	74,547	70,460	4,087	65,376	63,761	1,606	272,361	1969-----	187,784	184,548	3,236	143,236	148,811	—5,490	356,932		
1957-----	79,990	76,741	3,249	68,768	67,142	1,626	270,188	1970-----	193,743	196,588	—2,845	143,158	156,301	—13,143	373,425		
1958-----	79,636	82,575	—2,939	66,580	69,731	—3,151	276,013	1971-----	188,392	211,425	—23,033	133,785	163,651	—29,866	399,475		
1959-----	79,249	92,104	—12,855	65,827	77,071	—11,244	284,398	1972-----	(estimate)-----	197,827	236,610	—38,783	137,788	182,519	—44,731	446,022	
1960-----	92,492	92,223	269	75,650	74,865	785	286,065	1973-----	(estimate)-----	220,785	246,257	—25,472	150,617	186,784	—36,167	481,878	
1961-----	94,389	97,795	—3,406	75,179	79,336	—4,157	288,862										
1962-----	99,676	106,813	—7,137	79,703	86,594	—6,891	298,212										
1963-----	106,560	111,311	—4,751	83,550	90,141	—6,591	306,099										
1964-----	112,662	118,584	—5,922	87,205	95,761	—8,556	312,164										
1965-----	116,833	118,430	—1,596	90,943	94,807	—3,864	317,581										
1966-----	130,856	134,652	—3,796	101,427	106,512	—5,085	320,102										
								Cumulative deficit (1954-73)-----			—159,768				—225,543		

¹ The unified budget concept includes both Federal funds and trust funds for receipts and outlays. Federal funds correspond roughly to the old administrative concept used by the Federal Government prior to fiscal year 1969. Federal funds are those which the Government administers as owner as distinguished from those administered in a trustee or fiduciary capacity (the trust funds). Historical functions of Government, such as National Defense, Veterans' Benefits, Commerce, Labor, Agriculture, interest on the public debt, and others are paid from Federal funds (tax revenue and borrowed funds). Income taxes (individuals and corporations), most excise taxes, estate and gift taxes, customs duties, and miscellaneous receipts are paid into the Federal funds accounts from which all Federal funds expenditures are paid. All trust funds receipts are paid into the specific trust fund accounts for which the revenue is earmarked. All trust fund payments are made from the specific trust funds accounts. Trust funds surplus receipts are invested in Federal securities (public debt or Federal agencies obligations). At the end of fiscal year 1971 the trust funds owned \$96,000,000,000 of public debt securities. Major Federal trust funds are: old-age and

survivors insurance, disability insurance, health insurance, unemployment, Federal employees retirement, railroad employees retirement, and the highway trust fund.

² Since the Second Liberty Bond Act of Sept. 24, 1917, the U.S. Government gross public debt has been subject to a statutory ceiling or maximum limit. Public Law 92-5, Mar. 17, 1971, established a debt limit of \$400,000,000,000 and temporarily increased the limit to \$430,000,000,000 through June 30, 1972. Since 1954 there have been 21 legislative measures increasing or extending the public debt limit. During this period the debt limit has been raised from \$275,000,000,000 to \$430,000,000,000. New legislation is expected in the immediate future to raise the public debt limit above the current level of \$430,000,000,000 so as to permit financing of the current budget deficit.

Sources: U.S. Office of Management and the Budget (selected budget documents). U.S. Treasury Department (selected Treasury reports).

As our budget has grown, Congress has been forced to increase its reliance on continuing appropriations measures. These stopgap measures extend the time available for consideration of the budget, but wreak havoc on orderly budgeting and spending. They allow the processes of government to continue, but they do not allow rational planning and spending of funds.

Starting in 1954 Congress dramatically increased its use of the continuing appropriation. Chart 3 presents a record of continuing appropriations since 1954.

CHART 3—A RECORD OF CONTINUING RESOLUTIONS: FISCAL YEARS 1954-72

The single source for this record was the *Final Calendars* for each session of Congress from the 1st Session of the 83rd Congress through the 1st Session, 92nd Congress. Two points of variance in the Calendars' record of continuing resolutions might be noted:

(1) Continuing resolutions and their legislative history were included in the tables titled "Status of Major Bills" at the back of the Calendars for the 91st and 92nd Congresses. They were not included in such tables of the Final Calendars for the 83rd-90th Congresses; however continuing resolutions are listed in the index under "Appropriations, Continuing Resolutions" and their legislative histories appear under "House

Joint Resolutions" in the body of each Calendar.

(2) Continuing resolutions were consistently termed "temporary resolutions" before the 85th Congress and both terms were employed for the same kind of resolution during the 85th and 86th Congresses.

"Temporary resolutions" and "continuing resolutions" are stopgap funding provisions that enable various agencies of the Government to continue their operations uninterrupted pending final action on the regular appropriation bills.

Although the terms are used interchangeably on the floor and in committee, the resolutions are consistently listed as "continuing resolutions" in the Calendars from the 87th Congress to the present.

A RECORD OF CONTINUING RESOLUTIONS: FISCAL YEARS 1954-72

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1954

Number of bill	Reported	Passed House	Reported in Senate	Passed Senate	Reported to conference	Date approved	Law No.
1. H.J. Res. 287	June 27, 1953, Report 681	June 27, 1953	June 27, 1953, Report 474	June 29, 1953	N/A, 1953	June 30, 1953	83-91

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1955

1. H.J. Res. 552	June 30, 1954, Report 2008	June 30, 1954	N/A, 1954	July 2, 1954	N/A, 1954	July 6, 1954	83-475
------------------	----------------------------	---------------	-----------	--------------	-----------	--------------	--------

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1956

1. H.J. Res. 366	June 30, 1955, Report 1033	June 30, 1955	N/A, 1955	June 30, 1955	N/A, 1955	June 30, 1955	84-123
------------------	----------------------------	---------------	-----------	---------------	-----------	---------------	--------

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1957

1. H.J. Res. 671	July 2, 1956, Report 2550	July 2, 1956	N/A, 1956	July 2, 1956	N/A, 1956	July 3, 1956	84-658
------------------	---------------------------	--------------	-----------	--------------	-----------	--------------	--------

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1958

1. H.J. Res. 391	Discharged, 1957	July 1, 1957	N/A, 1957	July 1, 1957	N/A, 1957	July 1, 1957	85-7
2. H.J. Res. 426	July 30, 1957, Report 931	July 30, 1957	July 30, 1957, Report 771	Aug. 13, 1957	N/A, 1957	Aug. 14, 1957	85-13

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1959

1. H.J. Res. 640	June 27, 1958, Report 2046	June 27, 1958	June 27, 1958, Report 1765	June 27, 1958	N/A, 1958	June 30, 1958	85-472
2. H.J. Res. 672	July 29, 1958, Report 2298	July 29, 1958	N/A, 1958	July 30, 1958	N/A, 1958	July 31, 1958	85-572

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1960

1. H.J. Res. 439	June 25, 1959, Report 578	June 30, 1959	June 30, 1959, Report 455	June 30, 1959	N/A, 1959	July 1, 1959	86-76
2. H.J. Res. 475	N/A, 1959	July 29, 1959	N/A, 1959	July 29, 1959	N/A, 1959	July 31, 1959	86-118
3. H.J. Res. 510	N/A, 1959	Aug. 31, 1959	N/A, 1959	Aug. 31, 1959	N/A, 1959	Sept. 3, 1959	86-224

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1961

1. H.J. Res. 778	N/A, 1960	July 1, 1960	N/A, 1960	July 1, 1960	N/A, 1960	July 2, 1960	86-569
------------------	-----------	--------------	-----------	--------------	-----------	--------------	--------

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1962

1. H.J. Res. 465	June 29, 1961, Report 612	June 29, 1961	N/A, 1961	June 29, 1961	N/A, 1961	June 30, 1961	87-65
2. H.J. Res. 544	N/A, 1961	Aug. 28, 1961	N/A, 1961	Aug. 28, 1961	N/A, 1961	Aug. 30, 1961	87-182

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1963

1. H.J. Res. 769	June 28, 1962, Report 1944	June 28, 1962	N/A, 1962	June 28, 1962	N/A, 1962	July 1, 1962	87-513
2. H.J. Res. 839	N/A, 1962	July 26, 1962	July 27, 1962, Report 1789	July 27, 1962	N/A, 1962	July 31, 1962	87-564
3. H.J. Res. 864	N/A, 1962	Aug. 28, 1962	Aug. 28, 1962, Report 1778	Aug. 29, 1962	N/A, 1962	Aug. 31, 1962	87-625
4. H.J. Res. 897	N/A, 1962	Sept. 28, 1962	N/A, 1962	Sept. 28, 1962	N/A, 1962	Sept. 29, 1962	87-724

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1964

1. H.J. Res. 508	June 25, 1963, Report 448	June 25, 1963	June 25, 1963, Report 306	June 25, 1963	N/A, 1963	June 29, 1963	88-55
2. H.J. Res. 667	N/A, 1963	Aug. 27, 1963	N/A, 1963	Aug. 27, 1963	N/A, 1963	Aug. 28, 1963	88-109
3. H.J. Res. 782	N/A, 1963	Oct. 28, 1963	N/A, 1963	Oct. 28, 1963	N/A, 1963	Oct. 30, 1963	88-162
4. H.J. Res. 809	N/A, 1963	Nov. 26, 1963	N/A, 1963	Nov. 27, 1963	N/A, 1963	Nov. 29, 1963	88-188

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1965

1. H.J. Res. 1056	N/A, 1964	June 25, 1964	June 25, 1964, Report 1116	June 25, 1964	N/A, 1964	June 29, 1964	88-325
2. H.J. Res. 1160	N/A, 1964	Aug. 18, 1964	N/A, 1964	Aug. 18, 1964	N/A, 1964	Aug. 22, 1964	88-488

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1966

Number of bill	Reported	Passed House	Reported in Senate	Passed Senate	Reported to conference	Date approved	Law No.
1. H.J. Res. 553.....	June 28, 1965, Report 553..	June 28, 1965.....	N/A, 1965.....	June 28, 1965.....	N/A, 1965.....	June 30, 1965.....	89-58
2. H.J. Res. 591.....	July 28, 1965, Report 689..	July 28, 1965.....	N/A, 1965.....	July 28, 1965.....	N/A, 1965.....	July 30, 1965.....	89-96
3. H.J. Res. 639.....	Aug. 25, 1965, Report 856..	Aug. 25, 1965.....	N/A, 1965.....	Aug. 30, 1965.....	N/A, 1965.....	Sept. 1, 1965.....	89-159
4. H.J. Res. 673.....	Sept. 27, 1965, Report 1095..	Sept. 28, 1965.....	Sept. 29, 1965, Report 796..	Sept. 29, 1965.....	N/A, 1965.....	Sept. 30, 1965.....	89-221
5. H.J. Res. 695.....	Oct. 13, 1965, Report 1157..	Oct. 13, 1965.....	N/A, 1965.....	Oct. 13, 1965.....	N/A, 1965.....	Oct. 15, 1965.....	89-256

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1967

1. H.J. Res. 1180.....	June 27, 1966, Report 1662..	June 28, 1966.....	N/A, 1966.....	June 28, 1966.....	N/A, 1966.....	June 30, 1966.....	89-481
2. H.J. Res. 1284.....	Aug. 29, 1966, Report 1907..	Aug. 29, 1966.....	N/A, 1966.....	Aug. 29, 1966.....	N/A, 1966.....	Aug. 31, 1966.....	89-549
3. H.J. Res. 1308.....	Sept. 26, 1966.....	Sept. 28, 1966.....	N/A, 1966.....	Sept. 28, 1966.....	N/A, 1966.....	Sept. 30, 1966.....	89-611

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1968

1. H.J. Res. 652.....	June 21, 1967, Report 374..	June 26, 1967.....	June 27, 1967, Report 366..	June 28, 1967.....	N/A, 1967.....	June 30, 1967.....	90-38
2. H.J. Res. 804.....	Aug. 24, 1967, Report 596..	Aug. 24, 1967.....	N/A, 1967.....	Aug. 24, 1967.....	N/A, 1967.....	Aug. 29, 1967.....	90-75
3. H.J. Res. 853.....	Sept. 28, 1967, Report 724..	Oct. 3, 1967.....	Oct. 4, 1967, Report 580..	Oct. 4, 1967.....	Oct. 4, 1967.....	Oct. 5, 1967.....	90-102
4. H.J. Res. 936.....	Discharged, 1967.....	Nov. 28, 1967.....	N/A, 1967.....	Nov. 28, 1967.....	N/A, 1967.....	Nov. 28, 1967.....	90-162
5. H.J. Res. 888.....	Oct. 16, 1967, Report 785..	Oct. 18, 1967.....	Oct. 20, 1967, Report 672..	Oct. 25, 1967.....	Dec. 7, 1967, Report 1011..	Dec. 18, 1967.....	90-218

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1969

1. H.J. Res. 1368.....	June 26, 1968, Report 1588..	June 27, 1968.....	N/A, 1968.....	June 28, 1968.....	N/A, 1968.....	June 29, 1968.....	90-366
2. H.J. Res. 1420.....	July 26, 1968, Report 1800..	July 26, 1968.....	N/A, 1968.....	July 26, 1968.....	N/A, 1968.....	July 31, 1968.....	90-447
3. H.J. Res. 1461.....	Discharged, 1968.....	Sept. 26, 1968.....	Sept. 27, 1968.....	Sept. 30, 1968.....	N/A, 1968.....	Oct. 1, 1968.....	90-451

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1970

1. H.J. Res. 782.....	N/A, 1969.....	June 17, 1969.....	N/A, 1969.....	June 17, 1969.....	N/A, 1969.....	June 18, 1969.....	91-31
2. H.J. Res. 790.....	June 24, 1969, Report 324..	June 24, 1969.....	June 25, 1969, Report 274..	June 25, 1969.....	N/A, 1969.....	June 30, 1969.....	91-33
3. H.J. Res. 966.....	Oct. 23, 1969, Report 595..	Oct. 28, 1969.....	Nov. 12, 1969, Report 529..	Nov. 13, 1969.....	N/A, 1969.....	Nov. 14, 1969.....	91-117
4. H.J. Res. 1017.....	Discharged, 1969.....	Dec. 1, 1969.....	N/A, 1969.....	Dec. 4, 1969.....	N/A, 1969.....	Dec. 5, 1969.....	91-141
5. H.J. Res. 1072.....	Discharged, 1969.....	Feb. 2, 1970.....	Feb. 3, 1970.....	Feb. 3, 1970.....	N/A, 1969.....	Feb. 9, 1970.....	91-193
6. H.J. Res. 1232.....	May 14, 1970 Report 1094..	May 14, 1970.....	N/A, 1969.....	May 14, 1970.....	N/A, 1969.....	May 19, 1970.....	91-257

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1971

1. H.J. Res. 1264.....	June 18, 1970, Rept. 1220..	June 24, 1970.....	June 24, 1970, Rept. 959..	June 24, 1970.....	N/A, 1970.....	June 24, 1970.....	91-294
2. H.J. Res. 1328.....	July 27, 1970, Rept. 1334..	July 28, 1970.....	July 29, 1970, Rept. 1041..	July 29, 1970.....	N/A.....	July 30, 1970.....	91-370
3. H.J. Res. 1388.....	Discharged.....	Oct. 5, 1970.....	Oct. 6, 1970, Rept. 1280..	Oct. 12, 1970.....	N/A.....	Oct. 15, 1970.....	91-454
4. H.J. Res. 1421.....	Discharged.....	Dec. 31, 1970.....	N/A.....	Jan. 2, 1971.....	N/A.....	Jan. 2, 1971.....	91-645
5. H.J. Res. 468.....	Mar. 15, 1971 Rept. 41..	Mar. 18, 1971.....	Mar. 19, 1971, Rept. 40..	Mar. 24, 1971.....	N/A.....	Mar. 30, 1971.....	92-7

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1972

1. H.J. Res. 742.....	June 23, 1971, Report 302..	June 24, 1971.....	June 25, 1971, Report 240..	June 29, 1971.....	N/A.....	July 1, 1971.....	92-38
2. H.J. Res. 829.....	Aug. 2, 1971, Report 439..	Aug. 2, 1971.....	Aug. 5, 1971, Report 354..	Aug. 6, 1971.....	N/A.....	Aug. 9, 1971.....	92-71
3. H.J. Res. 916.....	Oct. 6, 1971, Report 551..	Oct. 6, 1971.....	Oct. 7, 1971, Report 391..	Oct. 8, 1971.....	N/A.....	Oct. 15, 1971.....	92-139
4. H.J. Res. 946.....	Nov. 4, 1971, Report 612..	Nov. 10, 1971.....	N/A.....	Nov. 16, 1971.....	Nov. 18, 1971, Report 676..	Nov. 20, 1971.....	92-162
5. H.J. Res. 1005.....	N/A.....	Dec. 15, 1971.....	Dec. 15, 1971, Report 585..	Dec. 17, 1971.....	N/A.....	Dec. 18, 1971.....	92-201

Note: N/A—Not available.

NUMBER OF CONTINUING RESOLUTIONS BY CONGRESS

83d Cong.....	2
84th Cong.....	2
85th Cong.....	4
86th Cong.....	4
87th Cong.....	6
88th Cong.....	6
89th Cong.....	8
90th Cong.....	8
91st Cong.....	11
92d Cong. (1st sess.).....	5

The continuing appropriations process does little to assure careful Federal planning. It helps to create an uneven funding

pattern for Federal programs. Many may be funded late in the fiscal year so that Federal officials are forced to "use or lose" funds in a short period of time because funds not used by the end of the fiscal year revert back to the Treasury. Since 1964 the average delay between the beginning of the fiscal year and passage of all appropriation acts has been over 3 months. In the last 9 years we have passed a total of only seven appropriation acts before the beginning

of the fiscal year. This record rests on the base of 116 appropriation measures presented during that period. During our consideration of the fiscal year 1972 budget, four of the 14 measures considered were passed later than 4 months into the new fiscal year. One of the bills was finally passed 252 days into the new fiscal year. Chart 4 illustrates the delay in approval dates for appropriation acts between fiscal 1964 and 1972.

CHART 4.—APPROVAL DATES AND NUMBER OF ELAPSED DAYS AFTER BEGINNING OF FISCAL YEAR FOR ALL REGULAR APPROPRIATION ACTS, FISCAL YEARS 1964-72

Titles of appropriation act ¹	Fiscal years—										Total number of elapsed days between start of fiscal year and appropriations	
	1964 (1963 *)	1965 (1964 *)	1966 (1965 *)	1967 (1966 *)	1968 (1967 *)	1969 (1968 *)	1970 (1969 *)	1971 (1970 *)	1972 (1971 *)	Total	Average per year	
Agriculture, environmental and consumer protection programs:												
Date of approval.....	Dec.	30 Sept.	2 Nov.	2 Sept.	7 Oct.	24 Aug.	3 Nov.	26 Dec.	22 Aug.	10		
Number of days elapsed beyond beginning of fiscal year.....	183	64	125	69	116	39	149	175	41	961	107	

Footnotes at end of table.

CHART 4.—APPROVAL DATES AND NUMBER OF ELAPSED DAYS AFTER BEGINNING OF FISCAL YEAR FOR ALL REGULAR APPROPRIATION ACTS, FISCAL YEARS 1964-72.—Continued

Titles of appropriation act ¹	Fiscal years—										Total number of elapsed days between start of fiscal year and appropriations	
	1964 (1963 ²)	1965 (1964 ²)	1966 (1965 ²)	1967 (1966 ²)	1968 (1967 ²)	1969 (1968 ²)	1970 (1969 ²)	1971 (1970 ²)	1972 (1971 ²)	Total	Average per year	
Department of Defense:												
Date of approval	Oct. 17	Aug. 19	Sept. 29	Oct. 15	Sept. 29	Oct. 17	Dec. 29	Jan. 1, 1971	Dec. 18			
Number of days elapsed beyond beginning of fiscal year	109	50	91	107	91	109	182	185	171	1,095	122	
District of Columbia:												
Date of approval	Dec. 30	Aug. 22	July 16	Nov. 2	Nov. 13	Aug. 10	Dec. 24	July 16	Dec. 18			
Number of days elapsed beyond beginning of fiscal year	183	53	16	125	136	41	177	16	171	918	102	
Office of Education:												
Date of approval	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	Aug. 18	July 9			
Number of days elapsed beyond beginning of fiscal year								49	9	58	29	
Foreign assistance and related agencies:												
Date of approval	Jan. 1, 1964	Oct. 7	Oct. 20	Oct. 15	Feb. 2, 1968	Oct. 17	Feb. 1, 1970	Dec. 31	Mar. 8, 1972			
Number of days elapsed beyond beginning of fiscal year	190	99	112	107	217	109	216	184	252	1,486	165	
Independent offices and Department of HUD:												
Date of approval	Dec. 19	Aug. 30	Aug. 16	Sept. 6	Nov. 3	Oct. 4	Nov. 26	Dec. 17	Aug. 10			
Number of days elapsed beyond beginning of fiscal year	172	61	47	68	126	96	149	170	41	930	103	
Department of Interior and related agencies:												
Date of approval	July 26	July 7	June 28	May 31	June 24	July 26	Oct. 29	July 31	Aug. 10			
Number of days elapsed beyond beginning of fiscal year	26	7				26	121	31	41	252	28	
Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies:												
Date of approval	Oct. 11	Sept. 19	Aug. 31	Nov. 7	Nov. 8	Oct. 11	Jan. 26, 1970	Jan. 11, 1971	Aug. 10			
Number of days elapsed beyond beginning of fiscal year	103	81	62	130	131	103	210	195	41	1,056	117	
Legislative branch:												
Date of approval	Dec. 30	Aug. 20	July 27	Aug. 27	July 28	July 23	Dec. 12	Aug. 18	July 9			
Number of days elapsed beyond beginning of fiscal year	183	51	27	58	28	23	165	49	9	593	66	
Military construction:												
Date of approval	Dec. 21	Sept. 2	Sept. 25	Nov. 2	Dec. 8	Sept. 26	Dec. 29	Dec. 11	Nov. 18			
Number of days elapsed beyond beginning of fiscal year	174	64	87	125	161	88	182	164	141	1,186	132	
Public works and AEC:												
Date of approval	Dec. 31	Aug. 30	Oct. 28	Oct. 15	Nov. 20	Aug. 12	Dec. 11	Oct. 7	Oct. 5			
Number of days elapsed beyond beginning of fiscal year	184	61	120	107	143	43	164	99	97	1,018	113	
Department of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and related agencies:												
Date of approval	Dec. 30	Aug. 31	Sept. 2	Nov. 8	Nov. 8	Aug. 9	Dec. 24	Oct. 21	Aug. 10			
Number of days elapsed beyond beginning of fiscal year	183	62	64	131	131	40	177	113	41	942	105	
Department of Transportation and related agencies:												
Date of approval	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	Oct. 23	Aug. 8	Dec. 26	Mar. 30, 1971	Aug. 10			
Number of days elapsed beyond beginning of fiscal year					115	39	179	273	41	647	129	
Treasury, Postal Service, and Executive Office of the President:												
Date of approval	June 13	Aug. 1	June 30	June 29	July 7	June 9	Sept. 29	Sept. 26	July 9			
Number of days elapsed beyond beginning of fiscal year		32			7		91	88	9	227	25	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration:												
Date of approval	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	Nov. 8	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)			
Number of days elapsed beyond beginning of fiscal year					131					131	131	
Number of regular appropriation acts	12	12	12	12	14	13	13	14	14			
Number of acts approved prior to July 1	1	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	0			
Total number of days elapsed between start of fiscal year and approval of appropriation acts	1,690	685	751	1,027	1,533	756	2,162	1,791	1,105	11,500	1,278	

¹ The titles of the appropriation acts are listed on the basis of fiscal year 1972 breakdown. Through the years there have been changes in some of the agencies and activities included in specific appropriation acts.

² The years listed at the head of the columns represent the calendar years applicable to the approval date of the specific acts.

³ Prior to fiscal year 1971, appropriations for the Office of Education were included in the Labor, HEW Appropriation Act.

⁴ Prior to establishment of the Department of Transportation, appropriations for various activities

of this department were distributed among several appropriations acts, i.e., Coast Guard in the Treasury Act, highways in Commerce Act, and Federal Aviation Administration in independent Offices, etc.

⁵ Appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration were provided in a separate act for fiscal year 1968. NASA appropriations generally are included in the Independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act.

Source: U.S. Statutes at Large.

If Congress were able to consider the budget on a 12-month cycle the use of the continuing resolution could be substantially reduced. More importantly, Congress could become involved in developing long-range plans for Federal spending. Chart 4A illustrates congressional progress on passing budget measures as of May 25, 1972.

CHART 4A.—FISCAL YEAR 1973 APPROPRIATION BILLS, AND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILLS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1972—SHOWING BUDGET AUTHORITY AND ESTIMATED OUTLAYS BY BILL, AS REQUESTED BY THE PRESIDENT, AS PASSED BY THE HOUSE AND SENATE, AND AS ENACTED IN THE 92D CONG.

[In thousand of dollars]

	Budget request	House action to date	Senate action to date	Enacted
FISCAL YEAR 1973				
Legislative branch (H.R. 13955):				
Budget authority in bill	1519,348	427,605	514,723	(³)
Requests not considered		85,721		
Outlays:		436,390	518,754	
Requests not considered		81,164		
Outlays from current (1973) budget authority	[469,198]	[382,534]	[464,898]	
Requests not considered		[81,164]		

See footnotes at end of table.

	Budget request	House action to date	Senate action to date	Enacted
State, Justice, Commerce, the judiciary and related agencies (H.R. 14989):				
Budget authority in bill	14,704,327	4,587,104		
Requests not considered		16,338		
Adjustment to budget basis ¹	+138,690	+138,690		
Appropriations to liquidate contract authority	(233,312)	(233,312)		
Outlays ²	4,286,768	4,199,495		
Requests not considered		13,273		
Outlays from current (1973) budget authority	[2,905,619]	[2,818,346]		
Requests not considered		[13,273]		
Housing and Urban Development, Space, Science, and related agencies (H.R. 15093):				
Budget authority in bill	120,258,183	19,718,490		
Requests not considered		84,998		
Outlays	19,055,965	19,023,035		
Requests not considered		2,430		
Outlays from current (1973) budget authority	[14,726,766]	[14,693,836]		
Requests not considered		[2,430]		
Transportation and related agencies (H.R. 15097):				
Budget authority in bill	12,946,542	2,791,614		
Requests not considered		37,361		
Adjustments to budget basis ¹	-118,834	-80,400		
Appropriations to liquidate contract authority	(5,418,000)	(5,393,990)		
Advance (1974) appropriation	(131,181)	(131,181)		
Outlays ²	8,511,957	8,429,457		
Requests not considered		7,500		
Outlays from current (1973) budget authority	[2,076,888]	[2,012,388]		
Requests not considered		[7,500]		
Agriculture and Environmental and Consumer Protection:				
Budget authority in bill	12,952,220			
Requests not considered		(195,500)		
Appropriations to liquidate contract authority				
Outlays ²	12,270,420			
Outlays from current (1973) budget authority	[10,226,616]			
Department of Defense:				
Budget authority in bill	176,986,184			
Outlays	72,586,284			
Outlays from current (1973) budget authority	[54,926,357]			
District of Columbia:				
Budget authority in bill	343,306			
Outlays	371,048			
Outlays from current (1973) budget authority	[343,306]			
Foreign assistance and related agencies:				
Budget authority in bill	15,163,024			
Outlays	3,483,594			
Outlays from current (1973) budget authority	[1,314,797]			
Interior and related agencies:				
Budget authority in bill	12,527,154			
Appropriations to liquidate contract authority	(228,540)			
Outlays	2,533,657			
Outlays from current (1973) budget authority	[1,785,873]			
Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies:				
Budget authority in bill	132,317,498			
Outlays	30,427,340			
Outlays from current (1973) budget authority	[21,780,679]			
Military construction:				
Budget authority in bill	3,017,800			
Outlays	1,998,300			
Outlays from current (1973) budget authority	[640,641]			
Public Works and Atomic Energy:				
Budget authority in bill	15,489,058			
Appropriations to liquidate contract authority	(53,000)			
Outlays ²	5,709,840			
Outlays from current (1973) budget authority	[3,092,677]			
Treasury, Postal Service, and general Government:				
Budget authority in bill	15,066,603			
Outlays	5,186,644			
Outlays from current (1973) budget authority	[3,767,330]			
1972 Foreign Assistance and related agencies (H.R. 12067, Public Law 92-242) (scorekeeping effect of congressional action in current session):				
Outlays		4-105,000	4-105,000	-105,000
Urgent supplemental, 1972 (H.J. Res. 1097, Public Law 92-256):				
Outlays	5,765	5,765	5,765	5,765
2d supplemental, 1972 (H.R. 14582):				
Outlays	415,389	250,139	956,889	501,889
Requests not considered		65,250	8,500	8,500
Total, fiscal year 1973:				
Budget authority in bills	172,291,247	27,524,813	514,723	
Requests not considered		224,418		
Adjustments to budget basis ¹	+19,856			
Total, budget authority	172,311,103			
Appropriations to liquidate contract authority	(6,128,352)	(5,627,302)		
Advance (1974) appropriation	(131,181)	(131,181)		
Outlays ²	167,366,025	32,239,281	1,376,408	402,654
Requests not considered		169,617	8,500	8,500
Outlays from current (1973) budget authority	[118,056,747]	[19,907,104]	[464,898]	
Requests not considered		[104,367]		
FISCAL YEAR 1972				
Foreign assistance and related agencies, 1972 (H.R. 12067, Public Law 92-242) (scorekeeping effect of congressional action in current session):				
Budget authority		4-353,230	4-353,230	-353,230
Outlays		4-50,000	4-50,000	-50,000
Urgent supplemental, 1972 (H.J. Res. 1097, Public Law 92-256):				
Budget authority	957,476	957,476	957,476	957,476
Outlays	951,711	951,711	951,711	951,711

CHART 4A.—FISCAL YEAR 1973 APPROPRIATION BILLS, AND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILLS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1972—SHOWING BUDGET AUTHORITY AND ESTIMATED OUTLAYS BY BILL, AS REQUIRED BY THE PRESIDENT, AS PASSED BY THE HOUSE AND SENATE, AND AS ENACTED IN THE 2D SESS. OF THE 92D CONG.—Continued

	Budget request	House action to date	Senate action to date	Enacted
2d supplemental, 1972 (H.R. 14582):				
Budget authority.....	4,881,943	3,954,453	5,063,517	* 4,347,698
Budget authority treated in bill as offsetting receipts.....	66,138	66,138	66,138	66,138
Appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	(33,000)	(33,000)	(33,000)	(33,000)
Requests not considered.....		106,682	16,000	16,000
Outlays.....	4,229,010	3,848,400	3,991,510	3,956,510
Requests not considered.....		15,610	7,500	7,500
Supplemental, special payments to international financial institutions, 1972 (H.J. Res. 1174, Public Law 92-301):				
Budget authority.....	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
Total, Fiscal Year 1972:				
Budget authority.....	7,505,557	6,224,837	7,333,901	6,618,082
Outlays.....	5,180,721	4,750,111	4,893,221	4,858,221

¹ Amended by H. Doc. 267, 268, 271, 272, 275, 277, 278, 286, 289, 291, 292, 300, and 301.

² Includes outlays from appropriations to liquidate contract authority.

³ Includes \$180,000,000 for Appalachian development, carried in the budget as permanent contract authority with \$175,000,000 in appropriations to liquidate contract authority, and treated in the bill as direct appropriation.

⁴ Enacted figure used for comparability.

⁵ To adjust to budget basis, add \$138,690,000 for maritime subsidies treated in budget as budget authority, and in the bill as appropriation to liquidate contract authority.

* To adjust to budget basis, (1) deduct \$125,419,000 for Urban Mass Transportation appropriation which under law automatically is offset against prior year contract authority, (2) add \$6,585,000 appropriation to airway trust fund treated in budget as offsetting receipt and as nonadd item in the transportation bill.

⁷ Subject to or in conference.

⁸ Pending signature.

The Fiscal Responsibility Act requires Congress to consider the economic state of the country at the beginning of each budgetary cycle. It is required to establish an overall limitation on expenditures 45 days after the President's economic message. Congress is encouraged at that time to establish a comprehensive plan for Federal budget priorities. Additionally, the Fiscal Responsibility Act re-establishes the fiscal year to coincide with the calendar year.

In 1842 Congress authorized changing the beginning of the fiscal year from January 2 to July 1. They customarily would meet in December to pass all the appropriations bills before January 1. The change in the fiscal year was required so that the Congress would review the budget carefully. Congress is now a full-time job. Our budget considerations should take into account changes in the budget. We now use ma-

chinery which we used 40 years ago to consider \$5 billion budgets. If Congress is not to abdicate its responsibilities completely, it must modernize its mechanism to consider our budget of \$240 billion. Deliberations on the budget would then become a series of competing spending decisions between departments and agencies. We have heard a great deal of rhetoric lately about changing the Nation's priorities, but Congress cannot have a hand in this process until it starts to consider the budget as a plan for action which makes basic choices between competing categories. Aaron Wildavsky, author of "The Politics of Budgetary Process," describes several different uses for the budget. He states that it is a financial document, a plan of "intended behavior," a statement of goals, a choice mechanism, and a contract. In recent years Congress has worked from the President's budget exclusively so that its

adjustments have been made without reference to an overall congressionally established spending plan. The roles in the budget which include planning and evaluation are lacking in congressional deliberation. This seems incongruous in light of the many thousands of hours of thought and work which goes into individual pieces of legislation which creates the programs the budget later funds.

In the last 5 years Congress has found it necessary to pass 29 supplemental appropriations bills. These represent several midyear corrections in Federal spending policy. However, they also represent a serious deficiency in congressional budgetary planning. In the last 9 fiscal years we have appropriated almost \$10 billion a year through supplementals. Chart 5 presents a record of supplemental appropriations since 1964. Chart 5A presents the cost of these supplemental measures for each fiscal year since 1964.

CHART 5.—A RECORD OF SUPPLEMENTAL RESOLUTIONS FISCAL YEARS 1964-72

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1964

Number of bill	Reported	Passed House	Reported in Senate	Passed Senate	Reported to conference	Date approved	Law No.
1. H.J. Res. 875 (HEW).....	Dec. 14 (63) Report 1401.....	Dec. 19, 1963.....	Dec. 20, 1963.....	Dec. 21, 1963.....	(*).....	Feb. 10, 1963.....	88-268, 1963.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1965

1. H.R. 12633.....	Sept. 17 (64) Report 1891.....	Sept. 22, 1964.....	Sept. 29, 1964.....	Oct. 1, 1964.....	Oct. 1, 1964.....	Oct. 7, 1964.....	88-635.
2. H.J. Res. 234 (Agriculture).....	Jan. 26 (65) Report 2.....	Jan. 26, 1965.....	Feb. 1, 1965.....	Feb. 3, 1965.....	Feb. 8, 1965.....	Feb. 11, 1965.....	89-2.
3. H.R. 7091 (Second).....	Apr. 2 (65) Report 224.....	Apr. 6, 1965.....	Apr. 23, 1965.....	Apr. 27, 1965.....	Apr. 28, 1965.....	Apr. 30, 1965.....	89-16.
4. H.J. Res. 447 (Defense).....	May 5 (65) Report 286.....	May 5, 1965.....	May 5, 1965.....	May 6, 1965.....	N/A, 1965.....	May 7, 1965.....	89-18.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1966

1. H.R. 10586 (Labor, HEW).....	Aug. 19 (65) Report 818.....	Aug. 24, 1965.....	Sept. 2, 1965.....	Sept. 7, 1965.....	Sept. 7, 1965.....	Sept. 23, 1965.....	89-199.
2. H.R. 11588.....	Oct. 13 (65) Report 1162.....	Oct. 14, 1965.....	Oct. 19, 1965.....	Oct. 20, 1965.....	Oct. 20, 1965.....	Oct. 31, 1965.....	89-309.
3. H.R. 13546 (Defense).....	Mar. 11 (66) Report 1316.....	Mar. 15, 1966.....	Mar. 17, 1966.....	Mar. 22, 1966.....	(*).....	Mar. 25, 1966.....	89-374.
4. H.R. 14012 (Second).....	Mar. 25 (66) Report 1349.....	Mar. 29, 1966.....	Apr. 25, 1966.....	Apr. 27, 1966.....	May 3, 1966.....	May 13, 1966.....	89-426.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1967

1. H.R. 18381.....	Oct. 14 (66) Report 2284.....	Oct. 18, 1966.....	Oct. 19, 1966.....	Oct. 20, 1966.....	Oct. 20, 1966.....	Oct. 27, 1966.....	89-697.
2. H.R. 7123 (Defense).....	Mar. 13 (67) Report 119.....	Mar. 16, 1967.....	Mar. 17, 1967.....	Mar. 20, 1967.....	(*).....	Apr. 4, 1967.....	90-8.
3. H.R. 9481 (Second).....	Apr. 28 (67) Report 217.....	May 3, 1967.....	May 17, 1967.....	May 19, 1967.....	May 23, 1967.....	May 29, 1967.....	90-21.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1968

1. H.R. 14397.....	Dec. 12 (67) Report 1037.....	Dec. 12, 1967.....	Dec. 13, 1967.....	Dec. 14, 1967.....	Dec. 14, 1967.....	Jan. 2, 1968.....	90-239.
2. H.J. Res. 1268 (highways and claims).....	May 9 (68) Report 119.....	May 9, 1968.....	June 12, 1968.....	June 13, 1968.....	N/A.....	June 19, 1968.....	90-352.
3. H.R. 17734 (Second).....	June 7 (68) Report 1531.....	June 11, 1968.....	June 19, 1968.....	June 26, 1968.....	June 27, 1968.....	July 9, 1968.....	90-392.

Footnotes at end of table.

CHART 5.—A RECORD OF SUPPLEMENTAL RESOLUTIONS FISCAL YEARS 1964-72—Continued

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1969

Number of bill	Reported	Passed House	Reported in Senate	Passed Senate	Reported to conference	Date approved	Law No.
1. H.R. 20300	Oct. 7 (68) Report 1953	Oct. 9, 1968	Oct. 9, 1968	Oct. 10, 1968	Oct. 10, 1968	Oct. 21, 1968	90-608.
2. H.J. Res. 414 (unemployment compensation)	N/A	Feb. 6, 1969	N/A	Feb. 7, 1969	N/A	Feb. 9, 1969	91-2.
3. H.J. Res. 584	Mar. 24 (69) Report 91-112	Mar. 25, 1969	Mar. 26, 1969	Mar. 27, 1969	N/A	Apr. 1, 1969	91-7.
4. H.R. 11400 (Second)	May 15 (69) Report 91-252	May 21, 1969	June 11, 1969	June 19, 1969	June 24, 1969	July 22, 1969	91-47.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1970

1. H.R. 15209	Dec. 11 (69), Report 91-747	Dec. 11, 1969	Dec. 17, 1969	Dec. 18, 1969	Dec. 19, 1969	Dec. 26, 1969	91-166.
2. H.R. 17399 (Second)	Apr. 30 (70), Report 91-1033	May 7, 1970	June 8, 1970	June 22, 1970	June 23, 1970	July 6, 1970	91-305.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1971

1. H.R. 19928	Dec. 9 (70) Report 91-1688	Dec. 10, 1970	Dec. 11, 1970	Dec. 14, 1970	Dec. 15, 1970	Jan. 8, 1971	91-665.
2. H.J. Res. 465 (Labor)	Mar. 15, (71) Report 92-40	Mar. 16, 1971	Mar. 16, 1971	Mar. 16, 1971	N/A	Mar. 17, 1971	92-4.
3. H.J. Res. 567 (Urgent)	Apr. 22 (71) Report 92-144	Apr. 22, 1971	Apr. 23, 1971	Apr. 23, 1971	N/A	Apr. 30, 1971	92-11.
4. H.R. 8190 (Second)	May 6 (71) Report 92-187	May 12, 1971	May 13, 1971	May 19, 1971	May 20, 1971	May 25, 1971	92-18.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1972

1. H.J. Res. 915 (Labor)	Oct. 6 (71) Report 92-550	Oct. 6, 1971	Oct. 7, 1971	Oct. 8, 1971	N/A	Oct. 15, 1971	92-141.
2. H.R. 11955	Nov. 30 (71) Report 92-689	Dec. 2, 1971	Dec. 2, 1971	Dec. 3, 1971	Dec. 6, 1971	Dec. 15, 1971	92-184.
3. H.J. Res. 1097 (Second)	Mar. 9 (72) Report 92-909	Mar. 14, 1972	Mar. 14, 1972	Mar. 15, 1972	N/A	Mar. 21, 1972	92-256.
4. H.R. 14582 (Second)	Apr. 24 (72) Report 92-1015	Apr. 26, 1972	Apr. 27, 1972	May 1, 1972	May 3, 1972		

¹ Senate agreed to House amendment to Senate amendment Jan. 29, 1964.

² House agrees to Senate amendments Mar. 23, 1966.

³ House agrees to Senate amendments Mar. 21, 1967.

Note: N/A—Not available.

Source: The Final Calendar for each Congress, 88th-91st, and the Calendar of May 3, 1972 of the 2d sess., 92d Cong. Supplemental resolutions and their legislative history are included in a table for each session titled "Status of Major Bills" at the back of the Calendars.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILLS, 1964-72

Fiscal year—										Total
1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972		
1	4	4	3	3	4	2	4	4		2

CHART 5A.—TOTAL DOLLAR AMOUNT FOR SUPPLEMENTALS

FISCAL YEARS 1964-72¹

Fiscal year and Public Law		
1964: 88-264 (total)		\$289,688,000
1965:		
88-635	1,117,196,068	
89-2	1,600,000,000	
89-16	2,227,563,977	
89-18	700,000,000	
Total	5,644,760,045	
1966:		
89-199	1,223,181,500	
89-309	4,741,644,602	
89-374	13,135,719,000	
89-426	2,788,143,303	
Total	21,888,688,405	
1967:		
89-697	5,025,264,579	
90-8	12,196,520,000	
90-21	2,197,931,417	
Total	19,419,715,996	
1968:		
90-239	1,842,923,790	
90-352	50,980,863	
90-392	6,295,831,498	
Total	8,189,736,151	
1969:		
90-608	446,688,727	
91-2	36,000,000	
91-7	1,000,000,000	
91-47	4,352,357,644	
Total	5,835,046,371	
1970:		
91-166	278,281,318	
91-305	6,021,535,005	
Total	6,299,816,323	

1971:	
91-665	1,853,372,792
92-4	50,675,000
92-11	1,037,872,000
92-18	7,028,195,973
Total	9,970,115,765

1972:	
92-141	270,500,000
92-184	3,406,385,371
92-256	957,476,059
(in conference)	4,347,698,270
Total	8,982,059,700

¹ These figures represent new budget—obligational—authority, not budget expenditures—budget outlays—which in addition to expenditures from new budget authority include billions of dollars of expenditures from carryover balances of appropriations made in previous years, and also expenditures from certain so-called permanent appropriations, such as interest on the public debt and a number of trust funds which Congress is not required to act upon at each session. Neither were release of reserves counted.

Source: Congressional Record—end-of-the-year tables titled "New Budget (Obligational) Authority in the Appropriation Bills, fiscal year ____" and general discussion on the supplemental bills themselves.

The Federal Fiscal Responsibility Act provides for periodic reassessments during the year of the congressional expenditure limitation. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget is required to submit a report to Congress at the end of the second and third quarters which details his estimate of how well Federal spending policies are complying with the expenditures limitation. If the Director estimates that spending will be in excess of the limitation for the present fiscal year he can establish pro rata reductions in all Federal departments and agencies to bring spending in line with the limitation. Upon submission of the Director's report Congress has

30 days to specify or exempt appropriations categories where the reductions shall be made. This allows the Congress an on-going responsibility in staying within its own spending limits. Previous congressional expenditures limitations have been exceeded because Congress did not continue to monitor spending levels after they had established their priorities.

Several Members of Congress have introduced measures which would regulate executive impoundment of funds. The President has claimed the right not to spend appropriated funds since the time of Jefferson. The practice has become more widespread since the Dawes memorandum of 1921. Charles Dawes, the first Director of the Bureau of the Budget, stated that appropriations from the Congress "were to be treated as ceilings on expenditures rather than as directives to spend the full amount." Louis Fisher, who has written extensively on the Federal budgetary process, comments that the passage of the Employment Act of 1946 broadened the President's role in determining economic policy. This has lead all postwar Presidents toward the use of impoundment as one of their anti-inflationary tools.

The impoundment of funds has been hotly debated since the Dawes memorandum. It can be defined as the withholding or delaying of expenditure or obligation of appropriated funds.

There is some question as to what constitutes impoundment for appropriated

funds which are made available on an "until expended basis." However, the President's use of impoundment is made more open to inquiry for funds which are appropriated on an annual basis. In a 1969 memorandum Assistant Attorney General Rehnquist questioned the practice of impoundment. He said:

With respect to the suggestion that the President has a constitutional power to decline to spend appropriated funds, we must conclude that existence of such a broad power is supported neither by reason or precedent.

He continued:

It may be argued that the spending of money is inherently an executive function, but the execution of any law is, by definition, an executive function and it seems an analogous proposition that because the executive branch is bound to execute the laws, it is free to decline to execute them.

Congress must use on-going evaluations as well as regulation of impoundment to insure that its appropriations acts will be carried out.

The Fiscal Responsibility Act establishes two types of impoundment. The first is a pro rata reduction across the board in any department or agency. If the President decides to impound on this basis he must notify Congress of his impoundment. Either House of Congress then has 60 days to disapprove of the impoundment. The President is allowed to establish variations of up to 10 percent between appropriations categories. This allows the President sufficient flexibility in carrying out his economic policies while preserving congressional prerogatives in establishing spending categories.

The second type of impoundment established in the bill is called special impoundment. In cases where the President decides that he wants to impound in one budget category without regard to the pro rata restrictions established under the regular impoundment procedure, he must come to Congress 30 days in advance of his proposed impoundment. Either House of Congress then has 30 days to disapprove of the proposed action. In cases of special impoundment Congress should have the opportunity to express its wishes on proposed cuts in a program prior to its implementation. The most common reasons given for impoundment are related to economic considerations. When impoundment is carried out for noneconomic considerations such as in impoundment which is targeted against a particular program or activity Congress should have the opportunity to review the proposed action taking into account the program goals established in the authorizing legislation.

In order to show the impact of impoundment on the Federal Budget Chart 6 is a copy of a statement of budgetary reserves compiled by Caspar Weinberger in April of this year.

BUDGETARY RESERVES, APRIL 1972

Under authority delegated by the President, the Office of Management and Budget operates a system of apportioning the funds provided by the Congress. The apportionments generally are for the current fiscal year and limit the amounts the agencies may obligate during specified periods.

There are occasions when the amounts of available funds are not fully apportioned. That is, some amounts are either withheld

from apportionment, or their use is temporarily deferred. In these cases, the funds not apportioned are said to be held or placed "in reserve." This practice is one of long standing and has been exercised by both Republican and Democratic Administrations as a customary part of financial management.

The reasons for withholding or deferring the apportionment of available funds usually are concerned with routine financial administration. They have to do with the effective and prudent use of the financial resources made available by the Congress. Thus, specific apportionments sometimes await (1) development by the affected agencies of approved plans and specifications, (2) completion of studies for the effective use of the funds, including necessary coordination with the other Federal and non-Federal parties that might be involved, (3) establishment of a necessary organization and designation of accountable officers to manage the programs, (4) the arrival of certain contingencies under which the funds must by statute be made available (e.g., certain direct Federal credit aids when private sector loans are not available). In other cases the funds may be withheld in accordance with provisions of the Anti-Deficiency Act (31 U.S.C. 665) for such reasons as a change in conditions since they were appropriated or to take advantage of previously unforeseen opportunities for savings.

Table A, attached, lists the items and amounts currently reserved for such routine financial administration. They total \$9.4 billion, which is a reduction of more than \$1 billion since January of this year. This reduction is indicative of the fact that amounts are frequently released from reserve—and put to use—during each fiscal year as plans, designs, specifications, studies, project approvals, and so on are completed. As a result, the total amount held in reserve usually reaches a low point at the end of the fiscal year.

The reserves established for reasons of routine financial administration are recognized by all concerned to be temporary deferrals, and their need or wisdom is usually not questioned. In addition, however, there has been a long-standing and consistent practice in both Republican and Democratic Administrations to establish some—a much smaller amount of—reserves for reasons other than routine financial administration. It is these latter reserves which have sometimes been criticized as "impoundments" of funds.

Amounts being held in reserve for reasons other than routine financial administration generally could be used (i.e., obligated) during the apportionment time period. They have not been apportioned from time to time for such reasons as the Executive's responsibility to (1) help keep total Government spending within a congressionally-imposed ceiling, (2) help meet a statutory limitation on the outstanding public debt, (3) develop a governmentwide financial plan for the current year that synchronizes program-by-program with the budget being recommended by the President for the following year, or (4) otherwise carry out broad economic and program policy objectives.

Table B, attached, lists the items and amounts currently held in reserve for reasons other than routine financial administration. They total \$1.6 billion, a reduction of almost \$200 million from the amount so reserved in January of this year.

The total of all current reserves (i.e., Tables A and B) is 4.6% of the total unified budget outlays estimated for fiscal 1972. The comparable percentage at the end of fiscal years 1959 through 1961 ranged from 7.5% to 8.7%. At the end of fiscal 1967, it stood at 6.7%, and a range in the neighborhood of 6% has been normal in recent years. The amount currently reserved is expected to decline still further during the remainder of the fiscal year.

(In thousands of dollars)	
Agency and account:	Amount
Executive Office of the President:	
Council on Environmental Quality and Offices of Environmental Quality.....	53
Apportionment awaits development of proposals for contract studies of environmental problems.	
National Security Council.....	108
Apportionment awaits development by the agency of approved plans.	
Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention.....	682
Apportionment represents the balance of appropriation which cannot be utilized by the Office in 1972 due to late enactment of legislation. Release will occur as needed in 1973 operations.	
Funds appropriated to the President:	
Appalachian Regional Development Programs.....	40,000
Apportionment awaits development of approved plans and specifications.	
Economic Stabilization Activities.....	300
A total of \$100 thousand is reserved for subsequent use, as needed and anticipated, by the U.S. Courts in support of the Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals. The remainder is reserved for contingencies and will be apportioned as required.	
International Security Assistance:	
Foreign military credit sales.....	98,100
Apportionment awaits development by affected agencies of coordinated plans and specifications.	
International development assistance:	
Prototype desalting plant.....	20,000
Apportionment awaits development by the agency of approved plans and specifications.	
Inter-American Foundation.....	41,624

TABLE A.—Budgetary reserve for routine financial administration, April 1972
(In thousands of dollars)

	Amount
Amount represents balance of initial funding from AID transfer to cover first 4 years of the Foundation's operations. Apportionments will continue to be made annually as plans and specifications are developed.	
Department of Agriculture:	
Agricultural Research Service:	
Construction.....	70
Represents residual amount of appropriation for planning that is not required for that purpose. Apportionment awaits additional appropriation for construction.	
Scientific Activities Overseas (special foreign currency program).....	352
Amount shown here is in excess of current estimates of 1972 needs. If conditions change and the funds are needed, apportionments will be made.	
Animal and Plant Health Service.....	2,049
This amount is in excess of current estimate of 1972 needs. The funds will be apportioned, if needed, for animal and pest control.	

TABLE A.—Budgetary reserve for routine financial administration, April 1972—Con.

Department of Agriculture—Con.

Farmers Home Administration: Mutual and self-help housing grants	729
Amount shown here is in excess of current estimates of 1972 needs. If conditions change and the funds are needed, apportionments will be made.	
Direct loan account (farm operating loans limitation)	49,453
Amount reflects balances of loan authority now held pending demonstration of the need for funds.	
Consumer and Marketing Service: Consumer protective marketing, and regulatory programs	850
Amounts shown here is in excess of 1972 needs. If conditions change and funds are needed, apportionments will be made.	
Perishable Commodities Act Fund	1
Amounts shown here is in excess of current estimates of 1972 needs. If conditions change and the funds are needed, apportionments will be made.	
Forest Service: Forest protection and utilization: Cooperative range improvement	624
Amount shown here is in excess of current estimates of 1972 needs. If conditions change and the funds are needed, apportionments will be made.	
Youth Conservation Corps	1,730
These funds will be released later for the fiscal year 1973 portion of the calendar year summer program.	
Forest roads and trails	402,040
Reserve reflects amount of available contract authority above the obligation program that was approved and financed by the appropriation Congress enacted to liquidate the obligations.	
Expenses, brush disposal	13,803
Amount shown here is in excess of current estimates of 1972 needs. If conditions change and the funds are needed, apportionments will be made.	
Forest Fire Prevention	115
Amount shown here is in excess of current estimates of 1972 needs. If conditions change and the funds are needed, apportionments will be made.	
Department of Commerce: Bureau of the Census: 19th Decennial Census	11,028
These funds are to be used for printing costs and will be apportioned when needed for this purpose.	
Regional Action Planning Commissions:	
Regional Action Planning Commissions	300
Funds will be released when Mississippi Valley Regional Commission is formed.	
Promotion of industry and commerce:	

Trade adjustment assistance (financial assistance)	50,000
Amount shown here is in excess of current estimates of 1972 needs. If conditions change and the funds are needed, apportionments will be made.	
Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center	5,446
Funds will be released when plans for participation in U.S. Bicentennial are completed and approved.	
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration: Research, development, and facilities	294
These funds are for disaster relief to fisheries. Apportionment awaits arrival of contingencies under which the funds must, by statute, be made available.	
Research, development, and facilities: (special foreign currency program)	411
Apportionment awaits development of research contracts with foreign organizations.	
Promote and develop fishery products and research pertaining to American fisheries	257
Amount shown here is in excess of current estimates of 1972 needs. If conditions change and the funds are needed, apportionments will be made.	
National Bureau of Standards: Plant and facilities	1,495
Funds are for a new laboratory now in the planning stage. Apportionment awaits development of approved plans and specifications.	
Department of Defense—Military Shipbuilding and conversion	1,388,946
For use in subsequent years; these projects are fully funded when appropriated.	
Other procurement programs	21,020
For use in subsequent years; these projects are fully funded when appropriated.	
Military construction and family housing	302,602
Apportionment awaits development by the agency of approved plans and specifications.	
Civil defense programs	1,080
Amount is in excess of currently estimated needs. It will be used, as needed, in subsequent fiscal years.	
Special foreign currency program	4,903
Apportionment awaits development by the agency of approved plans and specifications.	
Department of Defense—Civil Corps of Engineers: Construction, general: Lafayette Lake, Ind.	183
Funds are being held in reserve because of local opposition to initiation of construction of the project.	
Lukfata Lake, Oklahoma	450
Funds are being held in reserve because the State of Oklahoma is considering designating one of the streams to be inundated as a wild and scenic stream.	
New York Harbor Collection and Removal of Drift	80

Funds are being held in reserve because, although the project has been authorized by the Congress for initiation and partial accomplishment, initiation of construction must await approval of the Secretary of the Army and the President. The Secretary of the Army has neither approved the project nor sent the project report to the President.	
Panama Canal Government: Capital outlays	850
Under a proposal now pending before the Congress, these fiscal year 1972 funds will be combined with the 1973 appropriation for the purchase of major items of capital equipment.	
Wildlife conservation	474
Includes estimated receipts not needed for current year program. Will be used in subsequent years.	
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: National Institutes of Health: Buildings and facilities	2,565
Apportionment awaits development by the agency of approved plans and specifications. Construction obligations are to be incurred in subsequent years.	
Office of Education: School assistance in federally affected areas	4,996
Apportionment awaits development by the agency of approved plans and specifications. Construction obligations are to be incurred in subsequent years.	
Higher education	1,462
Apportionment awaits development by the agency of approved plans and specifications.	
Educational activities overseas (special foreign currency program)	16
Apportionment of this amount awaits development of approved plans and specifications by the agency.	
Social Security Administration: Construction	12,095
Apportionment awaits development of approved plans and specifications by the agency. These plans will depend at least in part on the outcome of legislation pending before the Congress to authorize acquisition of these facilities through purchase contracts that will provide for installment payments.	
Special Institutions: Gallaudet College	516
This part of an appropriation for a national continuing education program for the deaf is being held pending the development of a plan for the effective use of the funds, including necessary coordination with the other Federal and non-Federal parties that might be involved.	
Howard University	3,714
Appointment of this amount awaits development of approved plans and specifications. Construction obligations are to be incurred in subsequent years.	
Office of Child Development	54

TABLE A.—Budgetary reserve for routine financial administration, April 1972—Con.

Apportionment of this amount awaits development of approved plans and specifications.	
Department of Housing and Urban Development:	
Model cities programs.....	105,000
The 1972 appropriation is available for use in 1972 and 1973; the amount reserved is being allocated among cities to cover obligations to be made early in 1973. Thus, each such city will have in advance a target figure against which to plan.	
Department of the Interior:	
Bureau of Land Management:	
Public lands development, roads and trails.....	16,694
Reserve reflects amounts of available contract authority above the obligation program that was approved and financed by the appropriation Congress enacted to liquidate the obligations.	
Bureau of Indian Affairs:	
Road construction.....	53,699
Reserve reflects amounts of available contract authority above the obligation program that was approved and financed by the appropriation Congress enacted to liquidate the obligations.	
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation:	
Land and water conservation fund.....	30,000
Consists of 1972 annual contract authority which the 1973 budget shows as not being obligated. This contract authority, which was made available annually through fiscal year 1989 by Public Law 91-308, approved July 7, 1970, is not being used because the Federal agencies purchasing park lands have found annual contract authority cumbersome to administer. Instead, they prefer ordinary appropriations to finance such land purchases and the budget proposes appropriation of the full \$300 million annual authorization for the fund, of which about \$98 million is for Federal land purchases in 1973.	
Bureau of Mines:	
Drainage of anthracite mines.....	3,623
Funds are spent on a matching basis with Pennsylvania as that the State and Department of the Interior develop projects for this purpose. Apportionment awaits development of approved plans and specifications.	
Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife:	
Construction.....	9,075
Appropriated funds for D.C. Aquarium withheld because authorized facility cannot be constructed within the funding limits established by the authorization.	
National Park Service:	
Parkway and road construction.....	73,589
Reserve reflects amounts of available contract authority above the obligation program that was approved and financed by the appropriation Congress enacted to liquidate the obligations.	
Bureau of Reclamation:	
Construction and rehabilitation.....	1,055
Funds are being held in reserve pending completion and review of the economic re-study to determine the most effective use of funds for the Second Bacon Siphon and Tunnel Unit, Wash.	
Operation and maintenance and replacement of project works, North Platte project.....	
This amount fulfills the legal requirements for this account of an annually established contingency reserve.	
Department of Justice:	
Federal Prison System:	
Buildings and facilities.....	4,299
The apportionment awaits development by the affected agency of approved plans and specifications.	
Department of State:	
Education exchange fund (earmarked proceeds of payment by Finland on World War I debt).....	22
Apportionment awaits development by the agency of specific plans for the exchange of students.	
Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs:	
International Educational Exchange Activities (special foreign currency program).....	5
Funds represent recent recovery of prior year obligations in excess of current year needs. These funds are expected to be utilized in the future.	
Department of Transportation:	
Coast Guard:	
Acquisition, construction and improvements.....	7,607
Funds are for equipment or improvements and will not be needed until construction on seven projects is in an advanced stage. They will be released when needed.	
Alteration of bridges.....	1,000
Apportionment awaits development of approved plans and specifications.	
Retired pay.....	571
Appropriation is in excess of needs due to a lag in voluntary retirements.	
Federal Aviation Administration:	
Facilities and equipment (Airport and Airway trust fund).....	53,639
Grants-in-aid for airports (Airport and Airway trust fund).....	56,458
Construction, National Capital Airports.....	900
U.S. International Aeronautical Exposition.....	218
Civil Supersonic aircraft development termination.....	4,506
Apportionment of the above FAA accounts awaits development of approved plans and specifications.	
Federal Highway Administration:	
Territorial Highways.....	5,000
New program established by the 1970 Highway Act, effective December 30, 1970. No appropriation was provided until August 1971, although \$4.5M of contract authority was authorized for each of 1971 and 1972. Territories were not prepared to handle program and have just begun to organize agencies and prepare studies for use of the funds. Total obligations through December 31, 1971, were about \$93,000.	
Federal-aid highways:	
(1) 1973 contract authority.....	5,700,000
(2) Remaining balance from prior reductions to meet outlay ceilings and abate inflation.....	246,798
Urban Mass Transportation Administration:	
Urban mass transportation.....	299,970
The Congress provided a total of \$3.1B of contract authority for the five-year period 1971-1975. Executive Branch apportionments will result in \$1.0B of this amount having been used by June 30, 1972, another \$1.0B (including this \$300M) will be apportioned July 1, 1972, for fiscal 1973, leaving \$1.1B, or \$550M per year for the fiscal years 1974 and 1975. By appropriation action in fiscal years 1971 and 1972, the Congress effectively limited the amount of the contract authority that could be used each fiscal year. Thus, the \$300M shown is the difference between the \$600M apportioned for 1972 and the \$900M upper limit for which administrative expenses may be incurred under the 1972 Appropriation Act for the Department of Transportation: "Sec. 308. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for administrative expenses in connection with commitments for grants for Urban Mass Transportation aggregating more than \$900,000,000 in fiscal year 1972." (Underlining supplied.)	
Treasury Department:	
Office of the Secretary:	
Construction, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center.....	22,239
Apportionment awaits development by the agency of approved plans and specifications.	
Expenses of administration of settlement of World War Claims Act of 1928.....	1
Amount shown here is in excess of current estimate of 1972 administrative costs. If conditions change and funds are needed, apportionment will be made.	
Bureau of the Mint:	
Construction.....	79
Apportionment awaits the completion of studies for the effective use of funds.	

Atomic Energy Commission:

Operating expenses:

Reactor development—

Funds held in reserve for the Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor (LMFBR) demonstration plant awaiting the completion of detailed negotiations now underway involving AEC and the Commonwealth Edison Company and TVA.

43,350

Biomedical Research—

Funds held in reserve pending development of a plan for effective utilization.

370

Plant and capital equipment:

Funds held in reserve awaiting AEC's development of firm plans or specifications for two projects in the nuclear materials and weapons programs.

175

Funds held in reserve awaiting AEC's completion of feasibility studies or the results of research and development efforts for the national radioactive waste repository and two other projects.

3,133

Funds held in reserve for possible cost overruns and other contingencies.

5,000

Environmental Protection Agency:

Operations, research and facilities.

35,294

Awaiting completion of EPA study of requirements for Cincinnati laboratory (\$28.0M) and other laboratory facilities (\$7.294M).

General Services Administration:

Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service.

5,000

Amount shown here is in excess of the current estimate of 1972 needs. It reflects revised estimates of rent and utility costs. If conditions change and the funds are needed, apportionments will be made.

Construction, public buildings projects.

45,514

San Antonio, Texas, project awaiting Congressional approval of revised prospectus—\$7,402 thousand.

Philadelphia project—additional awards awaiting completion of present construction works—\$23,046 thousand.

\$10,803 thousand proposed in the 1973 budget for obligation in accordance with legislation now pending in the Congress to authorize private financing and installment payment/purchase of various projects.

\$4,263 thousand is reserved to meet possible contingencies that might arise in the course of construction.

Sites and expenses, public buildings projects.

14,665

Reserved to meet possible contingencies or for use in subsequent years—\$10,380 thousand.

Projects involving space for Postal Service are being restudied—\$4,285 thousand. Apportionment awaits the completion of this action for the effective use of the funds.

Operating expenses, Property Management and Disposal Service.

769

Amount shown here is in excess of the current estimate of 1972 needs for stockpile disposals. If conditions change and the funds are needed, apportionments will be made.

Veterans Administration:

Grants to States for extended care facilities.

8,420

State plans and requests for funds have not been presented to the extent originally expected.

Other Independent Agencies:

Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking Peoples.

30

Potential savings—

The obligation rate has been lower than anticipated because of operation under continuing resolution for two quarters.

Federal Communications Commission: Salaries and expenses (construction).

460

These funds are intended for replacement of a monitoring station. They cannot be used until the Congress raises the current limitation on FCC's 1972 construction program. It is expected that this will take place before the end of fiscal year 1972.

Federal Home Loan Bank Board:

Interest adjustment payments.

46,888

Amount which can be effectively utilized by the Board in the current year has already been apportioned.

Foreign Claims Settlement Commission: Salaries and expenses.

19

Apportionment awaits development by the agency of approved plans.

Payment of Vietnamese and Pueblo prisoner of war claims.

150

Apportionment awaits arrival of contingencies under which the funds must, by statute, be made available.

Smithsonian Institution:

Salaries and expenses, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.

11

Reserved for contingencies. Will be apportioned if and when needed.

Temporary Study Commissions:

Commission on Highway Beautification.

25

Amount being held for completion of Commission's work in 1973.

Commission on Population Growth and the American Future.

30

A small contingency amount is set aside to cover any increases in contracted costs after the Commission completes its work and disburses in May, 1972.

National Commission on Consumer Finance.

50

For terminating the Commission in 1973 after the report is completed.

Aviation Advisory Commission.

587

Funds in 1972 reserve will be used in 1973 to carry Commission through its expiration date of March, 1973.

United States Information Agency:

Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program).

407

Special international exhibitions.

746

Apportionment of the above accounts awaits development of approved plans and specifications.

Water Resources Council:

Salaries and expenses.

25

Funds in reserve pending establishment of new river basin commissions.

Total 9,394,669

TABLE B.—Reserves for reasons other than routine financial administration, April 1972
(In thousands of dollars)

Agency and account:	
Department of Agriculture:	
Rural Electrification Administration—	
Loans	* 107,000
Farmers Home Administration:	
Sewer and water grants	b 58,000
Department of Housing and Urban Development:	
Rehabilitation loans	* 53,042
Grants for new community assistance	* 5,000
Basic water and sewer grants	d 500,000
Department of Transportation:	
Federal-aid highways	623,000
Rights-of-way for highways	50,000
Urban mass transportation	* [299,970]
Atomic Energy Commission	17,655
NERVA-Nuclear Rocket	(16,990)
Flowshare	(665)
National Aeronautics and Space Administration:	
NERVA-Nuclear Rocket	22,400
National Science Foundation:	
Educational and institutional support	* 21,000
Graduate traineeships	9,500
Reserves established pursuant to President's August 15, 1971, directive to curtail previously planned Federal employment levels	85,300
Total	1,551,897

FOOTNOTES

* Apportionment of entire amount is planned on July 1, 1972.

b This amount is planned to be used for continuation of the water and sewer grant program after the fiscal year 1972.

c Funds remaining from the 1972 appropriation for rehabilitation loans will be apportioned on July 1, 1972.

d This amount is planned to be used for continuation of the water and sewer grant program in 1973 and subsequent years.

e This item is listed here only because of public and congressional interest. It is not counted in the total of Table B because its planned use is consistent with congressional intent. The Congress provided a total of \$3.1 billion of contract authority for the five-year period 1971–1975. Executive Branch apportionments will result in \$1.0 billion of this amount having been used by June 30, 1972, another \$1.0 billion (including this \$300 million) will be apportioned July 1, 1972, for fiscal 1973, leaving \$1.1 billion, or \$550 million per year for the fiscal years 1974 and 1975.

Title 4 of the Fiscal Responsibility Act establishes a study commission made up of the Comptroller General and the leadership of the Appropriations Committees,

the Ways and Means Committee, and the Finance Committee. The Commission will study the appropriations procedures in Congress and recommend further measures which will modernize congressional budgetary procedure. The 55 members of the House Appropriations Committee and the 24 members of the Senate committee do a remarkable job indeed, considering the tools we give them. Their review of the budget includes many hundreds of subcommittee and committee sessions. Their work and the work of the Congress could be improved by a modernization of our appropriations process. However, they clearly need more assistance and improved procedures to handle the mass of information before them.

The Commission will study the feasibility of funding some programs on a 2-year basis. Two-year funding might provide stability for many of our grant-in-aid programs. The Commission will also consider proposals such as the Magnuson bill in the Senate which would create a

split session in the Congress to divide consideration between a budget session and a legislative session. This division might make more Congressmen become directly involved in appropriations decisions. The split session is used in several State legislatures and in some parliaments in other countries. Its feasibility should also be studied. Estimates by the Office of Management and Budget state that 71 percent of the 1973 budget is considered "relatively uncontrollable." The Commission should study this trend toward larger segments of "uncontrollables" in the budget. If the budget is going to be a management tool, then we must be able to redirect our spending as national needs change.

Uncontrollables are thought to be an increasing problem for several reasons. Congressional procedure for appropriations fragments our deliberations between 14 separate appropriations bills, thus the uncontrollables hide in 14 bills and are never fully examined. A second

factor to be studied by the Commission is the influence which our lack of comprehensive consideration of the budget has upon our assessment of program costs at the beginning of a program. Many of our programs have very little, if any, thought given during the development phase to the overall cost relationship to other programs in the budget. These assessments may not be made, because some of us know that it may be easier to pass a new program with an underfunded budget and then work to increase appropriations after we get our program on the books.

Our concern for greater fiscal responsibility will only be realized if we make the hard decisions on spending in an atmosphere of continuous review; at the initiation of a program and, an ongoing basis. The Commission should examine the role and impact of uncontrollable expenditures in the budget.

Chart 7 shows estimates for uncontrollables in the Federal budget.

CHART 7.—CONTROLLABILITY OF FEDERAL OUTLAYS, FISCAL YEARS 1967-73

	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
[In billions]							
Relatively uncontrollable	\$96.6	\$109.8	\$120.0	\$130.3	\$145.7	\$162.8	\$174.6
Relatively controllable	65.6	74.0	69.6	72.7	73.1	81.4	79.8
Adjustments ¹	-3.9	-5.0	-5.1	-6.4	-7.4	-7.6	-8.1
Total outlays	158.3	178.8	184.5	196.6	211.4	236.6	246.3
"Uncontrollables" as a percent of total outlays	61	61	65	66	69	69	71

¹ Includes allowances for contingencies and reductions for undistributed intergovernmental transactions.

Source: Office of Management and Budget.

In a report of February of this year the General Accounting Office found that Congress lacks vital information necessary for making wise budgetary and fiscal decisions. The Commission should also review how Congress can effectively obtain adequate levels of information for budgetary decisions.

The authorizations/appropriations process used in Congress has often proven to be a clumsy system for developing appropriations measures. There seems to be a growing disparity between the authorizations and appropriations measures authored each year. The authorizations issued often represent only a "wish list" with little relevance to what is finally enacted into law. This disparity creates false hopes for those interested in a particular program or activity. In addition to the unrealistic expectations by the authorizations created, the unfulfilled promises do little to encourage careful budget planning. The authorizations/appropriations gap is especially apparent in social policy fields. Chart 8 demonstrates the gap in one area, education.

Most experts on budgetary process agree that present appropriations procedures include extremely limited involvement for most Members of Congress. In both Houses the decision of the Appropriations Subcommittees most often become decisions of the full committee. The decisions of the full committee most often become the decisions of the full House. In the House this system is further strengthened by the use of closed rules on the floor. The Commission should

CHART 8.—OFFICE OF EDUCATION
LEGISLATIVE AUTHORIZATIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS,
1961-71
[In thousands]

Fiscal year	Authorization ¹	Appropriation	Difference
1961	\$536,685	\$528,738	-\$7,947
1962	583,957	587,746	+\$3,789
1963	652,449	652,494	+\$45
1964	948,017	697,629	-\$250,388
1965	1,518,091	1,383,610	-\$134,481
1966	3,598,969	3,339,002	-\$259,967
1967	4,640,185	3,919,654	-\$720,531
1968	6,450,967	3,901,707	-\$2,549,260
1969	7,812,564	3,617,085	-\$4,195,479
1970	10,230,419	3,813,778	-\$6,416,641
1971	11,492,561	4,356,639	-\$7,135,922

¹ Since authorizations for some programs are indefinite in amount ("such sums as necessary"), their dollar figures cannot be included here. The authorization totals are therefore understated to that extent. That explains why an appropriation figure can sometimes exceed an authorization figure (fiscal years 1962-64).

² Appropriation after 2 percent reduction.

Source: Based on worksheets supplied by Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

also study ways to involve more Members of Congress effectively in making budgetary decisions. Budget decisions affect every citizen in the country. It seems proper that Representatives should plan an increasing role in deciding how our Government is to spend its money.

Congress should reassert its role in the budgetary process. The collective expertise of our membership covers every area of Federal activity. Louis Fischer quotes Justice Jackson's admonishment to Congress in his decision on the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Case. The Justice stated:

The tools belong to the man who can use them. We may say that power to legislate for emergencies belongs in the hands of Congress, but only Congress itself can prevent power from slipping through its fingers.

RETURNING ADDICTS FROM VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, like a horrible nightmare, the United States has discovered that getting out of Vietnam has a price it did not anticipate. Most everyone is sadly aware of the casualty figures of the dead, wounded, and missing in actions. Yet there is another, perhaps less obvious, casualty list that will haunt American society long after the last GI has left Vietnam—the troops who became addicted while serving in Southeast Asia. The number of them is staggering. In April 1971 I conducted a study mission on the foreign aspects of the drug problem. My findings in Vietnam led me to believe that at least 20 to 30 percent of our forces in Southeast Asia were at that time using heroin. This would translate into more than 60,000 men. This figure is based on estimates given to me by military intelligence, commanding officers, drug suppression and medical personnel, servicemen, and addicts themselves. Sixty thousand men—and only a relatively small number of them have enrolled in the

Army's drug amnesty rehabilitation program.

The heroin in Vietnam is plentiful, powerful, and cheap. It is 95 percent pure and sells for as little as \$2.50 for a quarter of a gram. This easy availability, combined with the danger and boredom faced by these servicemen, has produced one of the biggest problems of the war—that of stopping them from becoming addicted to drugs, especially heroin, and then bringing that addiction home with them. Once back in the United States they find that drugs are harder to get, 20 to 30 times more expensive, and considerably less potent.

Unless the addicted serviceman manages to break the habit before he gets out and returns to civilian life, he stands a good chance of drifting into a life of crime in order to support his habit, thus adding to our already skyrocketing crime rate. Moreover, as a noted physician pointed out before a Senate subcommittee, heroin addiction is a "communicable disease":

Through a natural ripple effect, 75,000 new addicts from Vietnam will produce an additional 250,000 to 750,000 addicts in the United States within a year.

In other words, as we release increasing numbers of servicemen back into our society, we are inviting a frightful addiction to the 560,000 estimated addicts in the Nation's civilian population.

Until rather recently, the military considered drug involvement to be a problem requiring disciplinary action only. But, like the rest of society, the military has now come to recognize a greater responsibility to these addicted men and is responding with treatment and rehabilitation programs. Unfortunately, these programs in Vietnam are sorely inadequate—largely as a result of too few personnel and facilities, too little experience, and lack of a coordinated Vietnam-wide effort to establish rehabilitation centers. Another major shortcoming has been the lack of legal authorization to retain a serviceman, addicted or otherwise, beyond his discharge date. Still another drawback has been the policy of giving addicted GIs the types of discharges which disqualify them for post-discharge treatment and other veterans' benefits.

A great deal of legislation—including my own omnibus bill, the Armed Forces Narcotic Control Act of 1971—has been introduced in this Congress which would make identification, treatment, and rehabilitation of GI addicts a mandatory obligation of the Armed Forces. Implementation of this program must receive the highest priority. The drug situation in Vietnam is epidemic, and unless these returning addicts are completely cured and rehabilitated, no one can reckon what the moral, emotional, and social costs will be here at home.

CONGRESS SHOULD ENACT A "FAIR FIREARMS ACT"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the recent attempt on the life of Gov. George C. Wallace has, once again, brought to the foreground the emotional alarmists in favor of stricter gun control and handgun confiscation. The blind emotions that foster these attacks fail to take into account the millions of sportsmen who use the handgun for recreational purposes as well as those individuals who keep handguns in their homes and businesses for self protection.

Gun registration is unfair and burdensome. It could prove to be more lethal than weapons themselves.

I have been in the forefront of the battle to save private firearms in the United States since the Kennedy-King-Kennedy assassinations, and the resulting wave of public hysteria against the so-called instruments of national calamity.

The confiscation of handguns is a direct violation of the right of the individual to secure and bear arms, and the constraint by the Federal Government in this matter is shameful.

There is little evidence to prove that the Gun Control Act of 1968 altered the trend of criminal violence in the United States, and there is no doubt the American sportsman was trampled under foot during that vote. His survival and that of all firearms owners is in jeopardy. This reason led me to introduce a bill to repeal this scandalous legislation and to reenact the Federal Firearms Act.

The mania to confiscate all handguns is a direct invitation to crime. While all law-abiding citizens were turning in their guns, the criminals would become omnipotent. The resulting balance in favor of the criminal would result in victim after victim added to the bloody statistics noted on police blotters around the country.

A lawbreaker will not bother to follow any gun control law whether it is harsh or not.

For example, just recently I know where a man presented himself to a firearms dealer and totally falsified the information on the required form needed to purchase a firearm. After ignoring the gun law, he proceeded to pass a bad check for his merchandise and left the place of business never to be seen again. Unfortunately, the owners of the establishment did not realize the individual had falsified his information until they tried to collect on his bad check.

In a recent article James J. Kilpatrick stated:

Congress can do less than judges can. If our courts would crack down hard on gun-toting criminals, hitting them with tough additional sentences for the use of a firearm, the word would get around.

The attack on crime should be the course of action, not one of misguided gun controls.

Previously I had introduced a bill in the House of Representatives calling for additional penalties for the use of firearms in the commission of certain crimes of violence.

Faced with a harsher sentence the criminal would be more reluctant to break the law. They will soon realize they cannot act as they please.

The Gun Control Act of 1968 should be replaced by a law the public can support and should include the following:

First, assure law-abiding citizens the right to own and use firearms for support and self defense; second, require mandatory penalties for the possession of a firearm or facsimile in the commission of a crime; and third, control the importation of all firearms and their component parts.

The circumstances surrounding the attempted assassination of Gov. George C. Wallace are truly tragic. However, he supports the citizens right to bear arms and his feelings on the subject are worth quoting at length:

Restrictive gun legislation . . . really in the long run restricts the law abiding citizen who owns a gun. But the law violator doesn't pay any attention to any law . . . Actually, the only way I know to stop the growth of the crime rate is to have stricter enforcement of the existing laws . . . and have sure and swift punishment for the people who violate the law.

Unwarranted attempts by the Government to restrict and/or confiscate sporting and protective firearms are trying the patience of loyal Americans.

I strongly urge the Congress to institute a Fair Firearms Act that would assure citizens of good repute the continuing right to own and use firearms.

ARMY'S DRUG TESTING PROGRAM A FAILURE

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, today I am publicly releasing statistics furnished me by the Army's Surgeon General's Office on the sample test results of the three commercial laboratories that are doing the drug testing for the Army. These shocking statistics cast a shadow of doubt over the effectiveness of the whole GI drug program. The statistics show that the Army's drug testing program here in the United States is failing to identify heroin addicts. As a case in point, one private laboratory failed to detect heroin in 77 percent of the test samples submitted by the Army. It is clear that many GIs who are drug users are going undetected because of the gross inefficiency of the present drug testing program. The three commercial laboratories—United Medical Laboratories, Portland, Oreg., Biochemical Procedures, North Hollywood, Calif., and Washington Reference Laboratory, Washington, D.C.—have been negligent in performing these tests.

In my judgment the Army is also at least equally negligent for not penalizing these laboratories for their poor performance. While the terms of the contracts require the laboratories to correctly identify the contents of 90 percent of the samples submitted by the Army, not one of the three U.S. firms doing the heroin testing has consistently met the 90 percent requirement. Yet the Army has not penalized these firms at all.

It is my hope that the Secretary of the Army will either penalize these contrac-

tors or find other laboratories that can do a decent job. These firms have been paid over \$1.6 million since the drug testing program began. It is a disservice to our GIs and to the taxpayers to continue to pay millions of dollars to laboratories which are falling short of what they promised.

A FOCUS FOR SOLAR ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, at the risk of seeming a bit quixotic, I suspect that the time has come for civilized man to stop taking the sun for granted.

This is not to imply that one need worry about the sun not rising tomorrow or exploding into a supernova next year or collapsing into a white dwarf in a few centuries. What I do assert is the spiraling need for the human race to tap the sun's enormous energy and put it to work as a major power supply—soon.

A lot of people have become involved lately in energy problems—including myself. The record abounds with reports and studies about the so-called energy crisis—and, in my opinion, there is such a crisis. There is nothing phoney about it.

What I want to emphasize is this. Crisis is a relative word; usually its essence is immediacy—short range or short term—something we must handle right away. On the other hand, what is "immediate?" That depends on what you are and what your environment is. If you are a guppy being chased by a predator in a fish tank, it is one thing. If you are Queen Elizabeth it is something else. And if you are a Member of Congress faced with making decisions which will affect not only your country but global civilizations as yet unborn, it is still another thing.

The point is that our energy crisis is both short term and long term. It is a continuum. We know we must find substantial new sources of energy to keep us going just for the balance of this century. We are also beginning to suspect that there is nothing now available to us which will serve our needs for clean energy during the next century or the one beyond that—except the sun.

In such context, is this not "immediate?"

The lifetime of our Nation is only 183 years—almost exactly the length of time that passed from the founding of Jamestown until the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia. Does that period seem long today? Not very. Let me shrink it a little more. The time of real need for solar power may well be only half a century or less away. This is about the same span of time as between the inauguration of George Washington as President and the death of Davy Crockett at the Alamo. That does not seem very long either.

Observed on this scale perhaps it is not so hard to see why, if we are to be assured of abundant energy in 2020 and beyond, we must get on with adequate and appropriate research as of now.

For the short-term crisis, the signs

are that we are waking up and moving—toward fossil fuel exploration, nuclear power development, chemical conversion research, geothermal experimentation, and the like. We have quite a way to go there, but we are started.

For the longer term crisis—toward significant solar power—we are basically still asleep.

NEEDS AND POSSIBILITIES

Projected figures on American and world energy needs are readily available and can be set forth in massive detail. Many of them are inconsistent. Some are frightening. All are revealing. None is reassuring.

It is not my purpose to document a case for energy research. That has been done many times over. But I do want to specify a few facts which seem particularly meaningful here.

One. Future energy needs.—One can find almost any kind of estimate on this matter except an estimate that trends downward. All are up. The most reliable, based on an averaging of more than 50 different forecasts, indicate that U.S. total energy needs will double in 25 years, and that electrical energy needs are doubling every 13 years which means an increase of over 400 percent before the year 2000. At the same time, our Committee on Science and Astronautics has testimony from the Interior Department which indicates the possibility of much higher energy demands depending on the accuracy of certain economic growth forecasts.

When we consider that the Nation is consuming electric energy close to its present peak capability right now, this is a sobering thing to contemplate.

Two. Energy research now underway.—Such research is presently underway in many fields including the fossil fuels, coal, oil, and gas; nuclear fuels involving processes of fission, fusion, and plasmas; hydraulic, geothermal, solar, wind, chemical, biological, and a number of other exotic types.

Reports our committee has issued show that about 4,400 energy research projects are now in the mill in the United States and probably about \$1 billion is going to support them. There are 1,162 projects on which we have detailed funding information, which shows about \$441 million supporting them.

This is commendable.

But let me point out that a large part of this research is devoted simply to locating new sources of fuel, such as oil, gas, and uranium, and developing new ways of getting at it.

In any case, only about 70 of the 4,400 research projects have any relation to solar energy, and they have available—so far as we can gage—considerably less than 1 percent of the total funds going into energy research. Moreover, much of the effort that is going into solar energy research—probably half or better—is not being devoted to terrestrial use, but for use in space.

Three. Supplies of energy.—Describing the world's supply of energy is very complex. It depends on many things. However, the engineers who have studied this problem tell us that "fossil fuel reserves are barely equivalent to twice the

cumulative demand for energy between 1960 and 2000." U.S. supplies are less than a fourth of the world total. They go on to say that even nuclear fuels, using present reactors, can provide a margin only a little more than twice the capacity of fossil fuels—but that breeder reactors could boost total nuclear capacity about 100 times—U.S. reserves of nuclear fuels are estimated at 10 percent of the world supply.

All such supplies are "depletable."

Sources categorized as "continuous" are solar radiation, wood fuel, farm waste, photosynthesis, hydropower, wind power, tidal, and geothermal. All of these combined, excluding solar radiation, are estimated to provide maximum annual energy amounting to about 1.5 percent of the total world supply of fossil fuel energy, about .6 percent of total nuclear energy available using present methods, and about .006 percent of total breeder-reactor energy.

Solar radiation energy falling annually on the world's land surface, however, is estimated at about 28 times the world's total supply of fossil fuel energy, about 9 times the total supply of conventional nuclear energy, and about 11 percent of the total supply of breeder-reactor energy.

Four. Outlook for various energy systems.—Again, it is difficult to describe the energy outlook in terms of utilization of the various kinds of fuels. This is mainly because new technologies may provide us with more efficient ways of recovering and using these fuels.

With present technology we have no practical way of recovering a very large part of the world's remaining supplies of oil, coal, and gas. And we are even hampered in using present methods in many cases due to public outcries against such methods as strip mining, offshore drilling, surface pipelines, jumbo tankers, and the like.

Present nuclear power methods seem to have made reasonable progress with their problem of thermal pollution but very little with long-term radioactive waste disposal. No one in this country has yet succeeded in producing a reliable commercial prototype of breeder-reactor; nor does anyone seem to have a practical solution to handling the small—in quantity—but exceedingly "hot"—radioactively—waste from such plants—a kind of waste which remains highly dangerous for thousands of years. With both types of reactors, there exist wide divergences of opinion with regard to fuel availability, hazards, and the economics of plant construction and operation.

With regard to power from nuclear fusion and plasmas, scientific feasibility has not been demonstrated, and we are lacking in our materials research, among other things. As yet we have no processes or materials to withstand the enormous temperatures and radiation levels which such methods demand.

DECISIONS TO BE MADE

By reciting these circumstances, I do not mean to be negative. I have great faith in our scientists and engineers, and I have no doubt that developing technology will help us find various options

to follow in alleviating the energy dilemma.

Nonetheless, in view of the foregoing evidence—and I believe that I have been reasonably conservative in my presentation of it—it seems to me that at least two firm conclusions are in order.

First. We must make a decision, probably during the 1970's, on what we want to do with some of the most valuable—but finite—resources on this planet. That is, coal, oil, natural gas, uranium and several other heavy elements.

Do we want to "burn" them? Use them all up for fuel?

Obviously we are going to be forced to do this for awhile. There is no alternative. But, as I have tried to point out earlier, a "while" is a relative thing which, if we are complacent, may quickly devour all the time we have left to develop options. Even assuming that we manage to evolve new adequate energy systems by then, what do we use in place of these precious materials which we have so inefficiently consumed?

It took billions of years for earth to make her fossil fuels material. We cannot manufacture more of it. Yet we have hundreds of needs for it other than energy. The bulk of the petrochemical industry, which is so vital to our well-being, will—for example—be lost. Such loss factors may be extended by orders of magnitude in other fields—for it is clear that important uses for these materials which are undreamed of today will exist tomorrow.

Meanwhile, at present rates of consumption, that priceless product—oil—which we first found in this country in Pennsylvania in 1825—will be gone worldwide by 2125 if not before. An interesting commentary on mankind, is it not? Particularly so in light of some of our efforts to eradicate the effects of burning oil—such as smog-control devices adapted to the internal combustion engine, which thus far, while achieving some progress toward that goal, have also succeeded in increasing auto gasoline consumption by about 20 percent when employed.

To me, the answer to the question of the indefinite use of fossil and nuclear materials for energy is clear. Let us look elsewhere.

Second. If we conclude that we must look elsewhere for major energy sources, where can we in turn expect to solar radiation?

I am not aware of another likely candidate—at least one with sufficient potential to provide very large amounts of undiminished power over large geographical areas for long periods of time.

Undoubtedly there will be, as there are now, many possible way and many technologies for transmitting, converting, storing and using solar energy. Each will be important in its contribution to the total energy panorama. But I am convinced that at least one key to the problem lies in some joint space-terrestrial method of generating electric power.

If this is correct, it is going to require a lot of research, development and demonstration beyond contemporary efforts.

NATURE OF PRESENT RESEARCH

So what are these efforts?

At present, those being undertaken privately are mainly concentrated in the short-term payoff area—exploration for sources, extraction techniques, nuclear engineering, coal gasification and the like. Research on solar energy is largely ignored.

What about the Federal effort?

Government-wide, budget requests for energy research for fiscal year 1973 come to about \$700 million—which is by no means hay but which is around 4 percent of the total Federal R. & D. budget. The amount earmarked for solar energy research is something like \$13 million, or less than 2 percent of the energy R. & D. budget. Almost all of this is funded by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the National Science Foundation.

Let me take the solar energy R. & D. budget a step further.

Only about \$4 or \$5 million of it is devoted to research which has terrestrial applications. The rest, including a small amount of Air Force money, is aimed toward applications in space—which I strongly support; it is vital to the total understanding of solar energy potential as well as our space-oriented missions. The point I am making is that our real government financial commitment to solar energy research for terrestrial purposes at present comes to about .0003—or 3/100ths of 1 percent—of our total Federal R. & D. budget.

To understate the case—this is not much of a commitment.

If the argument I have been making is at all valid, then something is wrong with our priorities.

Last June the President sent a special message to Congress on U.S. energy needs, which has helped create an encouraging environment for energy research. The Federal Council on Science and Technology has set up a Committee on Energy R. & D. Goals—which includes a Solar Energy Panel cochaired by officials from NASA and NSF. That Panel has 5 subpanels devoted to varying systems and about 40 expert consultants involved. An important function of the Panel is to investigate the large-scale use of terrestrial solar energy and recommend to the Energy Committee what research programs are needed. The report is due by July 1, 1972—though when it may be made generally available if at all, I do not know. Nor does anyone seem to know what happens to the Panel after that.

This is fine as far as it goes.

But it does not go very far and, unless somebody really pushes the throttle, it is going to be not merely too little but too late. Moreover, there seems to be no central point of responsibility for making the required effort.

In my view, we are going to need an effort comparable in spirit and commitment to the one we put into the space program in the 1960's in order to achieve our solar energy needs. Except this new effort is likely to be more difficult and complex than our space program has been up to now and will cover a longer period. It is not going to be easy.

Perhaps it will take a disaster or a real scare to produce the effort, but when that effort comes it will have to be focused, integrated, intense, and continuing.

Nothing else will suffice.

I know there are many who think the whole concept of solar energy is too "far out" and, by current engineering standards, too inefficient. But I would remind my colleagues that today we depend for our existence on many technologies which were completely unknown 25 years ago.

I am sure it is going to cost us more, but this should not be a deterrent. I believe we must accept the fact that in the future our utilities—among the most crucial commodities in our entire scheme of living—are likely to cost what they are worth. For 100 years we in this country have been taking them for granted and paying almost nothing for them. Meditate on that. We think nothing of paying \$5 or \$6 for a bottle of gin or \$2.50 for a lipstick or \$1.25 for a can of deodorant spray, yet we gripe if our water bill goes up to 50 cents for 1,000 gallons. Try doing without water for a while—or heat or electricity—and then decide what is it worth.

This is what we are going to have to do.

UNIQUE ROLE OF SCIENCE COMMITTEE

Mr. Speaker, I bring this matter to the attention of the Congress because, as chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, I believe I have a special and unique responsibility to do so.

Many congressional committees have a strong and deep involvement with energy matters. However, our committee has a particular duty in the oversight of energy research and, whether by chance or otherwise, it turns out that the three executive agencies which fall under our jurisdiction appear to be the best qualified to take the lead in supporting serious R. & D. on solar energy. These three are the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the National Science Foundation—which, as I have already mentioned, jointly manage the activities of the Federal Council's panel on solar energy—and the National Bureau of Standards. To give added potential to this triumvirate, it should be noted that NSF and the Bureau share between them responsibility for the Administration's new "technological innovations" program.

That program is expected to be funded in fiscal 1973 at about \$40 million. I do not know how it will be used, nor is it my job to dictate that use. But, assuredly, it is my hope that serious consideration will be given to providing some additional solar energy R. & D. support through these programs.

Furthermore, I deem it most appropriate to point out that, in addition to its immediate programs on solar energy research, NASA's space shuttle system could have incalculable value for ultimate solar energy use. This system may well be the only one which could assemble and maintain solar energy stations capable of employing microwave transmission to earth to overcome weather interference. I hope that those critics who have long downgraded the U.S.

manned-space-flight programs will give this some unbiased thought.

There is a fourth organization which also has a particular contribution to make to our committee regarding the solar energy endeavor. This is the Congressional Research Service (CRS) of the Library of Congress. Late last year, at the instance of Representative JOHN DAVIS of Georgia, chairman of our Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, the Science Policy Research Division of CRS began an extensive review of the materials research and materials needs of the United States. Their study is extensive and will take time—but it is critical, I believe, to the success of many of our research ventures, including solar energy research.

Many of our scientific and technological research personnel are aware of this fact. A number of government and non-government councils with the task of promoting materials research already exist. They are operating on the premise that some of the most urgent public needs facing the Nation demand new technologies which can be developed only with the advent of materials possessing properties not yet known to man.

CONTACT WITH EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

Mr. Speaker, my interest in solar energy research—and that of our committee as a whole—has stemmed in considerable part from the excellent work done over the past 9 months by our Energy Research Task Group.

This group, headed by Representative MIKE MCCORMACK of Washington, as a special unit of Representative DAVIS' subcommittee, has been given special briefings almost weekly. Each meeting has been held in a frank and informal manner with experts from all appropriate energy R. & D. fields—following extensive planning and consultation with the Congressional Research Service. The briefings culminated this month in 2 weeks of what I consider to be highly sophisticated hearings by the Davis subcommittee on our national energy research prognosis.

My comments today have been sparked by that work.

Also, as a result, I have recently been in direct contact with the heads of each of the agencies here identified as important contributors to solar energy R. & D.: Dr. James Fletcher of NASA, Dr. Guy Stever of NSF, Dr. Lawrence Kushner of NBS, and Dr. Lester Jayson of CRS.

Each has agreed to participate with the Committee on Science and Astronautics in considering the formulation of multidisciplinary, integrated programs of solar energy research. Toward this end we will begin exploratory meetings between appropriate personnel of the several agencies and of the committee within a few weeks.

In addition, it is my plan to request that each of the specified agencies report to the committee within 4 months on—

The particular contributions, existing and potential, which the agency involved is capable of giving to solar agency R. & D.;

The level of effort which the agency feels is best suited to it under present conditions;

The level of effort which is possible under accelerated conditions;

The level of commitment which the agency is willing to recommend to the administration over the next decade, insofar as this is feasible;

The identification and relative capabilities of other Government and non-Government organizations or institutions in solar energy research.

NEW TASK FORCE AND POLICY FORMATION

What do we expect from this beginning?

Eventually, of course, we hope for the creation of an effective program of solar energy research. I use the term "effective" here as synonymous with "successful."

As for immediate expectations, we are looking for three things:

First, The formation of what is perhaps the first task force of its kind—a joint Executive-Legislative-Industry task force which will cross not only the boundaries of executive departments but boundaries of the main branches of Government as well.

If executive agencies or legislative offices or committees other than those I have discussed wish to take part, they will be welcomed. In addition, expert representatives from industry should obviously be included if they are willing.

The chief mission of such an integrated task force will be to provide the mechanism for assuring a consistent, coherent and intensive assault on the enormous research problems inherent in the production and use of solar energy. If any of those three characteristics fails, the effort will fail.

Second, The promulgation of a statement of solar energy policy (perhaps involving energy generally). Hopefully, such a statement can be put in the form of a joint resolution and eventually given the force of public law. In my view, this will be especially important during those interim periods when we have made progress with the more conventional modes of energy and things begin to relax—for the moment. It is human nature then to say "why bother—why keep up the fuss over this solar bit?"

At such times, a national policy faithfully pursued may keep us from succumbing to that deceiving, and possibly fatal, technological lullaby.

Third, The concentration of attention on the possibilities of solar energy—and the ultimate essential requirements for it—on an international basis. No part of the energy dilemma is the peculiar province of the United States. While we may be the first and the most seriously affected by energy shortages, the problem itself is global. We are all in this thing together, and very likely solutions will have to come from many quarters, domestic and foreign.

One thing is apparent to me. If we do not get on with this job, such matters as the war in Vietnam, unemployment, crime, overcrowding, trade balances, education and all the other things which preoccupy so many nations today—will not make much difference. If the energy crisis becomes an energy catastrophe, we will find out, rather painfully, how relatively insignificant these contemporary issues have been.

THE THADDEUS KOSCIUSZKO HOME, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home in Philadelphia, Pa., as a national historic site.

The little house at 301 Pine Street, Philadelphia is the only structure remaining in the United States that has been identified as having been the home of Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko, patriot, engineer, soldier and statesman.

Thaddeus Andrzej Bonawentura Kosciuszko arrived in America in August of 1776 when the struggle for freedom of the Colonies was at its lowest ebb. A little more than a year later, the fruits of his engineering and soldiering skills were to be a major factor in the American victory at Saratoga. He planned the fortifications protecting the city of Philadelphia along the Delaware River. His fortifications on the Hudson River at West Point, N.Y., are now the site of the U.S. Military Academy.

Following his unsuccessful fight for Polish freedom and exile, General Kosciuszko took up lodging at the Pine Street house on November 29, 1797. Thomas Jefferson, then the Vice President of the young United States, often visited Kosciuszko at the home and there asked him to travel to France as this country's emissary for peace. It was during his residence at the Pine Street house that Kosciuszko prepared his last will and testament, directing that his worldly fortune be used to free the enslaved.

The house where General Kosciuszko lived in 1797-98 would be a significant addition to our National Parks System and a fitting memorial to one of our great heroes.

The text of my bill is as follows:

H.R. 15250

A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to preserve and interpret for the benefit of present and future generations the home of Thaddeus Kosciuszko in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase or exchange the property and improvements thereon in the city of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, generally described as 301 Pine Street, together with such other lands and interests therein which he deems necessary for the establishment and administration of a national historic site: *Provided,* That lands or interests in lands owned by such State or city may be acquired by donation only.

SEC. 2. The Secretary shall establish the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site by publication of a notice to that effect in the Federal Register at such time as he deems sufficient lands and interests in lands have been acquired for administration in accordance with the purpose of this Act.

SEC. 3. Pending establishment and thereafter, the Secretary shall administer lands and interests in lands acquired pursuant to this Act in accordance with the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1, 2-4), as amended and supplemented, and the Act

of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 416-467), as amended.

Sec. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

REVOLT IN LITHUANIA

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent years the more vociferous complaints of other racial groups concerning the policy of the Soviet Union toward its minorities has obscured the regrettable situation of the inhabitants of the Baltic States whose countries were forcefully incorporated in the U.S.S.R. by Stalin in 1940.

Occasionally there are brief indications of the dissatisfaction that exists in these areas as a result of the Soviet policy of Russification.

A recent drawing aside of the curtain with the attempted defection and forcible repatriation of the Lithuanian seaman Simas Kudirka a few miles off the coast of Martha's Vineyard a year and a half ago. In his subsequent trial, a transcript of which I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Kudirka graphically described the conditions which he sought to flee in his home country.

Now another tragic incident has dramatically proclaimed to the world the discrimination and deprivation of human rights suffered by the people of Lithuania. On May 21 in Kaunas a young man, Roman Talanta, burned himself to death as a protest against the domination of this proud country with its long record of cultural identity and individual development.

Following the immolation, there was an outburst of rioting which spread to such an extent that units of tough, heavily armed internal security forces were sent to Kaunas by the Russians.

Several weeks ago 17,000 Lithuanian Catholics sent a petition to the United Nations to complain that Soviet leaders interfered with freedom of worship in their country.

The sudden eruption of the dissatisfaction that lies beneath the surface gives one pause and since it comes at a time when the Soviets are publicly trying to put their best foot forward indicates deep-seated dissatisfaction.

It also indicates clearly the direction in which the Russian regime could move if it wished sincerely to implement the rights of the peoples incorporated within its boundaries. The United Nations in its basic documents sets forth a Declaration of Human Rights which describes the fundamental privileges which are due to every individual from a state in which he lives. These include the rights of assembly, of free elections and of freedom of worship. Most importantly, they include the right to move freely over the borders for emigration or temporary visiting.

In a meeting recently with Soviet leaders in the Kremlin itself I urged the desirability of making the rights described in the Declaration available to the people of Lithuania and I urge the same course today. If the rulers of the U.S.S.R. had the courage to carry out such re-

forms there would be no need for self-immolation to demonstrate the plight of a country and there would be no need of mass demonstrations to proclaim the frustrations of a people restrained against their will.

CHAPTER I: NEW YORK STATE NARCOTIC PAROLE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, recently I met with a group of dedicated civil servants in New York City. They are narcotic parole officers. Their responsibilities under the New York State mental hygiene law are to work with individuals who have been or are heroin addicts and who have come into rehabilitation programs as a result of being released from a New York State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission facility. They are required to investigate the working environment of the rehabilitant, keep contact with him and evaluate his religious, group, and individual relationships, make frequent unscheduled visits to the rehabilitants at their work places and general community environment, and apprehend or assist in the apprehension and return of rehabilitants who violate the conditions of their after-care status.

These men and women bearing the title of narcotic parole officer are in great physical danger many times because they are unarmed and yet have the role of peace officers, without the protection that a peace officer has under the law. They recounted to me various episodes which make up the daily life of these dedicated young people and which the public knows nothing about.

They are seeking a change in their legal status which would permit them to carry weapons in the same way that any other peace officers would be permitted to do, in line with his or her official duty. I am convinced that there is merit to their request and further believe that they have not received sufficient public commendation for their activities.

No one yet has come up with the answer to the question of how to successfully deal with narcotic addiction. And there is no program I know of that one could call overwhelmingly successful in terms of cure, if by that term we mean the rejection by a heroin drug addict of narcotic addiction for a sufficiently prolonged period of time, outside of a therapeutic community, so as to reasonably conclude he or she is in fact no longer drug addicted. But one program that certainly requires support until better ones come along is this one and it is shameful that the State of New York has reduced its scope. The assistance the narcotic parole officers give in individual cases can make the difference between life and death, and whether a rehabilitant engages in activities of a criminal or civic nature.

I would like at this time to place in the RECORD a more detailed description of the program and individual experiences of some of the NPO's with whom I met:

DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM

PREFACE

The Narcotic Parole Officers Association is a professional organization which serves as a forum among Narcotic Parole Officers serving at different facilities of the New York Narcotic Addiction Control Commission.

It seeks to represent the concerns of the Narcotic Parole Officers for increasingly effective treatment methods for the subjects certified to the NACC. It also seeks to encourage growth in professional skills of its membership.

While the Association attempts to keep dialogue with the administration of the NACC, it is not a union and contracts with the State of New York are negotiated by the Civil Service Employee Association.

OVERVIEW

Introduction

The New York State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission was established on April 1, 1967 because—

(1) It was realized that the problem of addiction is at the heart of the crime problem in New York State. Narcotic addicts are responsible for more than one half of the crimes committed in New York City alone.

(2) Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller, in his special message to the legislature on February 23, 1966, said that "the objective of the program is to eliminate this major cause of crime by preventing those who have not resorted to crime from doing so and those engaged in crime from repeating these acts, and to eradicate the fear and anxiety created by this problem."

Since it was recognized that most addicts avoid consistent treatment, it was necessary to establish procedures under the Mental Hygiene Law to legally commit subjects to the care and custody of the NACC for periods of three or four years.

The Narcotic Parole Officers Association is in agreement with the general principles upon which the NACC was established. But certain inconsistencies in implementation, omissions, and inadequacies in program and administration have prevented this agency from realizing its goals, and have not provided an opportunity for a fair test of what this program can and should accomplish.

The first problem area is that of enforcement. The NACC is an agency, charged with the responsibility of controlling and treating unwilling and unmotivated rehabilitants with both problems of narcotic addiction and criminal behavior.

These rehabilitants have escaped from residential treatment centers, and they have brought weapons and contraband into the community based parole and treatment centers. They have lost respect for the authority of the Commission and as a result, they refuse to make reports for examinations and counseling. They refuse to participate in the numerous services established in the day care centers. They choose to revert to drug addiction and criminal style life largely because they know that their chances of being apprehended are minute.

The public should be aware of the shocking fact that over 40 percent of all persons certified to the NACC are currently absconders from its control and treatment.

The public should consider the high cost in community losses in theft and injury that result from these rehabilitants being out of the Commission's control.

Significantly, at no time has the NACC had more than 16 warrant officers who are armed and trained to make apprehensions. That is 16 men to try to apprehend over 7,000 rehabilitants in abscondence.

The administration of the NACC has refused to designate and determine that their 235 narcotic parole officers are peace officers, as are their counterparts in the Division of Parole.

This means that the narcotic parole of-

ficer is told by NACC to apprehend absconders at his own risk.

The public should imagine how the narcotic parole officers and the rehabilitants see the administrative inconsistency, symbolized by the NACC issuing handcuffs to narcotic parole officers, to keep apprehended persons in custody, and then leaving all other questions and instruments of authority and security in doubt.

The public should know also that with these questions and concerns, the narcotic parole officer still apprehends readicted and dangerous rehabilitants in the facilities and in the neighborhoods and homes where the rehabilitants live.

The public should know, finally, that local police officers question the judgment of narcotic parole officers who go unarmed, unprotected into neighborhoods to apprehend rehabilitants which the police themselves do not like to apprehend.

Once the public comprehends the situation of enforcement, it will be clear that the NACC has been inconsistent in performing its basic responsibility of controlling and treating the unwilling and unmotivated addicts who have been certified to the care and custody of the NACC by the courts.

The second problem area is that of program administration. Again, the general design and intent of the NACC is worthy of a true application. Still there remains a number of strategically weak points in the application of the program.

Certification has often been used as a means of avoiding more appropriate criminal sentencing of the arrested addict. Rehabilitants are indiscriminately grouped in rehabilitation centers, mixing youths with hardened criminals, although the facilities were designed at some cost to allow segregation of types.

There are inadequate evaluations made of the rehabilitant's character and background, thereby not permitting appropriate programs to be developed for his treatment.

There is insufficient liaison between residential centers and parole centers in the communities.

There should be emphasis in working with the entire family constellation which would also require the use of more small satellite offices in addition to the limited number of full service centers now in operation.

There should be more effort expended to develop employment resources since private employers are unwilling to hire rehabilitants. Once a rehabilitant has proven his ability in a government funded job, private employers are more willing to hire him.

Halfway House programs should be designed to service rehabilitants whose cases warrant structured shelter. Day care and vocational training could be improved by focusing on skills more relevant to what will be needed by the rehabilitant in the community.

Greater use of the rehabilitated addict could be made in the areas of community research and clerical assistance to the officers.

Programs for inservice training for staff have generally been failures because they are orientated toward the needs of the NACC as a bureaucracy rather than the needs of the rehabilitant and the community.

A close examination of the NACC program application would reveal that the omission of certain program components is the result of an administration that is highly political in its composition and self-serving in too many of its operations.

The administrative structure of NACC was apparently designed to permit flexibility of treatment modalities and varied responses to neighborhood communities. The idea is good, but has failed to bring the desired results. Instead, the decentralized design has been used by inadequate administrators to compete among themselves because of the manner of funding.

Program priorities have not only varied among facilities, but are subject to sudden change within a single facility.

Different facilities have their own standards of rehabilitant performance, reasons for parole violation, access to certain services, such as job placement and admission to the halfway houses. All of these differences are reflected in the fact that after 5 years of operation, each facility is still producing its own mimeographed forms for most of the basic recording and servicing.

The net result of the administrative inadequacies has been to keep NACC facilities almost as chaotic as the communities and families from which the rehabilitants come. Rather than providing a structured and secure setting in which a rehabilitant may develop new behavior and insights, the NACC facilities continue the same confusion and gaming which originally contributed to the rehabilitant's need for narcotic drugs.

In closing, it should be noted that the administration of the NACC has been making sporadic efforts to correct some of the problems which have been stated above. The Narcotic Parole Officers Association feels that public awareness of the problems will greatly encourage the administration to increase its efforts to solve the problems. It is also felt that representatives of the Narcotic Parole Officers Association should be included in the discussions of the administration as it considers the problems.

INCIDENTS OBSERVED

Pursuant to questions raised about problems encountered by the Narcotic Parole Officers, in administering NACC policy, the following are actual incidents which took place within the past four months. These incidents have not been selected because they are shocking or outstanding, but because they are typical.

I. On March 16, 1972, a rehabilitant was to be returned by his Narcotic Parole Officer to the Edgecombe Returnee Unit, pending his transfer to Ridge Hill Rehabilitation Center. As is the practice, the Narcotic Correction Officer staff was alerted to the course of action to be followed.

When the Narcotic Correction Officer approached the rehabilitant, he attempted to strike him with a chair. Six officers were requested to subdue the rehabilitant and take him to the admission area. The rehabilitant swore that he would "get" his parole officer.

The rehabilitant had been a civil commitment to the NACC under Section 206 of Article 9 of the Mental Hygiene Law.

II. On —, a rehabilitant was being returned to the Edgecombe Returnee Unit by his Methadone Provision Parole Officer. Upon learning that he was to be returned, the rehabilitant attempted to leave the office, only to find his way blocked by the Narcotic Parole Officer.

When additional officers were summoned by the Narcotic Parole Officer, the rehabilitant pulled a .25 caliber automatic pistol from his pocket. The gun was later found to be loaded. The rehabilitant pointed the gun at his Narcotic Parole Officer and said, "If I have to . . ."

The officer reacted instinctively and knocked the rehabilitant's gun hand away and grappled with him. Arriving officers helped subdue the rehabilitant and the police were called.

The gun and the rehabilitant were placed in police custody.

III. On February 28, 1972, a rehabilitant who had apparently made a satisfactory adjustment to aftercare was in possession of a loaded gun. The circumstances leading to rehabilitants' confrontation are too frequently seen by staff members.

On the above date, the rehabilitant's mother came into the office of the Narcotic Parole Officer to inform him that her son had stolen and sold her entire kitchen set, consisting of a table and chairs, plus her dinnerware and blender; and, in addition,

had taken her sewing machine, portable tape recorder, and some perfume.

The officer returned with the parent to her home to evaluate the situation. The rehabilitant was not at home and the house was a shambles.

On his way back to the office, to pick up some additional information, the officer saw the rehabilitant in question proceeding through a nearby park. Apparently, on the way his mother's house.

The parole officer called to the rehabilitant, and after some discussion, the rehabilitant agreed to enter the facility with his parole officer.

When the rehabilitant was directed to empty his pockets, he began to do so. However, he aroused the officer's suspicion by omitting certain of his pockets. The officer told the rehabilitant to put his hands on the wall, which is the recommended position to conduct a search. The officer found a loaded gun in one of the rehabilitant's back pockets.

This rehabilitant was a civil commitment, certified to the Commission under Section 206 of Article 9 of the Mental Hygiene Law.

IV. On December 6, 1971, one of the officers received a call from a rehabilitant's wife, who said her husband was "strung-out", and was becoming assaultive.

This rehabilitant is 6'5" tall and weighs 240 lbs. He was committed to the Commission for 5 years on an assault charge. In addition, the rehabilitant had violated his parole, while on State Parole, and has a police record of assaults on police officers, as well as armed robbery.

The officer told the rehabilitant's wife that a warrant would be issued, and that the local police would be notified that the rehabilitant could be found at home.

The rehabilitant was arrested two months later, following his robbery of a man at knife point.

V. On January 27, 1972, a Narcotic Parole Officer, during a field visit, to a rehabilitant's home was confronted by a rehabilitant who was "high" and in possession of a quantity of pills, later found to be Doriden. Doriden is a substitute for Methadone. The rehabilitant should have been taken into custody immediately, but was not because the Narcotic Parole Officer did not possess the tools to effect custody; nor had he been officially informed as to the proper procedure to follow in such a situation.

Each officer, if he has been with the Commission more than a couple of weeks, has heard of or dealt directly with rehabilitants who have "ripped off" their own families. In many cases, the only time a parent or friend contacts the staff concerning any problems with the rehabilitant is when she or he is "ripped off" by the rehabilitant.

In addition, our officers are hesitant, and justly so, to try and take someone into custody if there is a chance the officer's health or safety may be put in jeopardy.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INWOOD LODGE AND CHAPTER OF THE B'NAI B'RITH

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 25th anniversary of the Inwood Lodge and Chapter of the B'nai B'rith. Located in my congressional district in New York City, the Inwood Lodge and Chapter has provided many valuable services for the residents of the Inwood area, and has served as a vehicle for strengthening Jewish group identification as well as a means of personal fulfillment. It has helped to foster a real sense of community among those who have had the opportunity to participate in the

many community-oriented programs it operates.

It is to the lodge and chapter's credit that its appeal has been successfully directed to people of all ages. The wide variety of services offered range from youth-oriented programs to adult education courses.

Founded in 1843 in New York City, the B'nai B'rith is a constantly growing organization, and today, it numbers over 550,000 members. Its lodges for men and chapters for women, as well as its various coeducational branches, function throughout the United States, Canada, and in over 40 countries of the free world. The B'nai B'rith has shown an ability to adapt to new needs, for it has recently lowered the admission age to 18 and is currently conducting an intensive youth services appeal.

The B'nai B'rith has always been guided by the words, "Let Thoughts Become Deeds." This is a recognition of the fact that the rhetoric of good intentions accomplishes nothing and that words must be translated into concrete action if people are to be helped. The Inwood Lodge and Chapter has truly lived up to these words, and I am confident that the lodge and chapter will continue its dedicated service to the Inwood community in the years ahead.

I was pleased to join with the Inwood Lodge and Chapter in celebrating its silver anniversary, and I would like to take this opportunity to commend it once again on the fine work it has done thus far, and to wish all of its members success in their future endeavors.

Both the Inwood Lodge and Chapter have been fortunate to have had dedicated and concerned men and women serve as president, men and women who were willing to devote a great deal of time and effort to the many activities sponsored by the lodge and chapter. I want to congratulate Sam Silverstein, the president of lodge No. 1717, and Gertrude Edelstein, president of chapter No. 690, as well as all of the officers and trustees of Inwood Lodge and Chapter, and I would like to include a complete list of the newly elected officers and trustees of both the lodge and chapter:

OFFICERS—1972-1973

LODGE NO. 1717

President, Sam Silverstein.
Vice President, Louis Cowan.
Vice President, Aaron Greenfeld.
Vice President, Werner Simon.
Treasurer, Ernest Horwitz.
Financial Secretary, Gunther Ehrlich.
Recording Secretary, Herbert Edelstein.
Corresponding Secretary, Ben Gordon.
Guardian, Henry Pershep.
Warden, Hans Munter.
Chaplain, Arnold Herzog.
Delegate to Met. Council, Des Gabor.
Delegate to Met. Council, Ernest Horwitz.
Alternate to Met. Council, Herbert Edelstein.
Alternate to Met. Council, Jason Rosenberger.

Trustees

Three years, Des Gabor, Jason Rosenberger, Hans Munter.
Two years, Edward Lehner (to fill vacancy).
Additionally, the following Trustees will be carryovers:
Two years, Ray M. Fried, Fred Grohslicht.
One year, Carl Dorfman, Martin Harth, Paul Ron.

CHAPTER NO. 690

President, Gertrude Edelstein.
1st Vice-President, Elsie Wachsmann.
2nd Vice-President, Rochelle Harth.
3rd Vice-President, Helen Horwitz.
Financial Secretary, Hazel Greenberg.
Corresponding Secretary, Ruth Wolf.
Recording Secretary, Edith Rosenberg.
Social Secretary, Hilla Simon.
Treasurer, Ruth Palmer Cowan.
Delegates to Met. Council, Ida Offenberger, Anny Lerman.
Alternates to Met. Council, Bea Sosnovy, Ruth Silverstein.

Members at large

Three years, Sophie Miller.
Two years, Tess Mandel.
One year, Clara Smith.
Counselor, Hannah Gordon.

I know that these fine men and women will serve ably in their respective positions.

The 13 men who have served as President of the Inwood Lodge are justifiably proud of their organization's accomplishments, and I would like to include in the RECORD some of their comments on this memorable occasion:

Henry D. Igar (Pres. 1947-49):

"I do often think of my activities in Inwood. They were good years—and I never so well participated in things Jewish—as well as civic—after I moved away."

Benjamin B. Scherman (Pres. 1949-51):

"Time has proven that B'nai B'rith in the community is a potent force and influence for unity of purpose and accomplishment."

Abraham Kadanoff (Pres. 1954-56):

"My chief interest has been to involve us in community affairs . . . We heard speakers of note and made liaison with important groups and residents in the community."

Theodore L. Crohn (Pres. 1957-59):

"I expect to be in Israel in May and we cannot accept the invitation to join your celebration. But our thoughts certainly will be with you, and please tell our good friends in Inwood that we wish them well."

Rudolph Wachsmann (Pres. 1959-61):

"When an organization lives to celebrate twenty-five years of fruitful existence, it is time for joyous celebration as well as examination and assessment."

David E. Miller (Pres. 1961-63):

"Despite the fact that the blue print for landing a man on the moon (exists), we still did not learn how to walk on this earth like human beings."

Abraham Gersh (Pres. 1963-64):

"As president, I particularly sought to increase participation by the Lodge and Chapter in Jewish activities and community work."

Rudy Schwartz (Pres. 1964-66):

"Although I am now serving as President of another Lodge in Ithaca, I find that the love and devotion I feel for Inwood Lodge can never be replaced by any other group. This will always remain special to me and my family."

Morris Kaplan (Pres. 1966-67):

"As much as any single aspect, the close camaraderie maintained by the Executive Committee will always be remembered . . . It is safe to say that all the board members were guiding lights, each in his own way."

Dennis Wolf (Pres. 1967-68):

"This was a year of exciting events, a year of a number of 'Firsts', and a year of transition."

Martin Lindenberg (Pres. 1968-69):

"The memorial services (arranged by the Lodge) for Sen. Kennedy and Dr. King still bring a lump to my throat."

Arnold Herzog (Pres. 1970-72):

"If you believe that your cause is just, continue to fight, in spite of the majority."

Sam Silverstein (Pres. 1972-?):

"Instead of paying lip service to the problems surrounding us and waiting for others

to do the job, the only way we can fulfill our mission as Sons of the Covenant is through personal involvement."

G. DUNCAN BAUMAN RECEIVES DISTINGUISHED AWARD

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include pertinent material.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a fellow Missourian and good friend, G. Duncan "Dunc" Bauman, publisher of the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, was the recent recipient of a distinguished civilian award from Hon. Robert F. Froehke, Secretary of the Army. The choice was an excellent one, for "Dunc's" love of country and heartfelt desire that this Nation maintain a strong national defense is a well-documented fact.

The following article is offered for the interest and enlightenment of all:

PUBLISHER GETS AWARD FOR CIVILIAN SERVICE TO ARMY

(By Thomas Amberg)

G. Duncan Bauman, publisher of The Globe-Democrat, was honored Saturday with a special award for "distinguished civilian service to the Department of the Army" by Robert F. Froehke, secretary of the Army.

The award presentation, which came as a surprise to Bauman, was made in Froehke's behalf by Maj. Gen. Wesley C. Franklin, deputy commanding general for Reserve forces (southern area) of the 5th U.S. Army, at ceremonies outside Soldiers Memorial.

The special award came during a ceremony honoring 65 members of the Missouri Army National Guard, the Army Reserve, the Missouri Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve.

The men received Globe-Democrat Outstanding Achievement Awards for character, leadership ability, judgment and common sense, loyalty, attitude, enthusiasm and performance.

In honoring Bauman, Franklin called the publisher, "a truly distinguished and patriotic American" and praised him for his "continued commitment to the national defense."

The citation accompanying a special ribbon and medal said in part:

"As publisher of The St. Louis Globe-Democrat and responsible for its editorial policy, Mr. Bauman has used the voice of that newspaper to continually promote and support the United States Army, the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard in all their critically important needs, goals and missions to insure a strong and adequate national defense."

Telegrams from Vice President Spiro T. Agnew, Gov. Warren E. Hearnes and Mayor Alfonso J. Cervantes praising Bauman were read at the ceremonies.

The award presentations to the reservists, National Guardsmen and Bauman were preceded by a parade from the Old Courthouse to the Soldiers Memorial, where displays of Army and Air National Guard equipment were viewed by the public.

In his opening remarks to the citizen-soldiers, Bauman said:

"We're buffeted on every side by the discordant cries of an irresponsible minority who somehow feel they should have special privileges and rights, but no responsibilities."

However, Bauman said, "the group gathered here today provides both proof of this nation's stature and a reassuring contrast to that vocal minority."

"It's encouraging to see a physical and emotional reminder that most Americans still feel that democracy, not anarchy, is the viable political system which will carry our republic

through this decade and the decades to come."

The citizen-soldiers "symbolize the feelings of the majority of Americans who believe that we're part of the team in the world's best ballpark," the publisher said.

Major Gen. J. Milnor Roberts, chief of the Army Reserves, praised the citizen-soldiers' role in maintaining national defense and said the Army is "placing unprecedented reliance upon these individuals."

He said 45 per cent of the total Army manpower is in reserve components which add increased readiness for defense.

During the award ceremonies, members of the Old Guard Fife and Drum Corps of the 3rd Army's 3rd Infantry Division in Washington played marches and gave a demonstration of Continental Army drills.

The group, which came from Washington for the ceremony, was dressed in Revolutionary War costumes and played tunes of that war.

Also playing at the ceremonies was the Spirit of St. Louis Drum and Bugle Corps, an award-winning, all-black marching unit.

Immediately after the award presentations, a squadron of five Air National Guard attack helicopters followed by four Phantom jets flew over.

A luncheon for recipients of the Outstanding Achievement Awards was held at the Sheraton-Jefferson Hotel.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MOSS, for the period 4 p.m. June 1 through June 6, 1972, on account of official business.

Mr. KYROS (at the request of Mr. TEAGUE of Texas), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. CORMAN, for May 31, 1972, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POWELL), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ESCH, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. QUIE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SAYLOR, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LINK) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ASPIN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of California, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. BIAGGI, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. DOWNING, for 30 minutes, June 1.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MAHON in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POWELL) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. ERLBORN.

Mr. STEELE.

Mr. ROBISON of New York.

Mr. KEATING.

Mr. HALPERN in three instances.

Mr. CEDERBERG.

Mr. DELLENBACK.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. McCLORY in two instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. O'KONSKI in two instances.

Mr. PRICE of Texas.

Mr. BURKE of Florida.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida in five instances.

Mr. BRAY in two instances.

Mr. PETTIS.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LINK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia in five instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. HAGAN in three instances.

Mr. ROGERS in three instances.

Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI.

Mr. HARRINGTON.

Mr. EDMONDSON in three instances.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. BEGICH in three instances.

Mr. MOORHEAD in five instances.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. GARMATZ in two instances.

Mr. WALDIE in five instances.

Mr. PICKLE.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3463. An act to amend section 906 of title 44, United States Code, to provide copies of the daily and semimonthly Congressional Record to libraries of certain United States courts; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate hearings entitled "Amphetamine Legislation 1971"; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1915. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States;

H.R. 5199. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma and the Miami Indians of Indiana in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 255 and 124-C, dockets Nos. 256, 124-D, E, and F, and dockets Nos. 131 and 253, and of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma in docket No. 251-A, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8116. An act to consent to the Kansas-Nebraska Big Blue River Compact;

H.R. 13361. An act to amend section 316(c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LINK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 1, 1972, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2042. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the semiannual consolidated report of balances of foreign currencies acquired without payment of dollars, as of December 31, 1971, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2363; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2043. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to transfer to the Secretary of Commerce certain functions of the Secretary of the Interior relating to encouraging, promoting, and developing travel within the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2044. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the supplement to the 1972 National Highway Needs Report, covering the designation and cost of construction of the Federal-aid urban system, pursuant to section 1219(d) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970 (H. Doc. No. 92-266, Part 3); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2045. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of the audit of payments from the special bank account to the Lockheed Corp. for the C-5 aircraft program, covering the quarter ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to Public Laws 91-441 and 92-156; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 13169. A bill to amend existing statutes to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to issue cotton crop reports simultaneously with the general crop reports; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-1099). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 14163. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1970, as amended, to indemnify farmers and ranchers whose domestic animals are killed by predatory animals; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-1100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 14423. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to enhance the ability of the Rural Telephone Bank to obtain funds for the supplementary financing program on favorable terms and conditions; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-1101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 9501. A bill to amend the North Pacific Fisheries Act of 1954, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 92-1102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1007. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 14990. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-1103). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 965. Resolution authorizing the Speaker to appoint delegates and alternates to attend the International Labor Organization Conference in Geneva (Rept. No. 92-1104). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MATSUNAGA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 985. Resolution authorizing additional investigative authority to the Committee on Public Works; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-1105). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NATCHER: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 15259. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-1106). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPIN:

H.R. 15227. A bill to provide for a comprehensive study and investigation of alternative routes for the construction of a Trans-Alaska pipeline; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CAREY of New York:

H.R. 15228. A bill to permit officers and employees of the Federal Government to elect coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.R. 15229. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to correct certain inequities in the crediting of National Guard technician service in connection with civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLS of Arkansas:

H.R. 15230. A bill to insure congressional review of tax preferences, and other items which narrow the income tax base, by providing now for the termination over a 3-year period of existing provisions of these types; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DRINAN:

H.R. 15231. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to improve the coverage of farmworkers by requiring farm employers with substantial payrolls to report all cash wages paid to their farm employees without regard to the existing minimum requirements for coverage (and by providing that the leaders of farm labor crews will be considered the employers of the members of such crews only if they would be so considered under the usual common law test); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 15232. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that any individual age 55 or over shall be considered disabled for purposes of entitlement to disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze if he meets the more liberal definition of "disability" presently applicable to blind individuals at that age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 15233. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual who is under a disability and is otherwise qualified may become entitled to full widow's or widower's insurance bene-

fits without regard to age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 15234. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for payment of full wife's and husband's insurance benefits without regard to age in cases of disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 15235. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual's marriage before attaining age 22 shall not prevent him or her from being entitled to child's insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 15236. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from 18 to 22 in all cases the age until which child's insurance benefits are payable (in the absence of disability) by eliminating the present requirement that a nondisabled individual be a full-time student in order to qualify for such benefits after attaining age 18; and to provide that entitlement to child's insurance benefits after age 22 may be based on a disability which began at any time before attaining such age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 15237. A bill to amend chapter 2 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the social security taxes imposed on self-employed individuals to the level of the taxes imposed on employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 15238. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase from 60 to 120 the number of "lifetime reserve" days for which inpatient hospital benefits may be paid under the medicare program, to reduce the coinsurance payment required of the beneficiary with respect to those days, and to provide a similar 60-day lifetime reserve for posthospital extended-care benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 15239. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the computation of the benefits payable to a married couple (or to the surviving widow or widower) to be made on the basis of their combined earnings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 15240. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the present ceiling (the so-called family maximum) on the total amount of benefits which may be paid on an individual's wage record; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 15241. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORSYTHE:

H.R. 15242. A bill to extend benefits under section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALIFIANAKIS:

H.R. 15243. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make grants for research to develop techniques of and information on the growing, harvesting, and processing of tobacco to assist tobacco producers in protecting the health of tobacco users; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 15244. A bill to eliminate the monetary limit on the amount which may be paid administratively by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration or the Department of Defense for claims for loss caused in the United States by aeronautical and space vehicles falling from outer space; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKAY:

H.R. 15245. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests of the

United States in property in Utah to the record owners of the surface of that property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McKEVITT:

H.R. 15246. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to liberalize, in the case of certain hospitalized veterans with mental illness, the reduction and repayment provisions applying to compensation or retirement pay; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McKEVITT (for himself, Mr. DAVIS, of Georgia, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HEINZ, and Mr. PETTIS):

H.R. 15247. A bill to authorize designated employees of the National Park Service and the U.S. Forest Service to make arrests for violation of Federal laws and regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MCKINNEY:

H.R. 15248. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income amounts won in State lotteries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 15249. A bill establishing a commission to develop a realistic plan leading to the conquest of multiple sclerosis at the earliest possible date; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 15250. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site in State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

H.R. 15251. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide benefits to survivors of police officers, firemen, and correction officers killed in the line of duty, and to police officers, firemen, and correction officers who are disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15252. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to deem any person placed for adoption by an appropriate adoption authority to be legally adopted during the period of placement; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 15253. A bill to provide equitable tariff treatment with respect to imported passenger automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 15254. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to make a comprehensive study of the dolphin and porpoise for the purpose of developing adequate conservation measures; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 15255. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional itemized deduction for taxicab fares paid by disabled individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 15256. A bill to provide for the annual reporting by Members of the Senate and House of Representatives and justices and judges of the United States of all income, assets, and liabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 15257. A bill to provide that Federal assistance for housing designed for the elderly may not be conditioned upon the construction or development of other housing in the same community; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ZWACH (for himself, Mr. QUIE, Mr. NELSEN, and Mr. FRENZEL):

H.R. 15258. A bill to further reduce Federal

control of assets of rural rehabilitation corporations; to the Committee on Agriculture.
By Mr. NATCHER:

H.R. 15259. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DU PONT:

H.J. Res. 1213. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the week beginning on the last Monday of May of each

year as "National Natural History Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H. Res. 1006. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14370) to provide payments to localities for high-priority expenditures, to encourage the States to supplement their revenue sources, and to authorize Federal collection of State individual income taxes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

395. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, relative to the price-grading system for grains and oil systems, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

245. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Richard W. Bowman, Graterford, Pa., relative to redress of grievances, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

OPERATION BREAKTHROUGH

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, through the gracious cooperation of the chairman of the Select Committee on Crime, Mr. PEPPER, Washington will learn of a really effective program of self-help and drug rehabilitation being conducted at the Federal Correctional Institute in Lompac, Calif.

The name of the program is "Operation Breakthrough" and the story of this effort and of those outside and inside the walls of the Correctional Institute are worthy of the attention so generously given by Mr. PEPPER.

The inmates who are working hard to spread the word on the outside about the insidious nature of drugs and the life behind walls for drug offenders will testify before the Senate Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries on June 13 and will also appear before the House Select Committee on Crime on June 15.

They will tell of their efforts and their hopes. They will share with us the harrowing tales of drugs, crime, and prison. It is not a pleasant story, Mr. Speaker, but it has to be told.

Great credit for working with Operation Breakthrough should be given Mrs. Betty Stephens of Santa Barbara, Calif. She has worked tirelessly in the community to assist the correctional facility staff and inmates in making this effort a success.

Her hard work to have the representatives of the program testify before the House and Senate has been successful and no doubt will greatly help the public to become aware of this excellent program.

Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Santa Maria, Calif., Times described the program and some of the people who are playing significant roles in it. I believe that it is of great interest for all concerned with the drug problem:

DRUGS AND PRISON: LOMPAC INMATES TELL THEIR STORIES AND THEIR DREAMS

(By Tom Leyde)

Douglas Lowery, Jesse Hernandez, Jimmy Rangel and Morgan Macdonald all have a story to tell; a true story about drugs, about crime and about prison.

The four are inmates at the Federal Correctional Institute (FCI) in Lompac, former drug users and members of Operation Breakthrough, an inmate run program helping

convicts to help themselves and inform the public.

Operation Breakthrough was conceived last May in a prison mop room when six inmates—members of the FCI Young American Jaycees—started meeting to discuss plans for a drug education program.

But despite its crude beginning, the program has blossomed and currently has 32 active members with more than 50 on its waiting list.

Through informal inmate panels, both inside and outside the institution, Operation Breakthrough attempts to communicate the truth about drug abuse to young people and parents as well as break down the stereotype beliefs people have of prisons and prisoners.

During an Operation Breakthrough panel, each inmate tells his own story—how he got involved with drugs and crime. In the case of the four inmates interviewed, all are serving sentences for drug related offenses.

Morgan Macdonald, Operation Breakthrough program director, has a rather colorful criminal record. At 25, Macdonald, who comes from Los Angeles, is serving a 15 year sentence for bank robbery. While supporting a heroin habit, he pulled five bank jobs and was also involved in forgery.

Sporting a reddish-brown mustache, Macdonald's face has a guy down the block familiarity about it. So familiar he is often mistaken for a prison officer when speaking outside the institution.

The truth about drug addiction and prison, Macdonald said, is it can happen to anyone "no matter how much education or money you've got."

Macdonald was a person who had everything going for him before he turned to heroin. He comes from a middle class family, spent four years in the Air Force as a photographer and has completed one year of college. Prior to his conviction, he was working as an analyst for the Matell Toy Company in Hawthorne.

But in 11 months, he said, "I went from the achievements I'd attained back down to the bottom and in the process burned all my friends and family."

Macdonald said he still dreams about fixing (shooting heroin) once in awhile. He cannot say with all honesty that he will not try drugs again.

As program director, Macdonald, the more loquacious of the four inmates and one of the original six members along with Jesse Hernandez, acts as a liaison between the inmates and the prison administration. He also handles program correspondence and schedules inmates for speaking engagements.

"Prison's a drag," said Macdonald, "but it's only what you make it. We're trying to make it as constructive an experience as possible."

Of those who started Operation Breakthrough, Macdonald said, none had had any previous experience in public speaking or running a drug education program. "Everything we've done so far we have played by ear. From now on we keep trying new things."

Joining Operation Breakthrough is strictly voluntary, said R. W. (Buster) Graham, cor-

rections officer at the FCI and staff coordinator of the program.

"It's a personal commitment," the veteran Oxnard policeman and former restaurant owner explained. "The men said look, I'm in prison and I want to be able to talk." Graham said the community is not ready for the program "but we're trying to educate them."

Inmates have made approximately 100 supervised trips to communities, he said, and have presented between 35 and 45 panels inside the institution. Through television interviews, radio talk shows and public appearance, Graham estimates word of the program has reached 400,000 to 500,000 persons.

"If we can reach one person and stop him from hitting the drug scene or prison," he said, "then we have accomplished something."

Particularly interested in reaching young people is Jesse Hernandez, 27, of Santa Barbara County. Serving a six month to six year sentence for smuggling, Hernandez has composed songs about his experiences with drugs and sings them to groups accompanying himself on guitar.

"Operation Breakthrough," he said, "is at the verge of expanding. We're getting more into the juvenile assistance side." The beauty of the program, he said, "is each man tells his own story. It's like 'a small index of short stories.'"

Hernandez, like the three other inmates interviewed, wants to go into counseling after he has served his time. All are enrolled in a program at the FCI that leads to a paraprofessional certificate. Earning the certificate means they are qualified to work with professional counselors.

Jimmy Rangel, a Mexican-American with a thin, black mustache is working hard for his certificate. He has lots of time. Rangel, a former heroin pusher and addict is serving six years for selling heroin and faces two state sentences—one from six months to 10 years and another from 10 months to 10 years—when he is paroled.

"I'm getting myself more qualified for out there," he said.

He feels the program is succeeding in reaching young people. "Students relate to us . . . They say things they wouldn't say to their parents . . . They want the truth."

The truth about Douglas Lowery, a 21-year-old black from Los Angeles, may be a shock to some. His story began at an early age.

"I started smoking grass (marijuana) when I was 12," he said. "I do not dig this place at all."

Like Macdonald, Lowery also robbed a bank. But he was not supporting a heroin habit. His trip was red devils (barbituates). Lowery was on red devils four years before the law caught up with him. He got six years.

Speaking of Operation Breakthrough, Lowery said, "The program motivates the inmate. It's their turn to tell the public how it is instead of higher officials . . . We're trying to come up for air for good."

When he leaves prison, Lowery hopes to