

QUORUM CALL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STAFFORD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate will shortly recess until 9 o'clock this evening, at which time it will reconvene, as in legislative session, for the purpose of assembling in a body to go over to the House of Representatives, where the President of the United States will address a joint session of the two Houses of Congress.

At the close of the President's address, the Senate will stand in adjournment, under the previous order, until 12 noon tomorrow.

On tomorrow, after the two leaders have been recognized, the junior Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD) will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes; after which there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 30 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes, all of which will be as in legislative session.

At the close of morning business, the Senate will resume consideration, in executive session, of the nomination of Mr. Richard G. Kleindienst for the Office of Attorney General of the United States. There will be no rollcall votes tomorrow.

RECESS UNTIL 9 P.M. TODAY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in recess until 9 p.m. today.

The motion was agreed to; and at 3:02 p.m. the Senate took a recess until 9 p.m.

At 9 p.m., under the previous order, the Senate was called to order by the Vice President.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES—MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the joint session.

Thereupon at 9:10 p.m., the Senate, preceded by the Secretary of the Senate, Francis R. Valeo, the Sergeant at Arms, Robert G. Dunphy, and the Vice President, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear the address by the President of the United States.

(The address delivered by the President of the United States to the joint session of the two Houses of Congress, appears in the proceedings of the House of Representatives in today's RECORD.)

ADJOURNMENT

At the conclusion of the joint session of the two Houses, and in accordance with the order previously entered, at 10:16 p.m. the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, June 2, 1972, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, June 1, 1972:

U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

Italo H. Abbondi, of New York, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1978, vice Glenn W. Sutton.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, June 1, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let Thy mercy, O Lord, be upon us according as we hope in Thee.—Psalms 33: 22.

O God, our Father, whom we seek to serve and to whom we look for guidance along the way, we bow before the altar of prayer offering unto Thee once again the gratitude and the loyalty of our hearts. We thank Thee for this new day and for its open possibilities for great and gracious living.

By Thy good spirit, may we always be honest and kind and forgiving; may we be generous in our criticisms of others, gracious with those who criticize us, and amid all differences may we seek to be understanding.

Through these trying times, bless our President as he returns, our Speaker, Members of this House of Representatives, and all who work with them. Together, lead us in the ways of wisdom and the paths of peace; for Thy name's sake. 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 a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 625. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of the two Houses of Congress on June 1, 1972, to receive such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 530. Concurrent resolution to reprint brochure entitled "How Our Laws Are Made"; and

H. Con. Res. 552. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of the Constitution of the United States together with the Declaration of Independence.

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

S. 1478. An act to regulate interstate commerce by requiring premarket testing of new chemical substances and to provide for screening of the results of such testing prior to commercial production, to require testing of certain existing chemical substances, to authorize the regulation of the use and distribution of chemical substances, and for other purposes.

ARAB TERRORISM AND TOO MANY OF THE WORLD'S NATIONS ARE INDIFFERENT

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, this past Tuesday we saw a terrible tragedy occur with 25 people killed and 76 grievously wounded at the Lod Airport in Israel when brutally gunned down by three Japanese terrorists hired by an Arab organization headquartered in Lebanon.

Mr. Speaker, it is not acceptable that Lebanon permit its facilities to be used by terrorists, known to the Lebanese Government, to plot these and other killings and then say it is in no way responsible. The three terrorists, who committed the atrocities at Lod, were employed by the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, the Lebanon based-terrorist organization which takes credit for the murders and maimings of innocent civilians.

The states of Egypt and Lebanon gloat over the murders and woundings. To its great credit the Japanese Government, through its Foreign Minister, called the shootings "a disgrace for Japan" even though it was not responsible for the actions of the three Japanese terrorists.

Our country is especially bereaved, because of 12 of the dead are Americans who were on a pilgrimage to the holy

places of their Christian faith. We must grieve for them and all the others—murdered and wounded, Jew and Christian—who were the innocent victims of Arab terrorism. A special word of contempt is called for when one reviews not only the failure of security employed by the French airline, Air France, and the callous response of French officials to the incident. I hope that American tourists will remember both when they make their airline bookings.

COMMEMORATING FLAG DAY, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 14

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday, June 14, will mark the 195th anniversary of Flag Day. For many years the House has had proper observances commemorating Flag Day here in the House Chamber.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday, June 14, for the Speaker to declare a recess for the purpose of observing and commemorating Flag Day in such manner as the Speaker may deem appropriate.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state for the information of the House that, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader, the Chair has informally designated the following Members to constitute a committee to make the necessary arrangements for appropriate ceremonies in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement just adopted: the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. NICHOLS; the gentleman from Maine, Mr. KYROS; the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. HALL; and the gentleman from New York, Mr. KEMP.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF THE CANADA-UNITED STATES DELE- GATION, CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-42, the Chair appoints as a member of the Canada-United States delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary group the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. BROOMFIELD, to fill an existing vacancy thereon.

A FIRM FOUNDATION FOR PEACE

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has completed his meetings at the summit in Moscow. As President Nixon departed for Moscow, he pointed out that he was going there not to make headlines, but to work toward a lasting peace. The unprecedented meetings and agreements have borne out his forecast.

These welcomed agreements signify an important first step on the long jour-

ney toward permanent peace. At the same time, it is important that we do not allow too great a feeling of euphoria to set in. We must bear in mind that the Soviet Union is ideologically our opposite, that the same press reports which recorded the important agreements told of the still virtually closed society, the absence of "unapproved" newspapers and magazines, the rigidity with which Soviet journalists follow the official party line, and the atheism espoused by the Soviet Government. But while we must be aware that there are many obstacles and pitfalls along the path to peace, President Nixon has shown that these snares can be avoided.

Many questions remain: Will a limitation on offensive weapons follow? Will a limitation on the size, type, and sophistication of weapons be added to the unrefined limitation on number of weapons? How these questions and others are answered will determine the ultimate outcome of the President's journey to Moscow. In the meantime, it is safe to say that the President has again displayed the bold, creative leadership which this country needs. He has erected a firm foundation for understanding where none existed before and has gone a long way toward improving the atmosphere and attitude between the United States and the Soviet Union.

THE PRESIDENT HAS ACCOM- PLISHED A DRAMATIC CHANGE IN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

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

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, as President Nixon returns from his historic mission, all Americans should join in applauding his tremendous effort to move from an era of confrontation to an era of negotiation in international affairs.

Never was Mr. Nixon's personal conviction to achieve world peace and harmony more superbly exemplified than in his speech to the people of the Soviet Union. It stands as a fitting tribute to a concerned and committed President who is doing his utmost to narrow the differences between the world's superpowers. I felt that he expressed the sentiments of Americans, regardless of party, who want a world to share in peace with people everywhere.

The President has indeed accomplished a dramatic change in American foreign policy in seeking to emphasize those things upon which nations may agree and narrowing our points of difference. He deserves great credit and respect as a thoughtful champion of peace.

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 13918), to provide for improved financing for the

Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 13918, with Mr. ASPINALL (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read the first section, ending on line 4, page 1, of the bill. If there are no amendments to be proposed to that section, the Clerk will read.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill is as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 396(g)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (H) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and by inserting after subparagraph (H) the following new subparagraph:

"(I) to encourage and assist the utilization and development of all forms of telecommunications facilities (including new technology) for the production and distribution of educational radio and television programs."

(b) Section 396(g) of such Act is amended by adding after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) (A) In each fiscal year the Corporation shall distribute to noncommercial educational radio and television stations, for use at each such station's discretion in activities related to its local broadcast operation, not less than 30 per centum of the total amount of funds received by the Corporation from the Public Broadcasting Fund for such fiscal year. The Corporation shall, after consultation with representatives of noncommercial educational radio and television broadcast stations, establish standards respecting eligibility for a distribution pursuant to this paragraph and for apportionment and distribution among noncommercial educational radio and television broadcast stations of the funds to be distributed pursuant to this paragraph. Such standards shall be designed to—

"(i) assure the maximum benefit to the public;

"(ii) reflect the relative needs and requirements of local communities;

"(iii) maintain and stimulate existing or potential sources of non-Federal financing available to noncommercial educational broadcast stations;

"(iv) stimulate the growth, development, and independence of noncommercial educational broadcast stations; and

"(v) encourage and assist the utilization and development of all forms of telecommunications facilities (including new technology).

"(B) No distribution may be made under subparagraph (A) to a noncommercial educational broadcast station for any fiscal year unless it has filed an application with the Corporation for such distribution for such fiscal year. Such an application shall—

"(i) contain such information as the Corporation may require to establish the applicant's status as a noncommercial educational

broadcast station as of the date the application is filed;

"(ii) set forth the amount of non-Federal support for noncommercial educational radio and television received by the applicant during the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the distribution application is filed; and

"(iii) be filed not later than one hundred and twenty days following the close of the fiscal year which immediately precedes the beginning of the fiscal year for which the distribution application is filed."

(c) Subsection (k) of section 396 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Financing

"(k) (1) There is established in the Treasury a special fund to be known as the 'Public Broadcasting Fund' (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the 'Fund'). For each fiscal year the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay from the Fund to the Corporation to carry out this section such sums as may be appropriated to the Fund for such fiscal year.

"(2) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Fund—

"(A) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, the lesser of—

"(i) \$65,000,000, or

"(ii) \$35,000,000 plus an amount which equals one-half of the non-Federal support for educational radio and television received during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; and

"(B) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, the lesser of—

"(i) \$90,000,000, or

"(ii) \$40,000,000 plus an amount which equals one-half of the non-Federal support for educational radio and television received during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972."

(d) Section 397 of such Act is amended by adding after paragraph (9) the following new paragraph:

"(10) The term 'non-Federal support for noncommercial educational radio and television' means the total of the value of cash and the fair market value of property received by public broadcasting entities—

"(A) as gifts, grants, or donations from any source other than (i) an Executive agency (as defined by section 105 of title 5 of the United States Code), or (ii) any other public broadcasting entity; and

"(B) as payment from any State, political subdivision of a State, agency of a State, or political subdivision of a State, or educational institution for services or materials respecting the provision of educational television or radio programs.

For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'public broadcasting entity' means the Corporation, any noncommercial educational broadcast station, or any nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association the principal activity of which is providing programs or services to noncommercial educational broadcast stations."

Sec. 3. (a) Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 396(c) of the Communications Act of 1934 are amended to read as follows:

"(c) (1) The Corporation shall have a Board of Directors (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Board'), five of whom shall be station members and ten of whom shall be public members, appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than eight members of the Board may be members of the same political party.

"(2) (A) The station members of the Board shall be appointed (i) from among citizens of the United States who are, at the time of their appointment, chief executive staff officers of noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast stations; and (ii) so as to provide, as nearly as practicable, a broad representation of various regions of the country, various size cities, various educational systems, and various types and sizes

of noncommercial educational broadcast stations.

"(B) The public members of the Board shall be appointed (i) from among citizens of the United States who are not regular full-time employees of the United States and who are eminent in such fields as education, cultural and civil affairs, or the arts; and (ii) so as to provide, as nearly as practicable, a broad representation of various regions of the country, various professions and occupations, and various kinds of talent and experience appropriate to the functions and responsibilities of the Corporation."

(b) After the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall make appointments to the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting in such a manner that such Board will have not later than six years from such date the composition of station and public members required by section 396(c) (1) of the Communications Act of 1934.

SEC. 4. Section 391 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended to read as follows:

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"Sec. 391. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, such sums, not to exceed \$25,000,000 as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of section 390. Sums appropriated under this section shall remain available for payment of grants for projects for which applications, approved under section 392, have been submitted under such section prior to July 1, 1974."

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 176]

Abernethy	Esch	Mikva
Abourezk	Eshleman	Miller, Calif.
Alexander	Fish	Mills, Ark.
Anderson,	Fisher	O'Neill
Tenn.	Flynt	Passman
Ashbrook	Fraser	Pelly
Baring	Fulton	Pike
Bell	Gallagher	Pryor, Ark.
Bingham	Gallagher	Pucinski
Blanton	Gibbons	Rees
Blatnik	Goldwater	Robison, N.Y.
Broomfield	Griffin	Rodino
Burton	Hagan	Roncallo
Caffery	Hanna	Rooney, N.Y.
Camp	Hawkins	Roybal
Cederberg	Hébert	St Germain
Celler	Heckler, Mass.	Scheuer
Chisholm	Holifield	Schmitz
Clark	Jarman	Sebelius
Clausen,	Jonas	Slak
Don H.	Jones, Tenn.	Slack
Clawson, Del	Kyros	Smith, Iowa
Clay	Long, La.	Springer
Collins, Ill.	Long, Md.	Stephens
Conyers	Lujan	Stokes
Corman	McCloskey	Stubblefield
Daniels, N.J.	McDonald,	Symington
Dent	Mich.	Teague, Calif.
Dickinson	McEwen	Teague, Tex.
Donohue	McKinney	Veysey
Dowdy	McMillan	Wilson, Bob
Dwyer	Melcher	Wilson,
Edwards, Calif.	Metcalfe	Charles H.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. GAIAMO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 13918, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 337 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of

the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. At the time of the quorum call, consent had been obtained that the bill would be considered as read, printed in the Record, and open to amendment at any point.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 8, immediately after "activities" insert "(other than construction of noncommercial educational television or radio broadcasting facilities, erection, repair, or modification of any building, or acquisition of real property)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 7, insert after line 18 the following:

"Sec. 5. (a) Section 396(e) of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

"(3) No officer or employee of the Corporation shall receive compensation at a rate in excess of that prescribed for level I of the Executive Schedule under section 5312 of title 5, United States Code."

"(b) No individual serving as an officer or employee of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting on the date of enactment of this Act shall have his rate of compensation as such officer or employee reduced solely by reason of the enactment of the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section."

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

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the chairman of the committee would explain this committee amendment, since it apparently has to do with pay under the Class Act, as I understand it.

Mr. STAGGERS. What is that?

Mr. GROSS. The amendment has to do with pay under the Class Act, does it not?

Mr. STAGGERS. It is a limiting amendment, that is correct, on any officer of the corporation.

Mr. GROSS. What does it provide by way of pay?

Mr. STAGGERS. One officer is paid \$65,000 a year. He is the president of the corporation. That salary was set by the corporation board. But we have decided that the pay for any of these positions should not be any higher than that of a Cabinet officer.

Mr. GROSS. Does the amendment have the effect of keeping that one individual on the payroll at a \$65,000 salary?

Mr. STAGGERS. That amount will be figured as his salary as long as he is in that position.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman saying that he is being featherbedded?

Mr. STAGGERS. He will be kept on under what we often call a grandfather clause, but anyone who is hired for that position from now on will not be able to get more than \$60,000. There was some question about the pay of people who have been hired for more money than

this. This, of course, would affect them. When we get to the amendment stage I would like to explain a little further.

The board has adopted a rule that any employee of a program producer receiving a grant from CPB will be limited to \$36,000. If they desire to pay him any more than that amount, they must come before the board and have their request approved by the board for a special reason. But we have a rule providing that those employees be limited to \$36,000.

Mr. GROSS. Where would the rest come from?

Mr. STAGGERS. What does the gentleman mean?

Mr. GROSS. The money above the \$36,000?

Mr. STAGGERS. It would have to come out of the corporation's funds.

Mr. GROSS. And they are supplied in part by foundations?

Mr. STAGGERS. They are indeed, yes.

In fact, of the money that is spent in public broadcasting, the public and individuals and private enterprise put in \$11 for every \$1 the Government puts in.

Mr. GROSS. Which means, sliced thick or thin, the taxpayers pay for it. It comes out of the taxpayer's pocket.

Mr. STAGGERS. One out of every \$12 that is paid does, yes.

Mr. GROSS. The foundations are able to create foundations only because of tax exemptions, are they not?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes, sir, and until they get all this settled about how that is to be finally, that will continue.

Mr. GROSS. Is there a mandatory retirement age?

Mr. STAGGERS. There is none I know of.

Mr. GROSS. Then Mr. Macy and Mr. Vanocur could be there at their present high salaries until they grow beards to their knees, could they not?

I mean gray beards.

Mr. STAGGERS. They may have gray beards now, I do not know.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. TIERNAN. First of all, the amendment provides that anyone under contract at the present time could not be affected by the restriction.

Mr. GROSS. That is the first good reason for defeating the amendment, but go ahead.

Mr. TIERNAN. And anyone who exceeds the compensation, that is in excess of \$36,000, that person's salary would have to be submitted to the board of the corporation for approval. It has not been that way in the past. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. GROSS. What may we anticipate the board will do?

Mr. TIERNAN. That in any event they will not exceed the level 1 of the executive schedule under the Civil Service Act.

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

Mr. Chairman, I listened to the colloquy. Now I would like to inquire of the Chairman exactly where we are on this matter of salaries. I thought I heard the gentleman from West Virginia say no one will draw a higher salary than the

salary of an officer of Cabinet level. Is that the amendment?

Then I thought I heard something about a grandfather clause. Does this mean that some kind of an exception is being made even under the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. STAGGERS. Only for the present member that is now holding the position. We do not know how long he will hold that position.

These are good and responsible men. They are top men.

Mr. RANDALL. We are all willing to concede that. But first, may I inquire what is the present compensation of the gentleman we are talking about?

Mr. STAGGERS. It is \$65,000.

Mr. RANDALL. At that salary it would be most unlikely he would resign. Also I doubt that the present board would ever remove him.

Mr. STAGGERS. I could not say about that. Certainly he was appointed by the board, and he can be removed by them.

Mr. RANDALL. But there has not been the slightest indication of any removal?

Mr. STAGGERS. No. I do not know whether the gentleman is saying we should cut his salary. I do not know whether we can by law.

Mr. RANDALL. Well, I am certainly hopeful that we make an effort to reduce that salary to save the taxpayers some money.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I listened to the debate yesterday afternoon, all of it, and I got the impression from proponents that this bill is the best thing that has happened since codliver oil for children and Lydia Pinkham's compound for adults. I am now convinced that it goes much farther in favoring a few people with continued special consideration.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I hope we take some action on these salaries before we adjourn today.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, am I correct in assuming that pending for Committee action now is a committee amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is correct.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, am I correct in assuming that the committee amendment proposes to reduce the salary to \$60,000?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry, the Chair will advise the gentleman.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, if the committee amendment is adopted, is it then possible to amend the committee amendment with regard to that portion of the bill having to do with the pending committee amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. If the committee amendment is agreed to, it is not subject to further amendment.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WAGGONER. Is a substitute to the committee amendment in order at this point?

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment to the committee amendment or a substitute is in order.

Mr. WAGGONER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MATHIS OF GEORGIA

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. MATHIS of Georgia: Page 7, line 24, strike out "level I of the Executive Schedule under section 5312" and insert in lieu thereof "level II of the Executive Schedule under section 5313".

Page 8, line 1, strike out lines 1 through 5.

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this substitute for the committee amendment is a very simple one. It does one thing. It says that no employee and no officer of the Public Broadcasting Corporation can be compensated at a rate greater than \$42,500 a year.

There has been much discussion on this matter in the past. There has been discussion on this matter on the floor of the House today. Apparently there was some concern in the committee relative to this matter, because the committee drew an amendment that has been offered that would limit this to \$60,000 a year.

I applaud the committee action in this direction. I simply believe it does not go far enough.

All Members of the House have been made aware of some of the salaries of some of the people employed by the Public Broadcasting Corporation. Mr. Sander Vanocur is making \$85,000, which has come to be a legend. Mr. Robert McNeill is making \$65,000. The President, Mr. Macy, is making \$65,000. And there are more.

All these gentlemen, in my opinion, have been living quite high on the hog as a result of funds coming from the Public Broadcasting Corporation.

My amendment simply provides that no officer or employee of the Public Broadcasting Corporation can be compensated at a rate greater than for a Member of Congress.

The amendment also goes to strike the grandfather clause, which gets to the people I am concerned about at this point right now.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that my substitute amendment is a very simple one. It goes to the heart of the matter, as I see it, to cut the salaries back to \$42,500.

I urge the adoption of my substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. I am happy

to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that we are talking about a new amendment, something not in the amendment under consideration?

The committee amendment, the amendment under consideration, was offered, as I recall, by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BROYHILL), and it went to cover anybody earning over \$60,000. There was one member of the Board, the head of the Board, John Macy, who was affected.

The amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BROYHILL) said that no more people should be hired by the Board at that high a salary.

This does not go to contract performers. If the gentleman is trying to reach the salary of on-the-air performers, I sympathize in some way with what the gentleman has been stating, but this is not the place, because the committee amendment goes only to the Corporation people.

He is under contract currently, given to him by the Corporation. He offered earlier—I believe it was in 1969—to take a reduction in pay.

The Board refused to cut his pay, saying that he was worth more than what he was getting then. So if the gentleman has in mind Mr. Vanocur or Mr. McNeil and other on-camera performers, this amendment that the committee has before it now is not the vehicle to do what the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

What he is saying is that the committee did not take any action to curb the salaries of these high-paid performers in public broadcasting.

Mr. TIERNAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TIERNAN. There is no way for us to limit the salaries of people like William Buckley who sell their programs to stations throughout the country. His company receives over \$700,000 a year for his programs to be shown on the network. So your amendment is directed only to three officers in the Corporation; namely the president and two vice presidents. I think the gentleman is mistaken in his intent, because we are talking about reducing salaries that are on a contract basis, and the gentleman, I am sure, will agree with me that we have a problem with regard to the sanctity of the contract.

What we have done in the committee is to require that no salary be in excess of level 1 of the executive salaries as set forth by the Congress. This is an extremely important step that is being taken. You are going now to try to limit it to such a status that it will be very difficult for the Corporation to carry out the mandate of the Congress.

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. The gentleman is entirely correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island for his observation, and I agree. He is very eminently correct. It is exactly what I am trying to do. If the gentleman has an amendment to perfect my amendment to get people like Mr. Vanocur to work for lower salaries, I would certainly support it.

Mr. TIERNAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. TIERNAN. There is no way that you or I as Members of Congress can dictate to a private corporation like William Buckley Productions Corp. as to the amount of money that he will sell his product or service for.

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. We could tell the officers of Public Broadcasting Company that they shall not expend these funds for that purpose.

Mr. TIERNAN. Then you will not be able to put any of these shows on television; I think you will run into difficulty.

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. I think that would be a good idea, too.

Mr. TIERNAN. To knock off Mr. BUCKLEY's program?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WYDLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WYDLER. I would try to get straightened out what we are voting on here so we can fully understand it. I would like the chairman of the committee to make two things clear to us. The first is whether this amendment and the substitute thereto will only affect the salaries of executive officers of the Corporation. Is that correct?

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. That is correct.

Mr. WYDLER. How many people besides the chairman of the board, who I understand is getting \$65,000 a year at the present time, will be affected by the substitute amendment to reduce the salaries to \$42,500? Who besides the chairman is getting more than that amount?

Mr. TIERNAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Macy, the President of the Corporation, is the highest paid member. He receives at the present time \$65,000 a year. The Vice President in charge of finance and the Treasurer of the Corporation, Ralph W. Nicholson, receives \$45,000 a year, and a John P. Witherspoon, the Director of Television Activities, receives \$40,000. Those three individuals would be affected, and actually only the President and the Vice Presidents, if I understand the gentleman's amendment correctly, would, which would reduce it to no more than what a Congressman receives, \$42,500.

So, you are only talking about reducing the salary of the President and the Vice President in charge of finance and the Treasurer of the Corporation.

I think the intent of the gentleman's amendment is not directed toward this area but, really, directed to people who receive salaries from other corporations that sell programs to the National Education Television System.

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. I will say to the gentleman from Rhode Island that the intent of my amendment is directed at both groups. I would like to have the intent of the amendment reach both the officers and the employees of the Corporation. We may not be able to get to this unless we have the amendment to the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the situation is exactly this: The committee amendment now pending affects the salaries only of the employees of the Public Broadcasting Corporation.

We have now pending before us an amendment in the form of a substitute which would reduce the amount provided for in the committee amendment, the level provided for, from \$60,000 to \$42,500.

Admittedly, it only affects those employees of the Corporation itself, but just bear with us and we will have before you for your attention and concern another amendment which will affect the performers who are not employees of the Public Broadcasting Corporation. Then, you will finally have available some information regarding the salaries paid these people and the talent that is used in these programs. They are completely out of line. They are nowhere near what they should be.

How many of you really think that an employee of the public broadcasting system or a performer should be paid more from tax dollars than the Vice President of the United States? That is exactly what the existing legislation provides for. We have got to do something about it.

Congress, of course, cannot tell a private company what they pay their performers, but Congress can limit grants to private corporations from the public broadcasting system if they feel salaries are exorbitant.

We will have an amendment to do that.

However, for the immediate moment, the concern of Congress is to bring into line the salaries of the paid employees of the Public Broadcasting Corporation.

The amendment to the committee amendment does that by limiting the salary of any employee to \$42,500 per year. This is what we urge your favorable consideration of and then we will take up the other amendment with reference to Mr. Sander Vanocur and others.

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

Mr. WAGGONER. Yes, I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. There has been some concern expressed as to whether the Mathis of Georgia amendment does away with the grandfather clause.

Mr. WAGGONER. The answer to that is "Yes."

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. May I ask this question: How long a contract does the

Corporation have with the two principals who would be affected?

Mr. WAGGONER. That I do not know, but when it expires, the grandfather clause will no longer affect them and the contract.

In effect, the contract would be continued at its present level. However, when it is renegotiated, it cannot exceed \$42,500 a year.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Could anyone from the committee indicate how long a contract the Corporation now has with the President and the Vice President?

Mr. WAGGONER. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island to answer the question.

Mr. TIERNAN. The contract with Mr. Macy was not entered into, in fact, by Mr. Macy. He refused to sign a contract with the Corporation but chose instead to let the Board of Directors of the Corporation at its free will at any time terminate it. I think the gentleman knows Mr. Macy has a distinguished career with the Government and I think if the gentleman in the well, my colleague from Louisiana and the minority member would give me an opportunity to talk on this and after we have had some discussion on this, I think I can explain a little bit more in detail the importance of not adopting the substitute amendment.

Mr. WAGGONER. Let me simply say that no one is talking about Mr. Macy as an individual. His character and ability are beyond question. We are talking about the system which allows Federal tax dollars to be expended in the way they are which I say to you is excessive. Whether it be Mr. Macy or anyone else is a moot question.

The question is, are we going to allow these tax dollars to be expended in an excessive way? I do not think we should.

I do not think we should, and the clearcut question is are you willing to pay these people more than the Vice President of the United States, or are you willing to pay these people more than a Member of the House of Representatives, or more than a Member of the U.S. Senate? I think not, if you lay any claim to fiscal responsibility in these days.

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

Mr. WAGGONER. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I understand the response given to me by a member of the committee, if the grandfather clause was stricken there is no violation of a written contract with Mr. Macy; is that correct?

Mr. TIERNAN. If the gentleman will yield, that is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. What about the contractual situation of the Vice President of the Corporation, if there is any?

Mr. TIERNAN. As to the Vice President, I am not sure, and I would have to answer honestly, but I believe that all the others that would be affected have some type of contract, but I do not have that information available.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. When does the existing legislation expire?

Mr. TIERNAN. As it came from the

committee it would be an authorization for 2 additional years.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am referring to the legislation that is currently in existence.

Mr. TIERNAN. There is nothing presently restricting the amount that the Corporation can hire personnel for.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I understand that, but when does the present or existing legislation that authorizes the public broadcasting service expire as such?

Mr. TIERNAN. At the end of this fiscal year.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. On June 30?

Mr. TIERNAN. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is it true, and I would assume so, that the Board of Directors could not sign a contract with any employee beyond the period of authorization of the existing law?

Is that correct?

Mr. TIERNAN. To answer the gentleman from Michigan I would have to say that apparently the present civil service schedule of salaries does not apply, and that is why in the amendment the committee adopted we have made it clear.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WAGGONER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, a moment ago when I said I did not feel that this body wanted to pay the employees of the Public Broadcasting System more than Members of the House of Representatives or more than Members of the U.S. Senate, a Member of the House at that time under his breath said, "They are worth more."

I am not going to get into an argument with that gentleman as to how little he thinks he is worth, but I want to say that I can justify to my constituents that I am worth more to them than those creating all of the chaos that stems from this Corporation.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would urge the adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, in the committee we had some discussion on this subject, and I think there is substantial sentiment among the members of the committee for the views that have been expressed by my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONER). I think that both sides have stressed the grandfather clause, and it seems to me that if only in equity for that one individual who is affected, who may have given up his employment elsewhere for this task, that we should protect his rights. And as has been revealed in the debate here by the minority floor leader, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, and Mr. WAGGONER, it is almost a moot point. Therefore, why don't we strike the section of the amendment which strikes the grandfather clause? Then we would have a just perspective, and it would be entirely legal. It would be equitable and recognize the validity of the contracts that have been entered into. Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment to the substitute

amendment which would eliminate the language on page 8, striking lines 1 through 5, and I give that to the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Massachusetts offering an amendment?

Mr. KEITH. I offer an amendment to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MATHIS).

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that an amendment to the Mathis amendment is in the third degree and is not in order.

Mr. KEITH. An amendment to the substitute is not in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that there is presently pending an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. KEITH. In the nature of a substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. No, it is not in the nature of a substitute; it is an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. KEITH. Then I would respectfully ask the Chair: would it be in order to offer a substitute to the amendment offered and pending before us?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that it would be in order to offer a substitute for the entire committee amendment.

Mr. KEITH. Then I would offer a substitute for the committee amendment that accomplishes that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts to the committee amendment.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KEITH FOR THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEITH as a substitute for the committee amendment: Page 7, line 24, strike out "level I of the Executive Schedule under section 5312" and insert in lieu thereof "level II of the Executive Schedule under section 5313".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, all that my substitute amendment would do is to change the \$60,000 maximum salary to that of \$42,500.

It leaves in the grandfather clause which, as has been revealed in debate, only affects two people—one of them voluntarily, because his contract is on an informal basis; the other's circumstances we do not know about and it makes very little difference whether we do know.

The fact of the matter is that we entered into a contract—or agents of the Government entered into a contract—to pay \$42,500 a year and I do not believe on the evidence offered here today that in equity or in law we have the right to do what we are doing.

It is a principle. It is not any great sum—we are only talking about \$2,500 for a period of maybe months, or of weeks.

I believe this Congress should not try

to set aside the terms of a contract of this nature or of any nature where it is possible to act the way we have.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, the substitute offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts is intended to do one thing—and that is to leave the grandfather clause intact in the bill.

You have heard the argument both ways—it has a purpose and it does not have a purpose, or maybe it might have a purpose.

I cannot understand why they want to preserve it if it does not mean something. Certainly, if it does not have some effect, then why leave it in the bill?

If you want to do something about it, you are going to have to get rid of the grandfather clause and say when the existing contracts do expire that the ceiling will be \$42,500 a year—period—for public broadcasting corporation employees no matter whether it is the director or anyone else.

So if you want to be sure that the grandfather clause is removed which they seem so determined to protect in the legislation, then you must vote against the substitute.

It is perfectly simple that this is what we must do, and for anyone to say that we in the Congress do not have a right to amend Federal legislation that we debate on this floor is beyond comprehension to me. The question is whether or not the Congress wants to amend the legislation to place a ceiling of \$42,500 on the salaries to be paid these employees, and whether or not you want to remove the grandfather clause from the committee legislation which gives them continued protection as long as they remain employed by the corporation.

So I urge you to vote down the substitute.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I understand the situation, the present law under which any and all individuals were employed expires June 30. The Board of Trustees or the Board of Directors cannot hire people beyond the limitation of the current legislation. The agreements for the President and the Vice President of this organization if any expire as of June 30, 1972. The Board of Directors has no authority to sign employment contracts beyond the expiration date of the legislation that gives them authority. Consequently there could not be any contract beyond June 30, and the proposed legislation only takes effect, if passed in time, on July 1, 1972.

If you leave in the grandfather clause, as I read it, it is an open invitation to the Board of Directors to hire or to rehire the President and the Vice President at their current salary. It is an open invitation for extended employment at that compensation. If you strike out the grandfather clause and have the categorical limitation, the Board of Directors after July 1st would be faced with an employment situation that affects everybody. I personally subscribe to the amendment

offered by the gentleman from Georgia, and I oppose the substitute.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TIERNAN. Do I correctly understand that the first vote will be on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH)?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the first vote will occur on the amendment to the committee amendment, that is, the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia. Then the vote will recur on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH) and then the vote will recur on the committee amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the Members of the House that the subcommittee had before it some question about salaries paid that had received substantial public notoriety with regard to individuals receiving very high salaries. In the hearings we discovered that most of these individuals involved were employees of agencies that the committee could not actually reach. I cite, for example, the fact that William Buckley apparently has a contract to devise a series of programs that are shown throughout our country on a weekly or a regular basis, and that his production company received a sum in excess of \$400,000. What Mr. Buckley receives as a salary you and I as Members of Congress are in no position by legislation to say that he shall not receive more than \$60,000 or, as the gentleman from Louisiana suggested, that he should not receive any amounts in excess of what a Senator or a Congressman is paid.

In the hearings it developed that many of you have situations in your own States where the system is either part of the educational system in your State or is a separate State entity.

The station managers, the people who manage the station agencies or the stations in the States receive salaries up to and including \$60,000 a year. Now, the managing head of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting was hired after a lengthy search for someone to run this Corporation. The committee was composed of very distinguished people in the country. Dr. Milton Eisenhower was one of the three, John D. Rockefeller was on the Board, and Mrs. Hobby Harvey from Texas was the third member. The salary range was suggested between \$50,000 and \$75,000 to hire a gentleman to run this Corporation. Finally, Mr. Macy was hired at \$50,000 with the understanding that, because this was a new Corporation and if it was to be an operating Corporation, his salary would be increased to \$60,000 or \$65,000 at the end of the first year.

Mr. Macy was presented with a contract and would not enter into a contract, because he wanted the Board to be in a position to terminate his employment with the Corporation if it did not work out, and he could not do the job. But I

think the success of the Public Broadcasting Corporation shows the job John Macy has done as the head of this Corporation. We were going nowhere with educational programs in this country until he took over.

So I think what we are doing today is seeing an attempt to get at someone like Sander Vanocur, but I suggest to the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Louisiana this is not the way to do it. I suggest at some place further we put some language in, either in this act or in the appropriation bill, if we want to include something with regard to Federal funding or entering into contracts with outside corporations that may produce shows that go on the public network.

Further, I suggest that we have to consider that this Corporation is competing with NBC, CBS, and ABC to get talent to go on the shows. The Members know the success we have had in the last few years with Sesame Street. Everyone in this Chamber knows it has been a highly successful tool in educating the children of this country.

If we start to do this kind of thing with the act, I think it is a pretty bad precedent. We will only show pettiness by it. We will be limiting the ability of this Corporation to do the job we want it to do.

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

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

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I agree with the gentleman that there is some confusion here between the treatment of the performers and treatment of officers, but I would say to the gentleman if the Members of this House wish to register a protest to the management of the Public Broadcasting Corp. as they have known it over the last several years, then a vote to take this grandfather clause out is, perhaps, the best way of registering that protest. Would not the gentleman agree?

Mr. TIERNAN. The gentleman might make that approach, but I suggest to the gentleman we not touch the grandfather clause, because that would only affect Mr. Macy who has been receiving \$65,000. The amendment says the board will not hire anyone in the future in excess of \$36,000 nor more than \$60,000 under level 1 of the executive standard. This gives them flexibility. I think the gentleman knows from his experience on the committee that they have gotten a difficult job done and now to tell them they cannot do this, that they cannot get the talent necessary to do the job is not realistic.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a question to the gentleman from Rhode Island. The gentleman keeps referring to William Buckley and his program. I presume that has some particular significance. I might be favorably inclined toward William Buckley, but that does not mean I want to give him any amount of money that some particular person along the line here decides to pay him.

Does the gentleman mean to tell me

that we in Congress have no control in any way, shape or form over the contracts these corporations are going to make for entertainment? Is that what the gentleman is telling me? Because, if it is, I would not personally vote another dime for this program if we are in a situation here where we cannot control how much they are going to pay anyone for salary he will draw as part of the contract which he enters into with the corporation. Would the gentleman clarify his statement? It is on the record, and I do not understand it.

Mr. TIERNAN. Let me say to the gentleman the problem we have is this question of accepting or entering into agreements to produce programs that are going to do one of two or three things: Meet an educational need, meet a cultural need, or meet a community program type need that would create an interest in this program they are going to present.

Mr. WYDLER. I do not want to talk about the merits of this for the moment. Would the gentleman direct himself to the question I asked, which is, can we here today on the floor of the House control the amount of salary anybody is going to receive from this corporation, whoever he is? Can we or can we not? Are we in a situation to lose control over this? The gentleman stated it, and I want to know if that is true.

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

Mr. WYDLER. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. TIERNAN. The gentleman knows there is no way, for example, that we can limit the amount General Motors pays to its president.

Mr. WYDLER. I am talking about the Public Broadcasting Corp.

Mr. TIERNAN. The Public Broadcasting Corp. can limit the amount of salaries, which is the amendment the committee adopted, except for the grandfather language, when we said the corporation could continue to pay Mr. Macy \$65,000. There is only one other person who receives more than \$42,500. That is the vice president in charge of financing. If we want to limit him, we could limit him under the executive schedule.

Mr. WYDLER. Will the gentleman please answer the question? I am talking about the statement about Mr. Buckley and Mr. Vanocur. Can we or can we not limit the salaries these men receive?

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

Mr. WYDLER. I yield for an answer.

Mr. TIERNAN. There is no way for the corporation to limit the amount that a private corporation, such as the William Buckley Production Corp., pays to Mr. Buckley or to anybody else in that corporation.

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

Mr. WYDLER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONER. The answer to the gentleman's question is simply, "No, we cannot limit what a private corporation pays its employees." But we can limit what we give in grants to that private corporation if they pay what we consider to be excessive salaries to those employ-

ees; and that is what we are attempting to do.

Will the gentleman yield for a further comment?

Mr. WYDLER. I yield further to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONER. The gentleman from Rhode Island said that they had to compete for talent. Some of us raised the issue when the Public Broadcasting System came into being that eventually this was the point we would reach, that they would be competing with the commercial networks.

I do not believe it was ever intended that the Public Broadcasting System be in competition with the commercial networks, as much distaste as I have for some of the things the commercial networks do. It was never intended that they be competitive with these networks. We ought to get rid of that idea.

Mr. WYDLER. I agree with the gentleman on that totally.

As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Rhode Island used Sesame Street as an example of where competition is necessary. It is a very fine program, but that program did not hire great high-priced talent at all. I know it well. It started out with people who came through commercial television, but they were not big stars when they came on that network. The people they use who are stars are very low-paid people, as a matter of fact.

The example, it seems to me, proves just the opposite.

We do not want to get public broadcasting into some type of competition for salaries with NBC, CBS, and ABC.

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

Mr. WYDLER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. TIERNAN. There is no way, as the gentleman knows, that we are going to achieve what we are talking about in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia. We are not limiting the amount paid Bob McCooney and the workshop, in developing "Sesame Street," because there is no way we can say to that corporation which put that together, "You are not going to pay more than x amount of dollars."

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

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot of discussion about how many officers and employees of the Public Broadcasting Corporation would be affected. I have heard one to two mentioned.

I should like to call the attention of the committee to the December 2 RECORD, where Mr. VAN DEERLIN, a member of the committee, inserted a letter from the president outlining salary schedules paid to the officers of the Corporation, and it lists as follows:

John W. Macy, president, \$65,000.

Ralph Nicholson, vice president, \$45,000.

Donald Quayle, \$45,000.

Hartford Gunn, \$42,500 up to \$60,000—we know not where.

I would suggest that there is more than one person who would be affected by this amendment, and again I urge the

adoption of my amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the next-to-the-last word.

Mr. Chairman, let me point out to the Members of the House that the new corporation known as the Postal Service has been importuning the Congress for several months, ever since the Postal Reorganization Act was passed, to permit top-level salaries to take flight in the Postal Service. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has refused thus far to give that request any consideration.

This legislation would set a precedent for bringing salaries in the Postal Corporation up to those paid to some of these individuals in this Public Broadcasting Corporation: If nothing is to be done to reduce these salaries, then how with any justice can top officials in another Government corporation be denied equal treatment?

I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia is adopted, and that the substitute offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts is soundly defeated.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I would like to commend the gentleman from Georgia for offering his amendment. It is certainly one that is needed and as far as the public broadcasting system competing for talent with NBC or CBS or whatever the source may be, there are many aspiring actors and actresses throughout this country who have great talent. They may not have been recognized by the Nation as such. I would hope in the public broadcasting sector, rather than trying to go out and get name personalities and compete, not necessarily because of the talent but because of the name, would seek out some of these individuals who do have talent but who have not been recognized and obviously do not command the salaries of the higher priced people. I hope they will read the legislative record made by us here and do this.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Is it the hope of the gentleman from Georgia that these able dancers and thespians will be appointed officers of the corporation for public broadcasting?

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. So far as the officers are concerned, I really cannot be concerned as to whether the officers or managers are former actors or not. I recognize the thrust of the gentleman's amendment goes primarily to the officers of the corporation, but we had discussions here on the floor the general area of salaries, and I hope in reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the public broadcasting officials who do have the program directing authority will recognize that there are many of us in Congress who would like to see some of the aspiring actors and actresses given a chance in some of the programs rather than trying to go out after the big name actors.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. If the gentleman will yield further, I think we can conclude that some message will have gotten through, if only from this debate.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. I concur.

I would like to point out very briefly, Mr. Chairman, that we are talking about saving a few thousand dollars here when we spend millions of dollars on public television. To my way of thinking, until the advent of Mr. Macy, public television was a national disgrace and a farce. They spent millions of dollars and became the laughing stock of the entertainment world. Since Mr. Macy has taken over, public television has been improved tremendously from the education point of view. There are programs like Sesame Street which have been shown to children across the country. Mr. Macy did not ask us for a contract and did not ask for any specific amount. He told us that we could set the salary at any level that we choose whether it was higher or lower.

I think this amendment ought to be defeated. There is no point in saving a few thousand dollars in one man's salary if we are going again to turn public broadcasting off and make it into a farce.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KEITH. It is my understanding that under the parliamentary procedures, an amendment to an amendment is first voted on before you vote on the first offered amendment and, similarly, a substitute amendment for an amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair stated earlier, the first vote will occur on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MATHIS). Following action on that, there will be a vote on the substitute amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, and then the vote will be on the committee amendment, as amended, if it is amended.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Do I understand that if the amendment which is now pending before the body is passed it would have the effect of bringing about a change with respect to rates from I to II, and it would also strike out the section providing for the grandfather clause?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman is asking the Chair to pass upon the effect of the action that might be taken by the committee.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Do I understand, then, if the first amendment is passed and then the second amendment is passed, that the second amendment will alter the effect of the first amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the Chair's original statement will apply.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to support the position of the gentleman from Louisiana in making this limitation. I think the gentleman from Georgia made an excellent point about new people and even, perhaps, new management people, coming along. After all, the Federal Government does put up money for public broadcasting.

However, what bothers me is whether what is sauce for the goose is going to be sauce for the gander. For example, I understand that for public television—public broadcasting—the U.S. Government puts up about one-seventh of the budget.

Now, do you have any idea of what percent of Lockheed's budget comes from the Federal Government? I imagine it is getting up pretty high.

After the Congress voted a substantial loan guarantee for that corporation several months ago, I read in the newspapers that that corporation voted a substantial increase in the pensions for retired corporate officers.

I wonder how much the president of that particular corporation receives by way of salary? I would not be surprised if it is in the neighborhood of \$100,000. I may stand corrected, but I saw it printed a month or so ago and I think it was even more than that.

Mr. Chairman, we try to get amendments through to take away these big, fancy limousines and chauffeurs for the bureaucrats in the Federal Government, and sometimes the effort is treated in a humorous vein, or as a joke. Only one such amendment has passed this year.

I just wonder whether or not these people in public broadcasting are politically unpopular. Never hit a man when he is up. Is that the idea of politics around here?

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

Mr. JACOBS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. With reference to the big, fancy limousines, would the gentleman support an amendment, should I offer it, that the Supreme Court Justices no longer have a big, black limousine but one used schoolbus?

Mr. JACOBS. That would play in a night club pretty well, but it is not going to play in this record, because the gentleman in the well sponsored an amendment just a few days ago which deleted the limousine for the Chief Justice. None was provided for the others in the first place.

So, to answer the gentleman's question, if the gentleman wants the gentleman in the well to be consistent, the gentleman in the well will be delighted to be consistent. I only ask of the people who advance this amendment, which I support, that the next time I offer an amendment of the kind the gentleman has referred to, let us have teller votes on the record and compare them with the votes on this amendment. And we shall see if, in the business of banning luxury at taxpayers' expense, there are tomcats and alley cats who get different treatment.

If we live in a democracy and we are going to limit salaries and say we are not going to contribute to the Corporation if it does not limit salaries to \$42,500, then let us be consistent when I next come around with an amendment to knock out some of these luxuries and get these easy riders off the backs of the taxpayers.

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

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONER. Talking about tomcats and alley cats, will the gentleman tell us why he has a box of cigars that he has been passing around to the Members?

Mr. JACOBS. If I can have unanimous consent to speak out of order I would be happy to answer the gentleman.

Mr. PELL. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, was that an objection, or a point of order?

But speaking as far as the cigars are concerned I am happy to announce that my great dane, C-5, became the father of 11 puppies shortly after midnight this morning. Rommy, the lovely mother and the pups are doing fine.

I would further add that there are plenty of cigars left, and I yield the balance of my time as well as the cigars.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the full 5 minutes, because I think we should vote on these amendments. I think we all have our minds pretty well made up on them. But I would like to say to the House that if this matter is voted down I believe that each of you will hear from your districts, because educational TV and educational radio are some of the greatest things you have in your States. Through this we have made great progress in education in America. It has brought us into the 20th century in the educational field, in the cultural field, and, yes, even in the public affairs field that some of the Members would like to cut out.

I would say further, as some of the other Members have said, that we are being very picayunish when we pick on two men and say we are going to cut their salaries, when actually we are trying to get at Sander Vanocur and someone else. Let us look at this thing in perspective. You have a place where you can do that, but this is not the place in the bill.

Here is a former Presidential assistant who said he would not sign a contract because he did not want the corporation directors to be obligated to him. That is how fair he has been, and some say they want to cut his salary down. Would any of you do that, any Member of the Congress? No, you would not do it, and I know you would not do it.

I would say that if you want to do this to take it out on Sander Vanocur, and Bob McNeil there is a place to do so, but do not do it to someone else. This is only affecting two people, as has been said. I think we ought to vote down all of these amendments and continue with

the rest of the bill, and see what the Members think about it.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I can assure the gentleman that when the vote is over on this amendment there will be another amendment that is intended to limit the salaries of people such as Mr. Vanocur.

Mr. STAGGERS. All right, I would like to get to that, but this is not the place. I do not think there is a man in this House who wants to hurt educational TV, or educational radio in America. I do not believe their constituents want them to do that. I do not believe the gentleman from Georgia does. And when he hears from his people he will certainly get their feeling from them, I am sure, when they find out that the gentleman is trying to cut out this organization.

The gentleman says that he is not trying to do that, but he is trying to hurt two men through two other men. Let us not do that in this back-door fashion. Let us vote for the committee amendment that was presented here, and defeat these other amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MATHIS) to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STAGGERS) there were—ayes 73, noes 46.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH) for the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEITH), there were—ayes 42, noes 78.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WAGGONNER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WAGGONNER: Page 8, insert after line 5, the following: Sec. 6. Section 396(g) of such Act is amended by adding after paragraph (4) (added by section 2(b) of this Act) the following new paragraph:

"(5) (A) The Corporation may not after the date of enactment of this paragraph make any grant to any organization or institution which—

"(i) compensates its officers or employees, or

"(ii) makes a grant to any organization or institution which compensates its officers or employees,

at a rate greater than the maximum rate of compensation prescribed by section 396(e) for officers and employees of the Corporation.

"(B) The Corporation may not after the date of enactment of this paragraph make any grant to or enter into any contract with any organization or institution if—

"(i) under such grant or contract, or

"(ii) under any grant made or contract

entered into by such organization or institution,

individuals are compensated for performances on radio or television programs and for services related to such performances at a rate greater than such maximum rate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment prohibits the Public Broadcast Corporation from making grants to any outfit or company which pays its employees over \$42,500 a year. It also would prohibit making a grant to another public broadcast system which might use it in turn to make such grants. It also prohibits grants or contracts with an entity which pays performers more than \$42,500 a year.

I submit that the Public Broadcast Corporation is not intended to be in competition with the commercial networks, and that this is the best that can be done with this issue. But I admit it is full of holes. The first part, no grants, would cut off all money to the bigger stations like, for example, Boston and New York, which may pay their station directors more.

The second part, which restricts payments for on-the-air performers, could be bypassed very easily. By doing it in two jumps, we avoid some of the pitfalls. Restricting and contracting in all instances could make it impossible to obtain programs from production companies, all of which probably have employees making over \$42,500. Hence the reason for the mention of grants only.

Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment which is intended to do what some tried to construe the first amendment to do. This is the amendment which will prohibit the Public Broadcast Corporation from making grants to individuals or people who participate in the system, who pay such salaries as \$85,000 per year to Mr. Sander Vanocur and \$65,000 per year to Mr. Robert McNeill, and \$75,000 per year to a former Press Secretary of President Johnson's, Mr. Bill Moyers. How many of you people would believe that Mr. Bill Moyers works even half the time in doing this work? You know what he does for a regular means of livelihood. But still he draws \$75,000 a year by participating in this program, and I say that we ought to prohibit grants in instances like this, and we should restore some commonsense to it. This affects station managers. This affects performers, and I do not believe that we ought to make grants where any such exorbitant salaries are paid.

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

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Would the amendment in any way prohibit public broadcasting from buying a program, say, from CBS or NBC?

Mr. WAGGONNER. No, it would not. It would prohibit the corporation from making a grant if they pay their performers or their employees more than \$42,500.

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Would the gentleman place the same limitation on military contracts?

Mr. WAGGONNER. The Congress can work its will on a military contract by writing legislation which restricts the authority of the Executive and every contract that the Executive has written having to do with a military contract is done under the authority of the Congress.

Mr. ECKHARDT. If the gentleman would yield further, I would hope we would not do anything so improvident with respect to military contracts as we may do in this area, because in both instances is not the question whether or not we hire competent people to serve a governmental agency on a contract?

Mr. WAGGONNER. I would like to say in response to the gentleman's comment that we are not talking at this point about a military contract, but I welcome the gentleman's continued support of the military contracts for the defense of this country.

Mr. ECKHARDT. If the gentleman will yield further, I am attempting to support the Government and the country both in the field of the military and in the field of public broadcasting.

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I do not understand the gentleman's amendment.

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

(On request of Mr. ADAMS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. WAGGONNER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Louisiana will yield further, if they purchase a program from that station to which they may have made a grant, and it is a quid pro quo contract, is that prohibited by the gentleman's amendment? It seems to me it would be, and I do not see how this Corporation would be able to buy anything.

Mr. WAGGONNER. We cannot make grants under the conditions of this amendment to any station which pays its station managers or their performers more than \$42,500 a year.

Mr. ADAMS. What the gentleman is saying is that there is really no place this Corporation can go and buy anything any more where anybody is paid more than \$42,500 in their hierarchy.

Mr. WAGGONNER. What the gentleman is saying is, as one Member of Congress, he believes the salaries have been exorbitant which have been under certain circumstances paid to station managers and to performers, and if, in purchasing documentaries, for example, they become exorbitant, we will attack that problem when it develops.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make inquiry of the gentleman from Louisiana if he believes that this Congress has the power of making grants to public broadcasters to put any sort of limitation it

wants on giving grants to a station, and whether the station is doing a good job for the community or fulfilling its obligations under the rules and regulations of the FCC. For a concrete example, let me ask the gentleman from Louisiana, does the gentleman feel the Congress would have the right to withhold grants from stations that have, say, more than 20 percent employees who are black?

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

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, yes, I think the Congress could do it. I admit it would be subject to a constitutional question, and whether it would stand a constitutional test I do not know.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman does know, if the gentleman will permit me. The gentleman knows it would not stand the test of constitutionality. I am perfectly sure in my own mind, although I have no precedent to quote to the gentleman, that this would not stand the test of constitutionality either.

I take the gentleman one step further in that line. Does the gentleman think it would be constitutional for the Congress to withhold grants from stations, no matter what kind of job they were doing, if the Congress did not like baldheaded people or people with a great deal of hair. Say that, no, the Congress in its wisdom says that if there is more than 40 percent baldheaded people hired by such and such a station, no grants would be forthcoming. Of course, I use that as a rather ridiculous extension of what the gentleman is trying to do, but, while it is illogical in a way, the legal aspects of it, it seems to me, could easily follow.

I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONER. Of course, this is not a matter before the House, but if the gentleman will go back and read the debates of 1964 on the civil rights bill, the gentleman will find the record says that prospective employers can advertise for whomever they want, if they prove need, without discrimination.

The gentleman says can we refuse to make grants because these people have salaries beyond a certain range? We do that, for example, in the U.S. Government when we say that certain contracts are set aside for small business, because their dollar volume does not exceed a certain amount.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. I cannot yield further to the gentleman.

I should like to point out to the gentleman that when this act was passed by the Congress in 1967 we took every step possible to try to insulate public broadcasting from any political pressure by any arm of the Government.

I believe that to take a step such as this, in which we are dictating not only to the Corporation but also to companies that get grants through the Corporation would be improper. We would be getting into whether or not somebody is qualified.

I do not know if the gentleman knows what a difficult job it is to run a good

station in public broadcasting, but I should like to re-echo the words of the gentleman on the other side of the aisle.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. (By unanimous consent, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out that before Mr. Macy took over this job public broadcasting just was not doing its job, and did not until they realized they had to get professional people, not necessarily as performers but as producers and writers, people who know how to operate a station. Until then it was the laughing stock of the entertainment business.

I believe the Congress has enough to do, without trying to run public broadcasting. We have not done very well before in trying to run it. I believe we ought to let them alone. We either should vote against the entire prospect of public broadcasting because they are not doing the job we set them up to do, or we should give them enough money to function so that they can do the job we set them up to do.

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

Mr. Chairman, when the question of salaries of Sander Vanocur and others came up, along with many other Members of the House I was greatly upset. I still, frankly, am.

However, in looking at the total picture, which I believe is what we have to look at, it leads me to a different conclusion from the one I started out with.

I supported the Mathis of Georgia amendment, because this went to those people who are running the Corporation. However, as I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana, it would in essence say, for instance, if we were going to buy an educational program from a college whose president was paid more than \$42,500, it would be prohibited. If we were going to purchase from BBC, or anyone else, a program such as "Henry the VIII," and BBC was run by someone who received more than \$42,500, we would not be able to purchase the program.

I believe that salaries should be limited, and I believe the corporation was wrong in not supervising or having anything to say about the salary of Vanocur and others, but they have taken steps, as I understand it, to correct this situation in the future. The Corporation has required that any such salaries by an independent station must be reviewed by the Public Broadcasting Corporation.

We are going to authorize, I assume, somewhere between \$35 million and \$65 million. That is a lot of money. The real question is, What will we get for it?

Are we going to restrict Public Broadcasting to the point that they cannot do what is needed to make public broadcasting what it should be? I am not happy about the trend in many public affairs programs we see. I believe they have been slanted. But I do not honestly believe that this amendment is the answer to the question.

I would hope that the amendment would be defeated, but at the same time

the message would be delivered to the officers, directors, and employees in public broadcasting that they have to do a better job.

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

Mr. FREY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. In line with what the gentleman is talking about, I stated to start with that they have adopted a rule under which individuals cannot be paid more than \$36,000 unless approved by the Board. I believe that takes care of the situation. They realize what is going on and certainly they are cognizant of the way the Congress feels.

They say they have adopted this rule, and I certainly would hope the Congress would not require it in this legislation.

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

Mr. FREY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARVEY. I will ask the gentleman does he not agree, however, that in accordance with the question raised by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONER) as to the right of the Corporation to make a distinction whether they make the grant or not to a particular station, that there are in this country more than 500 local educational TV stations. Yet the Corporation somehow determines that only 112 of those stations shall get grants. So I say to the gentleman is it not true that the Corporation assumed this power to decide whether a local station shall get a grant or not?

Mr. FREY. I think it is true, but to answer the gentleman, the subcommittee was trying to broaden the basis of the grants by adding five members representing the local stations to the Board so this inequity would be rectified. This would give the local stations one-third of the representation. I believe by our committee action we have cured the problem raised by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY).

Mr. PICKLE. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. PICKLE. I want to commend the gentleman from Florida for his appraisal of the pending amendment.

Many of us are in sympathy with putting a salary limitation, as we discussed, but this particular amendment would do violent damage to the overall program. The Corporation should not be restricted that much. Otherwise, the PCB could not participate in many quality programs because the corporations the education TV stations might be dealing with would surely have some employees on their payroll whose salaries would be in excess of this limitation.

The gentleman from Florida made a good analysis of it, and I commend him for his statement.

Mr. ADAMS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think the members

of the committee who have not had an opportunity to see the amendment presented by the gentleman from Louisiana for their own reading should be aware of the fact that under the language in the proposed amendment the corporation may not, after the date of the enactment of the amendment, make any grant to any organization or institution which compensates its officers or employees at a rate greater than the maximum rate of compensation prescribed by section 396(e) (3) for officers and employees of the Corporation.

Members of the House, I would like to point out to you that under the language of the amendment, the Public Broadcasting Corporation could not enter into a contract with the Texas Rangers, for example, if they wanted to do a show involving Frank Howard, because his salary would be in excess of the schedule proposed in the amendment. The "Sesame Street" program would not be able to be placed on the air because the corporation would be prohibited by this amendment in making a grant to that corporation because the producers of this show pay more than the scheduled salary to its employees. And how many more organizations, such as the Buckley organization, which received over \$750,000 for a series of programs by the Public Broadcasting Company, would be barred?

I do not know how far this amendment will go, and I seriously suggest to the Members of the House, as others have suggested and my colleagues on the minority side have already suggested, that this amendment goes much further than what has been stated to you. You will do tremendous damage to the program and to the progress that has been made under the direction of Mr. Macy of the corporation.

I urge your serious consideration in defeating this amendment because it does not get to what he intends it to do and, in fact, it would wreck the program. It would do serious harm to efforts to educate the children of this country by taking off the airwaves programs such as "Sesame Street." We would not have the "Mastepiece Theater" that Mr. COLLINS spoke of. How can we limit the Broadcasting Corporation of Great Britain as to the amount of salaries that they pay their performers, or put on some of the great individual cellists and cultural programs where maybe they are paid \$100,000 a year to perform on certain programs? We would not be in a position to have this talent made available if this amendment becomes law.

So therefore, gentlemen, I urge your support of the defeat of this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that the amendment my colleague from Louisiana—as offered by a conservative—is almost socialistic in nature in that it would curtail salaries in the private sector. Many of the public broadcasters would have a difficult time buying a camera from a corporation that paid its executives salaries in excess of this schedule. But, he has, I think, inadvertently offered in evidence some inconsistent testimony here. He says that Bill Moyer is paid a salary of \$75,000.

Do I understand the gentleman correctly in that regard?

Mr. WAGGONNER. \$75,000.

Mr. KEITH. A salary of \$70,000?

Mr. WAGGONNER. \$75,000.

Mr. KEITH. Actually, what we have done is contracted with an organization to pay the organization \$75,000 for a series of programs. Mr. Moyer is not getting any such salary as that. And, of course, if he is a bright man—and I assume he is—he would set up a separate corporation and get around this proposal.

But I submit, really, that the most ridiculous language which can be found in this particular paragraph is to this effect—that the corporation may not after the date of the enactment of this make any grant to any organization or institution—

That is retroactive legislation if I ever heard it. The paragraph is going to be enacted today when it passes this House.

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

Mr. KEITH. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Of course, the gentleman knows that in the expression of enactment of a Federal statute it requires the signature of the President after passage in the exact form by both bodies of the Congress.

Mr. KEITH. Why do you say, after the enactment of this subparagraph?

Mr. WAGGONNER. This subparagraph is not enacted, as the gentleman well knows, until it is signed by the President of the United States.

Mr. KEITH. It would seem to me that better draftsmanship would dictate that this language should read "after the enactment of this legislation."

Mr. WAGGONNER. The gentleman apparently has not been paying much attention to some of the legislation he has been voting for, because it is boilerplate language, believe me. I would suggest that the gentleman read some other bills which contain such boilerplate language.

Mr. KEITH. Well, I guess I will have to go to law school to find boilerplate language like that.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, I concur in the sentiments expressed by our colleague from Florida (Mr. FREY) as well as the chairman of the committee.

This is, I believe, very reactionary legislation, both as to philosophy and as to the mood of this House.

We want to get at certain things which none of us like in the way of these public broadcasting programs, but it is my understanding that they have made an effort to bring about a balance. However, there have not been a sufficient number of spokesmen differing with the philosophies that have been expressed to enter into the forum.

I think it is time for those of us, as I do, who disagree with the philosophy that is being expounded to express yourself and participate in these things and give these programs the balance that they need.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The gentleman says he has never seen language like this before.

I have a copy of the committee bill and if the gentleman will turn to page 7, line 3, subparagraph (b), the gentleman

will find somewhat similar language in the committee bill.

I was somewhat amused at the gentleman saying that this amendment having to do with the regulation of salaries in private industry was somewhat socialistic.

Would the gentleman feel then that anyone who voted for an increase in the minimum wage cast a Socialist vote? Is that what the gentleman says?

Mr. KEITH. I would say that gets to we, in our need to respond to the problems the social problems in our society and lems of the poor people, have had to do that with this, but this is raising standards of the poor, whereas this is lowering standards of professionals and I do not think that they are at all comparable.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Of course, the gentleman would agree that this is subject to controversy, would he not?

Mr. KEITH. That is correct.

Mr. MICHEL. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MICHEL. On Tuesday, April 25, Mr. Macy appeared before the Committee on Appropriations and I asked him the question: When you make a grant do you put any instructions on how much money you actually put apart for salaries?

He answered as follows:

We have since the controversy arose over salaries. We place a limit of \$36,000 for any payment of salaries out of funds provided by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting unless an exception is approved by the Board of the Corporation. The Board took that action in January.

It seems to me the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana simply denies the Board the opportunity to make that exception and, as a matter of fact, increases the \$36,000 which they have set as a limit now to \$42,500.

Mr. KEITH. As I read the amendment—

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

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

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, as I read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana, his amendment would apply to salaries of those who are under contract to an organization. So if you receive \$35,000 for salaries in connection with services rendered that is all right under the amendment, and under the provisions that are outlined in the testimony just offered by the gentleman from Illinois. Under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana, however, if you get \$43,000 over a year for all your services rendered to the Corporation you are prohibited from doing business with the Corporation. That is the way I see the difference, and it is to that which I object.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wholly agree with my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. KEITH) and indeed if some of this language is boilerplate language it would appear to

me more as if it were written by a boiler-maker than by a lawyer. I refer particularly to (B). I would like to point out how (B), if used as a general rule with regard to governmental contracting, would be extremely bad for the country.

That section says that if the Government makes a contract with a contractor to produce a part of this program, that that contract is illegal if the contractor pays anyone who helps in the production of the program more than that which is paid to a Congressman.

Let me invite you to apply that for a moment to a situation like the NASA contracts—I was formerly on that committee—and the principle is precisely the same.

Recently Wernher von Braun left the NASA program and is now working for an aerospace organization. He is a highly competent man, probably the man who knows more about rockets and rocket propulsion than anybody else in the world. Now, if we had the same rule with regard to the NASA program—and this, of course, might also apply to the military program—if you were having a piece of aerospace hardware produced by that aerospace company, and Werner von Braun worked on that contract, if he were one of those who helped perform the contract, such a contract would probably be illegal. Von Braun is, I am sure, making more than \$42,500; and, it could be said that under the contract he was compensated for services related to such performance at a rate greater than that maximum rate, such contract would not be permitted.

Now, how could anything be more ridiculous than to say if you need a part of the work and a part of the time of a highly competent man you cannot employ him if he gets more pay than we are willing to give ourselves, or feel that the public will. Must we then deny ourselves of that professional's services?

That is what this says.

I suppose, to a certain extent, nearly all the Members of the House can call themselves conservative with respect to certain processes and procedures. I do.

If my colleagues here consider yourselves at all conservative, certainly you would not want to write into a provision of Federal law the principle that in engaging in a contract with the private sector, Government should mandate to the private sector that it pay no one, though solely in private employ, an amount of money more than we get as Members of the Congress.

I suggest to you that would be an extremely bad precedent, and a precedent that would deny us the qualifications and the work and the contribution of some of the most competent professionals in the United States.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ECKHARDT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If I understand the gentleman's interpretation of the amendment, it is that the corporation may not purchase any services—that is the Corporation for Public Broadcasting—may not purchase any services from a company which compensates its employees more than \$42,500.

Now I do not read the amendment that way in terms of the actual language. I would ask the gentleman, if he would permit me, to ask the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONER) a question.

Mr. ECKHARDT. If I may answer your question first, and then I will yield to others on the floor.

My answer to that would be that it is clearly here in the language.

It says:

(B) The Corporation may not after the date of enactment of this paragraph make any grant to or enter into any contract with any organization or institution if—

(i) under such grant or contract, or

(ii) under any grant made or contract entered into by such organization or institution, individuals are compensated for performances on radio or television programs and for services related to such performances at a rate greater than such maximum rate.

Mr. WAGGONER. If my colleague will yield, the last few words contain the answer: "for services performed as a part of the contract with the Public Broadcasting Corporation."

Mr. ECKHARDT. Precisely—precisely. I gave the example of the space corporation. If you want to cover anyone in connection with the contract, then Mr. von Braun could not participate because he is making more than Members of this body.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. von Braun did have a limitation on his salary.

Mr. ECKHARDT. He did when he worked for NASA but not now.

Mr. WAGGONER. That was by the U.S. Congress as part of the Federal pay system.

Mr. ECKHARDT. And it is perfectly proper—if the gentleman will yield me back my time.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask for further elaboration of the proposed amendment from its author, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONER).

The way the Corporation for Public Broadcasting operates, as I understand it, is that it purchases programs from individual suppliers and it also makes grants to local stations for the development of their programming activities and makes grants to other organizations for work in connection with public broadcasting. I want to make it clear for myself, so I can determine how I am going to vote on this, just what the gentleman has in mind by this amendment?

Can the gentleman explain to me, first, do I understand correctly that under his amendment the Corporation for Public Broadcasting would be prohibited from making any grants to any stations which pay their employees more than \$42,500; is that right?

Mr. WAGGONER. At a rate of \$42,500 for those services which are performed for the Public Broadcasting Corp.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. All right. So the local station, if it paid more than \$42,500 to its managers or others for public broadcasting activities, would be prohibited and this means you are trying to keep local stations from paying more than \$42,500 for their management and

talent. That is consistent with the position the House has already taken in limiting the salary of those in the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to \$42,500 in the previous committee amendment; is that right?

Mr. WAGGONER. That is right as far as being able to receive public broadcast grants is concerned.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. What about the purchase of programs from private sources? Suppose somebody like MGM gets into the production of educational programs as an adjunct to its other activities and it pays high salaries to its officers; would this prohibit the Corporation for Public Broadcasting from contracting with MGM in this particular area?

Mr. WAGGONER. In my opinion it would not, but if the Public Broadcasting Corp. started paying exorbitant fees for such programs on a contract or a purchase-price basis, then I think it would be the obligation of the Congress in the future to review the actions of the corporation in that respect.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In other words, if the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, through its purchase price, made possible a small company or a large company paying exorbitant salaries, then that would be prohibited? I am confused.

Mr. WAGGONER. I do not understand the question.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the Public Broadcast Corp. buys a product from a company—

Mr. WAGGONER. Such as an antenna, for example, which someone raised a question about?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No, a program from a company, from the BBC, for example—although that is not a private corporation but rather a Government corporation abroad—but if they bought a program from BBC and BBC paid somebody more than \$42,500, would that be prohibited?

Mr. WAGGONER. Of course, BBC would not be eligible for grants from the Public Broadcasting Corp.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand the grant part. I am asking about the purchase of programs.

Mr. WAGGONER. No, this has nothing to do with salaries when you buy something on a contract basis. The fairness of the price of the contract, then, of course, would be discretionary with the Public Broadcasting Corp.—

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And it relates only to product purchased?

Mr. WAGGONER. Right, and would be subject to review by the Congress.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But it is not prohibited under this amendment?

Mr. WAGGONER. No, it is not.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. TIERNAN. The amendment clearly states in section 5(a) that a corporation may not make any grant to any organization or institution which, one, compensates its officers or employees or, two, makes a grant to any organization or institution which compensates its officers or employees at a rate greater than \$42,500.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Precisely. But, the purchase of a product under a contract is not a grant. It is a purchase. I would ask the gentleman from Louisiana to comment on that because it is his proposal.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Brown, you know very well the Corporation for Public Broadcasting makes the grants to every State, and if the State of Rhode Island or the State of Ohio has a superintendent of education making more than \$42,500, under that amendment they could not take the grant.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would like to ask the gentleman from Louisiana if that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired. For what purpose does the gentleman from Washington rise?

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized.

Mr. ADAMS. In answer to the gentleman from Ohio, I support the gentleman in his position on this question. Under section 5(a) there is a prohibition of any grants, and you must remember—and I am sure the gentleman is well aware—that the Corporation for Public Broadcasting has no production facilities. It has no ability to produce anything itself. So it either has to make a grant to an institution such as a university, or to a production facility, or to a station, to have its programs produced. The amendment would knock out all stations that I know of in the country, all universities that I know of in the country, for having people produce a program for public broadcasting.

Then let us turn to the contract section, which is the second part. Under the contract section, if any person is compensated in the production of a particular program at a rate greater than \$42,500 per annum, the Corporation cannot enter into the contract. It is illegal. Let us take the "Masterpiece Theatre." The BBC program undoubtedly has somebody on it who is compensated at a rate greater than \$42,500 per annum. So you knock out all quality productions of that type. You knock out productions of the American theater industry. You take away all independent centers of production. You would have us take the Children's Workshop, which produces Sesame Street. Mrs. Cooney, the head of that program, makes more than \$42,500, so there could be no grant for Sesame Street, and no contract to buy the program.

This is a mischievous amendment, and it is entirely unnecessary that we do this. What you are trying to do is to say that this country will not be able to buy anything of any quality from anybody, and, since it cannot produce itself, you will have effectively blanked it out, unless, Mr. Brown, you and I will sit in front of the television and debate questions on public television every night for free, which may be what we shall end up doing.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's remarks are improperly directed at me. I rose to ask questions of the gentleman from Louisiana. The amendment is his. I think the comments or the conclusions of the gentleman from Washington about what the amendment by the gentleman from Louisiana does should more properly be directed to the gentleman from Louisiana to get his clarifications of his amendment, because I confess I still have some confusion on this myself.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman agree, if this amendment passes, it would effectively stop the corporation from dealing with NBC or CBS or ABC and any company, and, in fact, would prohibit the corporation from buying anything from General Motors, because they pay their employees more than the limit in this amendment?

Mr. ADAMS. Precisely. Because this amendment says if they compensate their employees at a rate greater than \$42,500 per annum in a production, a contract would be illegal.

Mr. McKINNEY. And if we follow this amendment through far enough, even if the members of the corporation buy bicycles, they would not be able to ride on a bicycle to do their show, because some members of the bicycle manufacturing corporation would be paid more.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, I do not know how many times I have to say that when we are talking about salaries and contracts and products, we are talking about different things. Every Member of this House knows when we pass legislation, we have to make legislative history so that the executive may establish the guidelines by which that legislation is administered. I say it as positively as I possibly can, when we purchase something under contract conditions, something produced by any of these people that questions have been raised about, the question to consider then is the contract price. That is discretionary with the officials of the PBC, and what the PBC does then can be reviewed at any future time by Congress if they abuse those discretionary authorities in buying by contract the services or products.

Mr. ADAMS. What the gentleman proposes to do is to make these contracts illegal, and all subject to question, and will raise questions for everybody involved. I will read the language:

Individuals are compensated for performances on radio or television programs and for services related to such performances at a rate greater than such maximum rate.

The rate the man gets is the rate he gets paid per year by whatever group pays him.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. TIERNAN. I thank the gentleman

for yielding. Under the gentleman's amendment, we could not, for example, have the Boston Pops Orchestra perform on public contract, because the director, Mr. Fiedler, is paid \$75,000 a year. So I say we cut off all possible performances in the area of culture.

Mr. WAGGONER. No.

Mr. TIERNAN. This amendment would create tremendous problems.

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

TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Messrs. WAGGONER, STAGGERS, TIERNAN, and THOMPSON of Georgia.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 163, noes 182, not voting 87, as follows:

[Roll No. 177]

[Recorded Teller Vote]

AYES—163

Abbott	Gubser	Quile
Andrews, Ala.	Haley	Quillen
Arends	Hall	Randall
Baker	Hammer-	Rarick
Barrett	schmidt	Rhodes
Belcher	Harvey	Roberts
Betts	Hays	Robinson, Va.
Blackburn	Henderson	Roush
Bow	Hillis	Rousselot
Bray	Hogan	Ruppe
Brinkley	Horton	Ruth
Brown, Ohio	Hosmer	Sandman
Broyhill, N.C.	Hull	Satterfield
Broyhill, Va.	Hunt	Saylor
Buchanan	Ichord	Scherle
Burke, Fla.	Jacobs	Schneebell
Burleson, Tex.	Johnson, Pa.	Schwengel
Burlison, Mo.	Jones, N.C.	Scott
Cabell	Keating	Sikes
Carlson	Kemp	Skubitz
Carter	King	Smith, Calif.
Chamberlain	Kuykendall	Snyder
Chappell	Kyl	Spence
Clancy	Landgrebe	Steed
Cleveland	Latta	Stelger, Ariz.
Collier	Lennon	Talcott
Collins, Tex.	Lloyd	Taylor
Colmer	McClure	Teague, Calif.
Cotter	McCollister	Teague, Tex.
Coughlin	McCulloch	Terry
Crane	McEwen	Thompson, Ga.
Daniel, Va.	Mailliard	Thomson, Wis.
Davis, Ga.	Mann	Thone
Davis, S.C.	Martin	Ullman
Davis, Wis.	Mathis, Ga.	Vander Jagt
de la Garza	Michel	Waggoner
Delaney	Miller, Ohio	Wampler
Derwinski	Mills, Md.	Ware
Devine	Minshall	Whalley
Dickinson	Mizell	Whitehurst
Dorn	Monagan	Whitten
Downing	Montgomery	Widnall
Duncan	Myers	Wiggins
Edmondson	Natcher	Williams
Edwards, Ala.	Nelsen	Wilson, Bob
Erlenborn	Nichols	Winn
Findley	O'Konski	Wright
Ford, Gerald R.	Pelly	Wyatt
Fountain	Pettis	Wylder
Fuqua	Pike	Wyman
Garmatz	Pirnie	Young, Fla.
Goodling	Poage	Zablocki
Green, Oreg.	Poff	Zion
Gross	Price, Tex.	Zwach
Grover	Purcell	

NOES—182

Abourezk	Annunzio	Bevill
Abzug	Archer	Blaggi
Adams	Ashley	Biester
Addabbo	Aspin	Biatnik
Alexander	Aspinall	Boggs
Anderson,	Badillo	Boland
Calif.	Begich	Bolling
Andrews,	Bennett	Brademas
N. Dak.	Bergland	Brasco

Brooks	Hansen, Wash.	Pepper
Brotzman	Harrington	Perkins
Brown, Mich.	Hastings	Peyser
Burke, Mass.	Hathaway	Pickle
Byrne, Pa.	Hechler, W. Va.	Podell
Byrnes, Wis.	Heckler, Mass.	Powell
Byron	Helms	Preyer, N.C.
Carey, N.Y.	Helstoski	Price, Ill.
Carney	Hicks, Mass.	Rallsback
Casey, Tex.	Hicks, Wash.	Rangel
Clark	Howard	Rees
Collins, Ill.	Hungate	Reid
Conable	Hutchinson	Reuss
Conover	Johnson, Calif.	Riegle
Conte	Jones, Ala.	Robison, N.Y.
Culver	Karst	Roe
Curlin	Kastenmeyer	Rogers
Danielson	Kazen	Rooney, Pa.
Dellenback	Keith	Rosenthal
Dellums	Kluczynski	Rostenkowski
Denholm	Koch	Roy
Dennis	Link	Runnels
Dent	Long, Md.	Ryan
Diggs	McClory	Sarbanes
Dingell	McCormack	Scheuer
Donohue	McDade	Seiberling
Dow	McFall	Shipley
Drinan	McKay	Shoup
Dulski	McKevitt	Shriver
du Pont	McKinney	Smith, N.Y.
Eckhardt	Macdonald,	Staggers
Ellberg	Mass.	Stanton
Evans, Colo.	Madden	J. William
Fascell	Mahon	Stanton
Fish	Mallory	James V.
Flood	Matsunaga	Steele
Flowers	Mayne	Steiger, Wis.
Foley	Mazzoli	Stratton
Forsythe	Meeds	Sullivan
Frenzel	Minish	Symington
Frey	Mink	Udall
Gaydos	Mitchell	Van Deerlin
Gettys	Moorhead	Vanik
Gialmo	Morgan	Vigorito
Gonzalez	Mosher	Waldie
Grasso	Moss	Whalen
Gray	Murphy, Ill.	White
Green, Pa.	Murphy, N.Y.	Wolf
Griffiths	Nedzi	Wyllie
Gude	Nix	Yates
Halpern	Obey	Yatron
Hamilton	O'Hara	Young, Tex.
Hanley	O'Neill	
Hansen, Idaho	Patten	

NOT VOTING—87

Abernethy	Ford,	Melcher
Anderson, Ill.	William D.	Metcalfe
Anderson,	Fraser	Mikva
Tenn.	Frelinghuysen	Miller, Calif.
Ashbrook	Fulton	Mills, Ark.
Baring	Gallagher	Molloy
Bell	Gibbons	Passman
Bingham	Goldwater	Patman
Blanton	Griffin	Pryor, Ark.
Broomfield	Hagan	Pucinski
Burton	Hanna	Rodino
Caffery	Harsha	Roncallo
Camp	Hawkins	Rooney, N.Y.
Cederberg	Hébert	Roybal
Celler	Holifield	St Germain
Chisholm	Jarman	Schmitz
Clausen,	Jones, Tenn.	Sebelius
Don H.	Kee	Sisk
Clawson, Del	Kyros	Slack
Clay	Landrum	Smith, Iowa
Conyers	Leggett	Springer
Corman	Lent	Stevens
Daniels, N.J.	Long, La.	Stubblefield
Dowdy	Lujan	Stuckey
Dwyer	McCloskey	Thompson, N.J.
Edwards, Calif.	McDonald,	Tierman
Esch	Mich.	Vessey
Eshleman	McMillan	Wilson,
Evins, Tenn.	Mathias, Calif.	Charles H.
Fisher		
Flynt		

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HARVEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARVEY: Page 2, strike out lines 13 and 14 and insert in lieu thereof: "certain of the total amount appropriated under subsection (k) for such fiscal year."

Page 3, insert "and" at the end of line 18; strike out lines 19 through 23; and in line 24 strike out "(iii)" and insert in lieu thereof "(ii)".

Page 4, strike out line 3 and all that follows down through and including line 23 on page 5 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(c) Subsection (k) of section 396 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and for each" in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "for each";

(2) by inserting "; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, the sum of \$40,000,000" before the period at the end of paragraph (1); and

(3) by striking out "1972" in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "1973".

Mr. HARVEY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I asked that this amendment be not read in its entirety because it is really very simple. It has a twofold thrust. No. 1, it reduces the authorization of the committee bill from 2 years to 1 year and, No. 2, it reduces the amount of the authorization for fiscal year 1973 from \$65 million to \$45 million.

I might point out, Mr. Chairman, that the \$45 million would still be \$10 million more than the Corporation was granted in fiscal year 1972.

Mr. Chairman, there are three very strong arguments, I believe, that could be made for this amendment.

First of all, the administration itself has come before the committee and pledged to develop long-range financing for public broadcasting within the next year. I happen to think with a lot of others that if we go ahead and grant a 2-year authorization that this is going to undermine the efforts once again to get long-range financing. And I would read to you from the hearings on page 278 the statement of Mr. Clay Whitehead, adviser to the President, where he said this, and I quote:

We agree with the view, expressed strongly during these hearings, that there must be a workable long-range financing plan, as contemplated by the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, and the administration intends to submit one before the proposed extension of authorization expires.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the administration should be held to its commitment. I think that this Congress should hold the administration's feet to the fire to get a permanent plan for financing and do the job we set out to do when we commenced public broadcasting in 1967. I said at that time that we were putting the cart before the horse because we were setting up public broadcasting before we had set up the system of financing it. Now I think that we should force this administration to do just that, and within the next year come in with a plan for long-range financing.

Mr. Chairman, there is another reason why we should support this amendment. I point out the fact that the activities of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting have strayed an awful long way from the original intent of the act. This was conceived as a vehicle to assist local broadcasting, concentrating on local

issues. Instead it has increased its national level public affairs programming, and what it has really become is a forth network.

Mr. Chairman, over the past 4 years the Corporation for Public Broadcasting has received a total of \$91.7 million. \$78 million of it has been Federal appropriations.

In those 4 years it has distributed only 13 percent of its money to local broadcasting stations.

In addition, I would point out that the Corporation for Public Broadcasting's 1972 budget provides an estimated \$1.7 million to advertise and otherwise promote national network programs of the Public Broadcasting Service.

The Ford Foundation gives an additional \$1 million to the Public Broadcasting Service for advertising purposes.

I ask this question: Why should tax funds and tax-exempt funds of this magnitude be used to influence the viewers who watch the programs that their tax dollars support?

You need only to look at some ads that appeared in the Washington Post and the New York Times. I have two of them in front of me here. The one from the Washington Post and the New York Times that ran on April 25, 1972, just before the Massachusetts and the Pennsylvania primary elections.

I submit to you that in terms of space and cost to the network—one the public broadcasting and the other the NBC—there is very, very little difference.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting was supposed to use its funds and its statutory authority to develop diverse and pluralistic program production systems and minimize the domination of programming by the National Educational Television station in New York City. But, out of a total of 215 educational TV stations, only six major city stations produced 91 percent of all prime-time programs for PBS, and NET alone produced 25 percent of the total prime-time hours. Next season the New York City station will produce 70 percent of all PBS programs in the "cultural and performance" category. The New York City and Washington stations together will produce nearly 50 percent of all the news and public affairs programs on PBS. What kind of program diversity is this?

Nothing could be more clear in the legislative history of the 1967 act that the Congress did not want the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to create a fixed-schedule, nationwide TV network. Yet this is precisely what they have done and we now have a "live" interconnection network for these stations during 18.5 hours of prime time each week. I think we deserve an explanation of why our intent has been so blithely ignored.

It does not matter whether you are in Milwaukee, Wis., or Detroit, Mich., or San Francisco, Calif.—if you tune in a local station at a certain time of day you get the same program. That is because

they are trying to build up a huge public broadcasting network if they can.

I would like to point out that when our committee reported out the bill that ultimately became the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, the committee stated that localism was the fundamental concept of the public broadcasting system which was created by that legislation. The committee report specifically pointed out that "localism" means that—

Local stations shall retain both the opportunity and responsibility for broadcasting programs they feel best serve their communities.

The Senate committee's report similarly pointed out that—

We wish to state in the strongest terms possible that it is our intention that local stations be absolutely free to determine for themselves what they should or should not broadcast.

Against this background of clear congressional intent, the Members should be aware of the fact that the membership agreement between the Public Broadcasting Service—which is the public television network—and the local educational television stations prohibits the stations from deleting material in programs provided by Public Broadcasting Service without prior permission of the network. The Members should also be aware of the fact that PBS itself has the right to delete material in programs submitted to it by the program production centers. Thus, the Public Broadcasting Service exercises a right which it would deny to the local stations—a right the Congress clearly wanted the local stations to have.

Finally, let me say the third and last reason to support this reduced period of authorization and reduce the amount for next year is because I just think it is too much money. The authorization of \$65 million for fiscal year 1973 and \$90 million for fiscal year 1974, a 2-year authorization of \$155 million, would represent almost a 100-percent increase over fiscal year 1972 for next year, and almost a 200-percent increase for fiscal year 1974. We think that you will agree that these are rather staggering increases for what must be considered a luxury item.

If you do not believe me, I would refer you to the Washington Post of the day before yesterday, May 30, 1972, when this story appeared. The headlines say that Congress reported spending \$1 billion more than the budget.

If you still do not believe the bill is too much, I have here a list of activities which this administration has curtailed because of a lack of money.

There are 35 different activities in the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Defense, HEW, and the Department of Commerce, Housing, and others. They have had to curtail them because they feel they do not have the amount of money to go ahead.

In the light of that, I ask you, Do you want to give an almost 100-percent increase to the public broadcasting service next year?

Do you want to give almost a 200-percent increase the year after that?

This does not make the least bit of sense to me.

I hope that for these reasons all Mem-

bers will see fit to support the amendment which again I say simply reduces it to 1 year and would still give them \$10 million more than they had last year.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ADAMS FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HARVEY

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY).

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ADAMS in the nature of a Substitute for the Amendment offered by Mr. HARVEY: Page 4, line 20, strike out "and"; page 5, line 2, strike out the period and the quotation marks and insert in lieu thereof "; and"; and after line 2 on page 5 insert the following:

"(C) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, the lesser of—

"(1) \$120,000,000, or

"(II) \$50,000,000 plus an amount which equals one-half of the non-Federal support for educational radio and television received during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is the exact contrary of the amendment that was offered by Mr. HARVEY and is a substitute for it. I was deeply disappointed when an amendment which would cut the program back to 1 year was offered by Mr. HARVEY.

The committee originally started deliberations on this subject considering a 5-year bill, and there was a very good reason for it. It was to create a fund that was known and definite for this Corporation so that no matter who was in the administration or who controlled the Congress, the Corporation would be free from any possible political control, political vengeance, or political statements about how it ought to run its particular business.

I was on the committee in 1967 when we created this Corporation, and when the whole purpose of creating a separate fund at that time was to do this. We had the Johnson administration say they were going to do it. We have had the Nixon administration say they were going to do it. Nobody has done it. So the result is that if we are left with a 1-year authorization we will go through a fight of personalities every year as to whether or not someone happens to like or dislike Mr. Buckley, whether or not someone happens to like or dislike Mr. Van-ocur and that should not be the issue in a public broadcasting debate.

What we are trying to do is create a system whereby it can do two things. The first is to help educate our children. This has been done extremely well through programs such as Sesame Street. And do you know how long it took to produce that program? Over 2 years. With a 1-year authorization, you simply cannot develop production schedules that will allow you to produce quality programs.

The same was true of the Civilization series which took 3 years to produce.

It is also necessary to examine the status of the individual stations. No non-commercial station has to accept any program. What Mr. HARVEY said about

cutting parts of programs—cutting programs does not go to the point of local control at all. Each individual station, when something is produced by this Corporation, can say, "I do not want it," and a great part of the time they do not take it.

It should be understood that the Corporation does not operate like a network. It does not have a single production facility. What it does is that it goes out to the various stations throughout the country and says, "Let's see your program." It has a corps of balanced people who look at the programs as they come in. They then prepare a package and solicit all of the various stations around the country, saying, "Do you want it or don't you?" Then those stations decide.

This thing has been insulated to the greatest degree possible to keep it from being any kind of a propaganda operation.

It is first to educate.

The second point, there are certain programs we cannot put on commercially. Any Members who have been in commercial television or who have watched a great deal of it know what happens. Certain things become popular, such as detective stories, or westerns, or some kind of psychological thriller, and then everybody goes on with that. In order to have new ideas brought out, in order to produce programs that commercially are not always feasible, but which people should have a chance to begin to register whether they like them or not, the Public Broadcasting Corp. puts out something people can begin to look at and see. Hopefully then a commercial station will pick some of that up.

There are others that obviously a commercial station can never produce. We cannot put on a "Masterpiece Theater" that runs for 8 hours, that is 1 hour a week for 8 weeks, and have a station do it when it will run up against Columbo or one of the other programs.

So this has been a great thing that has occurred. Since 1967 we have had quality productions. Some of them I may not agree with, and some of them other Members may not agree with. That is a good thing that we do not agree with them all.

But let us not go to 1 year on this. I think the committee made a great attempt, and I will support the committee if it gets down to a 2-year bill. I happen to prefer a 3-year bill. We ordinarily in this committee authorize various agencies and groups within the jurisdiction of the committee on a 3-year basis, so they can come in at the end of that period, and we can look them over. An exception is being made in this case, and we know there will not be a program up for financing before mid-1973. Dr. Whitehead said he expects to be reporting on the corporation by mid-1973 for the year 1972. If we have a 1-year appropriation now, we will have to go to another 1-year appropriation a year from now, with a 1-year authorization, and then we will have to get into the idea again of do I like this program the station has put on, or do I not?

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Harvey amendment.

Mr. Chairman, while I have been a supporter of public broadcasting in the past, and particularly our local channel 47 on the Bradley University campus in Peoria which is excellently run and managed, I must say that I do have some reservations over the prospects of educational or public broadcasting television getting into this sticky realm of politics.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a portion of the transcript of a news interview conducted by WNEW-TV, channel 5, in New York City, on May 11, 1972, with Patrick Watson, a gentleman who moderated a 5-hour discussion program on Vietnam presented by WNET, channel 13, the public television station in New York City. The transcript reads as follows in its relevant portions:

BILL JORGENSEN. Last night Channel 13 Television here in New York City, the Public Broadcasting System, aired a five-hour program on the Vietnam situation.

There were 30 to 40 guests invited to make statements and express their feelings in various ways, and almost all were anti-war. And today Steve Bauman asked Channel 13's anchorman, Patrick Watson, if it wasn't true that there was virtually no representation of the Nixon administration's point of view.

PATRICK WATSON. Oh, yeah, absolutely true. The one man who could be considered a representative of the administration's point of view was Senator Dole, who was interviewed in Washington. I think I could argue, without being frivolous about it, that the program would have been better if there had been no representatives of the Washington point of view on, because it was perfectly clear that what this program was about was reflecting and articulating that body of opinion in the country that's concerned and frightened over what's going on in Vietnam. I think the country knows, and it's had ample exposure to what the administration's position is.

STEVE BAUMAN. Well, haven't there been ample expressions of the anti-administration point of view, and in terms of a balanced program, don't you feel you are obligated to attempt to get administration's spokesmen or supporters?

WATSON. Not within the body of one program. I think that's an old-fashioned concept that went out of broadcasting—where I live, anyway—a long time ago. You do the best program you can to deal with what you're dealing with at that moment. You don't balance out the astronauts with the Flat Earth Society. You don't look for opposite points of view . . .

BAUMAN. But isn't it true that the overall programming philosophy of Channel 13 winds up being anti-administration whenever there is a discussion of Vietnam?

WATSON. Yeah, I think it is true. I think that our people are much less concerned to hide and mask their bias about that issue than many newsmen are. Our people, like all the serious and independent-minded newsmen that I know, hate the war and don't admire the administration's policy about it. I think what we feel philosophically is that while we have an obligation to seek out the administration's position and to challenge it—and it's very difficult, because administration guys don't like to go on camera . . .

BAUMAN. You say you've had trouble having supporters of the administration point of view speak in favor of it. Are you saying you tried last night and were unable to get anyone?

WATSON. No, we were. We got one guy. We tried for three or four.

BAUMAN. Out of 30 or 40.

WATSON. Yeah. I'll repeat it if you like. I

think the program would have been a damn good program with none. . . .

As I am sure my colleagues know, section 396(g)(1)(A) of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 requires that there be strict adherence to objectivity and balance in the programs presented by public broadcasting. Moreover, section 399 of the act prohibits public broadcasting stations such as WNET in New York from engaging in editorializing. I submit to you that Mr. Watson's remarks in this interview demonstrate that his station is not complying with the law. And, for the information of my colleagues, this is the very same station that is a major programmer for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, in that the station produced over a quarter of the prime time programming made available by the public television network to the local stations.

Whether one is for or against the war is beside the point. The point is that sooner or later some Members are going to be in the position, when it gets to politics being discussed on public broadcasting, that their oxen are going to be goaded.

We have to sit on this Public Broadcasting Corporation, particularly with respect to this business of engaging in partisan politics. The best way to do it is to raise some warning signs here and to limit the scope of their activity by way of perhaps a shorter period of authorization, as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY) suggests, and by clamping down on the money available.

I believe that with a little more congressional oversight here we can get this whole program under control.

MR. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN. I am in the well as an advocate for the subcommittee's position. This authorization, as the Members of the House know, is a 2-year authorization.

My support of this 2-year authorization is inconsistent with my position in the past. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY) has served on the subcommittee and knows I was one of those who insisted 2 years ago that the House pass a 1-year authorization, which we did. The Senate then passed a 2-year authorization, and prevailed in the conference between the two bodies.

My feelings then were the same as expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, that we should keep the feet of the corporate directors of this corporation and of the administration of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to the fire, to see that we do get permanent long-term financing of the corporation.

However, in the hearings and in the deliberation on this bill, which originally called for a 5-year authorization, we had the benefit of the testimony of Mr. Clay Whitehead, who spoke on behalf of the Nixon administration with regard to the plans to present to the Congress the proposals with regard to long-term financing. Mr. Whitehead at that time told the committee that they are working on the plans and will present the plans to the Congress before June of 1973.

This, then, would require, as Members know and as our experience has shown us, that the matter take considerable time for hearings both by the Senate and the House. Our subcommittee would have to have hearings, to make sure that we had the views and the benefit of the advice of the many people involved with the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

So in fairness to all concerned the subcommittee adopted a 2-year authorization.

I would point out to the members of the committee that in order for the directors of the corporation to carry out the mandate that you and I have directed them to carry out we do have to give them an opportunity to prepare programs of quality.

It is entirely impossible for them to prepare a program such as Sesame Street, because it takes 2 or 3 years in the creation and in the preparation of these series to put them on television. So we have struck what we felt was a compromise between those who wanted to continue to keep the Corporation's feet to the fire to go in with their plan for long-term financing and the other extreme of the 3- or 4- or 5-year authorization.

Therefore, I think we should certainly vote the subcommittee's amendment and the bill as reported out of the subcommittee and the full committee for a 2-year authorization.

MR. REID. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

MR. TIERNAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

MR. REID. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Is it not true that the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 specifically lists as one of the criteria in the legislation: "the full development of educational programs of high quality?" Is it not further true that a 12-month authorization would in effect kill the programs that frequently take 8 to 24 months to prepare as well as, quite obviously, not reassure the stations that we want to assure and, therefore, a 1-year authorization is inconsistent both with the program quality, the morale, and the best program operation?

MR. TIERNAN. I would say the gentleman from New York is absolutely correct. I am sure he knows the experience in productions of this type. It is extremely difficult to prepare a creative, innovative program. We have tried to present cultural and educational programs to all of the people in this country. It is particularly mandated by us in the act and has been put in terms of what all Members of Congress believe; namely, to see that there are quality programs which are not the general run of the mill and something in contrast to what we have in commercial broadcasting. We also want to break through to our young children and also to present other programs that will lead to the improvement and the betterment of all of the people in America.

Therefore, I think it is important that we stay with the committee's authorization, and therefore, I request the defeat of both the Harvey amendment and also

the amendment offered by my colleague from Washington (Mr. ADAMS).

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. Many reasons have been set forth in the course of the debate yesterday and today which document the need for the amendment. I believe it may be of further value to recount briefly some of the legislative history of the Public Broadcasting Act. This legislative history demonstrates that the congressional intent was to create a system built on a strong foundation of independent local noncommercial educational broadcast stations. The national leadership entity—CPB—was intended to serve the interests of the autonomous local stations by disbursing funds to support their operating expenses; by arranging for interconnection of the stations in such a way as to maximize their freedom of choice in carrying CPB-funded programs; by obtaining high quality programs from diverse production sources; and by making available to the stations a balanced mixture of programming to serve the educational, cultural, artistic, and informational needs of the public. I would like to quote some excerpts from the Carnegie report and the House and Senate reports to show what the intent was in each of these areas; and the extent to which the congressional intent underlying the act has been implemented:

I. Station autonomy and CPB financial support for the local stations. The local stations must be the bedrock upon which public television is erected, and the instruments to which all its activities are referred.—Carnegie report.

It should be remembered that local stations are the bedrock of this system and as such must be responsive to the needs and desires of the public which they serve. It is not intended, therefore, that these stations be mere conduits for the production of other stations or other outside sources.

We wish to state in the strongest terms possible that it is our intention that local stations be absolutely free to determine for themselves what they should or should not broadcast.—Senate report.

Local stations shall retain both the opportunity and responsibility for broadcasting programs they feel best serve their communities. Similarly, the local station alone will make the decision whether or not to participate in any interconnection arrangements, be it state, regional or national. . . .

In the same manner that the bill strives to insulate the corporation [Corporation for Public Broadcasting] from governmental control, the bill provides and the committee intends to see to it that the local educational broadcasting stations conduct their operations without corporation interference or control.—House report.

When the Corporation is organized, one of its principal responsibilities will be to provide funds to local stations.—House report.

Since 1967, CPB has devoted most of its attention to building up its own structure, its networks—the Public Broadcasting Service—PBS—for television and National Public Radio—NPR—for radio—and its national program production entities.

On the station financial support side, during the entire period from fiscal year 1969 to fiscal year 1972, CPB devoted \$11.7 million of its \$91.7 million total funds to station operating support

grants—less than 13 percent. Furthermore, the record of support for local program production shows that, in fiscal year 1972, for example, the most generous year for this category of expenditure, only \$350,000 went for local program production—or about one-ninth what CPB spent on advertising and promotion for its nationally produced programming:

II. Interconnection network.—Ordinary networking of taped or filmed programs, inseparably linked with the concept of the single signal, appears to the commission to be incompatible in general with the purposes of public television. It presupposes a single audience where public television seeks to serve differentiated audiences. It minimizes the role of the local station where public television, as we see it, is to be as decentralized as the nature of television permits. . . .

The commission consequently proposes that public television look to interconnection primarily as a device for the distribution of programs. . . . There would be no expectation that the programs would be immediately rebroadcast by the local station (although of course there would be nothing to prevent such use). Instead, the local station manager would be expected to record those programs he might later use, ignoring the rest.

We wish to make it clear that what we recommend here is an attitude toward interconnection and not a rigid set of procedures. Beyond any doubt, public television must be fully prepared to use live networking when the occasion warrants. . . . What we recommend is simply that the ordinary use of the system be for distribution rather than networking.—Carnegie report.

Although the fundamental concept of the noncommercial educational broadcasting system envisions strong local stations and hence de-emphasizes networking as we know it in commercial broadcasting, interconnection will play a crucial role. We, therefore, expect that the corporation will develop a policy on interconnection which will reflect its primary purpose of program distribution while also recognizing that occasions will arise where live or simultaneous broadcasting will be warranted.

The corporation would use the interconnection facilities to distribute and transmit programs at all hours but each station would be required to make its own decision as to what program it accepts and broadcasts and at what time. . . .

Fears were expressed (in the hearings) that if the corporation was given this authority it would tend to develop a fixed schedule, network-type operation and thus the local station would be placed in a difficult position to control effectively its broadcast schedule.—Senate report.

Even with respect to live simultaneous broadcasts, local stations will have the absolute discretion to decide if such programs will be carried at the time the corporation has arranged for their transmission, at some other time, or not at all.—House report.

The Corporation needs [the] flexibility [to arrange for interconnection facilities], not to establish a fixed-schedule network operation, but in order to take advantage of special or unusual opportunities. . . .—Conference report.

Section 396(g) (3) precludes the Corporation from owning or operating "any . . . network" . . . It is assumed that, in compliance with this prohibition, the Corporation will not have . . . a system of fixed schedule broadcasting.—House report.

As noted, these excerpts are taken from the 1967 legislative materials, yet 5 years later, in the public television field at least, there is a system of fixed-schedule, network broadcasting during "prime time" evening hours: a system which op-

erates—like the commercial networks—as a programmer, rather than a conduit for programming. Network hours scheduled in prime time alone are now 18.5 hours per week—not "to take advantage of special or unusual opportunities," but for Friday night movies, drama, musical performances, French cookery, and the like:

III. Diversity of program production sources. The greatest practical diversity of program production sources is essential to the health of the system.—Carnegie report.

[An] element necessary to localism is to make an abundance of programming available to the local stations from major national production centers, independent producers and stations located in major metropolitan areas.—Carnegie Commission testimony on Public Broadcasting Act.

During prime time over 90 percent of the national programming for public broadcasting came from six "national production centers," and one center—WNET in New York City—produced over a quarter of this. Moreover, there is also apparent a growing tendency toward centralization of program decisionmaking by CPB, so that even the five or six stations doing national programming do not represent an effective diversity of production initiatives:

IV. Balanced mix of programming. Television should serve more fully both the mass audience and the many separate audiences that constitute in their aggregate our American society. There are those who are concerned with matters of local interest. There are those who would wish to look to television for special subject matter, such as new plays, new science, sports not now televised commercially, music, the making of a public servant, and so on almost without limit. There are hundreds of activities people are interested in enjoying, or learning about, or teaching other people.—Carnegie report.

Despite this goal for public broadcasting, in both fiscal year 1971 and fiscal year 1972, more than one-third of all nationally networked hours were devoted to a single subject: news and public affairs. Approximately another third of all nationally networked time is devoted to "Sesame Street" and "The Electric Co.," there remains less than a third of the national schedule to do adult education, drama, science, art, literature, music, and everything else public broadcasting is supposed to do besides public affairs and children's programming.

All of the issues, which must be resolved before long-range financing for public broadcasting can be made a reality, relate ultimately to the center of gravity of the system and the direction in which control of the system is to flow. The center of gravity should, as intended by the Congress, rest in the stations. In such a system, CPB would facilitate the growth of the community-based stations, enabling them to produce and exchange local programs, as well as programs of more than local interest. CPB would also fund the production of some national programs of a diverse nature for non-fixed schedule distribution over the interconnection facilities. In short, the control would flow upward from the strong local station to the national entities.

It is for these reasons, as well as many

already expressed by others of my colleagues, that I support the amendment.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly to oppose the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS) because, as a matter of fact, as members of the subcommittee know, this was my position before the subcommittee and full committee, although the amount of money was never in compromise to such a degree as was the period of time. I felt strongly that certainly in order to give the entire program a chance to keep its velocity going and to pick up even better programs than it has that they needed more leadtime.

As the members of the subcommittee know, I fought for the 3-year period right up to the very last vote, which came out of our subcommittee. I mention this not to talk about my participation in the committee's actions but to point out to you that this entire bill, the entire bill, is a series of compromises.

The bill as it was originally introduced went for a 5-year period and the amounts of money were much higher and there were many differences. However, the subcommittee got together and adopted amendments from both sides of the aisle. That compromise is before you today now as the bill that represents the feeling of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, who has dealt with this program since 1967.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that in considering an intricate piece of legislation we would not try to legislate here on the floor, because there is no doubt as to the intricacy of some of the problems that confront those who are trying to get an enterprise such as this on the road and rolling.

I would like to point out in rebuttal to a former member of the subcommittee who did a fine job when on the subcommittee and now is a very respected member of our full committee—that all Members on this side of the aisle on the subcommittee, except one, voted for it, and it comes out of the subcommittee cosponsored by eight members of the committee's complement of nine.

I would further point out that I believe in the deliberations of the subcommittee there were more so-called Republican amendments adopted than there were so-called Democratic amendments, because this is not a Republican or a Democratic bill. This is a bill for the listeners of the United States who have been subjected to not listening at all to TV or to be subjected to reruns and the usual daytime pap, the type of programming that the commercial networks say they have to put on on the theory of the lowest common denominator. As a matter of fact the networks recognize the value of the public broadcasting system to such an extent that they have contributed millions of dollars to keep public broadcasting going.

Mr. Chairman, insofar as localism is concerned, there was a great deal of argument before our subcommittee. As a matter of fact, we made it mandatory—we made it mandatory—in the bill that is before you that no less than 30 percent of the money allocated to the Corpora-

tion must be given to local stations to be used in any way that the local stations see fit.

Inasmuch as we discovered a little undercurrent of who was the real boss of this program, we put together what seem to be, and is, and does seem to all people concerned directly in the running of this organization the best possible proposal.

We have set forth a provision for a new board, five members of which are to be from local station management or managers themselves. These are to be appointed by the President. They will have an equal right and be given full faith and credit and vote before proposals are arrived at and they will meet with the other members of the board—15-man board—and be heard before something has occurred and help shape policy.

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

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

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. In closing, I would like to answer the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY) and say that nothing has changed since he left the subcommittee dealing with long-range financing.

As the gentleman well knows, he and I had been irritated by the fact that since 1968 we had been promised by administrations—not just this administration but by the various administrations concerned—that they would send to us a form of long-range planning in order to take this annual hassle off the floor of the House.

I thought the minority leader this morning pointed out one of the greatest problems that the corporation has when he pointed out—arguing against the substitute offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH)—that the contracts only went from year to year and he pointed out the fact that these would expire June 30.

Now, it is obviously terribly difficult to get men of substance, men of knowledge and experience and hire them only on a year-to-year basis. It is somewhat impossible to get good production going in a year with a sort of sword of Damocles hanging over the head of these talented people being let go.

I agree with Mr. THOMPSON that we should use more American people in developing the arts and production and the fine programs that are now available to the people who are funding this program and to those who want the funds.

If you look at page 19346 of yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD you will see that I inserted in the RECORD the number of organizations who support the program that is now before us, and they range from the National Association of Manufacturers to the AFL-CIO.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and the amendment in the nature of a substitute and all amendments thereto conclude in 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DEVINE).

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY), and in opposition to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ROUSELOT and Mr. GOODLING yielded their time to Mr. DEVINE.)

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, one of the principal reasons for passage of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 and creation of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting—CPB—was to break the hold that NET in New York City had over national programming on educational television. Supported by heavy funding by the Ford Foundation, NET had assumed a dominant position as the primary supplier of programs to local educational TV stations and was well on its way to becoming a fourth national network.¹ CPB was supposed to dilute NET's control and make the programming for public broadcasting more diverse and pluralistic. The intent was to create a public broadcasting system in which the programs would not bear the stamp of the particular cultural and political outlook of programers in New York City.

However, over the past 4 years NET, and later the merged operation of the NET program production center and the New York City public TV station—now WNET/13, have received the lion's share of program production funds supplied by CPB. In 1971 and 1972, CPB has given NET an average of 31 percent of the total funds it granted for program production. The plan for fiscal year 1973 is to give NET between 31 percent and 32 percent of these funds. This has enabled NET to dominate the prime time evening schedule of the public TV national networks, PBS, with NET consistently supplying between one-quarter and one-third of the national, prime time schedule over the past 4 years.

Moreover, the Ford Foundation has continued its massive support of the New York City program production center. In fiscal year 1971, Ford gave \$6.5 million to NET, in addition to CPB's grant of almost \$3.5 million. In fiscal year 1972 Ford's grant was \$6 million and CPB's was \$4.2 million. Of the 7-station program production centers supported by Ford and CPB, NET had over half the funds in fiscal year 1971, half the funds in fiscal year 1972, and will have slightly under half the funds in fiscal year 1973.

Funding at this level has permitted NET to continue to influence substantially public TV programming, although the type of programming produced by NET has shifted over the past few years from the public affairs program category to

¹ The role of the Ford Foundation and the blueprint for NET's "fourth network" are documented extensively on a study, entitled "The Fourth Network," prepared by The Network Project, a group of Columbia University students who have sued CPB for violating The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967.

the cultural program category. For example, the programming plan for fiscal year 1973 shows that NET will produce 86 hours—or over 70 percent—of the total program hours funded by CPB in the cultural category.

While NET will be responsible for producing only 23.5 hours of the total 221.5 hours of public affairs programs in fiscal year 1973, the National Public Affairs Center for Television—NPACT—which is associated with WETA-TV, the Washington, D.C. public TV station, is responsible for 93 hours. NPACT is headed by the former chief of NET's Washington news bureau and is staffed with other key producers and directors from the NET national public affairs unit. NET and NPACT combined will produce almost half of public TV's news/public affairs programs in fiscal year 1973.

One would not be concerned with so great a proportion of cultural and public affairs programs being produced by NET and NET-derivative organizations, if the production entity had a reputation for balanced and objective programming. But this is not the case. Key officers and employees of NET have had a record of biased, leftist and left-leaning programming and have openly acknowledged their biases. Thus, the American public will continue to be subject to views of culture and current events filtered through the particular points of view represented by the New York City program producers. CPB has not diminished NET's dominance, but actually has aided and abetted NET's control over what viewers will see and hear on public television.

I think these are sufficient reasons to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY) to back this down to 1 year and to back the authorization down from \$65 million to \$45 million in order that the program of the administration can be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. VAN DEERLIN) is recognized.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, considering the degree of near unanimity that prevailed in our committee when this bill was reported out, I must say I felt somewhat surprised when the gentleman from Michigan, my good friend (Mr. HARVEY) offered what I consider to be a crippling amendment as he did a moment ago.

I would have been no more surprised upon learning that Hallmark cards were going to sponsor a roller derby.

There is a good reason for a 2-year extension of this authorization. The reason has been referred to by our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MACDONALD). It is that, time and again over the last 5 years, we have been promised proposals from the Administration—this and the previous Administration—for permanent funding. Is there reason to believe we shall have such a bill before us in time for deliberation and enactment by next June 30?

Permanent funding was first recommended in the report of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television in 1967.

In 1968, in his education message to the

Congress, Lyndon B. Johnson called for a "long-range financing plan."

Richard Nixon in his budget message on January 29, 1971, promised such legislation.

Clay T. Whitehead speaking for the administration on May 13 of last year indicated that we would have legislation by the end of this year. He said:

The bill is now in its final stages of preparation.

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

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, his time was allotted to Mr. VAN DEERLIN.)

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY) commented earlier that 13 percent of Federal money was now going into the local stations.

This bill will provide 30 percent.

He also stated that decreasing from \$65 million to \$45 million, but he failed to realize the States and private industry contributions are diminishing to public broadcasting today—and that is why this legislation is much needed legislation.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. So 50 percent of every dollar we authorize in this legislation, if you elect to follow the committee's formula, will go directly through to local stations. This is localism at its best.

We have had our fun. We have taken our shots at Vanocur and McNeil. We have vented our resentment against several local stations whose programming annoyed us. All of these cases, if brought before the proper authorities, can be treated individually.

Let us now show the greatness that is in America. Let us show that this is, after all, a nation that can support diversity of opinion, and—yes, support it with public funding, for a sufficient time span to assure its independence and continuity.

Let us fund this agency for 2 full years. Let us follow the committee's considered judgment by rejecting both pending amendments.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. FREY, his time was granted to Mr. KEITH.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH).

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I would merely like to point out that the permanent funding which is talked of, that the administration has assured us in years past would be forthcoming, originally was in the amount of \$100 million, as recommended by the Carnegie Foundation. This is substantially under that which would have been therein authorized. So, by those standards and by the inflation that has ensued since, it is a much more modest amount than originally contemplated.

With reference to the comments which have been made about the New York pro-

gram, this, it seems to me, is a very serious charge and one that the Congress and the country should be alerted to. Funding of public affairs programs strikes at the very heart of the democratic system. There is, however, a process which we can observe and which should be observed in getting at that cancer, and that is the FCC. They have jurisdiction over that kind of programming, as they do over the private networks. I think that is the channel that should be used, and I would encourage the Public Broadcasting Service stations themselves to be among those who bring these charges, because what injures one station injures the validity of all.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would reject and vote against either amendment that is before us here today. Two-year funding is better than 3 because it keeps the feet to the fire. The 2-year funding is better than one because it gives the programming a chance and enables the system to continue to produce the caliber of programs that we have had in the last 2 years since this most recent act was enacted.

I recommend to my colleagues that we reject all amendments to the committee bill in this respect and support it in its present form.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Harvey amendment, which would cut the authorizations for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting from \$65 to \$45 million and would limit it to 1 year rather than 2 years, as opposed to the committee bill. I believe what is absolutely clear is that these public stations produce many of the most creative programs on television and on radio. As such, they need and deserve assured continuation with sufficient funds, not a critical hand-to-hand, mouth-to-mouth existence where they have to come begging to Congress every year. Let us finally learn to reward excellence with the respect it so clearly deserves. Mr. Chairman, the record of public television and public radio stations since their formation is indeed impressive. Not only the number of stations has been greatly increased, but clearly the demand for their broadcasts has soared, so that no less than 48 States in the Union are served with an estimated weekly watching audience of 50 million people. Popular programs on these stations vary from "Sesame Street," an educational program for young children which has been widely acclaimed by educators from coast to coast, to "The Advocates," also in a sense an educational program directed to adults, raising vital questions of public policy on a weekly basis in which both sides of these issues are fairly and broadly defined.

Now there are those in the Congress who would cut the Federal contribution to these stations and extend it for only 1 year, in many cases threatening their operations, if not their existence. I would point out that a simple 12-month authorization would kill any long-range programming or development of new programs, which take from 18 to 24 months

to develop and evaluate. In addition, a 1-year authorization would lower morale of the employees of the stations so that in all likelihood a large number of the most qualified broadcasters, reporters, and technicians would leave public broadcasting and return to the "safe" jobs at the major networks. This would virtually destroy these innovative and excellent programs which have been developed with care and precision in recent years.

Furthermore, let me state that the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 is very clear on the principal criteria. Certainly one of the principal criteria is, namely, "programs of high quality." High quality does not always lend itself to pluralism, localism, or whatever, but I believe that these stations are rendering a national service. The people working on them are dedicated. Programs like Sesame Street have lifted the education of our children. I hope the Congress will stand back of adequate authorizations and not cripple the authorizations or the fundamental programs that take 18 to 24 months to prepare.

Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of the Harvey amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY).

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, while I have been listening to the remarks of Members on the amendment, I have been sitting here looking at yellowed pages from the September 21, 1967, edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I find that then we were also discussing the fact that this committee wanted some sort of permanent financing. I will merely quote a short paragraph from my remarks then. I said—

Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate what I said earlier about the method of financing. Both the majority and the minority views show that the Carnegie Commission objected and strongly disapproved of the appropriation method of financing because of the political influence connected with it. The Ford Foundation people, Mr. Bundy and Mr. Friendly, well known personalities, objected to the appropriation process method of financing. We ought to consider those views.

Mr. Chairman, we are still objecting to this particular method. I submit that this is the first administration that has come before this committee and pledged that they will have a permanent system of financing submitted within the next year.

My plea is, give them a chance to submit it. We have been working for this system since 1967. We do not have it. Let us give them a chance to do it. This bill does not do that. This bill sets up a 2-year authorization that is going to give a perfect excuse to anybody not to go out and set up a permanent system of financing. Two years from now we will be back in this Chamber arguing at that time how much are we going to give them in this authorization and appropriation process.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind the gentleman from Michigan the previous administration came before our committee twice and

said they would like to have this permanent legislation. This administration has done it only once.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. HASTINGS KEITH, who is retiring at the end of this Congress. He is really one of the most hardworking, fair-minded men of the Congress. A man of integrity, who always follows the dictates of his conscience and puts that above political expediency. He has always been an asset as a member of our committee. I am proud of the position the gentleman has taken today and I want to compliment him.

Mr. Chairman, in following up briefly, the committee came to this House with a bill. We voted this bill to the House almost unanimously.

I intend to stand by what the committee brought to the floor.

I will stand by the 2 years. The subcommittee in their wisdom worked that out, and in the full committee we decided this was right. So I say I will stand by the 2 years. I would have been for 3 years otherwise, because I think that is the course we should take. The administration has said they will come up next year with a plan of long-range financing, but then we would also have to come in next year for another authorization. This carries us until we can get something from the White House or the administration, and it will take 2 years to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS) in the nature of a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY).

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY).

TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Messrs. HARVEY, STAGGERS, VAN DEERLIN, and KEITH.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 166, noes 183, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 178]

[Recorded Teller Vote]

AYES—166

Abbott
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Archer
Arends
Baker
Belcher
Betts
Blester
Blackburn
Bow
Bray
Brinkley
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.

Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burlison, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Carlson
Carter
Chamberlain
Chappell
Clancy
Cleveland
Collier
Collins, Tex.
Conable
Conover
Coughlin

Crane
Daniel, Va.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Dellenback
Dennis
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dorn
Downing
Duncan
du Pont
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn

Fish
Ford, Gerald R.
Forsythe
Fountain
Gonzalez
Goodling
Green, Oreg.
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Haley
Hall
Hammer-
schmidt
Harsha
Harvey
Heinz
Henderson
Hillis
Hogan
Hosmer
Hull
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, N.C.
King
Kyl
Landgrebe
Latta
Lennon
Lent
Lloyd
McClary
McClure
McCollister
McCulloch
McDade

McEwen
McKevitt
Mahon
Mallory
Mann
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Ga.
Mayne
Miller, Ohio
Minshall
Mizell
Mosher
Nelsen
Pelly
Pettis
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Powell
Price, Tex.
Purcell
Quile
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rarick
Rhodes
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Robison, N.Y.
Roussell
Runnels
Ruppe
Ruth
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Scherle

NOES—183

Abouzeck
Abzug
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Alexander
Anderson,
Calif.
Andrews,
N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspin
Aspinall
Badillo
Barrett
Begich
Bennett
Bergland
Bevill
Biaggi
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
Brooks
Brown, Ohio
Burke, Mass.
Byrne, Pa.
Byron
Carney
Casey, Tex.
Clark
Collins, Ill.
Conte
Gottel
Culver
Curlin
Danielson
Davis, S.C.
de la Garza
Dellums
Denholm
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Drinan
Dulski
Eckhardt
Eliberg
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Flood
Flowers
Foley
Ford,
William D.
Frelinghuysen
Frenzel
Frey

Fuqua
Garmatz
Gaydos
Gettys
Gialmo
Grasso
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gude
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harrington
Hastings
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Hicks, Mass.
Hicks, Wash.
Horton
Howard
Hungate
Jacobs
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Keating
Keith
Kemp
Kluczynski
Koch
Kuykendall
Link
Long, Md.
McCormack
McFall
McKay
McKinney
Maddens
Madden
Mailliard
Matsunaga
Mazzoli
Meeds
Minish
Mink
Mitchell
Mollohan
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers

Schneebell
Schwengel
Scott
Shoup
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Spence
Stanton
J. William
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Terry
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Vander Jagt
Waggoner
Wampler
Ware
Whalley
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Young, Fla.
Zion
Zwack

Natcher
Nedzi
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
O'Konski
O'Neill
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Peyser
Pickle
Pike
Podell
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Rangel
Rees
Reid
Reuss
Riegle
Roe
Rogers
Roncalio
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roy
Ryan
Sarbanes
Scheuer
Seiberling
Shipley
Shriver
Stanton,
James V.
Steed
Steele
Stratton
Stuckey
Sullivan
Symington
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Thone
Tiernan
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Whalen
White
Wolf
Wright
Yates
Yatron
Young, Tex.
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—84

Abernethy	Eshleman	Metcalfe
Anderson,	Findley	Michel
Tenn.	Fisher	Mikva
Ashbrook	Flynt	Miller, Calif.
Baring	Fraser	Mills, Ark.
Bell	Fulton	Mills, Md.
Bingham	Galifianakis	Montgomery
Blanton	Gallagher	Passman
Boggs	Gibbons	Patman
Broomfield	Goldwater	Pryor, Ark.
Burton	Griffin	Pucinski
Caffery	Hagan	Rodino
Camp	Hanna	Rooney, N.Y.
Carey, N.Y.	Hawkins	Roybal
Cederberg	Hébert	St Germain
Celler	Hollifield	Schmitz
Chisholm	Jarman	Sebelius
Clausen,	Jonas	Sisk
Don H.	Jones, Tenn.	Slack
Clawson, Del	Kee	Smith, Iowa
Clay	Kyros	Springer
Colmer	Landrum	Staggers
Conyers	Leggett	Stephens
Corman	Long, La.	Stokes
Daniels, N.J.	Lujan	Stubblefield
Dowdy	McCloskey	Veysey
Dwyer	McDonald,	Wilson,
Edmondson	Mich.	Charles H.
Edwards, Calif.	McMillan	
Esch	Melcher	

So the amendment was rejected.

(Mr. PICKLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in support of the committee version of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1972.

Mr. Chairman, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting is a Federal program success story, although at times a controversial story.

In 1962 when the Corporation was created, there were 76 public television stations serving slightly more than 50 percent of the population. Today there are 220 stations serving 75 percent of the population. These stations are in 48 of the 50 States. I might add that we have a very effective station in my hometown of Austin that is managed under the capable leadership of Bob Schenkkan.

In addition to the television stations there are 500 public broadcasting radio stations. In the 3 years of 1969, 1970, and 1971 there has been an increase in weekly viewers of public television that has grown from 30 million to 38 million to 50 million in 1971—an increase of almost 30 percent per year.

The effectiveness of the program is shown by the fact that for every dollar granted by the Federal Government for noncommercial educational broadcasting facilities, \$11 in State, local, and private funds have been expended. The education TV station in my district KRLN, last week raised over \$250,000 by a public auction.

We are all familiar with some of the worthwhile programs that have been developed through educational television; "Sesame Street" is an example. Although this has been billed as a children's educational program, I have heard many adults quoting from this program—including two or three of my colleagues.

It is also interesting to note that the public broadcasting stations have been used for instructional purposes in the public schools. Three out of four of the 81,000 public schools in the United States have television receivers. Telecasts from public television stations are used by 33 percent of all schools and more than 70 percent of the schools that have television sets.

Mr. Chairman, there have been efforts, and may be efforts on the floor, to cut back the committee authorization to 1 year at \$45 million. The committee bill contains 2-year funding at the rate of \$60 million for operations the first year plus \$25 million for acquisition and installation of noneducational broadcasting facilities. The committee bill provides \$90 million for the activities of CPB for fiscal year 1974.

Mr. Chairman, it is necessary for the effective operation of CPB that at least a 2-year authorization be granted, since 18 to 24 months leadtime is needed to successfully develop and produce an original program series.

Another important provision of the committee bill requires that five of the 15 Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting be chief executive staff officers of noncommercial educational television or radio stations. The other 10 members represent the public.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to adopt this bill today. Public broadcasting has proved itself an effective medium. It has received the financial support of the local and State governments and of private groups. Most important of all it has received the support of the viewers. Let's continue the effectiveness of this program.

The image many of us have of public television is based on our familiarity with our own public television. In central Texas, KRLN-TV is and has been a well-run, well-programed station serving the axis cities of Austin and San Antonio. The campus of the University of Texas is the headquarters of Austin public TV, and our university gives this program full support. Some of our grams—like Carrascollindas—have promise of becoming a regional or national program. Other interesting innovations are underway.

We should keep these TV stations going forward. The committee bill does that, and should be supported.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHAPPELL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHAPPELL: Page 8, after line 5, add the following:

Sec. 6. Section 396(f) of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by adding after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) The Corporation shall not conduct or finance any voter polls or public opinion surveys pertaining to projected balloting in Federal, State, or local governmental elections; nor shall any entity which conducts or finances such a poll or survey be eligible for receipt of funds from the Corporation during the fiscal year in which such conducting or financing occurs."

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CHAPPELL. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. I have asked the gentleman from Florida to yield to me in order to ascertain if we could set a limit of debate on this amendment.

Having heard the amendment read, it is a very simple amendment, and it can be read again if needed.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this

amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, is this coming out of the gentleman's time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that that is correct.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection if we would make it 20 minutes, and I will be as brief as I can. Otherwise I would object.

Mr. STAGGERS. I have asked unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida yield to the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. CHAPPELL. I will yield very briefly to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I will put that as a motion if the gentleman will yield for that purpose.

Mr. CHAPPELL. I yield briefly to the gentleman from West Virginia.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STAGGERS

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, is this going to be 20 minutes after the time of the gentleman in the well?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that it will be a total of 20 minutes.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS).

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Chairman, when the Congress adopted the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 it was fully intended that the Corporation for Public Broadcasting would be a nonpolitical entity. Indeed, I believe the legislation specifically enjoined the Corporation from engaging in political activity either in programming or in its general operations and activities.

Now the Corporation was not pre-

cluded from covering controversial political issues in the programs it funds and distributes, but it was required that there be strict adherence to objectivity and balance in all such programs or program series.

Unfortunately, experience has shown that there has been some difficulty in implementing the statutory prohibition against political activity, and the explicit requirement of balance and objectivity in all controversial programs.

The Corporation and the entities it funds, should in my opinion be precluded from conducting or financing voted polls or public opinion surveys pertaining to public voting in Federal, State, or local elections.

That is the purpose of this amendment.

At least one program production entity funded by CPB—the National Public Affairs Center for Television—has conducted voter preference polls and public opinion surveys during the State primary campaigns. Since these surveys seem to affect public opinion, as well as measure it, CPB and its program production centers should be prohibited from this activity in order to preserve the nonpolitical nature of the Corporation and close any possible loophole in the proposed restrictions against controversial political issue programing.

I want to reemphasize the wording of this amendment—it is a very simple amendment and reads as follows:

The Corporation shall not conduct or finance any voter polls or public opinion surveys pertaining to projected balloting in federal, state, or local governmental elections; nor shall any entity which conducts or finances such a poll or surveys be eligible for receipt of funds from the Corporation during the fiscal year in which such conducting or financing occurs.

Mr. Chairman, we ought to prohibit this kind of activity on the part of those who seek to use public funds in this kind of business. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak in favor of this excellent amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

What the gentleman has brought out here seems sound from every angle of fairness that it seems it would satisfy the logic and meet the approval of Members on both sides of the aisle.

All of us in politics know the impact of polling. We know how unreliable it is.

We also know how voters' moods change so quickly. In other words, a poll taken 3 days ago may not reflect the true voter interest at this time.

With all of the criticism and all of the discussion that constantly comes up on public broadcasting stations as to whether they are fair or equitable, it seems advisable to stay out of controversial public polling.

We would be a lot better off if we would remove this type of program information from the broadcasting field. Let us leave this to the professional pollers and take it completely out of the public broadcasting industry.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very sound amendment and I very strongly advocate its adoption.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of saving time—and that seems to be the objective of the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS)—I would be pleased to yield to him at this time to arise and accept this very worthwhile amendment.

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

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STAGGERS. I am afraid that is too much generosity and I just cannot take it.

Mr. GROSS. I did not know it was so easy to overwhelm the gentleman with generosity.

This amendment ought to be adopted. I do not know whether these polls are financed by Rockefeller Foundation money, Ford Foundation money, or the taxpayers' money. In any event I do not think the Public Broadcasting Corp. should be in the business of conducting political polls.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts yielded his time to Mr. VAN DEERLIN.)

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, I think some of our colleagues have planes to catch, so, as usual, I shall be a model of brevity. However, it does surprise me, when things get to the crunch, how often our conservative friends turn their backs on the principle of localism, and espouse instead the heavy hand, the mailed fist of centralized government.

What we have set forth in the public broadcasting law—and what we require over and above what we require of the commercial broadcasters—is that there shall be not merely adherence to the fairness doctrine, under which commercial broadcasters must seek out opposing points of view, but there must be "strict adherence to objectivity and balance" in all material that goes onto the air.

The proposer of this amendment has not suggested that he found polls conducted by public broadcasting stations any more onerous, any more mischief making than polls conducted by newspapers or by commercial broadcasting, and I would be happy to yield to Mr. CHAPPELL if he could cite any such examples. I do not hold any brief for polling in general, but let us not put any dampers on the right of our public broadcasters that we do not put on the right of our commercial broadcasters.

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CHAPPELL. Let me say, first of all, there is such an example on record, and let me make it perfectly clear that I am not opposed to polls in general, but I am opposed to any kind of poll which might be used or could be used to influence elections. I cite an example in Wisconsin during the present primary cam-

paigns where one of the stations there made a poll and gave the results of that poll before the Florida primary and after the Florida primary.

This was information which could have been used to influence voters, and I think the public dollars of this Nation should not be used in any wise to conduct polls which might influence elections.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. But the gentleman does not make a case that polls conducted by public television or financed by public television do any more mischief in that regard than polls that appear on commercial television, does he?

Mr. CHAPPELL. That is not the issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. TIERNAN yielded his time to Mr. VAN DEERLIN.)

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I will yield after making a point. That is the very issue that has been raised. This amendment asks us to put on the public sector of broadcasting a legislative restriction that we do not place on the commercial sector.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WYDLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I merely want to say at this time that I am delighted with the statement the gentleman just made about the requirements for objectivity on the part of our public broadcasting systems, because when I get my own time I am going to ask the chairman of the committee about a particular poll that was taken on channel 13 in New York when I consider a disgrace to any broadcasting system, and particularly to a public broadcasting system. I am going to read it in full, but I shall not take the gentleman's time to do it now. But I want him to remember his words.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. He has a long memory.

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENNIS. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding. I merely want to observe that I cannot understand the gentleman's argument that we should not put a restriction on public broadcasting that we do not put on anybody else. Obviously we cannot put restrictions on other people that we put on public broadcasting. The point the gentleman from Florida is making, of course, is quite correct. It is not proper to spend public money to influence elections. What private people do is their own business.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. When it comes to the matter of fairness and objectivity in respect to equal time, we have put restrictions on both public and commercial broadcasters. Let us not put restrictions on the public sector that we do not place on the private sector.

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CHAPPELL. Let me say, first of all, I do not think we are making a logical comparison here. Newspapers are privately owned and privately financed. The Public Broadcasting Corporation is

publicly financed. They are completely different. All of us know what the newspapers do and can do. We know what other private interests can do. But we concern ourselves here with public tax money. What the amendment provides is that tax money cannot be used to conduct any kind of poll which could be used to influence an election. I cannot see how anyone can be opposed to an amendment prohibiting the use of public money for that purpose.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Public polls reflect opinion, and might be an important part of public affairs which we have commissioned public broadcasting to provide.

Mr. CHAPPELL. The point I would make further is that we are here talking again about taxpayers' moneys being used to influence elections through the impact of polls and surveys however taken. We have no way of specifying what kinds of polls these institutions might take or their authenticity. All of us know there are all kinds of polls, and we can get all kinds of opinions with polls.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) to close the debate.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I do not have too serious a fight with this amendment, but I think the bill ought to be kept as it is. All of these stations have local men to direct their activities. If we start placing restrictions upon the stations, then we will just keep on doing it right along.

We have had no complaint on this in the committee. No single Member of Congress I know of has come to me on this. No one has come to us in the hearings to say this should be done. I do not think now is the time to legislate on this, until after we have had full testimony and hearings. Often we get only one side here on the floor. We ought to let the other side have their say.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, when Dean Burch appeared before our committee 4 months ago, he testified as of the morning he appeared there had been not one complaint directed to the FCC under the fairness doctrine on public television.

Mr. STAGGERS. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Chairman, this is the wrong place and the wrong time to legislate on this. I would be happy to have the committee hold hearings on this and hear both sides, which is fair, and then try to bring in a bill if necessary.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Chairman, is it not true if there have been no complaints and no problems with this sort of thing, it will not hurt to pass this amendment and be sure it does not happen in the future?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is a sort of negative way to get at the problem. I think the best thing would be to have hearings and have both sides come in so we can hear both sides.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CHAPPELL).

TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Messrs. CHAPPELL, STAGGERS, VAN DEERLIN, and Mr. COLLINS of Texas.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 203, noes 135, not voting 94, as follows:

[Roll No. 179]

[Recorded Teller Vote]

AYES—203

Abbott	Gonzalez	Pirnie
Alexander	Goodling	Poage
Andrews, Ala.	Green, Oreg.	Poff
Archer	Green, Pa.	Powell
Arends	Gross	Price, Tex.
Aspinall	Grover	Quile
Baker	Gubser	Quillen
Belcher	Gude	Rallsback
Bennett	Haley	Randall
Betts	Hall	Rarick
Blaggi	Halpern	Rhodes
Biester	Hamilton	Roberts
Blackburn	Hammer-	Robinson, Va.
Bow	schmidt	Roe
Bray	Hansen, Wash.	Roush
Brinkley	Harsha	Runnels
Brotzman	Harvey	Ruth
Brown, Mich.	Hays	Sandman
Brown, Ohio	Hechler, W. Va.	Satterfield
Broyhill, N.C.	Henderson	Saylor
Broyhill, Va.	Hillis	Scherle
Buchanan	Hogan	Schneebell
Burke, Fla.	Horton	Schwengel
Burleson, Tex.	Hosmer	Scott
Burlison, Mo.	Hull	Shoup
Byrnes, Wis.	Hunt	Shriver
Byron	Hutchinson	Sikes
Cabell	Ichord	Skubitz
Carlson	Johnson, Pa.	Smith, Calif.
Carter	Jones, N.C.	Smith, N.Y.
Casey, Tex.	Kazen	Snyder
Chamberlain	Keating	Stanton
Chappell	Keith	J. William
Clancy	Kemp	Stanton
Cleveland	King	James V.
Collier	Kuykendall	Steed
Collins, Tex.	Kyl	Steiger, Ariz.
Colmer	Latta	Steiger, Wis.
Conable	Lennon	Stuckey
Conover	Lent	Sullivan
Conte	Lloyd	Talcott
Crane	McClory	Taylor
Curlin	McCollister	Teague, Calif.
Daniel, Va.	McDade	Teague, Tex.
Davis, Ga.	McEwen	Terry
Davis, S.C.	McKevitt	Thompson, Ga.
Davis, Wis.	Mahon	Thomson, Wis.
de la Garza	Malillard	Thone
Delaney	Mann	Vander Jagt
Denholm	Martin	Waggoner
Dennis	Mathias, Calif.	Ware
Derwinski	Mathis, Ga.	Whalley
Devine	Miller, Ohio	White
Dickinson	Mills, Md.	Whitehurst
Dorn	Minshall	Whitten
Downing	Mizell	Widnall
Duncan	Montgomery	Wiggins
Edwards, Ala.	Murphy, Ill.	Wilson, Bob
Erlenborn	Myers	Winn
Evins, Tenn.	Natcher	Wright
Flowers	Nelsen	Wyatt
Ford, Gerald R.	Nichols	Wylder
Forsythe	O'Konski	Wyllie
Fountain	Pelly	Wyman
Frelinghuysen	Pepper	Young, Fla.
Frey	Pettis	Young, Tex.
Fuqua	Peyser	Zion
Gaydos	Pickle	Zwach
Gialimo	Pike	

NOES—135

Abourezk	Begich	Carney
Adams	Bergland	Clark
Addabbo	Bevill	Collins, Ill.
Anderson, Calif.	Biatnik	Cotter
Anderson, Ill.	Boggs	Coughlin
Andrews, N. Dak.	Boland	Culver
Annunzio	Bolling	Dellenback
Ashley	Brademas	Dellums
Aspin	Brasco	Dent
Badillo	Brooks	Dingell
Barrett	Burke, Mass.	Donohue
	Byrne, Pa.	Dow
	Carey, N.Y.	Drinan

Dulski	Koch	Purcell
du Pont	Leggett	Rangel
Eckhardt	Link	Rees
Ellberg	Long, Md.	Reid
Evans, Colo.	McCormack	Reuss
Fascell	McFall	Riegle
Fish	McKay	Robison, N.Y.
Foley	McKinney	Rogers
Ford	Maddison	Roncalio
William D.	Mass.	Rosenthal
Fraser	Madden	Rostenkowski
Frenzel	Mallory	Roy
Garmatz	Matsunaga	Ruppe
Gettys	Mayne	Ryan
Grasso	Mazzoli	Sarbanes
Gray	Meeds	Scheuer
Griffiths	Minish	Shipley
Hanley	Mink	Staggers
Hansen, Idaho	Mitchell	Steele
Harrington	Mollohan	Stratton
Hastings	Monagan	Symington
Hathaway	Moorhead	Thompson, N.J.
Heckler, Mass.	Morgan	Tierman
Heinz	Mosher	Udall
Helstoski	Nedzi	Van Derlin
Hicks, Mass.	Nix	Vanik
Hicks, Wash.	Obey	Vigorito
Howard	O'Hara	Whalen
Hungate	O'Neill	Wolff
Jacobs	Patten	Yates
Johnson, Calif.	Perkins	Yatron
Jones, Ala.	Podell	Zablocki
Karh	Preyer, N.C.	
Kastenmeier	Price, Ill.	

NOT VOTING—94

Abernethy	Flood	Miller, Calif.
Abzug	Flynt	Mills, Ark.
Anderson, Tenn.	Fulton	Moss
Ashbrook	Gallifanakis	Murphy, N.Y.
Baring	Gallagher	Passman
Bell	Gibbons	Patman
Bingham	Goldwater	Pryor, Ark.
Blanton	Griffin	Pucinski
Broomfield	Hagan	Rodino
Burton	Hanna	Rooney, N.Y.
Caffery	Hawkins	Rooney, Pa.
Camp	Hébert	Rousselot
Cederberg	Holifield	Roybal
Celler	Jarman	St Germain
Chisholm	Jonas	Schmitz
Clausen	Jones, Tenn.	Schubert
Don H.	Kee	Seiberling
Clawson, Del.	Kluczynski	Sisk
Clay	Kyros	Slack
Conyers	Landgrebe	Smith, Iowa
Corman	Landrum	Spence
Daniels, N.J.	Long, La.	Springer
Danielson	Lujan	Stephens
Diggs	McCloskey	Stokes
Dowdy	McClure	Stubblefield
Dwyer	McCulloch	Ullman
Edmondson	McDonald	Veysey
Edwards, Calif.	Mich.	Waldie
Esch	McMillan	Wampler
Eshleman	Melcher	Williams
Findley	Metcalfe	Wilson
Fisher	Michel	Charles H.
	Mikva	

Mr. PELLY changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

(Mr. FLOWERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Chairman, this legislation before us, H.R. 13918, is of immense importance to the continued growth of viable noncommercial radio and television stations throughout our Nation. If, as I sincerely believe we should, approve this legislation, each Member of this House will have voted to enrich the lives of the citizens of his district.

I speak with an especial knowledge of, and pride in, the distinguished record of public broadcasting in my own State of Alabama. It was 15 years ago, when public television was solely educational television, that a group of visionary citizens of the State of Alabama set to work fashioning what was to become the Alabama Public Television Commission.

These men and women sensed the importance that noncommercial broadcasting could have in bringing into their

schools a vital tool of educational technology and in bringing into their homes programs that are distinguished by their quality and depth.

And the Legislature of the State of Alabama, wise to the potential of this communications tool for the betterment of its citizens, provided in the beginning and has continued to provide the essential local bedrock support for the Alabama State Public Television Network.

The State network came into being with three stations; now there are eight. Each school day, the children of Alabama and their teachers may call upon a vast range of programs to markedly assist in the learning process. The great bulk of these instructional programs are produced by the skilled public television experts of local public school systems and the great universities of Alabama who are partners in this noble venture.

Children's programming—and who has not heard of "Sesame Street" and "The Electric Co.," and "Mister Rogers' Neighborhood"—are telecast in those hours when the youngsters first arrive back home.

In the evening, the Alabama public television stations skillfully mix the diverse fare available from national production centers with more local programs or programs available from the growing tape libraries of public television.

Indeed, for the citizens of Alabama, there truly is something for everyone on public television. The people in the rural areas may select for viewing a given program while the people living in the urban areas may choose another offering. We older viewers can enjoy quality drama and our children have their own programming.

And, Mr. Chairman, I believe that it is critical to continue to assist the Alabama State Public Television Network and all of those components of public broadcasting which exist to serve those local stations. I believe that the bill before us is essential if the growing service by public broadcasting is to continue, not only to the citizens of Alabama, but all citizens.

Specifically, if this bill becomes law, the State system in Alabama would receive roughly twice the current amount in the direct community service grant program from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Not only is this CPB grant program important, but that portion of H.R. 13918 which provides \$25 million for the HEW facilities program is of crucial importance to help our local public television stations to operate with quality. And, Mr. Speaker, I cannot mention the HEW facilities program without recalling that the father of that program in this House was the most distinguished Congressman Kenneth Roberts, part of whose House district, Dallas County, it will be my privilege to represent in the 93d Congress.

Looking at the state of public broadcasting in the Nation, it is overwhelmingly agreed by the local stations CPB is serving that the Corporation is writing a laudable record as it undertakes to develop public broadcasting into the vital natural resource it can and must become. We must not pull the rug out

from under CPB, either by cutting back on the funds or retreating from the important gain of a 2-year authorization as contained in H.R. 13918.

Up to now, CPB has been deeply involved in the mere establishment of a minimum of interconnection and a minimum of programs to offer local stations on that interconnection.

Mr. Chairman, this is the time to move beyond the establishment of the skeleton of a great nationwide system of strong local public broadcasting. This is the time to vote our confidence in the capacity of noncommercial broadcasting to realize the dreams which we hold for it—and which we will, I predict, see coming increasingly true if public broadcasting is given our support.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to follow up my statement to the gentleman from California regarding his statement that there were in the law provisions that will protect the public from unfair public television practices to make sure that it adheres to objectivity in the presentation that it makes to the public. Also, the statement of the chairman of the committee that he understands that to date his committee has never received a complaint about the objectivity of public television.

We are going to change that today because I am going to make this complaint on the floor of the House and I would like to hear from the chairman or the gentleman from California as to what can be done to see that public television does stay objective as they say it should stay and how a Member can protect the public from unfair and unobjective activities on the part of television stations?

What I am going to do is to read to the House a column that was written by a local editor of one of the papers in the New York area. The editor is Bob Logan who wrote in the Long Island Globe of Hempstead, N.Y. I do this because I personally did not see this program, but Mr. Logan reports on what the program presented, and if he is right certainly it calls for correction on the part of this Congress.

Here is the editorial:

Like many other viewers I was lured to tune in Channel 13 this past week because of huge publicity and newspaper listings for a program of the great days of radio in the thirties and forties. The program was supposed to feature Burns and Allen, Bob Hope, Bing Crosby, Jack Benny and Edgar Bergen and Charlie McCarthy.

The show was changed at the last minute to "a war watch" and what I saw and heard convinced me that the liberals have a secure hold on public television. Channel 13 invited its viewers to phone that station and vote "for" or "against" the President's recent action in Vietnam. This is fine, but before the voting started, the host, a Mr. Patrick, presented an anti-military folk singer who rambled on for a few minutes in a song that seemed to compare our military in Vietnam to the Nazi's invasion of the low lands and France in World War II.

The shrewd moderator gave the phone number of local congressmen and senators for the listeners to call, but first their anti-war ratings by a committee called "SANE" . . . Senator Buckley was rated zero . . . Congressman John Wydler was given a 10 per cent rating, etc. . . . However, the moderator

forgot to tell the viewers that "SANE" is against anyone who shows any support for appropriations for the United States Armed Forces.

The voting started to come in and the station reported the vote was going 5 to 1 against Nixon's recent policy in Vietnam.

A college professor appeared on the scene and promptly related his story about his visit to North Vietnam and how the United States Air Force bombed hospitals and innocent children. I don't know if this is true or not, but this reporter was on the Anzio Beachhead when the Luftwaffe came over and one of their bombs hit right in the middle of our hospital. This is war, and I'm sure the pilot never knew what he hit. However, the professor was sure the United States was intentionally bombing civilians and hospitals.

A rock group was next on the show and they promptly started off with some very obscene lyrics comparing the police to the war in Vietnam . . . Oh, yes, W. Averell Harriman showed up and presented his solution to everything he has ever participated in—a coalition government with the communists that usually results in a complete communist take over of the country.

The learned moderator reminded the viewers that we never had to fight a war on our soil . . . guess he forgot about the bloodiest war of all times, our own civil war. Final results came in and they were still five to one against Nixon's recent action.

The next morning I took a leisurely stroll through Hempstead and questioned as many people as I could about the latest action in Vietnam. I found out that the majority of the people I spoke to were in favor of the President's recent policy.

I can't figure out how the intellectuals on educational television get a count of 5 to 1 against the United States recent action and an editor of a small newspaper takes a poll on the street and comes to the conclusion that the majority are in favor of the recent moves in Vietnam . . . I must be doing something wrong.

Now, to make it worse, Mr. Chairman, although I did not see this program I did see another one a week later on this same channel 13, in which they gave an hour of prime time to Jane Fonda, who presented her views on the U.S. military activities in Vietnam, and I would like to know if that is the kind of objectivity we are being told is being produced on public television in this country. Where is the balance and fairness? If that is a representation of it, then I ask how can we protect our people, because I intend to protect my people from this kind of activity by the public broadcasting television service.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HEINZ

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HEINZ: insert on page 4 after line 11 the following: "No additional funds shall be authorized after Fiscal Year 1973 until an audit of operations and expenditures of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting at least through fiscal 1972 is conducted and completed by the General Accounting Office and its report is evaluated by the Congress."

And strike out starting with page 4 line 21 all through page 5 line 2.

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is really quite simple. It is to insure the proper and wisest possible management of the millions of dollars of public money that we will ultimately, in one way or another, authorize

here today for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

The amendment I have offered will require the General Accounting Office to conduct an audit of operations and expenditures of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting through the fiscal year 1972 as a necessary precondition to the authorization of funds after the fiscal year 1973.

I am making this proposal because I strongly believe that the public has a right and that we, in the Congress, have an obligation to know how funds have been used in the past by the Corporation before the Congress authorizes a very substantial increase in funds that are proposed for future use.

The bill we have before us would nearly triple the amount of Federal financing for the fiscal year 1972 budget to a total of \$90 million in the fiscal year 1974 as authorized.

Yet, since 1969, no audit of expenditures of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting has yet been conducted.

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

Mr. HEINZ. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TIERNAN. As I previously indicated to the gentleman in the well, the amendment basically is the same as the amendment with regard to funding the corporation for an additional year, but also provides for an audit to be conducted by the General Accounting Office.

I would point out to the gentleman, in the Act setting up the Public Broadcasting Corporation in 1967, it provides for an audit by the GAO—and that is up to the General Accounting Office to audit the books.

But I think further that to require this kind of audit to begin now just before the fiscal year ends is certainly an impossibility.

Mr. HEINZ. I thank the gentleman, but of course I am not proposing an audit to be conducted before the end of the fiscal year 1972. I am proposing it by the end of the fiscal year 1973 which is one year away and certainly any good accounting firm or the General Accounting Office might be expected to do that.

Mr. TIERNAN. I beg to disagree with the gentleman because your amendment says that no additional funds shall be authorized for the fiscal year 1973 until an audit of operations and expenditures of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting at least through fiscal year 1972.

So that would have to be done before July 1 of this year.

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

Mr. HEINZ. I yield to the gentleman. I would point out I know the gentleman's intention is right, but I think he got the wrong information.

Here is the audit of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for the year 1971 in the corporation's annual report.

The law says they must have an annual audit and not only an annual audit. The General Accounting Office can go in at any time during the year and audit if they chose to.

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

Mr. HEINZ. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. This audit that the

gentleman from West Virginia is referring to is apparently on the order of the fox auditing the chicken coop.

Mr. TIERNAN. That is the same fox that the gentleman in the well wants to audit the corporation.

Mr. HEINZ. I think it might be well to point out that what the distinguished chairman of the committee is referring to is a report published by the Public Broadcasting Corp.

Mr. STAGGERS. This is a private auditing company, one of the most respected in America. Price Waterhouse and Co. did the auditing. They certainly are known throughout the United States and the world. They are one of our most respected accounting organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(On request of Mr. TIERNAN, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HEINZ was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. HEINZ. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FREY. I would like to direct a question to the chairman of the committee. While many of us are in agreement with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania—and I think it is a good amendment—the effect of it would be to go to everything we have done. I am wondering if possibly the chairman of the committee could give assurances to the Members on the floor that he would try to get the General Accounting Office to look into this. That is possibly a solution.

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

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

Mr. STAGGERS. We have nailed it into law. It is in the basic law that we have passed. There must be an annual audit of the corporation. The one I hold in my hands is for the year 1971. It was made by Price Waterhouse & Co. If Members wish to request a copy of the report, I am sure we could get it for them.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am fascinated by the remarks of the chairman of the committee. It seems he is totally satisfied with the independent, private audit of this corporation, when he has, on occasion, if my memory serves me correctly, insisted upon a General Accounting Office audit of other financial institutions and agencies on other matters.

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

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

Mr. HARVEY. I wish to commend the gentleman. I think he has a very fine amendment, which I heartily support. I think a General Accounting Office audit would serve a useful purpose, and I think, even more importantly a 1-year authorization would be very helpful.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gen-

tleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HEINZ was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to make clear to the chairman and the Members, as was correctly pointed out by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY) that I have proposed in the amendment a restriction of the authorization to the fiscal year 1973 only, at the level originally proposed in the committee bill. I repeat, and would like to emphasize, that this amendment would leave untouched the full amount proposed in the committee bill, but for fiscal year 1973 only.

I would add, in closing, and specifically, that I have no quarrel with the Corporation for Public Broadcasting or with the quality of its programming. I believe it is doing a good job and deserves our support although I recognize that some of the Members may differ with me. What I do propose is that we take the time, the 1 year of substantial funding that would be the result of my amendment to reexamine during the coming year the role of this corporation, and I would urge my like-minded colleagues to support this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. TIERNAN. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not it would be agreeable to him that we ask the chairman of the committee to request that an audit be undertaken by the General Accounting Office and presented to the committee and to the full House in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or in whatever manner would be most feasible, for the purpose of getting the audit that is presently provided for in the law. I suggest to the gentleman in the well that the amendment not only requires that the audit of the operations and expenditures for the corporation through fiscal year 1972 be conducted and completed by the General Accounting Office, but that the report be evaluated by Congress. I do not know what the gentleman has in mind by "evaluation by Congress."

Mr. HEINZ. I am certain the report would be sent to the distinguished gentleman's subcommittee for study, and the amount of care given to it would be up to you.

Mr. TIERNAN. The point is that the amendment would not allow the expenditure of moneys until that report and evaluation is made, and that would be required to be at the end of this month.

Mr. HEINZ. I would point out to the gentleman that we are talking about a threefold increase in the amount of Federal support for fiscal 1974, and I am making a simple, direct argument for studying the situation carefully, having the facts available that we need before we decide to triple the budget.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TIERNAN. On my own time I do not mind the gentleman pointing that out.

Mr. STAGGERS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania this question. Our committee can ask for an

audit, and it will, for the forthcoming year. Would the gentleman withdraw his amendment then, knowing that there is an annual audit? We will ask the General Accounting Office to make a report to us and to the Congress.

Mr. HEINZ. I thank the gentleman for his suggestion. I would ask that the amendment, nonetheless, be considered.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, I continue my very strong opposition to the amendment, because, frankly, I point out to the Members of the House that it is not feasible nor practicable. The General Accounting Office presently has authority at the request of any Member of this body to have an accounting of the Public Broadcasting Corp. No request has been made by any Member of the House nor the gentleman now proposing this amendment, and he would now require a complete auditing of the expenses and expenditures and finances of this corporation to be made by the end of this month, in 30 days. It is almost impossible and totally impracticable now to require such an amendment to this bill. I therefore, oppose the amendment, and I hope it will be voted down.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the gentleman from Rhode Island the amendment says "no additional funds shall be authorized after fiscal 1973," which would mean fiscal year 1974, until such a GAO audit has been accomplished covering fiscal year 1972.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HEINZ).

TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Messrs. HEINZ, TIERNAN, VAN DEERLIN, and HARVEY.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 169, noes 165, not voting 99, as follows:

[Roll No. 180]

[Recorded Teller Vote]

AYES—169

Abbutt	Cleveland	Goodling
Anderson, Ill.	Collier	Gross
Andrews, Ala.	Collins, Tex.	Grover
Andrews, N. Dak.	Colmer	Gubser
Archer	Conable	Haley
Arends	Conover	Hall
Baker	Coughlin	Halpern
Belcher	Crane	Hammer-
Betts	Daniel, Va.	schmidt
Blester	Davis, Ga.	Harsha
Blackburn	Davis, S.C.	Harvey
Bow	Davis, Wis.	Hays
Bray	Dellenback	Heinz
Brinkley	Denholm	Henderson
Brotzman	Dennis	Hillis
Brown, Mich.	Dent	Hogan
Brown, Ohio	Derwinski	Hosmer
Broyhill, N.C.	Devine	Hull
Broyhill, Va.	Dickinson	Hunt
Buchanan	Dorn	Hutchinson
Burke, Fla.	Duncan	Ichord
Burleson, Tex.	du Pont	Johnson, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.	Edwards, Ala.	Jones, N.C.
Byron	Erlenborn	Keating
Cabell	Fish	King
Carlson	Ford, Gerald R.	Kuykendall
Chamberlain	Forsythe	Kyl
Chappell	Fountain	Latta
Clancy	Frenzel	Lennon
	Gaydos	Lent

Lloyd	Price, Tex.	Stelger, Wis.
McClary	Purcell	Talcott
McCollister	Quile	Taylor
McCulloch	Quillen	Teague, Calif.
McDade	Rallsback	Terry
McEwen	Randall	Thompson, Ga.
McKevitt	Rarick	Thomson, Wis.
Mailliard	Rhodes	Thone
Mallory	Roberts	Vander Jagt
Mann	Robinson, Va.	Vanik
Martin	Robison, N.Y.	Waggoner
Mathias, Calif.	Ruppe	Ware
Mathis, Ga.	Ruth	Whalley
Mayne	Sandman	Whitehurst
Miller, Ohio	Satterfield	Whitten
Mills, Md.	Saylor	Widnall
Minshall	Scherle	Wiggins
Mizell	Schneebell	Williams
Mosher	Schwengel	Winn
Myers	Scott	Wylder
Natcher	Shoup	Wylie
O'Konski	Smith, Calif.	Wyman
Patman	Smith, N.Y.	Yatron
Pelly	Snyder	Young, Fla.
Pirnie	Spence	Zion
Poage	Stanton	Zwack
Poff	J. William	
Powell	Stelger, Ariz.	

NOES—165

Abourezk	Gialmo	Nelsen
Adams	Gonzalez	Nichols
Addabbo	Grasso	Nix
Albert	Gray	O'Beay
Anderson, Calif.	Green, Oreg.	O'Hara
Annunzio	Green, Pa.	O'Neill
Ashley	Griffiths	Patten
Aspin	Gude	Pepper
Aspinall	Hamilton	Perkins
Badillo	Hanley	Peyser
Barrett	Hansen, Idaho	Pickle
Begich	Hansen, Wash.	Pike
Bennett	Harrington	Podell
Bergland	Hastings	Preyer, N.C.
Bevill	Hathaway	Price, Ill.
Biaggi	Hechler, W. Va.	Rangel
Blatnik	Heckler, Mass.	Rees
Boland	Helstoski	Reid
Bolling	Hicks, Mass.	Reuss
Brasco	Hicks, Wash.	Riegle
Brooks	Horton	Roe
Burke, Mass.	Howard	Rogers
Burlison, Mo.	Hungate	Roncallo
Byrne, Pa.	Jacobs	Rooney, Pa.
Carey, N.Y.	Johnson, Calif.	Rosenthal
Carney	Jones, Ala.	Rostenkowski
Carter	Kastenmeier	Roush
Casey, Tex.	Kazen	Roy
Collins, Ill.	Keith	Runnels
Conte	Kemp	Sarbanes
Cotter	Kluczynski	Scheuer
Culver	Koch	Shipley
Curlin	Leggett	Shriver
de la Garza	Link	Sikes
Delaney	Long, Md.	Skubitz
Diggs	McCormack	Staggers
Dingell	McFall	Stanton
Donohue	McKay	James V.
Dow	McKinney	Steed
Downing	Macdonald,	Steele
Drinan	Mass.	Stratton
Dulski	Madden	Stuckey
Eckhardt	Mahon	Sullivan
Evans, Colo.	Matsunaga	Thompson, N.J.
Evins, Tenn.	Mazzoli	Tiernan
Fascell	Meeds	Udall
Flowers	Minish	Van Deerlin
Foley	Mink	Vigorito
Ford	Mitchell	Whalen
William D.	Mollohan	White
Fraser	Monagan	Wolf
Frelinghuysen	Montgomery	Wright
Frey	Moorhead	Yates
Fuqua	Morgan	Young, Tex.
Garmatz	Murphy, Ill.	Zablocki
Gettys	Murphy, N.Y.	
	Nedzi	

NOT VOTING—99

Abernethy	Cederberg	Edwards, Calif.
Abzug	Celler	Eilberg
Alexander	Chisholm	Esch
Anderson	Clark	Eshleman
Tenn.	Clausen	Findley
Ashbrook	Don H.	Fisher
Baring	Clawson, Del.	Flood
Bell	Clay	Flynt
Bingham	Conyers	Fulton
Blanton	Corman	Gallianakis
Boggs	Daniels, N.J.	Gallagher
Brademas	Danielson	Gibbons
Broomfield	Dellums	Goldwater
Burton	Dowdy	Griffin
Caffery	Dwyer	Hagan
Camp	Edmondson	Hanna

Hawkins	Metcalfe	Sisk
Hébert	Michel	Slack
Hollifield	Mikva	Smith, Iowa
Jarman	Miller, Calif.	Springer
Jones	Mills, Ark.	Stephens
Jones, Tenn.	Moss	Stokes
Karath	Passman	Stubblefield
Kee	Pettis	Symington
Kyros	Pryor, Ark.	Teague, Tex.
Landgrebe	Pucinski	Ullman
Landrum	Rodino	Vessey
Long, La.	Rooney, N.Y.	Waldie
Lujan	Rousselot	Wampler
McCloskey	Roybal	Wilson, Bob
McClure	Ryan	Wilson,
McDonald,	St Germain	Charles H.
Mich.	Schmitz	Wyatt
McMillan	Sebelius	
Melcher	Seiberling	

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to speak in favor of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1972. I believe this bill can do much to improve the educational opportunities for both young people and adults in my State and around the country.

I do not mind telling you that I have not been pleased with all of the programs or the personalities chosen to appear regularly on national public broadcasting, but I agree with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have said that we must look at the total record of public broadcasting to date in making our decision on this legislation. On this basis, I am firmly convinced that H.R. 13918 deserves the support of the House.

I have been in touch with the individuals who operate public television and radio stations in my State in recent weeks, and I have come away convinced that this bill is an important step forward for public broadcasting in many ways. In particular, I am pleased that half of the money included in the first year's authorization would go directly to the stations to be used at their discretion. In Arkansas, for example, our Educational Television Commission is currently providing both classroom instructional programming and programming for the home viewer. However, the coverage provided by the present signal reaches less than one-half of the people of our State, and a limited operating budget limits the local programming effort as well. This is the kind of situation which this bill seeks to remedy. More money will be provided these local broadcasting stations so they can improve and expand their own programming.

With the help of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting the public radio station in my district—KASU-FM at Arkansas State University in Jonesboro—already has increased the service it is providing. With the aid of a special development grant in 1970, KASU expanded from 39 to a full 52 weeks a year of programming, providing a strong combination of cultural, educational, and public affairs programming. Last year the station staff used its annual community service grant from the corporation to extend the number of hours from 12 to 15 a day and the number of days from 6 to 7 a week.

The bill before us today would more than triple the amount of dollars going annually to local public television stations in community service grants. This would be especially helpful at a time when many of the people of my district and elsewhere in Arkansas are very in-

terested in having educational television. At the same time, the total amount of Federal dollars spent would remain a relatively small percentage of the total expenditure from public and private sources for public broadcasting.

As we struggle with the problem of how to get more from limited dollars we have for education at all levels, I believe we can make a strong case for investing more in public television and radio. We have seen in the past 3 years how these programs can make education both exciting and enriching. I believe we should provide both the dollars and 2-year authorization proposed in this bill so that this important work can continue and expand.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from West Virginia for the fine work that he and his committee have done on this legislation to extend the life of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. I believe that from its performance during its brief, but highly productive existence, the corporation has earned our wholehearted support. CPB, a product of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, has received especially warm praise for its efforts on behalf of noncommercial educational broadcasting stations.

In the past few years, the Public Broadcasting Act has greatly aided WTTW, channel 11, in my own city of Chicago. Funds from this act have helped this station develop a full range of public and educational television services for the Metropolitan Chicago community.

Since the inception of this legislation, I have received letters from many parents of young children, parents who are concerned about what their children are being exposed to by today's television programming. The vast majority of these letters have cited the "positive contribution of CPB" to what many of them feel is an otherwise often meaningless display of commercial marketing.

Mr. Chairman, a 2-year extension of the life of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting as is provided for in the committee bill, is, in my opinion, well deserved. I only wish that other Government-sponsored programs could prove to be as successful as has CPB.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Chairman, the corporation has recognized from the beginning the importance of giving financial aid to stations, and a system of direct station aid has been a feature of CPB's program from its first year, 1969, when each television station received \$10,000. In the current year, all TV stations receive a grant that ranges from \$20,000 to \$47,775, and all qualifying radio stations receive a grant of from \$8,000 to \$15,000. The exact size depends on the operating budget of the station.

Through the end of this fiscal year, CPB has devoted \$12 million of the \$78 million it has received during the last 4 years from the Congress for this purpose.

These community service grants, as they are called, have thus accounted for 15 percent of CPB's Federal funds so far in its short history.

In talking about these expenditures, it is important to note that these are only

the funds that have gone to stations directly for their general support. All but 6 percent of all CPB funds have gone to support various aspects of public broadcasting, and the chief beneficiary of these other grants have been the local station. Numerous stations, for example, have received grants to do special programs for local audiences and to do programming distributed nationally. And on the radio side, many stations have received grants enabling them to improve their operations and qualify for regular CPB support.

The major roadblock preventing CPB from increasing station support dramatically has been its own limited funding. There has simply not been enough money to meet all of the Public Broadcasting Act's mandates at once. Now that the mandate for establishing interconnection—which serves all stations—has been fulfilled, the corporation has made clear its intention to increase direct station aid, and the stations are in accord with its plans.

H.R. 13918 would insure that this goal is met in three ways: First, it would provide adequate overall funding for the corporation; second, it stipulates that not less than 30 percent of CPB's Federal funds would be used for community service grants. At a level of funding of \$65 million, this would enable CPB to give community service grants in fiscal year 1974 more than three times their current level, and third, the bill would increase the amount of funding given on a matching basis from \$15 million to \$25 million for the physical facilities to activate new stations and improve existing stations. These are funds administered by the educational broadcasting facilities program of HEW.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 13918. I know from personal experience how valuable the educational radio and television networks and stations are. In my home community we have been served well by WCNY-TV. I want to see that service continued and I think this bill will go a long way toward that end.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Chairman, one thing we should be aware of is that the legislation before us does not mean just a better public broadcasting system in this country but better commercial broadcasting as well. As public television has developed nationally over the past 4 years—helped by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting—it has had an increasingly obvious and positive influence on commercial television programming.

This point has been made by a number of television industry experts. One of these is Les Brown, author of the book "Television" and columnist for Variety magazine.

In a column in Variety on February 9, Mr. Brown made the point that the competitive situation among the commercial networks has prevented them from "gambling" on innovative programming. He maintains that public television, which is free of these competitive pressures, has succeeded in developing new forms and program techniques that have had a salutary effect on all of broadcasting.

The best example, according to Mr. Brown, is "Sesame Street," which is largely funded by the Office of Education and CPB. It touched off a revolution in children's programming. Its success at both entertaining and educating has encouraged and induced the commercial networks to improve their own children's programs. And "Sesame Street"—as well as the rest of the children's programs on PBS—could never have been developed by commercial television because of the competitive situation that dictates that all programs aim for the largest possible audience.

Mr. Brown believes the same holds true of public affairs and cultural programming. "Chronolog" and "60 Minutes" were imitations of the "Public Television Laboratory," he says. There are now attempts to serialize American novels since PBS scored such a success with the BBC import, "Forsythe Saga." Moreover the commercial networks which had no place for the excellent series like "Civilisation" are now buying "Six Wives of Henry VIII" and "The Search for the Nile."

Mr. Brown concludes:

All of television—and the country as well—stand to benefit from a lively non-commercial network aspiring to superior programming.

And this legislation, H.R. 13918, will continue to make this possible.

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Chairman, in my district in California, a local college has been providing educational radio service to the community for almost 20 years and television service for the past 10 years. San Bernardino Community College District made an initial investment in the equipment, staff, and facilities as a bold experiment to see that broadcasting could do to improve instruction in the classroom and education in the community. This local commitment to education and service is being repeated in many communities in all but three States in the Union—clearly demonstrating the importance and value of public broadcasting. Programs offering complete courses in basic educational subjects, which can be taken for credit at home, represent only one use of PBS facilities that are helping to meet some of the grave difficulties facing education today.

To again use my home area as an example, these instructional activities combined with the broadcast of important local school board meetings, live appearances by elected public officials where their constituents have the opportunity to telephone questions to them in direct dialog, and other programs where local issues and problems can be analyzed and discussed, have made KVCN-TV and FM radio among the most important public information resources available.

Another very important practical factor that receives much too little emphasis is that the many colleges and universities who have PBS stations are giving their students the all important advantage of on-job training in TV and radio broadcast technology. I think we are all aware that college is important in finding a good job. And, when you can combine schooling with actual work experience, employment opportunities increase even more. The importance of

this training spinoff from public broadcasting programs around the Nation cannot be overlooked.

The money to be authorized under H.R. 13918, including funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and the 2-year authorization which will make possible the meaningful planning so necessary in broadcasting, will provide stations throughout the country with the opportunity to develop and improve instruction and education in the classroom and the community. Fifty cents out of each dollar authorized by this legislation will be channeled to the local stations to support local efforts.

Continued support of these stations through the passage of H.R. 13918 is important not only in California, but to the people served by everyone in this Chamber. The need for classroom instruction and community education services has been clearly demonstrated. And, public broadcasting has shown it can do the job.

It is our responsibility and duty to provide the means to carry on with this important work. I urge my colleagues to give unanimous approval to the public broadcasting bill.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I most earnestly hope that the House will promptly approve, without any crippling amendments, this bill before us, H.R. 13918, providing for improved financing for the Public Broadcasting Corporation.

This bill, which is presented to us by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, with the approval of 41 of the 43 members, basically projects a 2-year authorization of funds to continue the operation of the Corporation with the requirement that at least 30 percent of the funds that are appropriated in each fiscal year must be distributed to local noncommercial, educational broadcasting stations for use in strengthening their community educational and informational programs.

Mr. Chairman, the fund authorization proposed in this bill is entirely reasonable by any standard and it provides a forward step toward the realization of our most desirable objective of establishing a long range financing plan to insure that public broadcasting remains efficient, effective, vigorous and independent in its great responsibility.

The record shows that the Corporation's activities, since its beginning in 1967, have been fully endorsed and commended by an impressively great number of professional organizations, community groups and individuals.

From the recommendations of the distinguished committee that favorably reported the bill and from all the testimony that has been presented to us, it is objectively clear that the Public Broadcasting Corporation has completely fulfilled the mandate of the Congress to provide our citizens of all ages with a broad range of educational cultural and public affairs programs. Unquestionably, the wholesome activities of the Corporation represent a significant contribution, in the public interest, to the improved quality of program broadcasting in this country and I urge the House to resoundingly approve, by the adoption of this

bill, the continuation of this contribution.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee bill.

Since its inception, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting has provided for a widening range of quality programming in the United States. The record of accomplishment of CPB justifies continued funding.

Public Broadcasting picks up where the commercial networks leave off. Its award-winning children's shows, drama, in-depth information programs have provided the public with choice in its viewing. It also increases the options and program choices for the local stations, enabling these stations to serve local and regional needs and interests.

Mr. Chairman, just last year, channel 57 began broadcasting in Springfield, Mass. Until that time, western Massachusetts was the largest population area in the country not being served by its own public station. Efforts to provide this service to the residents of the area might still be unsuccessful were it not for the assistance provided under the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967.

Public Broadcasting can offer the public more innovative educational programming and more diversified quality programs for older audiences. Its system of interconnection offers better program distribution. The public interest is well served.

Mr. Chairman, the funds authorized this bill will help public broadcasting to live up to its expectations. I believe that this bill will help the system to overcome some of the difficulties that it is still experiencing. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, once again a proposal has been made to further involve the U.S. Government in the activities that have traditionally been the promise of free enterprise in this Nation. How far down the road are we going to travel in allowing the Government to become involved in the activities that influence the thought processes of the citizenry?

The activities of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting have strayed a long way from the original intent of the act. Legislation to establish the CPB was conceived as a means to assist local broadcasting, concentrating on local issues. Instead, the CPB has increased its national level public affairs programming, and has become, in reality, a fourth network. Most incredible of all, the CPB has on many occasions taken a decisively anti-Government stand on the issues, in spite of the fact that it receives a great proportion of its moneys from the public treasury. That a Government should sponsor programming which is hostile to its own interests is just plain ludicrous.

I believe that the policies of Government ought to be subject to scrutiny and that the news media ought to raise questions and expect answers. However, it is unrealistic to expect that the Government should underwrite the cost of programming that defeats its own purposes and intentions.

Freedom of speech, and freedom of

inquiry have made this country great. However, Government participation in broadcasting activities can only threaten the loss of independence presently enjoyed by news gathering and disseminating organizations—I believe we must restrict the activities of public broadcasting so that we can preserve the independence and integrity of our news media.

The three major television networks are none too kind toward the policies of the U.S. Government. While we might charge that bias is in existence; nevertheless, the interests of Government and the citizenry are represented in a give-and-take dialog.

One other point needs to be raised; and that is the large budget deficit facing the Federal Government for fiscal 1973. In this time of pressing needs and demands upon our resources, we must make an effort as a nation to live within our means. If we continue to spend without regard to national income, we can only invite further inflation and the complete bankruptcy of our country.

It is for these many reasons that I oppose the bill H.R. 13918, and support the amendment to curb the expenditure of public funds and the projection of the Federal Government into activities which are the domain of the free and private radio and TV broadcasters of our Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to be proposed? If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GILMO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 13918) to provide for improved financing for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 956, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Heinz amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Insert on page 4 after line 11 the following: "No additional funds shall be authorized after fiscal year 1973 until an audit of operations and expenditures of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting at least through fiscal 1972 is conducted and completed by the General Accounting Office and its report is evaluated by the Congress."

And strike out starting with page 4, line 21 all through page 5, line 2.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, since this amendment in addition to requiring an audit by the General Accounting Office also cuts off the authorization for funding for the appropriation of public broadcasting for a 1-year authorization—

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is unable to determine whether a parliamentary inquiry has been made.

What is the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. TIERNAN. The parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, is whether or not a point of order could have been registered against this amendment on the theory that we had considered the matter earlier in the—

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

The SPEAKER. The point of order cannot be made at this time. The point of order would come too late, if it had been in order.

The question is on the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 166, nays 170, not voting 96, as follows:

[Roll No. 181]

YEAS—166

Abbt	Frenzel	Poff
Anderson, Ill.	Gaydos	Powell
Andrews, Ala.	Goodling	Price, Tex.
Andrews,	Gross	Purcell
N. Dak.	Grover	Quile
Archer	Gubser	Quillen
Arends	Haley	Rallsback
Baker	Hall	Randall
Belcher	Hammer-	Rarick
Betts	schmidt	Rhodes
Blester	Harsha	Roberts
Blackburn	Harvey	Robinson, Va.
Bow	Heinz	Robison, N.Y.
Bray	Henderson	Roussellot
Brinkley	Hillis	Runnels
Brotzman	Hogan	Ruppe
Brown, Mich.	Hosmer	Ruth
Brown, Ohio	Hull	Sandman
Broyhill, N.C.	Hunt	Satterfield
Broyhill, Va.	Hutchinson	Saylor
Buchanan	Ichord	Scherle
Burke, Fla.	Johnson, Pa.	Schneebeli
Burleson, Tex.	Keating	Schwengel
Byrnes, Wis.	King	Scott
Cabell	Kuykendall	Shoup
Carlson	Kyl	Smith, Calif.
Chamberlain	Landrum	Smith, N.Y.
Chappell	Latta	Snyder
Clancy	Lennon	Spence
Cleveland	Lent	Stanton
Collier	Link	J. William
Collins, Tex.	Lloyd	Steed
Colmer	McClory	Steiger, Ariz.
Conable	McCollister	Steiger, Wis.
Conover	McCulloch	Talcott
Coughlin	McDade	Taylor
Crane	McEwen	Teague, Calif.
Daniel, Va.	McKevitt	Terry
Davis, Ga.	Maillard	Thompson, Ga.
Davis, Wis.	Mallory	Thompson, Wis.
de la Garza	Mann	Thone
Dellenback	Martin	Waggonner
Denholm	Mathias, Calif.	Ware
Dennis	Mathis, Ga.	Whalley
Dent	Mayne	Whitehurst
Derwinski	Miller, Ohio	Whitten
Devine	Mills, Md.	Widnall
Dickinson	Minshall	Wiggins
Dorn	Mizell	Williams
Duncan	Mosher	Winn
du Pont	Myers	Wylder
Edwards, Ala.	Natcher	Wyllie
Erlenborn	O'Konski	Wyman
Fish	Patman	Young, Fla.
Ford, Gerald R.	Pelly	Zion
Forsythe	Pirnie	
Fountain	Poage	

NAYS—170

Abourezk	Fuqua	Murphy, N.Y.
Adams	Garmatz	Nedzi
Addabbo	Gettys	Nelsen
Alexander	Gialmo	Nichols
Anderson,	Gonzalez	Nix
Calif.	Grasso	Obe
Annunzio	Gray	O'Hara
Ashley	Green, Oreg.	O'Neill
Aspin	Green, Pa.	Patten
Aspinall	Gude	Pepper
Badillo	Halpern	Perkins
Barrett	Hamilton	Peyser
Begich	Hanley	Pickle
Bennett	Hansen, Idaho	Pike
Bergland	Hansen, Wash.	Podell
Bevill	Harrington	Preyer, N.C.
Biaggi	Hastings	Price, Ill.
Biatnik	Hathaway	Rees
Boggs	Hays	Reid
Boland	Hechler, W. Va.	Reuss
Bolling	Heckler, Mass.	Riegle
Brademas	Helstoski	Roe
Brasco	Hicks, Mass.	Rogers
Brooks	Hicks, Wash.	Roncallo
Burke, Mass.	Horton	Rooney, Pa.
Burlison, Mo.	Howard	Rosenthal
Byrne, Pa.	Hungate	Rostenkowski
Byron	Jacobs	Roush
Carey, N.Y.	Johnson, Calif.	Roy
Carney	Jones, Ala.	Ryan
Carter	Kastenmeier	Sarbanes
Cassey, Tex.	Kazen	Scheuer
Clark	Kee	Shipley
Collins, Ill.	Keith	Shriver
Conte	Kemp	Sikes
Cotter	Kluczynski	Skubitz
Culver	Koch	Staggers
Curlin	Leggett	Stanton
Davis, S.C.	Long, Md.	James V.
Delaney	McCormack	Steele
Diggs	McFall	Stratton
Dingell	McKay	Stuckey
Donohue	McKinney	Sullivan
Dow	Macdonald,	Teague, Tex.
Downing	Mass.	Thompson, N.J.
Drinan	Madden	Tiernan
Dulski	Mahon	Udall
Eckhardt	Matsunaga	Van Deerlin
Evans, Colo.	Mazzoli	Vanik
Evins, Tenn.	Meeds	Vigorito
Fascell	Minish	Whalen
Flowers	Mink	White
Foley	Mitchell	Wolf
Ford	Mollohan	Wright
William D.	Monagan	Yates
Fraser	Montgomery	Yatron
Frelinghuysen	Morgan	Young, Tex.
Frey	Murphy, Ill.	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—96

Abernethy	Flood	Moorhead
Abzug	Flynt	Moss
Anderson,	Fulton	Passman
Tenn.	Gallifanakis	Pettis
Ashbrook	Gallagher	Pryor, Ark.
Baring	Gibbons	Pucinski
Bell	Goldwater	Rangel
Bingham	Griffin	Rodino
Blanton	Griffiths	Rooney, N.Y.
Broomfield	Hagan	Roybal
Burton	Hanna	St Germain
Caffery	Hawkins	Schmitz
Camp	Hebert	Sebelius
Cederberg	Hollifield	Seiberling
Celler	Jarman	Sisk
Chisholm	Jonas	Slack
Clausen,	Jones, N.C.	Smith, Iowa
Don H.	Jones, Tenn.	Springer
Clawson, Del	Karth	Stephens
Clay	Kyros	Stokes
Conyers	Landgrebe	Stubblefield
Corman	Long, La.	Symington
Daniels, N.J.	Lujan	Ullman
Danielson	McCloskey	Vander Jagt
Dellums	McClure	Veysey
Dowdy	McDonald,	Waldie
Dwyer	Mich.	Wampler
Edmondson	McMillan	Wilson, Bob
Edwards, Calif.	Melcher	Wilson,
Elberg	Metcalfe	Charles H.
Esch	Michel	Wyatt
Eshleman	Mikva	Zwach
Findley	Miller, Calif.	
Fisher	Mills, Ark.	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Veysey for, with Mr. Moss against.
Mr. Landgrebe for, with Mr. Rooney of New York against.

Mr. McClure for, with Mr. Celler against.
Mr. Schmitz for, with Mr. Waldie against.
Mr. Ashbrook for, with Mr. Charles H. Wilson against.
Mr. Camp for, with Mr. St Germain against.
Mr. Abernethy for, with Mr. Flood against.
Mr. Baring for, with Mr. Ellberg against.
Mr. Griffin for, with Mr. Kyros against.
Mr. Passman for, with Mr. Karth against.
Mr. Stephens for, with Mr. Stokes against.
Mr. Hagan for, with Mr. Sisk against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Melcher with Mr. Sebelius.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Lujan.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Rodino with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Rangel with Mr. Symington.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Eshleman.
Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Wampler.
Mr. Conyers with Mrs. Abzug.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Dellums with Mr. Seiberling.
Mr. Galifanakis with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Metcalfe with Mr. Burton.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Caffery with Mr. Finley.
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Pucinski.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Corman.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Mikva with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Daniels of New Jersey with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Danielson with Mr. Ullman.
Mr. Slack with Mr. Jones of Tennessee.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Stubblefield.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Zwach.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. McDonald of Michigan with Mr. Pettis.

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

Messrs. BARRETT, SHIPLEY, ALEXANDER, and DAVIS of South Carolina changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 256, nays 69, not voting 107, as follows:

[Roll No. 182]

YEAS—256

Abourezk	Badillo	Brasco
Adams	Baker	Brinkley
Addabbo	Barrett	Brooks
Alexander	Begich	Brotzman
Anderson,	Bennett	Brown, Ohio
Calif.	Bergland	Broyhill, N.C.
Anderson, Ill.	Bevill	Broyhill, Va.
Andrews,	Biaggi	Buchanan
N. Dak.	Blester	Burke, Mass.
Annunzio	Boggs	Burlison, Mo.
Ashley	Boland	Byrne, Pa.
Aspin	Bolling	Byrnes, Wis.
Aspinall	Brademas	Byron

Carey, N.Y.
Carney
Carter
Casey, Tex.
Chamberlain
Chappell
Clark
Cleveland
Collins, Ill.
Conable
Conover
Conte
Cotter
Coughlin
Culver
Curlin
Daniel, Va.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, S.C.
de la Garza
Dellenback
Denholm
Dent
Dickinson
Diggs
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Downing
Drinan
Dulski
du Pont
Eckhardt
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Fish
Foley
Ford
William D.
Forsythe
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Frenzel
Frey
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gaydos
Gettys
Gialmo
Gonzalez
Grasso
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gude
Haley
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammer-
schmidt
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harrington
Hastings
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Heinz
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks, Mass.

NAYS—69

Abbit
Andrews, Ala.
Archer
Arends
Belcher
Betts
Blackburn
Bow
Bray
Brown, Mich.
Burke, Fla.
Burlison, Tex.
Cabell
Carlson
Clancy
Collier
Collins, Tex.
Colmer
Crane
Davis, Wis.
Dennis
Derwinski
Devine

NOT VOTING—107

Abernethy
Abzug
Anderson,
Tenn.

Hicks, Wash.
Hillis
Horton
Howard
Hungate
Ichord
Jacobs
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Keating
Keith
Kemp
Koch
Kuykendall
Landrum
Latta
Leggett
Lent
Link
Lloyd
McClory
McCormack
McCulloch
McDade
McFall
McKay
McKewitt
McKinney
Macdonald,
Mass.
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Mallory
Mann
Mathias, Calif.
Mathis, Ga.
Matsonaga
Mayne
Mazzoli
Meeds
Miller, Ohio
Mills, Md.
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mitchell
Molohan
Monagan
Montgomery
Morgan
Mosher
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
O'Konski
O'Neill
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Peyser
Pickle
Pike

Podell
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Purcell
Quile
Rallsback
Randall
Rees
Reid
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle
Roberts
Robison, N.Y.
Roe
Rogers
Roncallo
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roy
Runnels
Ruppe
Ryan
Sarbanes
Scheuer
Schneebell
Schwengel
Shipley
Shoup
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Staggers
Stanton,
J. William
Stanton,
James V.
Steed
Steele
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Stuckey
Sullivan
Taylor
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Thone
Tiernan
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggoner
Ware
Whalen
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Winn
Wolf
Wright
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zion

Goldwater
So the bill was passed.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
Mr. Zwach for, with Mr. Veysey against.
Mr. Pettis for, with Mr. McEwen against.
Mr. Smith of New York for, with Mr. Landgrebe against.
Mr. McDonald of Michigan for, with Mr. Schmitz against.
Mr. McCloskey for, with Mr. McClure against.

Until further notice:
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Melcher with Mr. Sebellius.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Lujan.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Rodino with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Rangel with Mr. Symington.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Eshleman.
Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Wampler.
Mr. Conyers with Mrs. Abzug.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Dellums with Mr. Seiberling.
Mr. Galifianakis with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Metcalfe with Mr. Burton.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Caffery with Mr. Finley.
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Pucinski.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Corman.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Mikva with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Daniels of New Jersey with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Danielson with Mr. Ullman.
Mr. Slack with Mr. Jones of Tennessee.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Stubblefield.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Terry.
Mr. Moss with Mr. King.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Flowers.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Kee.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Kyros.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Flowers.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Lennon.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Stokes.
Mr. Karch with Mr. Sisk.
Mr. Long of Maryland with Mr. Ellberg.

Mr. St Germain with Mr. Hagan.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Flood.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 14734. An act to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and for the U.S. Information Agency.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 14734) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and for the U.S. Information Agency," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SPONG, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. CASE, and Mr. COOPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 9580) entitled "An act 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," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. INOUE, and Mr. MATHIAS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, on the last vote I was in the Chamber, and desire to be recorded.

The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman answer when his name was called?

Mr. FLOWERS. No, Mr. Speaker, I did not. I did not realize the rollcall had been completed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman cannot qualify after the result of the vote has been announced unless he can state he answered.

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, had I qualified I would have voted "yea."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the Members of the House that it is the intention of the Speaker to recess the House after consideration of the two travel resolutions which are listed on the whip's notice; and it is further the intention to reconvene the House at approximately 9:10 p.m. for the joint session to hear the President of the United States at 9:30 p.m.

TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 985 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 985

Resolved, That notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 142, Ninety-second Congress, the Committee on Public Works is authorized to send not more than three members of such committee as congressional adviser and alternates to the United States delegation to the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment (such adviser having been designated by the Speaker of the House and appointed by the Secretary of State), and not more than two staff assistants, to attend the conference to be held in Stockholm, Sweden, during June 5 through June 16, inclusive; and in returning to the United States, also to inspect various projects and programs of significant national and international importance relating to public works, resource management and development, and anti-pollution in the Netherlands, Germany, Scandinavia, and the United Kingdom.

Notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 142 of the Ninety-second Congress, first session, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the members of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties for the purpose of carrying out the authority as set forth in this resolution, to travel outside the United States. In addition to any other condition that may be applicable with respect to the use of local currencies owned by the United States by members and employees of the committee, the following conditions shall apply with respect to their use of such currencies:

(1) No member or employee of such committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (22 U.S.C. 1754).

(2) No member or employee of such committee shall receive or expend an amount of local currencies for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs.

(3) No appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of such committee or its employees in any country where local currencies are available for this purpose.

(4) Each member or employee of such committee shall make to the chairman of such committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or, if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the cost of such transportation, and the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

(5) Amounts of per diem shall not be fur-

nished for a period of time in any country if per diem has been furnished for the same period of time in any other country, irrespective of differences in time zones.

Mr. MATSUNAGA (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: On page 1, line 8, after the word "staff" strike out "assistants," and insert in lieu thereof "assistants, to leave on June 3".

On page 2, line 4, strike out "Kingdom," and insert in lieu thereof "Kingdom, arriving back in the United States on June 23."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Hawaii is recognized.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I will be happy to.

Mr. HALL. I would like to know what disposition was made of the committee amendments as read by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. No disposition has been made at this time.

Mr. HALL. I beg the Chair's pardon?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii to debate the resolution and the committee amendments. The Chair did not do it first and started to put the question on the amendments, but when the gentleman sought recognition the Chair recognized him.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 985 is a simple travel resolution which authorizes travel by certain members and staff assistants of the Committee on Public Works to the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment to be held in Stockholm, Sweden, from June 5 to June 16, 1972.

The Committee on Rules recommends that the resolution be adopted.

The amendment which the Committee on Rules made to the original resolution simply clarifies the dates of actual travel as being from June 3 to June 23, inclusive.

House Resolution 985 provides that the Committee on Public Works may send not more than three of its members as congressional adviser and alternates to the U.S. delegation to the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm. The resolution also authorizes the committee to send not more than two staff assistants to attend the conference. The party would depart from Washington, D.C., on June 3.

In returning to the United States, arriving on June 23, the party is authorized to make stops in Scandinavia, the Netherlands, Germany, and Great Britain to inspect projects and programs relating to public works, resource management and development, and antipollution.

The resolution also authorizes the use of counterpart funds and contains the so-called Hall amendment.

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

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I will be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How is the environment in Stockholm in June? Is it a nice environment?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I have not been to Stockholm, I will advise the gentleman from Iowa. I do not know what the environment is like there. I know what the environment in Hawaii is if he cares to know that, but this resolution authorizes a delegation from the Committee on Public Works to go and study what programs and techniques they do have in certain European countries to clear up the environment.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman from Hawaii or the author of the resolution, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Boggs), think that three members and staffers will be sufficient to take care of the environment business that will be carried out in 13 days, from June 3 to June 16?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. The answer is a simple "Yes."

Mr. GROSS. You believe what number will be sufficient?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. So the Committee on Public Works recommends, and I have no reason to doubt their wisdom.

Mr. GROSS. Will two staffers be enough to take care of the three members, does the gentleman think?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. The same answer.

Mr. GROSS. The ecology, the environment and everything is perfect in Stockholm in June?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. That, I cannot say. As I stated earlier, I have not been to Stockholm. The committee members will go there to study it.

However, it is more the method and technique which may be utilized in this country which they will study.

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri whose name is connected with the amendment to which I referred.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's remark and I certainly appreciate him yielding.

I rise only to supply missing information.

I have been fortunate enough to have been in Stockholm and at the ancient capital named after/or for salt-baths 30 miles south, by electric tramway; and spending some time there in the springtime. It is very nice. The girls come out

and sun on the rocks and one can sail by on the bays and waters. Also, the environment is enhanced by the long winter. For those who would seek the sun, I say it is a very desirable place to be for those who are adequately staffed and cared for, so that they do not have to devote too much of their sun-time and beach-days to duty.

I realize the urgency also for this resolution since the date of departure is only 48 hours hence.

May I inquire of the distinguished gentleman of the Committee on Rules why we are exempting the provisions of House Resolution 142 for this self-same conference?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. One hundred and forty-two? I do not get the gentleman's question.

Mr. HALL. I would presume that since we have already passed House Resolution 142 it precludes the labors of any of the members of the Public Works Committee outside the continental United States or at least they are confined to the Western Hemisphere and it is necessary to exempt those resolutions since they are to use counterpart funds to travel either going or coming, not only to study the environment in Sweden but also Norway, Germany, probably England and Ireland, if they dare go there.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. The resolution, as the gentleman recalls, limits this to a period of 2 years and the Public Works Committee still needs to come back to the Rules Committee for foreign travel. It is for this reason that we have this resolution.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's explanation.

I am a bit concerned about the method of travel and whether they can make it in time or not.

I am also concerned about whether these countries to be visited know more about the environment than we do. They have lived longer, perhaps, than we have over there, but I doubt if they have fouled their nest quite as much and, maybe, this committee ought to stay home to investigate and prescribe.

Can the gentleman tell me who might be selected to make this particular junket outside the Western Hemisphere, for fear that an Irishman could get trapped in Belfast?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I have no idea who will be selected. That is in the prerogative of the Speaker.

Mr. HALL. I understand that.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I have no idea.

Mr. HALL. I just hope that he will find some good Scandinavian like BLATNIK or somebody like DINGELL or someone else who will do well in this particular area on this junket, adequately assisted by these two staffers for the three Members.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. The gentleman from California has the answer, I am told. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The chairman of the Public Works Committee (Mr. BLATNIK) will be the Member who will go, and there will be one staff member from the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker,

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON), I did not hear the statement the gentleman just made as to how many were going. What was the gentleman's statement, please?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It is my understanding that the only Member going from the Committee on Public Works will be the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK).

Mr. SMITH of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. And also one staff member from the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. SMITH of California. I thank the gentleman, because the resolution, I think, Mr. Speaker, is just a little bit misleading.

My understanding is that we are going to send three over there, which the distinguished Speaker of the House will appoint, and I believe they are the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLODY). I believe that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLODY) actually travels under the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary from the money standpoint, because they can travel outside of the United States, and probably the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) will travel on the authority of some other committee other than the Committee on Public Works. So even if those three Members are named by the Speaker it is my understanding that only the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK) will be from the Committee on Public Works, and that he intends to take off one staff member. That is my understanding. Of course, this is the first time we have had an environmental conference such as this any place, I guess, in the world—I am not sure about that, but it is the first one we are going to.

It is a nice country there, and I am sure that it will be a delightful trip.

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

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman have any information as to whether or not this is like the Commission on Education and Labor travel resolution that we pass annually—or that we defeated last May—appointing delegates to go to the International Labor Organization, in that we always appoint more than we need so that they can sort of shuttle back and forth or work in shifts? Maybe that is the plan here, and they are going to be relaxing on the rocks in Sweden, in relays.

Mr. SMITH of California. I think that there may be a little bit of difficulty in getting credentials for more than three Members of our body to this particular meeting. I think only three are going, and in that connection that will be the next one that we will go to bat on.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Since when did junketeers need credentials?

Mr. SMITH of California. I guess you have to have credentials in order to get into the meetings.

Mr. GROSS. All you have to have is a passport, is that not correct?

Mr. SMITH of California. From that standpoint, yes, but when you go to the meetings you have to have some credentials. They will have to be there as alternates, or delegates; they are there as observers, we do not have a vote on it.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRAVEL RESOLUTION FOR COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) and by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 965 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 965

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized to appoint a member from the majority and a member from the minority of the Committee on Education and Labor to attend the International Labor Organization Conference in Geneva, Switzerland, between June 7, 1972, and June 27, 1972.

He is further authorized to appoint as alternates a member from the majority and a member from the minority of the said committee.

Notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 213 of the Ninety-second Congress, first session, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the members of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties for the purpose of carrying out the authority, as set forth in this resolution, to travel outside the United States. In addition to any other condition that may be applicable with respect to the use of local currencies owned by the United States by members of the committee, the following conditions shall apply with respect to their use of such currencies:

(1) No member of such committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (22 U.S.C. 1754).

(2) No member or employee of such committee shall receive or expend an amount of local currencies for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs.

(3) No appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of such committee or its employees in any country where local currencies are available for this purpose.

(4) Each member of such committee shall make to the chairman of such committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or, if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the

United States Government, the cost of such transportation, and the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

(5) Amounts of per diem shall not be furnished for a period of time in any country if per diem has been furnished for the same period in any other country, irrespective of differences in time zones.

Mr. MATSUNAGA (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. 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, this is a simple annual travel resolution authorizing the Speaker to appoint one majority member and one minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor to attend the International Labor Organization Conference in Geneva, between June 7 and June 27.

The Speaker would also be authorized to appoint one majority member and one minority member of the committee as alternates.

The resolution authorizes the use of counterpart funds and contains the so-called Hall amendment.

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

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding, Mr. Speaker.

I certainly am thankful that the gentleman calls attention to the Hall resolution which is on page 3, paragraph (5).

This is simply a device to prevent the "junketeers" from collecting a per diem in counterpart funds in more than one country in spite of time zones—even though they may be in two in any given 24 hours.

I am thankful that the Committee on Rules has adopted this, and I think it serves a very useful purpose.

Outside of that, is this not another resolution that requires exemption from previous House action, in the form of House Resolution 213? Are those exemptions for the same purpose as the last resolution?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I think any travel resolution is a terrible mistake in this instance, because it is useless in the first place and besides this resolution is similar to the one that was defeated on a rollcall vote in this Chamber on May 6, 1971. Here, just a year and three weeks later, we have the same resolution before us again. I presume the same "warm bodies" that like to travel and like to go to this useless meeting which we have recently refused to support by appropriations, have brought up the like resolution?

Indeed, it has been brought out in prior debate leading to the defeat of this resolution that the Members are not even "advisers" as in the case of the last resolution and that they are there simply by sufferance of the Department of State, to the end that very little is done. If we approve this, we not only authorize it again after having defeated it last year—although perhaps some did attend as a result of the suffrage of one of the departments or bureaus downtown or through some other device—but I would certainly hope that this resolution might be voted down, and Members stay home from this particular meeting on June 7 through June 27—which have in the past worked in relays with the alternates, so we can have warm bodies for warm debate and the House can work its will here at home.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Now that the gentleman has warmed up from the previous junketing resolution, I am sure he is in good fettle to handle this one.

Has the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii ever been in Switzerland in the early summer?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. No, I have never yet been to Switzerland. I might say that my daughter is there now and she loves it. I wish I could join her, but I am not a member of the Committee on Education and Labor unfortunately, and I doubt I will be able to join her.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure if the gentleman's daughter is enjoying Switzerland at this time of the year, it must be enjoyable for the junketeers from Congress.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I would not call them junketeers, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What would you call them?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. It is said that education comes by travel to all men. If the gentleman from Iowa would believe in traveling himself, I think he would be the most highly educated Member of this body, as highly educated as he is right now.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Hawaii for yielding.

I would like to say that I can attest to having been a delegate to the ILO on four occasions, not including the last 2 years. In the normal course of events, the weather in Geneva at this time of the year is excellent—it is really beautiful. On some days one finds a little cloudiness and it is difficult to see Mount Blanc from Geneva—nevertheless it is beautiful.

On other days the wind is blowing a little too hard as it does here, and they have to shut down that beautiful fountain. But it is nice and it is a very pleasant atmosphere and also a very constructive and useful conference, I might say.

I remember distinctly thinking of my

friend from Iowa and my friend from Missouri when I was there 2 years ago and sending each of them a little present which I bought with the left-over portion of my money. I can understand why neither of you gentlemen acknowledged in writing my gift, but nevertheless you accepted it in good spirits, and I wish you would give me the opportunity to go again this year.

Mr. GROSS. Since that was an end-of-the-line deal, I cannot think of a better reason for voting down this repeat performance.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. No; I did not send you the other half of the package, you see, and this, unhappily, being your personal physician's valedictory session, I would like to send him the other half of the package that I am sending to you.

Mr. GROSS. I have never tried to speak the language, Swiss or French, but the gentleman referred to Mount Blanc. Is that a label or a mountain?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. No; it is the tallest of the mountains in the Alps. It is a beautiful place to go to contemplate one's labors of the day and to look forward to the arduous work of the next day.

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I would like to direct a question to the master of widgetry and junketing, who is a "warm body" and has responded from afar on many occasions.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Is the gentleman directing his question to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. HALL. No; I can usually take care of him in my own barnyard.

A sentence in the report of the committee states that "appropriate measures in the House resolution exist for covering expenses." Does that refer simply to the question of using counterpart funds that we may have stashed away abroad, or does it also involve for this committee, which must be exempted under old House Resolution 213 of this same Congress from traveling outside the United States or using cash from the United States for their daily expenses and dollars from back home?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Counterpart funds are what is involved.

Mr. HALL. That is all that is involved in the exemption of House Resolution 213?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman, and I hope the master of gadgetry goes with dollars and blessings, if we must vote this resolution.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Speaker, I concur in the remarks made by the gentleman from Hawaii that the resolution calls for two Members and two additional Members as alternates, so there will be four. The record, as I remember it, last year was quite a bit

different than this resolution. I think the first resolution we had before the Rules Committee was House Resolution 412, which called for 15 Members, as I recall, that I personally objected to it in the Rules Committee and said that it provided too many. They cut it down to 11. I still thought there were too many.

We brought it to the floor of the House, I believe, on May 6, 1971, and it was defeated.

Following that time we had a further resolution, House Resolution 434. That resolution called for a total of nine individuals, and that resolution passed the House of Representatives, I think, on June 18. I am not certain but what some of the Members were over there or en route at that particular time. I do know that very few went last year. Some were going to go, but their plans just did not work out. So four is the maximum, and I think it is the least number we have ever authorized for this trip. Maybe next year when I am gone they will not have even four but they will just provide for two Members.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the resolution providing for the four Members, and I urge its adoption.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 192, nays 81, not voting 159, as follows:

[Roll No. 183]
YEAS—192

Abourezk	Colmer	Green, Pa.
Adams	Conable	Gubser
Anderson,	Cotter	Gude
Calif.	Coughlin	Halpern
Anderson, Ill.	Culver	Hamilton
Andrews,	Curlin	Hanley
N. Dak.	Davis, S.C.	Hansen, Idaho
Anunzio	de la Garza	Hansen, Wash.
Ashley	Dellenback	Harrington
Aspin	Denholm	Harsha
Badillo	Dennis	Harvey
Barrett	Dent	Hastings
Begich	Diggs	Hays
Belcher	Dingell	Hechler, W. Va.
Bergland	Dow	Heckler, Mass.
Biaggi	Downing	Heinz
Blatnik	Drinan	Helstoski
Boggs	Dulski	Hicks, Mass.
Boland	Eckhardt	Hicks, Wash.
Brademas	Erlenborn	Hillis
Bray	Fascell	Hogan
Brownman	Fish	Horton
Brown, Mich.	Flowers	Howard
Brown, Ohio	Foley	Ichord
Broyhill, Va.	Ford, Gerald R.	Jacobs
Burke, Mass.	Ford,	Johnson, Calif.
Burleson, Tex.	William D.	Jones, Ala.
Burlison, Mo.	Forsythe	Kastenmeier
Byrne, Pa.	Fraser	Kazen
Cabell	Frelinghuysen	Koch
Carey, N.Y.	Frenzel	Kuykendall
Carlson	Gaydos	Kyl
Carney	Gettys	Leggett
Casey, Tex.	Gonzalez	Link
Clark	Gray	Long, Md.
Collier	Green, Oreg.	McClory

McCormack	Peyser	Stanton,
McCulloch	Pickle	J. William
McDade	Pirnie	Stanton,
McEwen	Poage	James V.
McKay	Preyer, N.C.	Steed
Madden	Price, Ill.	Steiger, Wis.
Mahon	Quie	Stratton
Mailliard	Reuss	Sullivan
Mallory	Rhodes	Talcott
Mann	Riegle	Taylor
Mathias, Calif.	Roberts	Thompson, N.J.
Matsunaga	Robison, N.Y.	Thomson, Wis.
Mayne	Roe	Udall
Meeds	Roncallo	Vanik
Minish	Rooney, Pa.	Vigorito
Mink	Rosenthal	Waggonner
Mitchell	Roush	Ware
Mollohan	Ruppe	Whalen
Monagan	Ryan	Whalley
Morgan	Sandman	White
Murphy, N.Y.	Sarbanes	Whitten
Natcher	Saylor	Wiggins
Nelsen	Schwengel	Williams
Obey	Shipley	Wolff
O'Hara	Shoup	Wright
O'Konski	Shriver	Wyman
O'Neill	Skubitz	Yatron
Patman	Smith, Calif.	Young, Tex.
Patten	Smith, N.Y.	Zablocki
Perkins	Staggers	

NAYS—81

Abbott	Grover	Pelly
Andrews, Ala.	Haley	Pike
Archer	Hall	Powell
Bennett	Hammer-	Price, Tex.
Bevill	schmidt	Quillen
Brinkley	Hosmer	Randall
Broyhill, N.C.	Hull	Rarick
Buchanan	Hunt	Robinson, Va.
Burke, Fla.	Hutchinson	Rousselot
Byrnes, Wis.	Johnson, Pa.	Runnels
Byron	Jones, N.C.	Ruth
Carter	Keating	Satterfield
Chappell	Kemp	Schneebell
Clancy	Latta	Snyder
Cleveland	Lent	Spence
Collins, Tex.	Lloyd	Steiger, Ariz.
Conover	McCollister	Stuckey
Conte	McKevitt	Teague, Calif.
Crane	McKinney	Thompson, Ga.
Daniel, Va.	Martin	Thone
Davis, Wis.	Mathis, Ga.	Whitehurst
Devine	Mazzoli	Winn
Duncan	Miller, Ohio	Wyder
Edwards, Ala.	Mills, Md.	Wyllie
Fountain	Mizell	Young, Fla.
Fuqua	Montgomery	Zion
Goodling	Myers	
Gross	Nichols	

NOT VOTING—159

Abernethy	Donohue	Kyros
Abzug	Dorn	Landgrebe
Addabbo	Dowdy	Landrum
Alexander	du Pont	Lennon
Anderson,	Dwyer	Long, La.
Tenn.	Edmondson	Lujan
Arends	Edwards, Calif.	McCloskey
Ashbrook	Ellberg	McClure
Aspinall	Esch	McDonald,
Baker	Eshleman	Mich.
Baring	Evans, Colo.	McFall
Bell	Evins, Tenn.	McMillan
Betts	Findley	Macdonald,
Blester	Fisher	Mass.
Bingham	Flood	Melcher
Blackburn	Flynt	Metcalf
Blanton	Frey	Michel
Bolling	Fulton	Mikva
Bow	Gallfianakis	Miller, Calif.
Brasco	Gallagher	Mills, Ark.
Brooks	Garmatz	Minshall
Broomfield	Gialmo	Moorhead
Burton	Gibbons	Mosher
Caffery	Goldwater	Moss
Camp	Grasso	Murphy, Ill.
Cederberg	Griffin	Nedzi
Celler	Griffiths	Nix
Chamberlain	Hagan	Passman
Chisholm	Hanna	Pepper
Clausen,	Hathaway	Pettis
Don H.	Hawkins	Podell
Clawson, Del	Hébert	Poff
Clay	Henderson	Pryor, Ark.
Collins, Ill.	Hollfield	Pucinski
Conyers	Hungate	Purcell
Corman	Jarman	Railsback
Daniels, N.J.	Jonas	Rangel
Danielson	Jones, Tenn.	Rees
Davis, Ga.	Karth	Reid
Delaney	Kee	Rodino
Dellums	Keith	Rogers
Derwinski	King	Rooney, N.Y.
Dickinson	Kluczynski	Rostenkowski

Roy	Smith, Iowa	Vander Jagt
Roybal	Springer	Veysey
St Germain	Steele	Waldie
Scherle	Stephens	Wampler
Scheuer	Stokes	Widnall
Schmitz	Stubblefield	Wilson, Bob
Scott	Symington	Wilson,
Sebellius	Teague, Tex.	Charles H.
Seiberling	Terry	Wyatt
Sikes	Tiernan	Yates
Slack	Ullman	Zwack
	Van Deerlin	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Terry.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Rodino with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Steele.
Mr. Daniels of New Jersey with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Celler with Mr. King.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Finley.
Mr. Metcalfe with Mrs. Abzug.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Dellums.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Scheuer.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Seiberling.
Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Podell with Mr. Bell.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Keith.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Eshleman.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Poff.
Mr. Hollfield with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Walde with Mr. Stokes.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. McFall with Mr. Schmitz.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Landgrebe.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. du Pont.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Pettis.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Frey.
Mrs. Grasso with Mr. Chamberlain.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Scherle.
Mr. Hathaway with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Zwack.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Wampler.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Roy with Mr. Sebellius.
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Ellberg with Mr. Blester.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Betts.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Melcher with Mr. McClure.
Mr. Rangel with Mr. Symington.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Hungate.
Mr. Collins of Illinois with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Edwards of California.
Mr. Burton with Mr. Kyros.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Rees.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Murphy of Illinois.
Mr. Mikva with Mr. Corman.
Mr. Caffery with Mr. Alexander.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Davis of Georgia.
Mr. Danielson with Mr. Evans of Colorado.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Garmatz.
Mr. Rogers with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Slack.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Jones of Tennessee.

Mr. Dorn with Mr. Pryor of Arkansas.
 Mr. Roybal with Mr. Gibbons.
 Mr. Fulton with Mr. Galifianakis.
 Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Pucinski.
 Mr. McMillan with Mr. Landrum.
 Mr. Karth with Mr. Blanton.
 Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Dowdy.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the rest of the week, if any, and the schedule for next week.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. In reply to the request of the gentleman, the distinguished majority leader, we have concluded the legislative program for this week.

As the gentleman knows, at 9:30 p.m. we will be here in joint session to hear the President of the United States upon his return.

There is no further business for this week.

On Monday, the Consent Calendar will be called. That will be followed by five suspensions:

H.R. 12674, National Cemeteries Act;
 H.R. 9501, North Pacific Fisheries Act;
 H.R. 10310, Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge;

H.R. 14731, shooting at birds, fish from aircraft; and

H.R. 14106, Water Resources Planning Act.

On Tuesday, the Private Calendar will be called.

Also, H.R. 15259, District of Columbia appropriations, fiscal year 1973, for general debate only.

On Wednesday, the District of Columbia appropriations will be considered to its conclusion.

H.R. 14990, Atomic Energy Authorization under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

On Thursday and the balance of the week:

S. 659, higher education conference report; and

H.R. 14149, Peace Corps authorization which is subject to a rule being granted.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, JUNE 5, 1972

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today that it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS IN ORDER ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday business in order for next Wednesday be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

ASHLEY FOARD

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on June 9, a remarkable civil servant will retire from the Department of Housing and Urban Development after 37 years of truly distinguished public service. The career of Ashley Foard in that Department and in its predecessor agencies spans the entire history of major Federal housing programs.

Ashley Foard joined the Federal Government in 1935 as a young lawyer. He was soon charged with the important responsibility of developing and drafting State public housing legislation for the many States wishing to participate in the Federal low-rent housing program. Later he assumed legal responsibilities with respect to all Federal housing, community facilities, urban renewal, and other urban development legislation. This body of law, both State and Federal, stands today as the foundation on which this Nation's entire housing and urban development structure is based.

In 1967 his responsibilities were further enlarged with his appointment as Deputy General Counsel of HUD. His interests ranged over the entire spectrum of legal matters of concern to that Department: legislation, litigation, and administrative law.

We in the Congress, and particularly members of the Committee on Banking and Currency and its Housing Subcommittee, are deeply indebted to him for the advice and guidance he has given us over the years. Every request of this committee for assistance, no matter how difficult and how short the notice, was received courteously and acted on with consummate skill. His effectiveness in working with us on behalf of his Department derived from his vast knowledge, high imagination, careful attention to detail, and complete disregard of his own convenience when heavy claims were made on his time.

Ashley Foard's work and influence have extended beyond our national borders. He has assisted Peru, the Dominican Republic, and San Salvador in the development of their housing legislation. He has also conferred, as a member of high-level exchange team, with West German officials concerning their urban planning responsibilities.

His services and accomplishments as a

national and international expert in his field have won for him many expressions of esteem from the Congress, governmental departments and his colleagues. He has received the highest honor of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Distinguished Service Award, and several years ago was the recipient of the nationally prestigious Rockefeller Public Service Award. It gives me a deep and personal pleasure now to add my own expression of appreciation and esteem to the many tributes already paid to this outstanding civil servant.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the tribute made by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania who is chairman of the Housing Subcommittee, to Ashley Foard, the Deputy Counsel of Legal Affairs for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. What Mr. BARRETT has said is nothing but the simple truth. I would like to add my endorsement to it.

As one of the original members of the Housing Subcommittee and one who has enjoyed the fruits of Mr. Foard's labors for close to two decades in this field, I can also appreciate his worth.

Three years ago, I was privileged to second his successful nomination for a Rockefeller Foundation award which goes annual to the top careerists of the Federal Government. At that time, I said of Mr. Foard that—

He is the one person whose continuous labors and broad skills contributed the most to tying the entire legislative accomplishment together. He did this without partisanship, but with knowledge; without bias, but with intense interest; and always with completely selfless dedication. He has, on all occasions, quietly devoted himself to the common good in the fields of housing and urban development. Importantly, there was never a time, regardless of whose administration, when we could not get an honest and informed answer from Mr. Foard.

He has been able to clarify the way for honest decision. He can sift through a tangled maze to tell you what was intended. If information, technical or practical, is desired, he will supply it. If no one else remembers the legislative history, Foard does and will recall it for you in detail. And everything is done with promptness, and absolute honesty.

Mr. Foard has been the chief legislative counsel, Deputy General Counsel, and the Acting General Counsel of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and its predecessor, the Housing and Home Finance Agency. In these and other legal capacities, he has served the agency as perhaps no other man has.

He is living testimony of the fact that nice guys do not finish last. We, who have long experienced his aid in the field of housing, have only regrets for his departure, and send best wishes to him "for whatever the future holds," and our heartfelt thanks for all that he has done.

TRIBUTE TO LEONARD VICTOR

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

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, several

days ago a distinguished reporter-photographer passed away at the age of 55. He was Leonard Victor of the Long Island Press, a man who won acclaim for his 37 years of outstanding service for the Newhouse newspapers.

Leonard Victor was also a personal friend and I was privileged to know this fine professional. Ironically, Leonard wrote his own obituary for the Long Island Press and as always his words are most expressive of the personality of this gentleman.

I insert in the RECORD at this point the article from the Long Island Press, of May 17, 1972, on the death of Leonard Victor, including his own obituary.

LEONARD VICTOR, PRESS WRITER-PHOTOGRAPHER, DIES

Long Island Press reporter-photographer Leonard Victor, whose crusading writing and eloquent photographs received national acclaim, died in his sleep yesterday at the age of 55.

In accordance with his wishes there will be no services.

Mr. Victor will be cremated and his ashes will be scattered in the Atlantic Ocean off Tobay Beach.

In the 37 years he worked for Newhouse newspapers in the metropolitan area, Mr. Victor's work received the acclaim of top public officials, journalists, local civil groups and the general public.

His spotlight series on youthful drug addiction on Long Island and the despoiling of Long Island's environment earned him two Page One awards for crusading journalism and three national conservation honors: The Thomas L. Stokes Award twice and the Scripps-Howard Meehan Award.

Mr. Victor was found dead in bed yesterday morning at home at 11 Laurel Drive in Selden. He formerly lived in Syosset.

He was born in Manhattan on Aug. 14, 1916, attended primary and secondary schools in Jamaica and received his higher education at New York University and Columbia University.

Except for the war years, when he was a photo officer in the armed forces, he spent all his working life with the Newhouse newspapers, starting as a photographer in September, 1935.

Mr. Victor was rated one of the outstanding photographers on the East Coast and was often called upon by photography clubs as a lecturer, panelist and judge.

He was a founder and active member of photography clubs on Long Island and his column on photography appeared regularly for many years in The Press.

His news and feature photographs won many awards, including the grand prize trophy of the Photographic Society of America for the best photo of the year in 1961.

As eight-part series on the need for Long Island Parks earned Mr. Victor his first conservation-writing honors. For the series, which he wrote and photographed, Mr. Victor received third prize in the 1960 Thomas L. Stokes Award for outstanding writing on the development and conservation of natural resources.

"You Can Survive," was the title of his 1961 Spotlight series on fallout shelters in which he designed an economy model that received "official and enthusiastic approval" of city and state civil defense officials. For the work, the Queens Veterans of Foreign Wars awarded Mr. Victor for "outstanding community service." The Society of Silurians, an organization of veterans newsmen, awarded him Honorable Mention in the public service category.

In 1963 Mr. Victor received the "Meritorious Public Service Award" from the director of the Internal Revenue Services for Queens, Nassau and Suffolk.

His series on cancer detection earned him a plaque from the Nassau Cancer Division in July, 1963. That same year Mr. Victor received a plaque from the National Audubon Society for his conservation writing. A spokesman called him "the leading journalist on Long Island conservation."

In 1964 his series on jet noise won the first two prizes in the 26th annual national Trans World Airlines aviation writing contest in the categories of aviation development and best news story.

"It's An Emergency," his Spotlight series on problems stemming from increased use of hospital emergency rooms, earned the Press a special public service award sponsored by the State Medical Society and the State Health Department.

His most acclaimed work was his 1966 Spotlight series, "Long Island's Young Addicts." Reprinted and distributed among schools and youth organizations, it earned him 28 local and national awards, including the coveted Page One Award of the New York Newspaper Guild.

The series also earned Mr. Victor the national Sigma Delta Chi award for distinguished public service in journalism. A spokesman for the professional journalism society praised the series at that time "for its stark unvarnished of the drug addiction menace to youth, with specific examples of the suffering and heartbreak and for extending the hand of hope to the afflicted."

Also in 1966 the Queens Jewish War Veterans gave Mr. Victor their Community Service Award for his series on drug addiction, water pollution and jet noise.

His Spotlight series, "Ugly Long Island," earned first prize in the 3rd annual Edward J. Meehan Conservation Award and top prize from the Scripps Howard Foundation for the nation's best writing on conservation. It also prompted the State Federated Garden Clubs to give him their first award to a newsman.

Mr. Victor's second Page One award came in 1968 after his series "Dredging Windfall" exposed the misuse of Suffolk County dredging equipment.

He was named "New York State Newspaper Conservation Man of the Year," in 1969 by the New York State Conservation Council. The award, presented by Gov. Rockefeller, said: "In recognition of outstanding efforts by the newspaperman whose exceptional articles, written after months of effort, revealed the extensive exploitation and abuse of Long Island wetlands."

The Spotlight series "Our Environment," earned him a Merit Award from the Queens County Sportsman's Federation in January, 1970.

Mr. Victor is survived by his mother, Ada of Elmhurst; his first wife, Mrs. Trudy Grossman of Glen Cove, and their daughter, Mrs. Amby Lyman of Westbury; his second wife, the former Doris Harris of Syosset, and their son Gordon of Manhattan, and a grandchild, Hal John Lyman.

In lieu of flowers, Mr. Victor wished that memorial contributions be sent to Samaritan Halfway House in Richmond Hill or the Queens Children's Shelter in Jamaica.

A REPORTER'S NOTES FOR HIS OWN OBITUARY (By Leonard Victor)

"I'm hoping this piece of copy will be very old and brittle before it is used. But, someday, someone's going to have to go looking for the 'makings' of an obit on me.

To spare him—and my family—the following:

Born Aug. 14, 1916 in Manhattan. Attended Jamaica Normal School (which wasn't normal because it was a teacher's training school), Jamaica High School, New York University and Columbia (with little success!)

Except for the World War II year's, I've spent my life (and had a helluva lot of fun)

working for Newhouse (Editor's Note: S. I. Newhouse, president and publisher of The Long Island Press and other Newhouse newspapers.) Started as a stringer (a part time employee) for the paper, covering Saturday night "rackets" as a photographer in September, 1935.

By Christmas, I'd made the payroll, by making a new job on the paper—midnight to morning police photographer, covering dented tin (vehicular accidents) fires and arrests. (I may still hold the record for the number of scrambled milk bottles delivery wagon wrecks covered. Those were the days when the horse ambled along and 4 a.m. drivers clobbered the wagons with amazing regularity.)

Later, when S. I. bought the old Star and North Shore Journal (later The Star-Journal), I became its sole and hence chief photographer.

During World War II, I was first chief news, publicity and floor-sweeping chief photographer for the Sperry Co., and later a photo officer with Transport Service. I set up the photo department for the Sheepshead Bay training base for seamen.

Later, I went to sea covering much territory—friendly and hostile—I'd gladly have missed.

Only war injury: Damaged shoulder resulting from fall off a 15-foot ladder while shooting movies in Brooklyn of sailors parading.

After the war, returned to The Press and in recent years have been writing feature material as well as shooting pictures.

(How can you put into words the fun of making a stinker in Suffolk unfreeze pipes for a bunch of helpless, nice "Little people?" How do you explain the thrill of being able to ride a destroyer-escort to 'Gitmo (Guantanamo Bay in Cuba) to tell the story of the men pulled back to duty by an international crisis? Even if I could put it into words, there wouldn't be room for it.)

Let's just say that I covered the range of big and little stories every newsman gets—and except for the grim ones like train and plane wrecks—loved every minute of it.

Family: Father, Joseph, a retired fur manufacturer, died in 1951. Mother Ada, wife, Doris, daughter Amby 31, (now Mrs. Sanford Lyman of Glen Cove) son, Gordon, now 18 (and grandson, Hal John Lyman.)

Hobbies: Amateur radio, flying. Licensed "ham" since age 11. Set up emergency net for New York City's Queens fire headquarters that later became one of the country's first Civil Defense Radio nets.

Flown since mid-30's. In the five years from 1946-51 covered for The Press and the Associated Press every major catastrophe in the metropolitan area. Was member of now-defunct Metropolitan Aviation Association (MAA) which fought for more airports for private fliers. With two others, Nat Cutler—now dead—and Speed Hanzlik, very much alive (Ed: Anthony "Speed" Hanzlik is the operator of Flushing Airport) first proposed what is now Kennedy Airport.

I took air views of the whole marsh area and closeups of a sand pumping operation along Rockaway Boulevard. We brought these to LaGuardia (Ed: then Mayor Fiorello H. La Guardia) and pointed out the possibility of a giant field on the waste land.

The Little Flower took it from there actually using my original photographs at first hearings (at one of which I spoke for the MAA).

Ironically, when I co-piloted the first paid landing at \$5 (Roy Carleton and I fighting for the controls) at Idlewild, the day before the official opening, our dream of a commercial field at one end, private flying at the other, had been long since swept away by the growth of commercial aviation.

Awards: Gloss it over with "won national and local awards for writing and photography."

LICENSE RENEWAL

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to establish more orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses. My bill will extend the maximum broadcast license period from 3 to 5 years and will provide for granting an application for renewal of license where an applicant is legally, financially, and technically qualified and has not exhibited a callous disregard for the law or regulations of the Federal Communications Commission. An applicant who is not fully qualified or one who has demonstrated a callous disregard for the law or FCC regulations will have those deficiencies weighed against him in a renewal proceeding.

The provision in my bill to extend the license period to 5 years is long overdue. The 3 year license period was instituted during the early years of broadcasting when the industry was still in its infant stages. My bill recognizes the maturity of broadcasting by providing for more realistic license terms. The overwhelming majority of licenses have consistently been able to obtain renewals of their licenses. That these broadcasters are certainly aware of their obligations to the public interest is evidenced by the public trust which the FCC has placed in the hands of the same broadcasters for so many years. A 5-year license term should in no way detract from the FCC's ability to perform its regulatory function.

A 5-year license term would greatly reduce many unnecessary costs which now burden both the broadcasters and the FCC. The time, money and manpower which both the licensee and the FCC must expend every 3 years during the license renewal process do not facilitate the accomplishment of any regulatory objectives which could not be achieved just as effectively at 5-year intervals. By limiting renewal consideration to every 5 years the Federal Communications Commission could in fact reallocate its scarce resources to more pressing problems and thereby increase its regulatory efficiency.

The second part of my bill would insure that a broadcaster who had compiled a record of broadcast service over the years in the interest of his community would be awarded a renewal license to continue that service to the community. Only in the event that he was found to be technically, legally or financially unqualified or that he had demonstrated a callous disregard for the law or broadcast regulations would he be subject to a challenge by competing applicants in a comparative hearing. At this stage his deficiencies would be weighed against him.

For almost 20 years, from 1951 to 1969, a policy by the FCC prevailed which gave preference to the meritorious service of renewal applicants over the paper proposals of new, competing applicants. This policy was apparently overturned in January 1969 by the infamous WHDH decision of the FCC. From that point on,

there has been no stable renewal policy which broadcasters or potential entrants into the broadcasting industry could take their bearings by when making future plans. The WHDH decision was quickly reinterpreted by the FCC to be a case sui generis which was not to apply in general to renewal applicants. After serious consideration by a Senate subcommittee of new legislation, the FCC released a new policy statement in February 1970 which basically restored the commission policy existing from 1951 to 1969. The policy statement was in turn thrown out in June 1971 by the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Legislative guidance is clearly called for to end the period of uncertainty which has faced broadcasters during the last 3 years. I am offering my bill as a vehicle to provide that guidance. It is a sound bill and is based upon our regulatory traditions and the recognition that we are dealing with an industry which is no longer young and untested but mature and responsible.

Finally, there are a couple of points which probably ought to be made concerning the FCC failure in the WHDH decision which started us on this merry-go-round. First, in one of the last FCC decisions to deal with WHDH as it was leaving the air, Chairman Dean Burch had this to say in concluding some criticism of the original decision:

The matters I have raised are not "nit-picking." They are crucial to the decision. They are not nuances of judgment. They represent irrational decision-making. Nor are they buried. They stand out, stark and obvious. That being so, I am puzzled how they passed muster, first with the Commission and later upon review before the Court. Process so rent with glaring error does not commend itself. (33 FCC 2d 436)

Finally, one of the major criteria which was used to withdraw the license from WHDH and award it to one of the competing applicants was that it would promote diversification of the media since the Boston Herald Traveler newspaper owned WHDH. WHDH argued in vain that profits from their television operations contributed to the viability of the Herald Traveler and therefore enabled more media voices to exist in the Boston area than would be the case if it was deprived of its license. We recently noticed that the Herald Traveler has been sold to one of the competing newspapers in the Boston area and will discontinue operations. The final irony in this debacle is that the FCC action to promote a diversification of the media has stilled one major media voice in the Boston area.

The stability provided by the rule of law which my bill will promote has several advantages over rule by discretion, not least among which are greater justice to those subject Government action and the creation of a climate conducive to social and economic progress.

H.R. 15266

A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section

307(d) shall be amended by striking the first two sentences and inserting the following: "No license granted for the operation of any class of station shall be for a longer term than five years and any license granted may be revoked as hereinafter provided. Upon the expiration of any license, upon application therefor, a renewal of such license may be granted from time to time for a term of not to exceed five years if the Commission finds that public interest, convenience, and necessity would be served thereby: *Provided, however*, That in any hearing for the renewal of a broadcast license an applicant for renewal who is legally, financially, and technically qualified shall be awarded the grant if such applicant shows that its broadcast service during the preceding license period has reflected a good-faith effort to serve the needs and interests of its area as represented in its immediately preceding and pending license renewal applications and if it has not demonstrated a callous disregard for law or the Commission's regulations: *Provided further*, That if the renewal applicant fails to make such a showing or has demonstrated a callous disregard for law or the Commission's regulations, such failure or demonstration shall be weighed against the renewal applicant."

A TURNING POINT IN UNITED STATES-SOVIET RELATIONS

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

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to note that today we will welcome the President back from his unprecedented diplomatic mission to the Soviet Union. It is my belief that these summit talks will be considered a turning point in United States-Soviet relations. For the first time in recent history, summit talks have provided the American people with a greater hope for the future. In the past, all we could frequently hope for was the avoidance of brinkmanship, the continuation of a detente and a hopeful reduction in the threat of a nuclear confrontation. In my opinion, these talks have culminated in a reversal of the Soviet-American philosophy originally instilled by the "cold war." We have turned away from a philosophy whose only aim was to avoid disaster to one whose aim is to improve the quality of life for the people of both countries and a better chance for world peace. The cooperative agreements on the environment, space, health, and scientific endeavors will prove what benefits can be gained by two great powers working together. I have today written the White House to commend and congratulate the President accordingly.

At the same time, I think we should also recognize that if the policy of our country is to assist other nations in providing a better life for their people, as in the Soviet Union, then we cannot overlook those people in those nations who are the victims of serious discrimination and repression. In the Soviet Union the 3 million Soviet Jews now look to our country with renewed hope that the promise of a fairer, better life extended to the Soviet and American peoples will also apply to them as well.

It is my hope that the President will use the channels of communication which he has strived for 3 years to open, to express the concern of the American

people over the treatment of the Soviet Jews. Although the next formal session of summit talks is not scheduled until next November, I urge the President to lay the groundwork for the consideration of this problem. It is my hope that the advances made during the last week will lead to the attainment of the goal which the President has set for us—a better life for all people be they Americans or Russians, Jews or gentiles.

MASSACRE AT TEL AVIV

(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, no individual with any amount of human decency can fail to be shocked and outraged by the wanton murder of 25 air travelers at Israel's international airport on May 30. This ghastly act, perpetrated on behalf of the fanatic Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine by hired killers, is a sickening reminder of the tragic continuation of the conflict in the Middle East and the failure of the United States to do all within its power to bring that conflict to a negotiated settlement.

It is imperative that this Nation make clear—absolutely clear—its total revulsion to such cowardly, bloody tactics and take every necessary step to assure that this horrid incident is never repeated. We can start by heeding the call of Israeli leaders who have demanded an international boycott of Beirut, which in the words of Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir "is openly enabling the centers of the terrorist organizations to reside in its midst. There they plot, from there instructors set out to various countries and from there come the broadcasts of their great successes. Can it be possible that governments . . . should acquiesce in this?"

My answer to this is clear: No. This Nation cannot allow its voice to be silent nor its condemnation unfelt in this matter. We must demonstrate in clear, unequivocal terms our total revulsion to this deed and bring it home to bear on those whose vitriolic rhetoric has fueled the fires of violence in the Middle East and who have given asylum and support to the despicable instigators of this massacre.

I have today sent an urgent telegram to the President urging him in "the strongest possible terms to bar American air flights to Beirut."

But we must recognize that only true peace will bring an end to the conflict and violence. In the words of the New York Times editorial of June 1:

The ultimate responsibility . . . lies with all nations, including the United States and the Soviet Union, to redouble diplomatic efforts to stop the new wave of insanity that threatens to engulf the Middle East . . . There will be no security for Israel or for the Arab states until the Palestinian problem is solved as part of a negotiated peace.

If there is to be a memorial to those 25 innocent victims of the shooting at Tel Aviv airport, let it be an end to the terrorist killing and violence, a lasting peace in the Middle East.

LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, it cannot be stated too often that the intent of the Congress in establishing a legal services program within the Office of Economic Opportunity was to make available to the poor in America the legal counsel and representation that they may require but are unable to afford. At no time was it intended that the legal services program should become a vehicle for radical reform of our society without benefit of popular approval or legislative action.

Obviously to promote effective legal services to the poor, and to facilitate the exchange of information and expertise among legal services programs, the program has expanded to include more than a dozen "backup centers," central research and assistance facilities that serve either all of the legal services programs in a given geographic area, or provide specialized support in specific areas of poverty law to programs across the Nation. Normally, Mr. Speaker, the backup centers operate under the auspices of university law schools. Those that specialize in specific areas of the law deal with fields such as housing and economic development, employment, health, consumer affairs, education and welfare.

At first glance, it would appear that these backup centers fill a vital need within the legal services program. And in truth, they are indeed necessary to the effective conduct of the OEO legal services program. But there is more here than meets the eye. The fact is that to an alarming degree the backup centers have become supportive services for radical activity, rather than for the provision of legal services to the poor.

Let us consider the self-appraisal of one backup center Mr. Speaker, the National Housing and Economic Development Law Project of Berkeley, Calif. Kenneth Phillips, director of the project, described its work in the April 1972 issue of the Clearinghouse Review, in an article entitled, "What Backup Centers Can Do." The Clearinghouse Review, it should be noted, is published by the National Clearinghouse for Legal Services, an OEO grantee at Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., and is circulated among Legal Services projects, attorneys and backup centers across the Nation.

Phillips stated in his article that:

A major function of the Project is an overriding obligation to affect the body of law that directly imposes or perpetuates substandard housing conditions on millions of people.

He continued:

The Project has developed impact strategies . . . to expose, document and dramatize the reality of housing breakdown and the evasion or malfunction of protective legal requirements. . . . A second and related major purpose of impact strategies is to foster the development of organizations of low-income and minority residents, such as tenant unions, urban renewal project area committees, workable program citizen coalitions and model city citizen component groups as instruments of pressure for social change.

Phillips added:

The Project is the principal legal advisor to such organizations as the National Tenants

Organizations . . . and spends much of its time and resources in the development of legislative proposals.

The Clearinghouse Review is full of examples of activity by Legal Services back-up centers that have far less to do with the needs of the poor than with the determination of some radical individuals and organizations to impose their concept of society upon us all, whether we like it or not. Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to mention just a few of the topics of concern to these backup centers:

Legislative advocacy: instruction in lobbying, pressure tactics, how to pass legislation; Organization of grass roots campaigns in behalf of desired legislative goals, et cetera.

Community organization: principles of effective group action; how to obtain a favorable press; formation of community coalitions, et cetera.

The Clearinghouse Review also focuses attention on the efforts of individual legal services programs in cases whose relevance to poverty is questionable: codes in schools and other institutions regulating hair length; parent-child conflict—not involving brutality; reapportionment of the Texas State House of Representatives; the determination of requirements for nomination to political office; and attacks on the Federal rent stabilization policy.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that the backup centers of OEO's legal services program are fulfilling their purpose when they devote such substantial portions of their time and resources to activities that have relatively little to do with the immediate legal needs of the poor. If there are to be back-up centers—and I believe they do fill an important need when properly administered—their activities should be limited to the purposes for which they were intended. OEO's legal services program is not intended to be a vehicle for social revolution; nor are its backup centers supposed to function as command posts in such a revolution. Both should concentrate on the job at hand: the provision of legal advice, counsel, representation and education to the poor of America.

ACTION AGAINST ARAB TERRORISM

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

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I know our colleagues share my shock and anger over the massacre yesterday at the Tel Aviv airport in Israel. This was just the latest in a long series of shameful acts of violence organized and carried out by Arab guerrilla organizations and it never should have been allowed to occur.

Yesterday's slaughter was a crime against all humanity and it must be treated as such. It raises issues that must be confronted by all nations and without delay, for the Arab terrorists are already indicating that additional attacks are being planned.

I met this morning with Israel's Consul-General in New York, both to express my sorrow and sympathy for the families of the victims and also to ex-

plore with representatives of the Government of Israel possible steps to avoid any repetition. In my judgment, the United States must exercise immediate initiative and leadership and it should be directed in three major areas:

First, there should be an immediate review by our own Federal Aviation Administration of the techniques and devices now in use to detect weapons and explosives in airports and onboard aircraft. We must have assurance that the best possible measures are being employed at U.S. airports, for they are certainly as vulnerable to attack as are airports in foreign countries.

Second, I am urging President Nixon to immediately seek an international conference—either through the United Nations, the International Civil Aviation Organization or other world body—with the purpose of establishing minimum international standards to protect airline passengers from acts of terrorism.

Third, I believe the United States must make clear to every nation of the world that we will cut off all forms of assistance to any nation failing to take, or failing to require its air carriers to take adequate measures to protect passengers from terrorist attacks and we can begin by cutting off aid right now to any nation which encourages, harbors, protects or otherwise fails to crack down on terrorist groups.

Mr. Speaker, there are no words really adequate to express my horror over the killings at Lod Airport yesterday. I was particularly touched because a number of the victims were Puerto Ricans on a religious pilgrimage.

With the Arab terrorists bent on further acts of violence, the need for immediate and decisive action on our part is urgent. I hope and pray that President Nixon shares the sense of urgency that we feel.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point a statement I made on May 31, 1972, and articles that appeared in the New York Times today:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN
HERMAN BADILLO

MAY 31, 1972.

Men of good will throughout the world cannot but view with shock and horror the senseless slaughter of over two dozen men, women and children and the wounding of countless others at Tel Aviv's Lod International Airport. The demented and irresponsible perpetrators of this horrendous act deserve the full condemnation of the family of free nations.

Last night's shootings represent another bloody chapter in the two and half decades of warfare between Israel and her Arab neighbors. This is just not warfare, however. It is nothing more than out-right murder conducted by a band of international gangsters.

Although we are preoccupied by our involvement in Southeast Asia, this latest incident in Israel serves to point up the fact that the Middle East represents the greatest single threat to the maintenance of international peace and stability. Israel, the hub of our Judeo-Christian heritage and culture, attracts millions of citizens from throughout the globe. The report that 11 of those who were killed were Puerto Ricans on a religious pilgrimage simply highlights the fact that we cannot ignore the constant harassment, intimidation and assaults against Israel's

territorial integrity and basic security by her Arab neighbors. Unless positive initiatives are taken by the United Nations to reach some type of meaningful and lasting settlement to this dispute we will continue to witness an increasing arms imbalance in the Middle East and further terrorist activities by groups such as the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine and similar misdirected radical organizations. How many more defenseless persons—both Israeli citizens and foreign tourists—must be killed before affirmative action is taken to prevent such terrorist outbreaks in the future?

In the wake of this tragic event the United States must reaffirm its support of Israel and move to insure that her people will not continue to be victimized by Soviet-armed, Cairo-inspired Arab terrorist attacks.

FATED PILGRIMAGE PUERTO RICAN'S FIFTH

(By Robert Hanley)

For the 13 Puerto Ricans who were killed and the 27 who were wounded at the Tel Aviv airport terminal Tuesday night, the trip had started joyously as a combined pilgrimage to and tour of the Holy Land and parts of Europe.

The 40 victims and the 28 others in the group, nearly all of them members of the United Evangelical Church on the island, left San Juan Monday on the church's fifth annual pilgrimage.

In earlier years, the church had limited the pilgrimages to churches and other holy sites in Spain, Mexico or the Holy Land. This spring the itinerary listed 10 days of touring and praying in Tel Aviv and Jerusalem, then another eight days of sightseeing and relaxation in Italy and Switzerland.

The extended 18-day journey this spring attracted a small group of teachers. For them, and the Protestants who gathered at San Juan International Airport on Monday, the cost of the round trip was \$1,100. They came from moderate-sized towns and small cities all over the island—Fajardo, Manati, Hatillo, Arecibo, Gebabaja and Rio Piedras. Most of the members of the tour ranged in age from the mid-fifties to the late seventies.

The first leg of their journey took them to Kennedy International Airport in New York, where they boarded a chartered Air France flight for Paris. The 68 Puerto Ricans and 64 other passengers then flew to Rome, the last stop before Tel Aviv.

After debarking at Tel Aviv airport, the Puerto Ricans and 47 others who had flown in from Rome apparently rode to the terminal in buses.

Moments after they had entered the building, three Japanese pulled guns and hand grenades and started firing.

Yesterday the Associated Press bureau in San Juan received a call from a group calling itself the "anti-Communist Action Movement" that warned that "three Arabs or Japanese would be killed for every Israeli killed in Tel Aviv."

ISRAELIS SUGGEST BOYCOTT OF BEIRUT BY ALL AIRLINES

(By Peter Grose)

JERUSALEM, May 31.—Israeli leaders called today for a boycott of Beirut by international airlines, charging that terrorist attacks on air travelers such as the shooting at the Tel Aviv airport last night are planned by Arab guerrillas on Lebanese soil.

In a strongly worded address before Parliament, Premier Golda Meir condemned Arabs for "rejoicing" over the airport attack, in which 25 persons were killed and 76 wounded by three Japanese gunmen reportedly acting on behalf of Arab guerrillas. The dead included 12 Puerto Ricans on a Christian pilgrimage to the Holy Land.

Mrs. Meir denounced the guerrillas for recruiting the gunmen, who arrived at the

airport on an Air France flight they had boarded at Rome, and she accused the airline and foreign governments of having failed to put into effect security precautions that had long been advocated.

"I am confident," Mrs. Meir told Parliament, "that Israel will find a remedy and a way to make sure that this shall not recur."

[In Beirut, President Suleiman Franjeh called an emergency meeting of the nation's civilian and military leaders to consider precautionary measures in the case of possible Israeli retaliation against Lebanon. At the United Nations, Israel, in a letter to the Security Council, charged the Arab states and, in particular, Lebanon, with the responsibility for the airport shootings.]

SCIENTIST AMONG DEAD

The members of Israel's Parliament stood in solemn respect for the victims of the attack. Of the 25 dead, five remained unidentified. The Government listed eight Israelis among the dead, including Dr. Aharon Katzir-Katchalsky, a leading scientist.

The number of dead did not include the two Japanese gunmen who died in the attack—one apparently a suicide, the other shot by a companion. The third was taken prisoner.

In her address, Mrs. Meir specifically absolved the Japanese Government and people of any guilt in the shootings, which came just three weeks after Palestinian guerrillas hijacked a Belgian Sabena jetliner to the Tel Aviv airport. [In Beirut, a Marxist guerrilla group, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, claimed full responsibility for the shootings, said they were carried out to avenge the deaths of two Arab hijackers killed by Israeli troops May 9 in Tel Aviv and warned against reprisals.]

"It is no secret," Mrs. Meir declared, "that Beirut is openly enabling the centers of the terrorist organizations to reside in its midst. There they plot, from there instructors set out to various countries and from there come the broadcasts of their great successes. Can it be possible that governments, that aviation companies, should acquiesce in this?"

"Is it at all conceivable," she asked, "that a state which harbors and abets the plotting of such crimes, where the terrorists are free to plot, to set out, to hit and return safely with impunity, that on the soil of such a country foreign planes will continue to land?"

After an emergency cabinet meeting this morning, Foreign Minister Abba Eban said of the proposal for an active boycott of Beirut:

"What would Beirut be without its air traffic? The international community has specific pressure to bear within the specific aviation context—so why are not those pressures brought to bear?"

Meanwhile, an Egyptian commentator, speaking over the Cairo radio, said: "The heroes proved they can penetrate the conquered territories to avenge the blood of others. Now Israel has no alternative but to close down Lydda Airport and to prevent tourist visits if she wishes to protect her borders."

To this kind of statement Mrs. Meir replied: "As soon as the news broke joy broke out in Cairo and in Beirut as well over the great victory. Those who were unable to stand up against us on the battlefield are great heroes at hiding explosives in planes, at assaults on planes and passengers."

"This indeed takes great courage," she said with sarcasm. "And if the courage is lacking, the terrorists recruit foreigners for the purpose."

NO CANCELLATIONS REPORTED

An official of the Israeli Ministry of Tourism said that quick checks among travel agents in Europe and the United States revealed no rush of tourists to cancel travel plans to Israel.

The Minister of Transport, Shimon Peres, who had spent most of the night at the airport, returned this morning to plan additional security measures, including possibly further inspections of baggage as it is unloaded from the aircraft on arrival.

But few Israelis accepted the suggestion that it was Israeli security, rather than the measures taken before the planes took off abroad, that should be tightened.

"I cannot understand why the foreign airlines are so indifferent to the problem," said Deputy Premier Yigal Allon. "Today there are electronic methods that could easily have detected the arms hidden in the luggage."

Mr. Peres reported that the assailants' two suitcases, now in Israeli custody, had no secret compartments or false bottoms.

Mrs. Meir drew a sharp contrast between the precautions taken by Israel's national carrier, El Al, and the foreign airlines.

"We in Israel shall do all we possibly can to safeguard our planes—and, indeed, they are secure," she said. "We have taken all the necessary steps to make sure that everybody coming to Israel or leaving Israel in our planes can fly in safety."

"But I have not the slightest doubt that unless other governments and airlines will cooperate and consider this as their concern—and not merely for our sake—the scourge will remain to plague all."

"Only a short while ago, we had the Sabena affair, in which security checks somewhere failed to be carried out," she added. "Yesterday, the same thing happened. What occurred yesterday could have easily been avoided if the airline concerned had paid proper attention and carried out a check. I am aware that for El Al passengers, this is a nuisance and a loss of time, but against this, they are secure."

EXEMPTING STATE LOTTERY WINNINGS FROM FEDERAL INCOME TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. McKINNEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon, I introduced legislation which would exempt lottery winnings from an individual's taxable income.

The primary purpose of this legislation is to encourage the expansion of State revenues. With many of our States' coffers hard pressed to meet their financial obligations, it would seem appropriate that the Federal Government explore possible avenues which would generate increased State revenues. This becomes particularly pertinent with the advent of revenue sharing which predicated a State's share of Federal moneys on the size and scope of its tax effort.

The lotteries of those six States which offer them have generated substantial amounts of additional revenue which have been channeled into the States' educational and social service programs. For example, in a large State like New York, the lottery has produced \$318.8 million since its inception in 1967, while the comparatively small State of New Hampshire has grossed over \$30 million in its 9 years of operation.

However, even a cursory examination of the working of State lotteries reveals that Federal restrictions and regulations far from encouraging such revenue efforts hinder and, in some cases, retard their growth. Each of the six commis-

sioners in those States which currently operate lotteries have indicated that the prime source of public dissatisfaction with lotteries is the exorbitant size of the Federal tax bite. To illustrate the size of the Federal tax bite, I refer you to the attached correspondence from Connecticut's Commission on Special Revenue. With a prize of \$75,000, the average family in Connecticut would return \$39,780.00 to the Government—approximately half of the prize. This situation becomes an even greater source of irritation to the ticket buyer when he learns that in foreign countries, lottery prizes are exempt from taxation or subject only to a very minimal tax. As Mr. Ernest Bird, director of New York State's lottery, states:

The impact of this bill on our lottery would be considerable. Since we began operating the lottery in June of 1967, complaints against state and federal taxes on the prizes have been among the most numerous that we have received from the public.

Thus, I think it can be said that the exemption of lottery prizes from taxation would provide a boon to ticket sales because of its very strong public appeal and promotional value.

In keeping with their efforts to make State lotteries more appealing to the public, lottery commissioners are considering the establishment of daily lotteries, to offset the illegal numbers racket which grosses a staggering profit for organized crime. However, such promotional improvements will go for naught, until the overriding appeal of the tax free prize offered by the numbers racketeer is counteracted.

As you can see, the Federal Government has placed itself in the curious position of making the illegal numbers racket more appealing than State-sponsored lotteries. With more than 30 States actively considering instituting lotteries, now is the time to change this archaic, counterproductive Federal policy.

The material follows:

SWEETSTAKES COMMISSION.

Concord, N.H., May 24, 1972.

HON. STEWART B. McKINNEY,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McKINNEY: Your idea of exempting State lottery winnings from Federal income taxes is not only exciting but will receive widespread public support. Our present sweepstakes law exempts prize money from any tax imposed by the State of New Hampshire, as set forth on Page 9 of the enclosed pamphlet. Of course, this is academic at this time since N. H. does not have a general income tax.

We are now in our 9th year and have grossed over \$30 million. We will gross close to \$9 million during this sweepstakes year. We have paid out in excess of \$12 million in prizes. We presently pay 50% of the gross in prizes. The breakdown for this year will be approximately: prizes—50%, operating costs—13%, net to education—37%.

The net education will probably be more than this inasmuch as we anticipate 8-10% in unclaimed prizes. We started our weekly 50¢ program on July 14, 1971 and it has been highly successful thus far. We also sell a \$3 ticket with four sweepstakes races this year. We are considering a daily lottery with 25¢ tickets, but it is doubtful that it will be initiated this year.

This concept of raising revenue will not be

fairly tested in the market place until the archaic Federal restrictions involving the use of the mails, radio and television have been eliminated. Sovereign States with legalized lottery programs are at least entitled to the same privileges afforded pari-mutuel racing. In a free society the role of Government, both Federal and State, should be to ensure that the people are receiving what they pay for and not to restrict or impede their participation.

DEPARTMENT OF
TAXATION AND FINANCE,
Albany, N.Y., May 24, 1972.

HON. STEWART B. McKINNEY,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. McKINNEY: Thank you for your letter of May 18, 1972, indicating you are considering introducing legislation in Congress aimed at exempting state lottery winnings from Federal income taxes.

The New York State Lottery Law stipulates that not less than 45 percent of gross sales shall be allocated to the General Fund to be earmarked for primary, secondary, and higher education, and for providing scholarships. The Law further states that no more than 40 percent of gross sales may be allocated for lottery prizes. The balance of 15 percent then is utilized for all administrative costs, including commissions to sales agents and fees for bank services. Banks are our principal distributors of lottery tickets to retail sales agents.

As to the impact of such a bill on our lottery, I feel it would be considerable. Since we began operating the lottery in June 1967 complaints against State and Federal taxes on the prizes have been among the most numerous that we have received from the public, and as you can readily appreciate more particularly from the winners of large sums. Such correspondents are not assuaged when we explain that the biggest part of the total tax bite is caused by the Federal income tax. Many reason that the purchase of a lottery ticket is a sort of voluntary tax, and to some extent this is true, noting that of each dollar spent on lottery purchases in New York only 40 percent (in the other five lottery states—45 percent) is returned in prize money to the players. Thus New York State retains 60 cents on each dollar; 45 cents for education and 15 cents for administration. Because of this, the argument is made that it is unreasonable that taxes be levied on the prize amounts.

Thus I think it can be said the exemption of lottery prizes from taxation would provide a boon to ticket sales because of its very strong public appeal and promotional value. Taxation of these prizes is at present repeatedly held up by the press and news media as a source of disappointment to the winner, with implications of deception. Much is made in such stories, for example, about a situation in which a winner of \$100,000 may have a net gain of perhaps only \$60,000 or so after taxes, depending upon his ordinary income, exemptions, deductions, etc. This sort of publicity, of course, is not helpful in promoting lottery ticket sales.

It is common knowledge among many ticket buyers that in foreign countries lottery prizes are either totally exempted from taxation or subject to only a very minimal tax. They therefore question why the situation should be different in the United States.

Lottery prizes are subject to the New York State income tax. The New York Personal Income Tax Law generally conforms with the Federal Income Tax Law. If the proposed bill were drawn in such a manner as to delete prizes offered by state lotteries from the Federal income tax base, such prizes would automatically be deleted in reporting New York State tax income. On the other hand, if the Federal law were to delete a lottery

prize as a credit, special New York State legislation would be required to achieve conformity with the Federal law.

Possibly it might be argued New York would thus be deprived of some personal income tax, but it is not unreasonable to expect this might well be balanced off by the additional revenue resulting from increased lottery ticket sales.

Whenever this matter of tax exemption for lottery prizes has come under discussion, the question is also raised as to whether this same exemption should not then be expected on pari-mutuel and other gambling profits. In this regard, however, there appears to be a distinction inasmuch as the lottery is operated by an agency of the State of New York for the purpose of raising additional revenue for the State. On the other hand, this is not true to the same extent of pari-mutuel horse racing from which the State receives a much smaller percentage of the gross take. Admittedly, in New York State at least, the State's income from pari-mutuel taxes is considerably greater than its income derived from the lottery.

As an example, in the past fiscal year, April 1, 1971–March 31, 1972, the State's income from pari-mutuel taxes was \$164,332,113 as opposed to \$34,304,047 received from the sale of lottery tickets.

Since 1967 New York lottery sales have amounted to \$318.8 million, resulting in \$110.6 million being paid in prizes to 329,701 winners. The State's share of the gross sales has been \$157.6 million for State educational purposes. For fiscal 1972–73 the State's projected revenue from lottery sales is approximately \$55 million.

I am enclosing for your information a pamphlet indicating our present prize structure. In addition to this regular 50 cent weekly lottery we plan an occasional "Special" lottery such as the one to be offered this summer in which the tickets will be priced at \$3, offering two chances for a set of ten thousand prizes ranging from the single first prize of \$50,000 a year for life, with a minimum of \$1 million guaranteed, plus 9 second prizes of \$100,000, 90 third prizes of \$10,000, 900 fourth prizes of \$1,000, and 9,000 fifth prizes of \$200. It is our present intention to offer some type of "Special" lottery at least once, and possibly twice, each year.

I am most encouraged to learn of your interest in the proposed legislation, and am at your disposal to provide any additional information which might be of interest to you.

Sincerely,

ERNEST T. BIRD,
Director.

COMMISSION ON SPECIAL REVENUE,
Wethersfield, Conn., May 30, 1972.

HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY,
U.S. Representative, Cannon House Office
Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR STU: In answer to your letter of May 17, I am pleased to enclose some statistical data prepared by our Research Unit, which may be of assistance to you in your efforts to exempt State Lottery winnings from Federal Income Taxes. It is a laudable effort, and we certainly hope it can be successful.

You realize, of course, that very few states now have lotteries, so you might not have total acceptance initially. However, we believe lotteries will spread and many of your fellow congressmen will be looking toward the future.

If there is anything further we can do to assist, please call upon me.

My best regards,

JOSEPH B. BURNS,
Executive Secretary.

Prize winnings	Income	Total income	Federal tax
\$75,000.....	0	\$75,000	\$28,640
\$20,000.....	0	20,000	3,540
\$10,000.....	0	10,000	1,190
\$5,000.....	0	5,000	290
\$75,000.....	\$13,000	88,000	39,780
\$20,000.....	13,000	33,000	7,880
\$10,000.....	13,000	23,000	4,380
\$5,000.....	13,000	18,000	3,010

¹ Based on head of house plus 3 dependents. Source: U.S. Internal Revenue Service, 550 Main St., Hartford, Conn.

² Average family income in Connecticut is \$13,000. Source: The Colonial Bank & Trust Co.

Source: U.S. Internal Revenue Service, 550 Main St., Hartford, Conn.

PROJECTIONS FOR CALENDAR YEAR OF FEBRUARY 1972 TO FEBRUARY 1973

Amount of prize	Annual winners	Annual prizes
\$75,000.....	45	\$3,375,000
\$20,000.....	45	900,000
\$10,000.....	25	250,000
\$5,000.....	780	4,400,000
\$400.....	8,320	3,328,000
\$40.....	83,200	3,328,000

Note: Quarterly prizes: 4 quarterly prizes for year equals \$4,685,000. Total amount of prizes to be awarded during calendar year, \$20,000,000. Total amount for distribution to State treasury equals \$21,798,000. All computations based on sales of 88,400,000 tickets. Liability for prizes equals 34.4 percent. Liability for agent and bank commissions equals 5.5 percent. Liability for operating expenses equals 10.6 percent.

MAY 22, 1972.

HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCKINNEY: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 18, 1972.

At the present time lottery winnings in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania are subject to our 2.3% Income Tax. Legislation has been introduced that would exempt lottery winnings from State Income Tax; however, it is difficult to speculate on the fate of this Bill. Should lottery winnings be excluded from Federal Income Tax, this would certainly add a great deal of impetus to favorable consideration of our own legislation.

Since the inception of the lottery, our ticket sales have averaged about 7,000,000 tickets per week; it is anticipated that for the next fiscal year net revenues of the lottery will be at least \$60,000,000.

Our prize structure is such that 45% of our ticket sales are reserved for prizes; sales agents' commissions and other commissions add about 6%. We hope to keep our operating costs to a 5% limit—with the balance reverting to the State as net proceeds.

There has been a great deal of conjecture as to the effect of various state lotteries on the numbers game, and I do believe that all states having lotteries are at least looking into the possibility of having a daily lottery to offset the illegal schemes presently being operated.

In view of the fact that the numbers game is more or less a clandestine operation, one of its strong points is the easy evasion of paying of income taxes on winnings. It would appear that to have a sizable impact on the illegal numbers traffic, that the exclusion of such winnings from tickets bought through legal (State) sources would be a most important ingredient.

From what one gathers, law enforcement has not been able to effectively deal with the illegal numbers game, and from various estimates, the revenue so produced is much greater than that of the present state lotteries.

A daily state lottery, commercially competitive with the numbers racket now in existence, could probably be more effective in diminishing this illicit traffic than any steps yet taken.

This may very well be considered an admission of failure in enforcement of existing law, and an attempt at correction by redirecting the funds through what would then be legal channels. Although this would be a realistic appraisal, it is one which ignores the moral questions that are and will continue to be raised.

If you require any additional data, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY H. KAPLAN,
Executive Director.

H.R. 15248

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income amounts won in State lotteries

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part III of subchapter B of chapter I of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to items specifically excluded from gross income) is amended by redesignating section 124 as section 125 and by inserting after section 123 the following new section:

"SEC. 124. STATE LOTTERY WINNINGS.

"(a) General Rule.—Gross income does not include any gain resulting from a wager placed in a sweepstakes, wagering pool, or lottery conducted by an agency of a State acting under authority of State law if the wager is placed with the State agency conducting such sweepstakes, wagering pool, or lottery, or with its authorized employees or agents.

"(b) Definitions.—For purposes of this section, the terms 'lottery' and 'wager' have the same meaning as provided by section 4421." (b) The table of sections for such part III is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 124. State lottery winnings.

"Sec. 125. Cross references to other Acts."

(c) Section 74(a) of such Code (relating to inclusion in gross income of prizes and awards) is amended by striking out "section 117 (relating to scholarships and fellowship grants)" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 117 (relating to scholarships and fellowship grants) and 124 (relating to State lottery winnings)".

(d) Section 165(d) of such Code (relating to wagering losses) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Nothing in this subsection shall apply to any transaction gain from which is excluded from gross income under section 124 (relating to State lottery winnings), and no amount of any loss from such a transaction shall be allowed as a deduction."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to amounts received or accrued in taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

WORLDWIDE POLLUTION CONTROLS AND H.R. 13116

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, a recent computer study by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology predicts that in only 33 years the earth's population will double from its present 3.5 billion to 7 billion, and 30 years beyond that will see yet another doubling—to 14 billion. All

this will take place within the lifetime of children who are today in the kindergarten-elementary school age group. It will happen unless disaster—starvation, plague or war—or massive birth control intervenes. None of these is likely.

It is equally unlikely that mankind—now that the dimensions of environmental threat are coming to be known—will allow himself to be destroyed. This seems evident from the speed with which society has rallied to organize itself to confront the crisis. The U.N. Conference on the Human Environment, which will convene in Stockholm in June is the first step in what promises to be a worldwide effort to reverse the trend toward destruction. In all probability, the next few years will see many "first steps" and false starts at the international level. But it seems clear there are no real alternatives to a concerted and cooperative effort to correct and reverse the destructive effects of man's activities on the world's commons—the oceans and the atmosphere.

The effort promises to be even more actively pursued at national levels. The vigorous environmental program inaugurated in the United States in the past few years seems likely to be duplicated in most of the world's developed countries in the near future. It may seem ironic, but in these vigorous national environmental efforts lie the seeds of yet another serious problem for the world—the impact of environmental measures on world trade and investment.

Although the goal of environmental quality is being rapidly adopted by societies, man is still impelled to the pursuit of economic goals to satisfy his life's needs. His highly organized institutions are geared to economic growth, as they have been for several hundred years, and there is little evidence that this will change very much. In fact, for most of the new populations of the world in the coming century, economic goals will be even more actively pursued than they are now.

The nature of environmental problems dictates that their solutions must be based on scientifically-determined standards. Goals for acceptable levels of air or water quality must be so expressed as to satisfy both equity and the requirement of policy in terms of health, welfare and esthetics. It goes without saying that the attainment of such policy goals will require that a substantial portion of production enterprises will be forced to radical changes in their processes, or to install anti-pollution technologies, both of which will increase the cost of finished products.

One of the first results of national environmental policies will be an increase in costs for a number of enterprises. And to the extent to which the products of these enterprises are traded in world markets, increased production costs may cause a diminishing of exports, and, sooner or later, of imports. The ultimate effect, especially for those countries enforcing the highest standards of environmental quality, will be a reduction in their balance of payments.

This whole train of events would be mitigated to the degree that trading nations harmonize their environmental policies. But, given the differences in prior-

ities among even the world's most advanced nations, such harmony will not be easily achieved. What is more likely to happen is that, when the balance of payments of the more environmentally ambitious nation is adversely affected, that country will find it necessary to offset its deteriorating trade position through the enforcement of import restrictions or some other form of trade inhibition. In extremely serious cases, it is conceivable that the affected nation might deflate its economy, or devalue its currency.

Those who take the long view may consider the consequences of national environmental policies on trade as temporary dislocations that would eventually be resolved through the reallocation of resources or the reordering of national priorities. But political processes are required to be responsive to the more immediate problems, and governments, faced with severe economic consequences of stringent environmental policies, might well choose to waive environmental goals in favor of economic stability.

Another economic problem is posed by national policies to achieve a high quality environment. A presidential commission last summer pointed out that "different national standards, regulations, and effluent charges may lead to changes in patterns of international investment." Countries whose environmental policies permitted production enterprises to operate under less environmental restraint could become "pollution havens," in much the same manner that lower taxes have attracted investment. Although some relocation of industry might be desirable, this could be disadvantageous in other cases. During environmental seminars of the United Nations regional economic commissions last summer, representatives of some of the underdeveloped countries expressed concern that enforcement of high environmental quality standards in the developed nations might force polluting industries to relocate in developing regions. Most of them understand that the solution of many of their environmental problems is to be found in the process of development itself. But they are also concerned about the quality of their environments, and do not want to become "pollution havens."

While I have said that it would be difficult to harmonize national environmental policies to reduce the adverse effects of economic dislocation, there appears to be no real alternative to seeking just such harmonization. The Stockholm Conference provides an appropriate focus for tackling this difficult task. Already, the Environment Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—OECD—has begun important work in this area. It recently identified and drafted a set of guiding principles concerning the economic aspects of environmental policies, and recommends that OECD member countries observe them as they formulate national environmental programs. Briefly, the OECD recommends the adoption of the principle that environmental costs be charged to the polluter, and that governments will seek common standards for polluting products and agree on the timing of enforcement of such standards.

Such a procedure would undoubtedly

succeed in reducing much of the impact of environmental management on world trade. But it also calls for close attention by each country to the progress of environmental policy among its trading partners. Such attention is the main thrust of a bill which I have introduced in the Congress. That bill proposes the creation of a Commission on International Trade and the Environment, which would be charged with determining answers to several questions as a guide for formulating our own national environmental policies. Specifically, it would be asked to determine:

First, what antipollution measures and recommendations relating to industrial pollution are being proposed by the United Nations, its related organizations, and any other international agencies;

Second, the effect which compliance by major U.S. industries with antipollution statutes and ordinances has had or will have, with respect to increased costs which must be charged for the goods produced by such industries;

Third, if any competitive advantage is, or will be, given to foreign producers by reason of the enforcement of, or compliance with, such antipollution measures;

Fourth, what antipollution measures are applied, or are being considered for application, in the industrialized countries of the world and what effect, if any, such measures will have on the cost of goods from those countries in the international market;

Fifth, ways and means by which the U.S. Government, in the course of providing domestic safeguards against environmental pollution, can prevent a situation whereby U.S. industry is priced out of world markets;

Sixth, what equitable standards of environmental protection should be proposed by the United States, in United Nations forums, to the industrialized countries of the world; and

Seventh, what methods of enforcing these standards in such a way as to assure adequate oceanic and atmospheric protection, without placing any one nation at an unjust trade disadvantage, might be proposed by the United States in United Nations forums.

The findings of this Commission would serve to guide the forum of our environmental policies. They would also be an indispensable source of information in the negotiations that the United States and other nations must pursue to achieve the necessary degree of harmonization of national environmental policies, if we are to avoid chaos in world trade conditions.

LOSS OF PHILADELPHIA 1976 INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION IS A TRAGIC FAILURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on May 16, 1972, the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission voted against having an International Exposition in Philadelphia in 1976, the year in which we are celebrating the 200th birthday of this great United States.

In addition to the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission—ARBC—the Commerce Department and the Office of Management and Budget—OMB—were supposed to submit reports to the President. After reviewing the reports from these three agencies, the President was then supposed to make a decision on whether or not the International Exposition would be held in Philadelphia, which was the city that had been designated as the International Exposition City during the bicentennial year.

As one of four members of the ARBC representing this House, I was shocked when, on Monday, May 22, 1972, the Congress of the United States received a message from the President, who had departed for his trip to Moscow on May 20, 1972, stating that he had asked the Secretary of State to take action at the impending meeting of the Bureau of International Expositions to withdraw the registration of the International Exposition in Philadelphia. This indicates that the important subject of an International Exposition received only 3 days of consideration.

This action simply means that, in all probability, that while we are celebrating our 200th anniversary, an International Exposition will be held in some other country. It was this International Exposition that would have attracted extensive international participation in our bicentennial year celebration, would have increased our gross national product by \$6 to \$8 billion, and would have given us almost a billion dollars in favorable balance of payments.

It was in 1968 that the Bureau of International Expositions—BIE—designated the United States as the country to have the International Exposition in 1976. At that time, Russia also had applied for the International Exposition in 1976 and had made a strong effort to secure the International Exposition for 1976. It could be that Russia will now have the International Exposition in 1976.

The rejection of the International Exposition for Philadelphia in 1976 was no accident. The ARBC asked each State to set up their own State bicentennial commission. Most of the States have complied with this request, and those States that have not set up their own bicentennial commissions have designated one of their existing departments to handle their States bicentennial plans.

Under the plans of the ARBC, each State will receive a total of \$90,000 for planning their bicentennial celebration, and the States are planning their celebration around the basic history of that State. As one example, Virginia is planning their major bicentennial celebration for Yorktown.

Of course, some Federal funding will be necessary to assist each State in actually staging their own bicentennial celebration. It is in this manner that our 200th birthday will be celebrated in an appropriate way in every State of the Union. The International Exposition would have attracted many visitors to this country who could have visited the bicentennial celebration of the various States.

In order to understand the operation

of the ARBC, I must explain that, prior to my appointment to the ARBC, the ARBC had set up an executive committee consisting of only 10 members. The full commission membership is 52 when it is at its full strength. This executive committee meets monthly while the full commission, the ARBC, meets quarterly.

The ARBC "Recognition Process," formulated by the executive committee, states that the only action which will be taken by the ARBC—the full commission—are those items that the executive committee feels, for one of various reasons, fall within the scope of the full commission. No attempt is made to define the various reasons which could cause the executive committee to refer something to the full commission for action.

The first indication that the chairman and the executive committee were opposed to an International Exposition occurred on February 21, 1972, at a meeting of the full commission. At this meeting, a model was shown to the commission members of a park which was described as a bicentennial park. These bicentennial parks were to be built in each State on 100 to 500 acres of surplus Federal land located near urban centers. After looking at the model, receiving an explanation of the model, and after a brief discussion, all of which took less than 1 hour, the commission was asked to pass a resolution which would make the bicentennial parks an official ARBC project with an estimated cost of \$1.25 billion.

Since questions could not be answered on any details, such as the availability of surplus Federal land, the commission voted that the commission staff of approximately 65 members, working with the various executive agencies of the Government, conduct a feasibility study on the bicentennial park concept and report back to the commission as soon as possible. This study was just started on Tuesday, May 30, 1972, and is being conducted by an executive department group.

After an executive committee meeting on May 1, 1972, called for the express purpose of finalizing the ARBC procedures manual, the executive committee, through the chairman, issued a statement to the effect that if the incomplete facts which they had before them on the International Exposition proved to be accurate, the executive committee could not recommend that an International Exposition be held in Philadelphia. This announcement came after Philadelphia and Pennsylvania had spent more than \$3 million developing plans for the International Exposition, and the representatives of the Philadelphia 1976 Bicentennial Corporation were scheduled to make their presentation to the full commission on May 16, 1972, in Boston.

During the week of May 8, 1972, I and other commission members received a packet of material from the ARBC staff which included a sheet which placed the cost of the International Exposition between \$1.51 and \$1.76 billion. The \$772 million was marked as "app'd, but unfunded." I assumed that the "app'd, but unfunded" meant, approved, but unfunded. However, when I called the Di-

rector of the ARBC to clear up this point, he informed me that the "app'd but unfunded" meant appropriated, but unfunded, and he had no explanation as to how the money for any project could be appropriated but at the same time, be unfunded. Actually, it turned out that the \$772 million was for projects, such as highways, for which the money had been appropriated and construction had started, and these projects had nothing to do with the international exposition.

On this cost sheet was \$250 million for the State of New Jersey. At a meeting in the Commerce Department on May 11, 1972, I asked a representative of the Office of Management and Budget, if he had reviewed New Jersey's request for \$250 million. His reply was that OMB had simply taken the New Jersey report on its request at its face value and this is obviously an unusual action on the part of OMB. Later, the \$250 million was reduced to \$40 million to cover the cost of only those projects which had a direct relationship to the international exposition.

After it was determined which members of the commission would not be in attendance at the meeting in Boston on March 16, 1972, some of the members of the commission who were not going to be in attendance at the meeting, received telegrams from the ARBC asking them to send a telegram of opposition to the international exposition if they did not favor such an exposition. The telegram made no mention of anyone who did favor the exposition sending a telegram to that effect.

It is my understanding that on May 15, 1972, the first day of the 2-day ARBC meeting, a luncheon was given for some members of the ARBC, and the major subject discussed at the luncheon was opposition to the International Exposition, and support for the bicentennial parks.

At the Commission meeting on March 16, 1972, Mr. William Rafsky and Mr. John Gallery made a fine presentation on the International Exposition in behalf of the Philadelphia 1976 Bicentennial Corporation. Mr. Rafsky stated that the Federal cost of the International Exposition would be \$600 million. When I asked Mr. Rafsky where the additional money would come from, if his figures were incorrect, and we allowed a 2-percent overrun on the \$600 million figure, which would make the Federal share \$612 million, Mr. Rafsky replied that the additional money would come from the city of Philadelphia and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

In spite of the excellent presentation made in behalf of the International Exposition and in spite of the fact that the Federal cost was much less than one-half of the cost which had been projected in the ARBC memo, the Commission voted 23 to 4 against the International Exposition.

Neither the chairman nor any members of the Executive Committee who were present at the meeting voted in favor of the International Exposition. In fact, the Chairman even had proxies from some Commission members to vote against the International Exposition in spite of the fact that the ARBC proce-

dures make no provision for proxy voting, and the members whose proxies the Chairman held did not hear the presentation from the Philadelphia representatives.

We have less than 4 years in which to finish our preparations for our Bicentennial Commemoration. At the rate of progress we are presently making, our Bicentennial Commemoration will be nothing but a dismal failure. I can only hope that the full Commission will take a more active interest in the decisions of the ARBC and the ARBC must develop better and closer liaison with the individual States.

While it would seem to me that the International Exposition for 1976 is lost for this country, I do believe that this administration should carefully reconsider the 1976 International Exposition and make every effort to see that it is held in Philadelphia.

COMMENDS NEW YORK PRESSMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, tonight the President is to deliver a report to this Congress on what appears to have been a highly successful trip on behalf of a lasting peace. I might add, a President who is determined, I believe, that this country will never be without the strength to preserve that peace. It is indeed ironic that at this moment in history when the chances to negotiate more peaceful resolutions of the world's problems, when our relations with Peking and Moscow have reached the most promising stage in history, when we have achieved the first measure of success in negotiating a halt to the arms race, some Members of this body feel compelled to impeach our President. They want to impeach the man who has sole responsibility for negotiating toward those objectives, as well as our goal of a ceasefire in Indochina and the return of our POW's-MIA's.

In their compulsion to impeach the President, these Members took out an advertisement in the New York Times, two full pages, calling for support for such action. Courageously and patriotically, the New York Printing Pressmen's Union, No. 2, delayed the start of the first edition of the May 31, 1972, issue to protest the contents of that advertisement. The chairman of the union, Richard Siemers, said the pressmen felt the advertisement was traitorous and detrimental to the boys in Vietnam and the prisoners of war. The Times refused even to allow the pressmen to have printed a statement of their viewpoint. To set the record straight, I include the Times article in the RECORD. Certainly it is not my wish to contend Mr. Sulzberger's freedom to print what he wishes, but merely to point to the courage of the pressmen to exercise their freedom to express their moral and political outrage.

I intend to introduce a joint resolution next week commending the New York Printing Pressmen's Union No. 2.

Mr. Speaker, there is plenty of time

for criticism. But with sensitive negotiations taking place at this time in all areas of international diplomacy, it is highly unfortunate that critics have chosen this moment of national hope to ask for the impeachment of the world leader who has helped to bring us that hope.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION COMMENDING NEW YORK PRINTING PRESSMEN'S UNION No. 2

Whereas, the President of the United States has just concluded an historic peace-making mission to Moscow, and

Whereas, the President of the United States is making every effort to effect a more stable and peaceful world for ourselves and our children, and

Whereas, the President of the United States is making every effort to bring an honorable end to the war in Southeast Asia, and

Whereas, the New York Times showed great misjudgment on Wednesday, May 31, 1972, in agreeing to publish a two-page advertisement calling for the impeachment of the President, and

Whereas, The New York Printing Pressmen's Union, No. 2, showed a remarkable degree of courage and patriotism in protesting the Times' publication of the advertisement to impeach the President, and

Whereas, this type of criticism makes it exceedingly difficult to negotiate with an intransigent enemy, and is detrimental to American men in Vietnam and our POW's-MIA's, and

Whereas, The Pressmen's Union indicated a willingness to publicly defend the President of the United States despite obvious risk to their own jobs at the Times,

Be it therefore resolved that the Congress of the United States does hereby commend and congratulate the New York Printing Pressmen's Union, No. 2 for defending the President, and standing up for an honorable end to the war in Southeast Asia.

PRESSMEN DELAY EDITION OF TIMES

Pressmen at The New York Times delayed the start of the first-edition press run of yesterday's issue for nearly 15 minutes to protest the contents of a paid advertisement seeking the impeachment of President Nixon.

The two-page advertisement of the National Committee for Impeachment sought support for a campaign to impeach Mr. Nixon for allegedly violating the Constitution and ignoring bipartisan legislation by continuing the war in Vietnam and by increasing air operations there.

Initially, officials of The Times said, the pressmen said they would not operate the presses unless the advertisement was removed. The Times management refused to do this.

The pressmen then asked that a statement of their viewpoint be printed with the advertisement, but production officials again refused, saying that it was a matter for the news department to look into.

Arthur Ochs Sulzberger, the publisher of The Times, said in a statement yesterday that it was "inconceivable" that The Times would yield to economic pressure from its pressmen for elimination of the advertisement with which they disagreed.

Richard Siemers, chairman of the New York Printing Pressmen's Union No. 2 at The Times, said the pressmen felt the advertisement was "traitorous" and "detrimental to the boys in Vietnam and prisoners of war." He issued the following statement for the pressmen:

"We the members of the New York Times press room want it known that we do not agree with the action or intent of the paid advertisement on pages 22 and 23 of the Wednesday issue, dated May 31, 1972, and are working under protest in printing it."

Mr. Sulzberger said in his statement that "fortunately" the pressmen allowed themselves to be persuaded to permit work to go forward before any real damage was done and that the advertisement ran as scheduled. He continued:

"In the service of freedom of expression our columns must remain open to a wide variety of views, with many of which obviously both we and others will disagree."

"The work stoppage, which involved the use of economic force in an effort to censor the contents of the newspaper, was a challenge to the concept of freedom of expression on which a free press is founded. It would have been inconceivable for this newspaper to have yielded to such pressure."

"We doubt that those involved had fully thought out the implications of their action. The gravity of the situation will be explained to them, and we trust that there will not be any repetition of the incident."

TERRORISM AT TEL AVIV AIRPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, we were all horrified and shocked by the Tuesday night incident at Tel Aviv Airport in which three terrorists gunned down over 100 people, killing 25 of them. Among the dead were 12 Puerto Ricans on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land and Dr. Aharon Katzir-Katchalsky, the noted scientist.

Although the perpetrators of this outrage were apparently not of Arab nationality, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine has claimed responsibility for the incident. It is well known that even though this group and other Arab terrorist groups may not be officially connected with the governments of Arab nations, they receive the protection and covert support of these governments in planning and carrying out their activities. In this particular case, the terrorist group is based in Beirut, Lebanon.

I am today introducing a resolution expressing the horror of the Congress at this unprovoked attack. The resolution also calls upon the President and the State Department to express in the strongest terms their disapproval of the harboring and aiding of these terrorist groups by Arab governments, particularly the Government of Lebanon. Finally, the resolution asks international airlines to boycott Beirut Airport as a protest against the international outlawry countenanced by the Lebanese Government.

I include the text of the resolution at the conclusion of my remarks and express my hope that it will receive the support of my colleagues:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Whereas, 25 innocent civilians were killed and over 75 innocent civilians wounded in an unprovoked armed attack at the Tel Aviv Airport on May 31, 1972, and

Whereas, a terrorist group known as the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine has claimed responsibility for this incident, and

Whereas, a number of Governments in the Middle East, including the Government of Lebanon, are known or believed to be harboring, aiding, and encouraging the said Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine and similar terrorist groups: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the sense of

the Congress concerning the incident at the Tel Aviv Airport on May 31, 1972, is one of horror, shock, and dismay, and further

Resolved, that the Congress calls upon the President and the Secretary of State to express to the Government of Lebanon and any other Governments harboring, aiding, or encouraging the terrorist Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine or any other similar terrorist groups the strong disapproval of the United States at such harboring, aiding, or encouragement, and further

Resolved, that the Congress calls upon all international airlines to boycott Beirut, the headquarters of the said Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, until such time as the Government of Lebanon takes strong and effective measures to terminate the existence of such group, and any other similar terrorist groups, on its territory.

PENTAGON WASTE IN CONTRACT TERMINATIONS

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, I am publicly releasing today a recent report by the General Accounting Office which indicates that the Pentagon throws away millions of dollars trying to terminate contracts with faulty contractors.

The Government paid an extra \$6 million in contracts valued at \$15 million because of pervasive mismanagement in our defense industries. The extra charges of \$6 million were the result of the Pentagon paying for sub-standard items, ignoring contractors delays in delivering items, and writing contracts with giant loopholes that allow the contractors to collect large sums if a contract is terminated.

The most blatant example of this waste is the payment of \$4.9 million to Westinghouse of Baltimore, Md. for not producing 12 decoy devices for jet fighters. The decoy devices were designed to aid the F-105 Star Fighter Jet. The original value of the contract was \$5.6 million for producing four prototype decoy devices and 12 production units. Instead, the Government paid Westinghouse \$4.9 million and Westinghouse did not deliver one single item.

Other firms were paid for producing faulty computer parts, radios, parachutes and electronic tubes. Some companies were paid despite the fact that there were considerable delays in the performance of their contracts.

One firm, Mason Electronics, was paid over \$300,000 for a gun bolt assembly for the M-61 rifle that it did not produce for the Air Force. Instead, Mason turned to another firm which produces an identical gun bolt for the Army and let a sub-contract.

Mr. Speaker, I am calling upon Defense Secretary Laird to explain to the American people why the Pentagon pays contractors who provide inadequate equipment or produce nothing at all. This kind of waste and mismanagement only reinforces the belief of many Americans that the Pentagon is an inefficient bureaucracy incapable of efficiently and effectively procuring new weapons.

HISTORY OF THE POLISH AMERICAN CLUB OF NEWINGTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COTTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 4, the Polish Americans Club of Newington is celebrating its 50th anniversary. I have long admired the work of this proud civic organization, and I know my colleagues will wish to join me in recognizing the achievements of this dedicated group.

I especially want to point out to the Members of Congress the work of the president of this club, John Bedus, and the chairman of the club building committee, Stanley May.

For the benefit of my colleagues and the readers of this RECORD, I am enclosing a brief history of this fine organization.

The history follows:

HISTORY OF THE POLISH AMERICAN CLUB OF NEWINGTON

The Polish American Club was organized in 1922. The originators: John Cames, Joseph Wenis and Adam Czarnecki labored to organize this club which was dedicated to civic responsibility and to benefits for the members. The originators started the club with 22 charter members. Many of the sons of the original members are still active in the club.

After the charter became effective, these members decided to purchase some land to build a clubhouse. This was on the south side of Wilson Avenue.

First, a dancing pavilion was built and the money derived from the dances enabled John Bedus and Jacob Hollis to build a clubhouse. Some of the most exciting dances and picnics of Newington were held at this club. Revenue from the dances and picnics, together with team work from all members, soon had the officers thinking of constructing a bigger and better club.

The title of the land purchased was in the name of the Newington Independent Club and its officers at that time were Joseph Stemplien, President, and John Bedus, Secretary.

This area, known as "Home Gardens" Tract, also nicknamed "Settlement", was settled mainly by Polish Immigrants.

In 1927, Joseph Stemplien and John Bedus decided to change the name of the club to Polish American Republican Club.

As the community grew, so the Polish American Club grew. By the year 1948, the club had growing pains and a larger meeting hall was needed. John Bedus, its president, saw the future of the club and sold the members the idea of purchasing additional land. Mr. Bedus had enough foresight to get the young people interested in the club. In 1938, the Club purchased additional land on the north side of Wilson Avenue.

Stanley May was named chairman of the building committee and with the help and with great teamwork from all its members, the new Polish American club was built. The dedication of the new club was in 1949 and a prouder building was not seen anywhere in Newington.

John Bedus, the club's president, who held the Presidency even longer than the late President Roosevelt, 28 years in all, had the named changed to the Polish American Club of Newington.

Just recently, this proud organization completed paying off its mortgage and on Sunday it will celebrate its 50th Anniversary.

FRANK WYKOFF: OLYMPIAN, EDUCATOR, GREAT AMERICAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIELSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure today to pay tribute to Frank Clifford Wykoff, famed athlete and three-time Olympic Games gold medal winner. Our colleague from Illinois, RALPH METCALFE, was on the winning team with Frank Wykoff when they brought back to the United States the 400-meter relay gold medal from Berlin in 1936.

Frank Wykoff first represented the United States as a member of the Olympic team in 1928 while he was a student at Glendale High School in Glendale, Calif. He received the gold medal for the 400-meter relay held that year in Amsterdam. In 1932, this time as a student at the University of Southern California, Frank again won the gold medal in the 400-meter relay in the Olympic events in Los Angeles. His third gold medal came from the Olympics held in Berlin in 1936. For many years Frank Wykoff held the title of the "World's Fastest Human."

In addition to this own athletic achievements, Frank Wykoff has devoted his life to education and to youth services. Tonight he is being honored by a retirement testimonial dinner at the International Hotel in Los Angeles, marking retirement as director of the Los Angeles County Special Schools after 22 years of service in that capacity. He came to that job in 1950 and during the intervening years the special schools department has grown from a few teachers into a large department.

Frank Wykoff has provided leadership in the field of education as a teacher, as principal, and as superintendent of elementary schools in Carpinteria, Calif., giving 17 years of service in the latter position before joining the Los Angeles County school system. He has helped to research new educational methods and has been concerned with reeducating youth and children in trouble. His contributions in the educational arena have been as outstanding, if not as well known, as his athletic successes.

Frank Wykoff was born in Des Moines, Iowa, on October 29, 1910. He has lived in southern California most of his life, in Glendale, in Carpinteria, and presently in Alhambra in the 29th Congressional District which I am pleased to represent. I am proud to have Frank Wykoff as a constituent and to take this occasion to pay tribute to his many contributions to southern California and to the United States.

THE ISSUE AT HAND—IMMEDIATE FISCAL RELIEF FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues at times can only appear to their colleagues in this House who know them best as so many jugglers, so many issues do they appear to be managing, circulating, and balancing in their hands at any one time. However, I do not think until the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972, H.R. 14370, was reported out of the Ways and Means Committee, was the extent of their true talents shown for all to see. In the days that have followed the committee's favorable reporting of that bill, the House has been treated to an incredible display of balancing act virtuosity by some of our colleagues. So expertly have some managed to keep a number of unrelated issues in the air that the debate over emergency Federal assistance to government at the local level has grown beyond recognition into the great national debate, centering on such controversial issues as the need for tax reform, the need for congressional reform, the historical jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee and, almost lost sight of in the ensuing debate over these controversial issues which have been in the air for years, the issue at hand, the revenue-sharing proposal of the administration as revised and modified in the traditional legislative process of hearings and committee action. Make no mistake about it, revenue sharing is the issue at hand in all of this and I contend the issue we are in danger of losing sight of. Suddenly, like some lightning rod this bill seems to have attracted to itself all the fierce, raging undercurrents of controversy in the air over tax reform, seniority reform, procedural reform, and seems to be coming close to crystalizing an opposition which can only be described as formidable in its very diversity.

It is as if the very concept of revenue sharing were not controversial enough in and of itself. The concept of revenue sharing in and of itself has raised from its very introduction into political discussion a whole host of directly related issues—each of them controversial in turn in and of itself.

The committee in considering the concept of revenue sharing was ineluctably forced to involve itself in such controversial matters as: deficit spending, the sorry state of the national economy, the always emotional specter of an ever-increasing national debt, the quality of government service at the local level and the undeniable need for reform of existing local government institutions, the critical state of local government finances, the stifling burden of skyrocketing local property taxes, the desirability of one kind of tax over another—with the underlying awareness that all taxes are evil, however necessary—the quality of life in the cities and the trend to the suburbs and drift from the farms, the old federalism versus the new federalism, States' rights versus a strong, central government, traditional interstate rivalry and intrastate prejudices, the whole patchwork of differing taxes from State to State with all that implies for the fierce competition for industry, the infinite variety of State constitutions and the difficult road for constitutional

amendments to achieve more equitable State tax structures—just to rattle off a few of the controversial areas that the committee had to traipse through in arriving at any bill at all on the subject of revenue sharing. No committee, even one possessing the wisdom of Solomon or the ingenuity of WILBUR MILLS—let alone a committee made up of 25 members, each claiming to possess the wisdom of Solomon—could possibly be expected to satisfactorily and definitively answer any one of these open-ended questions in one year's session. In a sense, the chairman in accepting the administration's challenge on revenue sharing was accepting a commission to choreograph a ballet suitable for staging with safety in a veritable minefield. No matter which way the committee turned, it found itself smack up against the most devious of issues. If our legislative process was ever put through a more taxing ordeal than it was on this bill in the committee stage, I must confess the episode escapes me now. If ever there was a committee report and bill which was the result of painstaking compromise and a resolve to do the best possible for our local communities and the local taxpayer in their hour of desperate financial need, it is the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972. If there is truth to the observation that no legislation has ever passed both Houses and been signed into law that pleased every interested group in every detail, it is an understatement to say that proof positive can be found in this bill. No one has pretended for 1 minute that this bill will meet all of the demands that are being made on this Congress for immediate relief. No one has or will argue that this bill has succeeded in avoiding all the pitfalls along the way. What can be said and should be said before this bill is buried in the welter of controversy surrounding it is that it does represent the best hope possible here and now for providing immediate relief to our local governments. This is the point that must be made. This is the point which cannot be lost sight of. This is the point which every organization representing local communities of every variety are making to you, their representatives in Congress.

To be sure these groups have not arrived at their position willingly or enthusiastically. They are there, no doubt, with a degree of reluctance. Every community around this Nation interested in this legislation has had to make adjustments along the way. That positions have changed in the course of the development of this legislation is unquestionable. Yet equally unquestionable is the fact that today nearly a year later, the mayors and Governors around this country are united as never before in agreement that the bill coming before you in a matter of days embodies not only their best hope for desperately needed assistance but their only hope.

For months now, it has been fashionable in the press to lambast the Committee on Ways and Means for taking its time in reporting out a revenue-sharing measure. Clearly these reporters chose to ignore what they had to know to be the case and, that is, given all the

fantastic complexities involved in a discussion on revenue sharing and the need to come up with an equitable formula that met the needs of our major cities without ignoring the needs of our counties and towns of our State governments, the committee could hardly rush through its assignment. The time was but one indication of the difficulties involved.

Take my own case, for instance. I entered the deliberations of the committee equipped with a full set of reservations, both philosophical and economical, about the wisdom of the administration's revenue-sharing plan. I think the same can be said of every member of the committee and indeed every Member of Congress. That is what hearings are for. It was only in the process of weeks of hearings and months of deliberations in executive session that I became convinced that it was possible to come up with a formula of distributing revenue that addressed itself to the serious problems at hand without squandering the Federal taxpayers' money and which avoided some of the dangerous philosophical implications of the original revenue-sharing concept. Above all, as the hearings wore on, I think it is safe to say that the overwhelming majority of members were in agreement on one point and that is, many of our cities and towns were in desperate financial situations and help had to be forthcoming immediately if Congress was to escape the charge that Washington fiddled while Main Street burned. This conviction, if anything, has been reinforced with each passing month and in rising today, I simply want to cut through the rising crescendo of criticism these past few weeks centering on this revenue-sharing bill because I think the last thing this bill, the result of painstaking compromise, needs is to get involved in added controversy. I think it can only be a source of great concern to every local government around this Nation and every local property taxpayer that there are those in this House who for reasons of their own have chosen to make the debate over revenue sharing a debate on other matters such as wholesale Federal tax reform and congressional reform.

This does not mean that I am not concerned about and am not committed to tax reform. It is long overdue. The chairman has unquestionably gone further than any other chairman of the Ways and Means Committee since the Federal income tax was added to the constitution of this country in filing the legislation he filed yesterday. Far reaching Federal tax reform, for the first time, is a distinct possibility with the filing of this legislation. I certainly will do all in my power and lend whatever prestige I have to translating this commitment into a reality. But no one knows more than the advocates of far reaching tax reform the difficulties of getting a genuine tax reform bill through Congress. They know it is not like instant coffee and something which can be done overnight. In attaching far reaching Federal tax reform to a bill such as the one which is before us in the form of an amendment on the floor, they are jeopardizing the very bill before us. In effect, they know they are asking the impossible. Much

of it is pure grandstanding for public consumption. If these men were serious, they would, in fact, be conserving their energy and joining the Chairman in a constructive effort to undertake hearings forthwith on genuine and complete tax reform, instead of trying to freight this bill down with an amendment that can only diminish the chances of any bill passing this House and the other.

Similarly, with those forces advocating congressional reform and who can always be counted upon to oppose the concept of a closed rule for Ways and Means Committee legislation. Again, these people are making this bill a hostage for instant congressional reform here and now. Again, I have no quarrel for the demand for congressional reform. Congressional reform is long overdue. But why this bill? In their insistence in bringing up this issue at this time they are wittingly or unwittingly contributing to the likely defeat of a much needed measure of fiscal relief to our local cities and towns. Again, the issue at hand is revenue sharing, not congressional reform.

As if we did not have enough to contend with, the newest ripple of discontent surrounding this bill is coming from my good friends on the Appropriations Committee. Apparently, a decision has been made to add to the woes of revenue sharing by raising the issue of committee jurisdiction. This is an appropriations measure they say, not a revenue measure. Perhaps there is something to what they say, but in view of all the time invested by one committee of this House which had unquestioned jurisdiction over the revenue-sharing concept as originally proposed, they surely must be aware that the net effect of raising their jurisdictional question at this time is to further diminish the chances of passing any measure this session on revenue sharing. To be sure, revenue sharing has been changed somewhat in the process by the committee. All legislation experiences similar changes. But it is well to remember that the division of responsibility on revenue matters between a revenue raising committee and a revenue distributing committee is sometimes hazy. If pushed far enough these people may find themselves in the unexpected position of making one of the best arguments of combining revenue distributing and revenue raising functions in one committee as was originally the case in this body and is still the case in many of our State legislatures. What I am saying is if the argument is made too often and too loud that revenue should be distributed only after proper consideration has been given to the availability of such revenue then one can argue that the House is acting irresponsibly each day it operates with separate committees on appropriations and ways and means.

Be that as it may, my main point today is that neither one of these groups has enough votes to defeat this proposal and be successful in having their point of view adopted by this House. Acting in concert, however, the net result of their efforts could well be the defeat of revenue sharing this session. Make no mistake about it, the price we will pay for this is the real issue at hand. If Members want to use the opportunity of consideration

of a revenue-sharing measure to reform the Federal tax structure, reform the procedures of the House of Representatives, and decide the areas of jurisdiction between the Ways and Means Committee and the Appropriations Committee, all in one afternoon, then let them know that to do so is at the risk of kissing goodbye to revenue sharing this Congress. Let them know that the years and months of efforts by local officials and homeowners around this Nation have been but in vain. There is little enough time as it is to get this measure through the House and through the Senate and signed by the President this Congress. The last thing this bill needs is further hurdles to cross in the limited time available.

In view of all the foregoing, anyone who is genuinely interested in seeing revenue sharing succeed this Congress can only conclude that anyone who votes against the closed rule ultimately is no friend of revenue sharing. Ultimately, that is the common denominator for the strange bedfellows that have joined forces against the closed rule. The great bed of ware itself would not be capable of accommodating the strange bedfellows this rule fight has thrown together. Make no mistake about it, revenue sharing is in serious jeopardy as a consequence of this strange alliance. Every mayor, Governor, and local property taxpayer around the country has their work cut out for them in the few days remaining to lobby support for this bill. Failing that, the best we can hope for is to begin anew with the next Congress, having in the process accomplished nothing either for revenue sharing, tax reform or genuine congressional reform in this Congress.

I am including at this point letters and reports indicative of the serious concern shared by officials throughout the Nation over the fate of the revenue sharing bill.

[TELEGRAM]

MAY 26, 1972.

CONGRESSMAN JAMES A. BURKE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: H.R. 14370—revenue sharing—is now scheduled to be brought before the House the week of June 5th. As I stated in the Massachusetts delegation luncheon two weeks ago, I cannot overemphasize the importance of the revenue sharing legislation to the Commonwealth, as the passage of the bill will provide an additional 179 million dollars to help ease Massachusetts' serious economic situation.

The survival of revenue sharing depends on every individual Congressman's vote to support the closed rule on H.R. 14370. Therefore, I strongly urge you to vote yes on the previous question, and to assure final passage of this measure.

FRANCIS W. SARGENT,
Governor,
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS,
Washington, D.C., May 15, 1972.

HON. JAMES A. BURKE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BURKE: The State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972 (H.R. 14370) was recently approved by the House Committee on Ways and Means. The bill provides \$5.3 billion to state and local governments to assist them in providing desperately needed public services. The bill will also help alleviate the fiscal crisis facing many of our nation's cities. The National

League of Cities and the United States Conference of Mayors urge that you vote for the bill.

The bill is pending before the Rules Committee and we hope that the Committee will report the bill out under a closed rule and waiving points of order. We are supporting this motion.

When the bill is on the House floor, a few Congressmen have indicated that they will oppose the rule. We believe a closed rule is necessary. The bill amends the Internal Revenue Code and such amendments have traditionally been considered by the House only under a closed rule. Furthermore, a closed rule is needed because the bill includes a complex formula for allocating funds to local governments. The Ways and Means Committee labored for weeks designing the formula on the basis of need. To open the formula for discussion would probably result in endless debate about it on the floor. At this point in time, the nation's cities need help, not debate over the technicalities of a formula.

Since the bill itself is a five year appropriation, points of order must be waived. If a point of order were allowed on the floor, this provision might be deleted. The five year appropriation is key to the program. Your local government officials need a long-term appropriation to properly budget and manage local programs—hire staff, purchase equipment, make long-term commitments on facilities. The Ways and Means Committee, in considering this provision, determined that cities must have assurance that the federal funds would be regularly available, but that the program should be limited to five years. This will automatically provide the Congress with an opportunity to review the program. For these reasons, we urge you to vote against any move on the floor to defeat the closed rule or allow points of order.

For your information, enclosed is an analysis of the major objections raised about the bill.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. GUNTHER,
Executive Director, U.S. Conference of
Mayors.

PATRICK HEALY,
Executive Vice President, National
League of Cities.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES,
Washington, D.C., May 26, 1972.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As you know, the House Rules Committee last week by a vote of 8-7 approved for floor consideration with a closed rule, H.R. 14370, the "State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972". On behalf of the tens of thousands of elected, appointed and officials in the 3,067 counties throughout the United States, we urge you to vote "Yes" on the previous questions to support the closed rule and to vote "Yes" for final passage of H.R. 14370.

This proposal for General Revenue Sharing was reported by the Ways and Means Committee on April 17, 1972. The measure was the result of many, many months of hard work by the Committee and its staff. It represents a consensus of the majority of the Committee as being the best possible way to provide fiscal assistance to state, county, and city governments throughout the United States over the next five years. The associations representing states, counties, and cities, along with their membership, support this measure. The assistance provided under H.R. 14370 is desperately needed if many of our local governments are to survive fiscally and continue to provide essential, valuable services to their citizens.

This legislation will be before your body for action in the very near future. We again strongly urge you to vote yes on the previous question and on the final passage of H.R. 14370, so that badly needed funds will begin to flow to state and local governments unincumbered by the red tape and delay gen-

erated under existing, specific grant-in-aid programs.

Your positive consideration of our requests will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM J. CONNER,

President.

BERNARD F. HILLENBRAND,

Executive Director.

[From the NAC News & Views, May 26, 1972]

EXECUTIVES RALLY FOR REVENUE BILL

Our elected county executives, 16 strong, spent two days in Washington last week meeting with Sen. Russell Long (D-La.), their own Senators, and key leaders in the House of Representatives to dramatize the urgent need for general revenue sharing this session. However, we are in a desperate battle against the clock to secure passage of both general revenue sharing and welfare reform.

Sen. Long is very strongly supportive of general revenue sharing legislation and has given us every assurance that he will do his best to get it passed through the Senate. He indicated that he would hold hearings on the legislation as soon as it passes the House and as soon as he disposes of welfare reform legislation.

The problem we face now is that we must get passed the House Rules Committee before going to the floor of the House of Representatives. The rallying cry before the Rules Committee is that Congress should not approve a \$5.3 billion spending program without providing a new revenue raising plan to pay for it. This indeed would be a brand new precept to be followed in the Congress, and we can imagine the consequences if the same reasoning should be applied to foreign aid appropriations, Defense Department expenditures, or any one of hundreds of other items of federal expenditures.

The Rules Committee completed three days of hearings last week, receiving pro and con testimony from members of the Ways and Means Committee and other Congressional Leaders. The Committee will decide next Tuesday the form of rule under which the revenue sharing bill (H.R. 14370) will go to the floor. NACo is supporting a "closed" rule, waiving points of order, which would not allow amendments to the revenue sharing proposal in the form of an altered formula or major tax reform legislation.

Even though we have been having problems with the Rules Committee, we are encouraged by the fact that the leadership of the House of Representatives has scheduled the opening of the general revenue sharing debate for Wednesday, May 31.

AMENDMENT TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 providing for an additional itemized deduction for taxicab fares paid by disabled individuals.

As you may know, the handicapped are a very significant segment of American society. As a result of crippling disease, birth defects, traffic accidents, and war-inflicted wounds, more than 22 million people have a disabling condition severe enough to interfere with their major daily activity. Although the disabled constitute a sizable portion of our total citizenry, their problems and needs have long been bypassed and neglected.

One of the most inexcusable oversights with regard to the handicapped is the present discrimination in the field of transportation. As members of the taxpaying public, disabled individuals help subsidize public transportation systems. However, due to architectural barriers or their physical impairments, public transportation is rendered unavailable to many of the disabled. Thus, while contributing to the maintenance of public transportation which does not serve them, the handicapped are forced to use taxicabs or other nonregulated private carriers which prove costly, particularly considering the high medical expenses of many handicapped and their discriminately lower salaries. Consequently, I am introducing a bill to eliminate one of the most unjust obstacles that the disabled have previously had to confront.

The handicapped do not want special privileges, only the chance to become self-sustaining contributors to society rather than dependent burdens. Providing for the transportation costs of the disabled who are restricted to taxicabs is only the first step on the long path to relieving the inequities our handicapped citizens must deal with every day.

I would like to request the support of all Members of the House on this important legislation and urge them to join with me in continuing the quest for equal rights for the handicapped.

For the information of my colleagues, I am inserting the full text of my bill:

H.R. 14255

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional itemized deduction for taxicab fares paid by disabled individuals

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by redesignating section 219 as 220 and by inserting after section 218 the following new section:

"SEC. 219. TAXICAB FARES PAID BY DISABLED INDIVIDUALS.

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTION.—In the case of a disabled individual, there shall be allowed as a deduction any taxicab fares paid by him during the taxable year for his transportation.

"(b) DEFINITION OF DISABLED INDIVIDUAL.—For purposes of subsection (a), the term 'disabled individual' means an individual who—

"(1) is blind (as defined in section 151 (d) (3)) for the entire taxable year, or

"(2) has a medically determinable physical impairment so severe that he is unable during the entire taxable year to use, without hardship or danger, a bus, subway, train, or similar form of public transportation (not including taxicab) as a means of traveling. No individual shall be considered to be disabled unless he furnishes such proof of the existence of his blindness or other impairment in such form and manner as the Secretary or his delegate may require."

(b) The table of sections for such part VII is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 219. Taxicab fares paid by disabled individuals.

"Sec. 220. Cross reference."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

ENERGY CRISIS

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

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, on the opposite-editorial page of the New York Times for May 11, 1972, an institutional advertisement by Mobil Oil Corp. discussed in considerable detail the energy crisis faced by this Nation.

The Select Small Business Subcommittee on which I serve has been holding hearings on the energy crisis and the high cost of oil and gas in the United States. This is a most complicated subject which involved oftentimes conflicting interests of conservationists, industry, and consumers burdened with both rising costs and decreasing supplies of energy.

The Congress has a very great responsibility in this area and we must find a reasonable procedure for balancing the twin goals of protecting the environment and meeting national requirements for various energy sources.

The Mobil advertisement highlights many of the important issues involved in this subject and offers several recommendations. Without endorsing the latter, I do believe the presentation is an important public service, bringing these issues to the attention of the public. For that reason I am pleased to include the text in the RECORD:

THE GAP

By 1985, Americans will be consuming twice as much energy as they do today, according to government forecasts.

Why? More people plus rising living standards.

The problem is, no one can be sure how the U.S. will be able to get the additional energy needed.

Mobil is convinced the nation must start planning now to find rational solutions to this problem. As petroleum suppliers, we're unavoidably involved, since oil and gas are expected to account for two-thirds of U.S. energy used in 1985.

Most Americans probably don't know about the gap between forecast energy supply and demand. Even if they did, it's easy to take it for granted the gap will somehow be closed. Unfortunately, the suggested solutions we at Mobil see most frequently are plagued with worrisome if's and but's, such as:

Solution #1: We can increase U.S. reserves by finding more oil and gas through stepped-up drilling onshore in the lower 48 states.

But the most promising areas onshore have already been drilled up, which lessens the likelihood of our making the massive discoveries we need.

Solution #2: We can intensify oil drilling offshore, where the odds are much better.

But environmentalists have succeeded in placing some marine areas at least temporarily out of bounds. Last December's federal sale of offshore Louisiana leases had to be called off. Some California undersea drilling has been held up. East Coast drilling, although it is some years away and probably would occur at least 30 miles at sea, is already under attack.

Solution #3: We can bring in oil and gas from Alaska's North Slope.

But environmentalists have stalled construction of a pipeline to move this petroleum. Even with the pipeline built, the North Slope in 1985 would supply less than a tenth of U.S. crude oil consumption—a much-needed tenth, to be sure.

Solution #4: We can rely even more heavily

on imported oil and gas to make up the difference between what we can produce here at home and what we consume.

But how much of our petroleum supply can come from abroad before we become dangerously dependent on sources that can be shut off as the result of foreign political or economic pressures? We import a quarter of our oil needs today; by 1985, that will rise to over half. And since natural gas is already rationed in some American cities, the U.S. has begun to import costly gas from overseas.

The U.S. can reduce the risks of imports by building security stockpiles of oil and gas. But while stockpiles are indeed possible, they would be costly. Even so, coupled with stringent rationing, they could provide a lot of insurance.

Solution #5: We can extract synthetic oil and gas from our virtually unlimited domestic coal and oil-shale deposits.

But at what cost? Nobody yet knows how to make synthetic fuels at costs approaching those of conventional fuels. We don't know to what extent environmental restrictions will stymie development of synthetic fuels. We do know we'll have to have some synthetic fuel capacity to meet the 1985 energy demand—or rely even more heavily on imported oil and gas.

Solution #6: We can close the gap with more nuclear power.

But nuclear plant construction has lagged far behind expectations, mainly because of soaring costs, design problems, and environmental fears. To supply 40 percent of U.S. electrical energy by 1985, as forecast, means building 250 one-million-kilowatt nuclear plants between now and then.

In varying measure, all these solutions will be needed; no single solution can do the job.

An alternative suggested by some is that America simply level off or perhaps cut back its use of energy. But that's no solution. The 240 million Americans of 1985 will consume far more energy than today's 208 million. It will take additional energy just to improve the environment.

We can and should stretch our reserves by using energy more wisely. But it would take stringent rationing and a mandatory reduction of living standards, together with zero population growth, to make a dent in our rising energy consumption.

Mobil believes adoption of comprehensive national energy policies could deal with the energy problem by (1) recognizing the need for continued economic growth, (2) placing the national interest in energy matters above any regional or other special interests, and (3) recognizing the natural priorities among various energy sources. Only in this way can we strike a balance between unacceptable environmental risks and unacceptable economic risks.

The most unacceptable risk is that somehow we fail to close the energy gap at all.

CHAPTER II: NEW YORK STATE NARCOTIC PAROLE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION—CASE STUDIES

(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, on May 31 I advised the House of the activities of a dedicated group of civil servants in New York City who are narcotic parole officers. My statement described the scope of their activities and the need for their program. Today I am setting forth the details of a case in which these fine young men and women have been involved so as to make more meaningful the nature of their work.

The details follow:

CASE CONFERENCE RE JOHN X—PRESENT: 17
STAFF MEMBERS, DECEMBER 16, 1971

PROCEEDINGS

A clinical conference was held Tuesday to reassess the case of John X for the purpose of attempting to determine what part this Aftercare Center played in the case and how we might correct our own shortcomings in order to provide better service for our clients in the future.

The meeting was opened by the staff psychologist, who read the only data from outside this agency that was in Mr. X's folder. These data were in the form of a screening report from the Brooklyn House of Detention written 6 days after Mr. X's 2nd certification to the NACC in August, 1970.

John was described as a 26 year old male, separated from his wife for 5 years, who also had custody of their two young children. He had begun mainlining heroin from the beginning of his drug usage in 1959 and continued for some 8-10 years. He had gone thru numerous detoxification programs: Manhattan General 4 times for a total of 14 weeks, Lexington 4 mos., Teen Challenge 12 mos. and NACC-Day Top 17 mos. Treatment prior to Day Top was described as unsuccessful. The Day Top experience was seen as a positive one, even though John split and left the center because of internal strife. He was described as having been previously certified to the NACC in 10/67 (civil) and released from the NACC Intramural Facility (IMF) to Day Top, no mention is made of his certification status and whether or not he was previously decertified. His new certification, he claimed was a "cop-out" to avoid further jail and the fact that it was a "bum rap". The counselor's comments reflected John's own feelings that he needed structured supervision.

Following the reading of this report, we built up a more or less chronological picture of what John was like, what he did and what this Aftercare Center did during the ensuing months. This picture was based on observations from the various teachers, therapists, counselors, etc., present at the meeting.

It was unanimously felt by the 4 therapists who were the first to come in contact with John here at this center that John resented his position as a "beginner" and was not able or willing to begin looking into himself at the time the instant aftercare program was disbanded. Thus, after only one month of structured therapy as a resident rehabilitant, during which time he did not begin to deal with himself, the structure was taken away.

From the time the instant aftercare program was disbanded up to the present, John was virtually on the "other side of the fence" so to speak. Intelligent, articulate, creative, he endeared himself to staff, who, to a man, capitalized on John's strengths and almost totally neglected his weaknesses. John's talent for painting was recognized, praised both inside this Aftercare Center and in the NACC exhibit, and he was allowed to make substantial financial profit during the second month of his second certification.

At the same time, because of his facility with words and his previous experience in group work acquired in other treatment experiences, he was allowed and encouraged to be an active leader. A number of participants at the conference noted that while John was getting all this acclaim with its attendant responsibility, no one confronted John or required that he begin to deal with his own problems. Our "treatment" for John, therefore, consisted of treating him "as if" he were a man fully capable of handling the responsibility of his own life as well as showing others how to be responsible for themselves. The exact opposite, of course, could have been assumed from his previous record and even from his own statements that he needed "the constant reinforcement of a therapeutic community, or the supervision/

counseling that an aftercare situation would provide". (John X., 8/70, Brooklyn House of Detention).

By December, 1970, between 3 and 4 months after his recertification to the NACC, Mr. X was working as a "therapist" at one NACC facility as well as outside the facility at an independent narcotics program. He was being paid by both places and meanwhile was also living in this Aftercare Center.

Again, it was clear from statements made by various participants in the conference that doubts as to the wisdom of what was happening with John and also its resultant effect on our other rehabilitants, were growing stronger and stronger. While many of these doubts were expressed verbally among the staff, no written records of his progress appear in his folder until 2/71, at which time a psychological evaluation was requested for purposes of decertification! The lack of written communications, while irresponsible at any time, appear especially detrimental in this case. The conference took note of the fact that during these first few months of Mr. X's stay with us, not only was the instant aftercare program discontinued (who provided his supervision), but the halfway house supervisor was changed three times (where he lived), and the head of community care (where he studied his course work) changed five times! It seems rather obvious now, that with such discontinuity of personnel, that written case continuity could have been of the utmost importance in helping point up the lack of therapeutic planning with respect to Mr. X. Another fact which emerged during the discussion was that no one present felt they had more than a superficial knowledge of, or relationship with, this client.

In the psychological evaluation of 2/71 the psychologist took note of John's tendency to externalize responsibility and the fact that his ability to convince others was the source both of his strength and his greatest weakness. The strong suggestion was made that John move out of the halfway house and demonstrate his ability to live independently in a non-sheltered situation, before he was decertified. Despite this suggestion, John continued to live at this Aftercare Center's halfway house until at least April 15 (the exact date of his leaving is not on record), only 1½ months before he was given an administrative discharge. In the meantime, Mr. X got his High School Equivalency diploma, passed the Narcotic Correction Officer trainee exam and was hired by the NACC as a Narcotic Correction Officer trainee to work here at this center. In addition, John went to Washington to testify before the President's Commission on Drug Abuse.

A number of those present at the conference, pointed out that by this time it was quite apparent to both staff and clients alike that John was getting favored treatment and that we seemed to be pinning the badge of "success" on him, to fill our needs for success. The total effect was seen as detrimental to all concerned. John, himself, was pictured as playing out the success role which we had defined for him.

The other clients were reported as looking upon the situation as a great game. Some tried to follow the same pattern that John was following and many became angry and resentful both at John and at the NACC, but in general the clients' attitude toward the NACC program was thought to become increasingly more cynical and mistrustful.

The final chapter in the case of Mr. X, his return to drug usage, his being allowed to enter an upstate college with the full knowledge of several staff members (and naturally many of the clients in the same program at this college), and the subsequent leaving of college and fleeing from Synanon was perhaps the most shocking indictment of our treatment of this case to emerge from the conference. The conference came to the

conclusion that our need for a spectacular success was so great that it was possible for some staff to overlook or blind themselves to the most glaring and obvious fact of all that John was not a success and had begun to reuse drugs long before he went off to college!

The meeting lasted somewhat over two hours. Partly because of the late arrivals of a number of participants and also the early departure of others, no formal summary was made at that time. The data, however, were very clear as to the progressive trend of John's behavior back to the use of drugs. There were warning signs, some obvious, some not so obvious, that were present from the very beginning of his stay with us. These signs grew in intensity and number, yet, either went unheeded or were misinterpreted or were repressed. There were no written records kept on this man pertaining to therapeutic planning or progress reports. Most of the data that emerged today was unrecorded previously and if transmitted from one worker to another it was done only verbally. In view of the many workers involved and the constant supervisory shifts, Mr. X did not therefore get any structured supervision. Taking advantage of the NACC disorganization, he capitalized on it by becoming a leader and spokesman in his own case, leading ultimately to his own downfall.

SEVERAL REVISIONS TO CURRENT POLICY SUGGESTED BY THIS ABOVE CONFERENCE

1. Better Intake and Orientation Procedures, which include testing and evaluation of current functioning with respect to past behavior.

2. Evolution of a therapeutic plan during the intake procedures.

3. Keeping a running history of client's contacts and progress, which is available and used by everyone who deals with client.

4. Any large shifts in client's life plan should be looked upon as changes in the therapeutic plan and should be reviewed by a clinical committee. (These are changes such as living-in or leaving the halfway house, leaving parents home for own apartment, getting a job, shifting from abstinence to Methadone or vice-versa, discharge, etc.).

Submitted by Associate Psychologist 12/16/71.

MORTON SPEAKS ON ENVIRONMENT

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month our very able Secretary of Interior and former colleague, Rogers C. B. Morton, addressed the Ohio Conference on Environmental Improvement in Columbus, Ohio.

Pointing to progress made since 1969, Secretary Morton made reference to the Council on Environmental Quality and the Environmental Protection Agency as two new organizations created to help accomplish the job.

Secretary Morton's remarks are as follows:

REMARKS OF ROGERS C. B. MORTON, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

(Before the Ohio Conference on Environmental Improvement, Ohio State Fairgrounds, Columbus, Ohio, Noon, Friday, May 19, 1972)

I'm very pleased you asked me to appear at your conference on environmental improvement. The sponsoring organizations deserve to be congratulated for their initiative in arranging this conference. Meetings such as these are very encouraging to me for they demonstrate the awareness of environmental problems that is now coming to the fore in our Nation. They demonstrate the develop-

ment of an environmental ethic which must influence our society if man is to preserve his environment.

I haven't come here to point with alarm at our many environmental problems. Your participation here today indicates your recognition and your concern for the problems we face. Instead, I come before you to report on the positive aspects of our environmental situation, namely, the status of your Government's efforts to improve the environment and the legislation we are proposing to achieve some of our most critical national environmental goals.

In the perspective of ten—or even five—years ago this Administration and the Congress can be justly proud of what has been accomplished in the environmental field. In looking at the problems yet to be solved, it is all too easy to forget just how far we have already progressed. I think it is crucial that we all maintain our perspective and that we recognize what has already been achieved . . . otherwise, many will become discouraged and in their discouragement, turn away from the pursuit of goals we must attain.

Here then is the status of our efforts to improve the environment.

We have two new organizations to help do the job—the Council on Environmental Quality to advise the President and the Environmental Protection Agency to monitor and safeguard the quality of our environment.

We have standards for air and water quality and enforcement controls to assure that they are met. In the Federal sector, we are requiring environmental impact statements to assess the effect of major Federal actions.

On the technical front, we have undertaken research programs to facilitate the recycling of solid wastes and to develop efficient sources of clean energy. We are at the early design stages in producing clean gas from coal and clean electric power from the fast breeder nuclear reactor.

We have taken steps to conserve some of the most precious natural scenery and wildlife in this country. Wilderness areas and wild and scenic rivers are being set aside for preservation in their pristine state; once designated, no further development is allowed in these areas.

To protect the environment on the public lands, we have banned the use of poisons. Also, we are instituting controls on the use of off-road vehicles which often damage the fragile environment of these lands.

In the great State of Alaska, we have set aside 125 million acres of some of the finest natural areas in the world . . . from which we will select areas for new national parks and national forests, new wildlife refuges and additions to the wilderness and wild and scenic river systems. This is a once in a lifetime opportunity to preserve precious environmental natural resources on America's last frontier, and we are taking advantage of it.

For some time, the Department of the Interior has been analyzing some pressing and complex environmental problems involving the management of our natural resources. Now we have moved into the action stage. We have developed what we think are the bases for practical, workable solutions to many of these problems and we have submitted a forward-looking legislative package to the Congress.

Very candidly, I seek your understanding and your support for these legislative proposals.

The cornerstone of our legislative thrust goes right to the heart of the problem—the manner in which the Executive Branch is organized. Today, the responsibility for resource management which has a lasting impact on the environment is fragmented through a great many Federal agencies . . . three develop water resources . . . four manage public lands . . . six administer Federal

recreation areas . . . and more than you can count are involved in energy. Conservation is not well served by this proliferation which inevitably discourages communication.

The President is asking Congress for authority to consolidate all of these efforts in a single Department of Natural Resources. It's the only way we can permeate government activity with an environmental ethic that will give us the best balance in conservation, development and preservation of our natural resources.

Now let us look at specific problem areas and our legislative response to them.

If there ever was a natural resource that cries for better management, it's minerals. Look at the laws that control mining on our public lands. The Mining Law of 1872 is a century old and the Mineral Leasing Act has been on the books for more than 50 years. In this time, the technology of mining has changed enormously and mining's capacity to damage the environment has become staggering.

We have asked the Congress to revise these laws to accomplish the following:

- One, give Interior the authority to prevent mining in certain areas on public lands where the environment is very fragile.

- Two, provide a more realistic return to the public for mineral resources taken.

Mining is not the only problem we have on the public lands. Many of the laws and policies which still govern the public domain are older than the Mining Law of 1872. The attitude that prevailed in the days of Manifest Destiny, the open range and "Fifty Four Forty or Fight"—namely that the public lands should be freely available to any and all who desire to use them—has never been officially put to rest. And my management authority in many ways does not protect the public interest. The Bureau of Land Management has a trusteeship for one-fifth of the Nation's entire land area, yet this Bureau does not have the authority to prohibit most forms of damage to the resources or to arrest the offenders. The National Resource Land Management Act . . . which is also known as the BLM Organic Act . . . would provide the management tools we so badly need.

To return to the subject of mining again and to a problem that is serious right here in Ohio . . . strip mining. You have met the problem head on by enacting strict regulatory measures, but should you be placed at a competitive disadvantage with states which do not enact such measures or which fail to enforce regulations already on the statute books? We think not. That is why we are asking Congress for the Mined Area Protection Act.

This legislation will encourage the states to regulate mining to avoid adverse environmental consequences. But if a particular state doesn't act, the bill gives the Department of the Interior authority to step in and do the job, and believe me, we will do it. There is no doubt that environmental damage from mining operations can be effectively controlled. In the future, the price of coal and other minerals taken must include the cost of damage control and mined land reclamation. We can no longer allow the environment to bear this cost.

A long range problem we must address ourselves to is power plant siting. We must have an adequate supply of power and we must have an orderly procedure for locating plants and transmission lines on the most environmentally acceptable sites.

To achieve these objectives, we must recognize that both energy needs and environmental quality are legitimate concerns in planning power facilities. Both must be considered from the earliest stages of the planning process.

Under the proposed power plant siting bill, electric utilities would be required to obtain federal approval of their plans to build bulk power facilities. This approval would be

granted only if the facility would not, and I quote from the Act, "unduly impair important environmental values and (would) be necessary to meet electric power needs." With these procedures, the impact of a proposed facility would be investigated, considered in public hearings and resolved in advance of the need for the power. Hopefully, we would avoid power shortages from delays caused by environmental controversies—a situation that actually threatens the power supply of many parts of the country this summer.

President Nixon set a new national goal when he asked the Congress for a National Land Use Policy Act. One need only fly over the whole country as I have—from Portland, Maine to Seattle, Washington—to realize that the country needs a sound land use policy.

The bill we propose will encourage the states to establish land use planning agencies and to develop comprehensive land use programs. It will encourage them to assert control over problems that are of more than purely local significance. Local control is unable to deal with land use problems which involve environmental values of state-wide concern, like the preservation of greenbelts in urban areas and the protection of wetlands.

We must realize the ominous, and immediate, portent of continued helter skelter growth. Our land space is a precious and limited natural resource, but we have not treated it so. We have taken the lazy approach. We have grown too much like topsy. To begin a new sense of order on the land that will encourage the preservation of irreplaceable values, recognize man's dependency on open space and improve the quality of life in America, we must adhere to the discipline of good land use policy at all levels of government. Enactment of the National Land Use Policy Act will be a big step in this direction.

I think it is self evident that considerable environmental progress hinges on the fate of the legislative program I have just described. I think it is also evident that we have drastically redefined the natural resources role and responsibility of the Federal Government in many instances. It is clear to me that in many areas we must take the lead—that some problems are too widespread, too large in scale, too complex for other public or private entities to cope with them.

The future is going to require new institutional arrangements and more flexible Federal-State-local methods of planning, cost-sharing and regulation, all under the eyes of a public made more watchful and understanding in their concerns because of conferences like this one today.

The magnitude of our environmental task makes for either total, self-defeating depression, or one of the greatest challenges of all time. I have accepted the challenge and now I seek your help. I seek your support for our efforts to meet this challenge—the legislation I have outlined.

Together, let us fulfill the prophecy of the President in his Environmental Message, and I quote: "The pursuit of environmental quality will require courage and patience. Problems that have been building over many years will not yield to facile solutions. But I have no doubt that Americans have the wit and will to win—to fulfill our brightest vision of what the future can be."

A better environment will not be achieved by rhetoric or moral dedication alone . . . and most important not by government alone. It will not be cheap or easy or quick. We must realize that environmental progress can be achieved . . . only if we are willing to be practical . . . only if we are willing to pay the price . . . and only if we are willing to be patient.

I think this nation is ready and willing to follow the path of reason and determination to improve the environment. It is a path we must follow. The survival of our civilization

depends upon our ability to achieve a new harmony between nature and man.

REFORM ELECTION REFORM

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, which became effective on April 7 of this year, is the first major legislation on campaign financing since the passage of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act in 1925. Like all new legislation, it is subject to drafting defects which only become apparent after enforcement begins. A major drafting mistake which has recently been discerned is the inadvertent extension of the scope of section 611 of title 18, United States Code, to include corporations and labor unions.

It is now alleged that this clearly unintentional but very significant change in the scope of section 611 renders impotent the Hansen amendment to section 610 which "codifies" existing case law permitting corporations and unions to establish segregated voluntary political funds. If this argument is correct, the same serious first amendment problems now exist in regard to section 611 that the Hansen amendment was drafted to avoid in regard to section 610. To understand how this problem arose, it is necessary to review the legislative history of sections 610 and 611.

The Congress originally enacted section 610 in 1925 to prohibit corporations from making any contributions or expenditures in connection with an election for Federal office in order to influence that election. In 1947 this section was amended to extend the same prohibition to unions. Through a series of important court decisions, these general prohibitions were interpreted to be fully consistent with the constitutional demands of the first amendment free speech guarantees and therefore to permit corporations and unions to communicate freely with their membership and to allow the establishment of segregated voluntary political funds.

During the debate on the Federal Election Campaign Act, these court decisions were extensively considered and finally explicitly incorporated into section 610 by the Hansen amendment in what appeared to be a constitutional necessity. The lengthy debate on this subject clearly indicates that the Congress by enacting the Hansen amendment never intended to make any change in existing law restricting the rights of corporations and unions in this regard.

Section 611 was enacted in 1940 on the theory that individuals and organizations engaged in a contractual relationship with the Federal Government should be subject to the same restrictions imposed upon corporations by section 610. During the legislative debate, it was proposed that section 611 be made specifically applicable to corporations. However, since corporations were already subject to the prohibitions of section 610, this proposal was rejected in the version which was finally enacted. Until the recent passage of the Federal Elec-

tion Campaign Act, section 611 has never, therefore, been interpreted to apply to corporations.

In the amendment of section 611 under the Federal Election Campaign Act, certain technical changes were made to strengthen the prohibitions of the section. Virtually no legislative discussion of any of these changes indicates a desire to effect the major substantive change that is alleged to have occurred in section 611.

The cause of this problem of interpretation is the amendment by the Federal Election Campaign Act of section 591, the definitional section for the Criminal Code sections on elections, to apply its coverage also to section 611. This extension of coverage was intended solely to conform the definition of terms used in section 611 with those used in other related sections of the Criminal Code.

However, section 611 applies to "whoever" enters into a contract with the United States. In section 591(g) the definition of the term "whoever" includes a corporation. Therefore, a corporation and, by inference, a union which has a Government contract is now arguably prohibited by section 611 from the same type of limited political activity permitted by the Hansen amendment to section 610. This novel interpretation is based on the fact that section 611 does not explicitly permit such limited activity as the establishment of voluntary segregated political funds whereas section 610 clearly does allow it.

The serious question of legal interpretation now in existence has caused a great uncertainty to arise among corporations which wish to be in full compliance with the law. Common Cause, arguing that section 611 prohibits corporations holding Government contracts from establishing the voluntary political funds permitted corporations by section 610, has even filed a lawsuit against TRW Corp. to test the validity of that interpretation and to enjoin TRW's maintenance of a voluntary political fund.

From the time Congress spent debating the Hansen amendment to section 610 and the total absence of any indication of legislative intent to amend section 611 in so drastic a manner, it is clear to me that Congress never intended the law to be interpreted as alleged by Common Cause. Virtually every large corporation is engaged in some sort of contractual relationship with the Government. If Common Cause is correct, the Hansen amendment is rendered totally useless. Moreover, the very serious first amendment problems which the Hansen amendment recognized and avoided emerge in full force and would most likely cause section 611 to be declared unconstitutional.

Therefore, in order to cure this defect, in order to make perfectly clear the true intent of the Congress, and in order to avoid a possible interpretation that might cause section 611 to be declared unconstitutional, I introduced today a bill designed as an amendment to section 591(g) which eliminates the applicability of section 611 to corporations or labor organizations. I trust an early consideration of the bill will be forthcoming.

THE RETIREMENT FUND

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a letter, dated May 25, 1972, from Mr. Robert E. Hampton, Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, provides an updated report on the current status of the civil service retirement system both with respect to financing and the effect of recent legislation.

As Members of Congress know, the retirement system has long been plagued with a huge and growing unfunded liability, reaching a high of more than \$64.6 billion at the end of the 1970 fiscal year.

Mr. Hampton's report is cautiously optimistic and at the same time carries a warning that further annual increases in the numbers of Federal employees, pay increases, and benefit liberalizations will undo the progress that has been made toward reducing the annual actuarial deficits.

For the benefit of all Members I am inserting at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Mr. Hampton's updated report as follows:

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,

Washington, D.C., May 25, 1972.

Hon. H. R. GROSS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. GROSS: A year ago I reported the current status of the Civil Service Retirement System with respect to its financing and with particular emphasis on the effect of Public Law 91-93 enacted October 20, 1969. As indicated then, the improved retirement system financing established by Public Law 91-93 continues to work well and the system is in a sound financial position. I believe it is important now that we maintain this condition. Events of the past year have had their effect on the system, and I want to give you an updated report on the retirement program and some insights on what the future holds in store.

The 1969 law fixed employee deductions and agency contributions at 7% each. This income, totaling 14% of payroll, approximated the then estimated normal cost of the retirement system. The Board of Actuaries has since completed a valuation of the system as of June 30, 1970 which resulted in an updated calculation of normal cost. In its recent report to us, copies of which were forwarded to the Congress on May 3, 1972 the Board calculated normal cost at 12.95%. The reduction in normal cost of slightly more than 1% results primarily from an anticipated higher rate of return from retirement system investments in Government securities. The assumed interest rate is now 5%, in contrast to the formerly assumed 3.5% rate.

Under this latest valuation at a 5% interest rate, the unfunded liability was approximately \$53 billion as of June 30, 1970. Under the previous 3½ percent rate of interest, the unfunded liability had been \$64.6 billion at the end of Fiscal Year 1970. This liability is subject to periodic increase, however, because Public Law 91-93 requires amortization only of new liability resulting from subsequent legislation. Continued increase in unfunded liability will come because of commitments authorized by earlier laws. Examples of this are the wage increases resulting from wage survey, a process authorized by an earlier law. Another example is periodic cost-of-living increases for annuitants, each 1% of which adds \$350 million to the unfunded liability, which also stems from an earlier law.

One major purpose of Public Law 91-93 was to spread out the impact of a more adequate financing basis for the retirement program to avoid the necessity of sudden heavy payments to the retirement fund. Consequently the law provided that beginning in Fiscal Year 1971, 10% of the annual interest payment on unfunded liability would be made, with progressively larger payments of an additional 10% increment per year to be made until we reach 100% of the annual interest payments needed each year beginning in 1980. The following statistics may be helpful in understanding the effect of this provision.

\$277 million was transferred from the Treasury to the Fund in 1971 as first payment (10% of a full annual payment).

\$3.65 billion would be transferred to the Fund in 1980 and subsequent years, if one assumes no change in unfunded liability beyond 1971 (representing 100% of the annual interest payment achieved by adding 10% increments each year after 1971).

\$4.90 billion would be transferred in 1980 if one assumes continuation of the same rate of increase in cost-of-living and wages as occurred in calendar year 1971, and the payments would continue to rise in each year beyond 1980.

Interest payments would stabilize in 1980 only if the static assumption of the second illustration above proves correct; otherwise payments will increase each year though the impact will be particularly heavy in the period up to 1980 at which point each payment will represent a full payment of annual interest on unfunded liability.

Government payments to the fund will also increase to the extent that additional legislation grants benefits which add to the liabilities of the retirement system. Added liabilities are created by benefit liberalization, by extending coverage to additional persons, or by pay increases. For example, every \$1 of pay increase creates an additional \$1.95 liability to the retirement fund. Public Law 91-93 requires that any new liabilities be amortized by equal annual payments over a 30 year period. Since our report to you last year, a postal salary increase has been negotiated, and a general schedule salary increase was provided by Public Law 91-210 effective January 1, 1972. These, together with earlier liberalizing laws referred to in our previous report will result in substantial Government payments to the retirement fund over the next 30 years.

Existing liabilities will require a total payment of \$610 million in Fiscal Year 1972.

A \$665 million yearly payment will be required by Fiscal Year 1973.

Payments at this level will be required through Fiscal Year 1999.

Further salary increases or enactment of program changes which create new liabilities would add to the size of these annual payments. For example, if one assumes the same degree of salary and benefit increases each year as occurred in calendar year 1971, then the required yearly payment would increase to about \$1.04 billion by fiscal year 1973, and about \$3.72 billion by fiscal year 1980.

The rate of increase in required payments is of concern because of the rapid build-up which has occurred just in the few years since passage of Public Law 91-93.

\$215 million payment required in Fiscal Year 1970.

\$437 million payment required in Fiscal Year 1971.

\$610 million payment required in Fiscal Year 1972.

A third source of Government payments to the retirement fund is the 7% of payroll contributions made by each employing agency. These also involve substantial sums, as the following statistics show.

Agency contributions totaled \$1.72 billion in Fiscal Year 1970, and \$1.89 billion in Fiscal Year 1971.

By way of illustration, assuming static

conditions, (no further increase in work force or cost of living, and no salary increases beyond those already enacted or agreed to) agency contributions would peak at \$1.93 billion in Fiscal Year 1973 and remain constant thereafter.

If one assumes a continuation each year of the conditions which prevailed in calendar year 1971 with respect to increases in work force, salary levels, and cost-of-living, then agency contributions will increase each year to:

\$2.62 billion by Fiscal Year 1975.

\$3.70 billion by Fiscal Year 1980.

\$3.96 billion by Fiscal Year 1981.

Perhaps a better appreciation of the Government's commitment to the retirement fund can be obtained if all three of these types of Government contributions are added together.

If one assumes no further increases in cost-of-living, salary levels, or work force, and no additional benefit liberalizations beyond 1971, the total Government contributions to the retirement fund would be as follows.

\$1.95 billion in Fiscal Year 1970.

\$4.30 billion in Fiscal Year 1975.

\$6.25 billion in Fiscal Year 1980.

By way of contrast, assuming a continuation each year of the same degree of increase in work force salary levels, and cost of living, and the same extent of benefit liberalization as occurred in calendar year 1971, total Government contributions to the retirement fund would be about as follows:

\$1.95 billion in Fiscal Year 1970

\$6.71 billion in Fiscal Year 1975

\$12.32 billion in Fiscal Year 1980.

Employees have an interest in the system because of the substantial total of their contributions, as well as the extent of benefits they will receive. Employees contributed \$1.74 billion in Fiscal Year 1970 and \$1.92 billion in Fiscal Year 1971. These contributions will rise to the same degree as agency contributions, the amount of increase depending upon the extent to which we experience further increases in salaries, work force, or cost-of-living.

Annuity payments, which constitute outgo from the retirement fund, will continue to increase for over 40 years as more and more employees are added to the annuitant rolls. An increase will occur even though no increases are made in work force level, as present employees become eligible for retirement benefits. Growth in the total of annuity payments under the retirement system is illustrated by these statistics.

Payments in Fiscal Year 1960 totaled \$893 million.

Payments in Fiscal Year 1970 totaled \$2.74 billion.

Assuming static conditions beyond 1971 (no further growth in work force, salary levels, or cost-of-living, and no further retirement program liberalizations) payments in Fiscal Year 1980 would total about \$6.1 billion.

If one assumes a continuation each year of the conditions which prevailed in calendar year 1971 with respect to increases in work force, salary levels, cost of living, and the same degree of program liberalizations, then by Fiscal Year 1980 annuity payments would total about \$9.5 billion.

In summary, in each category of funds associated with the retirement system—Government contributions, employee contributions, and benefit payments, we are dealing with large sums of money. A more comprehensive picture of retirement system financing may be gained by reference to the table in Attachment A. The size of these sums will grow substantially even under static employment conditions because of commitments provided by existing laws. We are concerned, as I am sure you and your fellow Committee members are, that any further proposals for retirement program changes be considered in the light of policy in all other

areas of compensation for Federal employees, and with full recognition of the burden being placed on the budget and the taxpayer.

In short, we believe that total compensation should be considered before making a decision to change any part of it, including the retirement program. In comparing the components offered by different employers, it is apparent that the individual parts of the compensation package will vary from one employer to another. This is illustrated in the

recent comparison of supplementary compensation (see Attachment B) published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. In this comparison, for example, considerable variation in retirement, health, and leave benefits exists between practices in Government and those of private industry. We believe such variations should be expected as a natural outgrowth of the process of gearing benefits to the needs of a particular work force.

More significant, in our judgment, is the

degree to which the total compensation package compares with the total package of other employers. In this respect the Government has achieved approximate comparability with industry. By carefully considering such overall comparisons, we can better assure that the cost of a proposed change is worthy of public support.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. HAMPTON,
Chairman.

ATTACHMENT A
RETIREMENT FINANCING
[In millions of dollars]

	Actual, fiscal year 1971	Projected (assuming no changes beyond fiscal year 1971 in work force, pay, benefits, and cost of living)		Projected (assuming changes each year in work force, pay, benefits, and cost of living at the same rate experienced in calendar year 1971)	
		Fiscal year 1975	Fiscal year 1980	Fiscal year 1975	Fiscal year 1980
1. Treasury transfers for interest on unfunded liability and for military service credits.....	277	1,706	3,654	1,880	4,903
2. 30-year amortization payments.....	437	665	665	2,210	3,718
3. Agency contributions.....	1,890	1,930	1,930	2,624	3,697
4. Total Government cost.....	2,604	4,301	6,249	6,714	12,318
5. Employee contributions.....	1,920	1,960	1,960	2,654	3,727
6. Annuity payments.....	3,024	4,445	6,100	9,300	9,500
7. Retirement fund (June 30).....	25,018	37,430	57,690	42,500	121,500
8. Unfunded liability (June 30).....	58,616	65,550	67,601	76,100	97,800

ATTACHMENT B

BASIC WAGES AND SALARIES, COMPARISON FRAME OF PRIVATE NONFARM ECONOMY AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, 1970

Compensation practice	Expenditures as a percent of basic wages and salaries	
	Comparison frame, ¹ January-December 1970	Federal Government, ² July 1970-June 1971
Total, all supplements except pay for overtime, weekend, and holiday work, and premium pay for shift work.....	26.6	27.8
Pay for leave time (except sick leave).....	8.8	1.6
Vacations and Holidays.....	8.5	11.0
Payments to funds.....	(9)	(9)
Payments to workers.....	8.5	11.0
Vacations.....	5.3	8.1
Holidays.....	3.2	2.9
Civic and personal leave.....	3	6
Health and insurance programs.....	6.3	5.6
Workmen's compensation.....	8	5
Sick leave.....	1.1	3.3
Life, accident, and health insurance.....	4.4	1.8
Retirement programs.....	9.1	10.0
Social security and railroad retirement.....	4.3	2
Private pension and retirement plans.....	4.9	9.8
Unemployment programs.....	1.1	5
Legally required programs.....	8	4
Payments to employees.....	1	1
Payments to funds.....	1	(9)
Nonproduction bonuses (including awards).....	9	1
Savings and thrift plans.....	4	(9)

¹ Data relate to establishments in the United States, except Alaska and Hawaii, having the indicated minimum employment size in the following industries: Manufacturing (250); retail trade (250); transportation, communication, electric, gas, and sanitary services (100); commercial research and development laboratories (100); finance, insurance, and real estate (50).

² Data provided by the Civil Service Commission and Office of Management and Budget.

³ Less than 0.05 percent.

⁴ No such program in the Federal Government.

⁵ Includes items in addition to those shown separately.

Note: Because of rounding sums of individual items may not equal totals.

Source: Published by Bureau of Labor Statistics.

NATIONAL ACTION CONFERENCE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

(Mr. MORGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to announce that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will be the host to the National Conference on Intergovernmental Science and Technology Policy.

This important conference will be held in Harrisburg, our Commonwealth capital, from June 21 to June 23.

The purpose of the 3-day meeting is to strengthen active cooperation between Federal, State, and local governments in applying financial resources, as well as inputs of science and technology, to the solution of local problems.

In addition, the conference will endeavor to bring private industry and our universities into a more effective partnership with the different levels of government so that, working together, they may all make the maximum contribution to the development of our economy and the quality of life in our country.

As the Representative in Congress of the 26th District of Pennsylvania, and as a medical doctor, I am deeply interested in what science and technology can do to improve employment opportunities for our people, to establish a more healthful environment, and to raise the standard of living.

The forthcoming conference, by focusing on these objectives, can render a great service to our entire Nation.

I am delighted that my good friend and colleague, the Honorable GEORGE P. MILLER, chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, will serve as the honorary chairman of the conference.

The tasks of the general chairman will be handled by the Honorable Jack M. Campbell, president of the Federation of Rocky Mountain States and former Governor of New Mexico.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, working through the Governor's Science Advisory Committee and the Pennsylvania Science and Engineering Foundation, has been providing leadership in the effort to bring science and technol-

ogy to bear on the problems of today—and the opportunities of tomorrow. I know that Gov. Milton J. Shapp personally, and the staffs of these agencies, will play key roles in the conference.

Joining our Commonwealth in sponsoring the meeting are the Committee on Science and Technology of the National Governors Conference; the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Committee on Science and Technology of the National Legislators Conference; the National Governors Council on Science and Technology; the Council of State Planning Agencies; Public Technology, Inc.; the International City Management Association; the National Science Foundation; and the Pennsylvania Science and Engineering Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, because all of us are interested in achieving more effective cooperation between Federal, State, and local governments and the private sector in making science and technology serve the best interests of the American people, I believe that my colleagues would like to know the program of the National Action Conference on Intergovernmental Science and Technology Policy. It follows:

PROGRAM

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 21, 1972

Registration: Opens at 2:00 p.m., and continues throughout the conference. Location—Sheraton-Harrisburg Inn Lobby.

Workshop assignment: When registering for the conference, please check at the Workshop Assignment Desk for the workshop to which you have been assigned.

Reception: 6:00 p.m.-7:00 p.m. Location—Courtyard.

Banquet session: 7:00 p.m.-9:30 p.m. Location—Pennsylvania Room.

Official opening of the conference: Congressman George P. Miller, California, Honorary Chairman.

Presiding—Walter G. Arader, Secretary of Commerce, Pennsylvania.

Welcoming Statement—Honorable Milton J. Shapp, Governor, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Introduction of Speaker—Congressman Miller.

Keynote Address—Dr. Edward E. David, Jr. Director, Executive Office of Science and Technology.

Pennsylvania film: 9:30 p.m. Following the Banquet Session, the film on Pennsylvania Science and Technology programs will be shown in the Pennsylvania Room.

THURSDAY, JUNE 22, 1972

Morning session: 9:30-11:30 a.m.

Location—York Room.

Chairman—Honorable Jack M. Campbell, President of Federation of Rocky Mountain States.

"Intergovernmental Science and Technology Policy: Experiences and Needs"—Honorable Jack M. Campbell.

"What Is Essential and What Is Possible"—Mr. William D. Carey, Vice President, Arthur D. Little, Inc.

"As The Federal Council of Science and Technology Sees It"—Dr. M. Frank Hersman, Head, Office of Intergovernmental Science Programs, National Science Foundation.

"Response to the Challenge": Dr. Thomas G. Fox, Governor's Science Advisor, Pennsylvania.

General Discussion.

Luncheon session: Noon-2 p.m.

Location—Cumberland Room.

Presiding—Dr. Paul Ylvisaker.

Professor of Public Affairs, Princeton University.

Intergovernmental Science and Technology Policy—Who Does What To Whom—The Government—Industry—University Relationship.

Dr. H. Guyford Stever, Director, National Science Foundation.

Dr. James H. Wakelin, Assistant Secretary, Science and Technology, U.S. Department of Commerce.

Afternoon session: 2:30-5:30 p.m.

Location—York Room.

Chairman—Congressman James W. Symington, Missouri.

Statement by Congressman Symington followed by six concurrent workshops. The workshops provide an opportunity for the conference to move to fully consider indicated subjects and those attending to make their views known, providing an input to the resolutions to be formulated and the actions to be taken.

Workshop theme and location

(1) Technological Solutions and Public Problems—Cumberland Room.

(2) Technology Assessment—Billard Room.

(3) Technology Initiatives—York Room.

(4) Technology Transfer and Utilization—Sovereign Room "A."

(5) "Partnership": intergovernmental policies and programs—Sovereign Room "B."

(6) "Partnership": universities—industry—government relationships—Dauphin Room.

FRIDAY, JUNE 23, 1972

Morning session: 9:00 a.m.-11:30 a.m.

Location—York Room.

Impact of Science and Technology: "What's Happening—Or Should Be."

Governor Russell Peterson, Delaware; Representative Thomas J. Anderson, Michigan; Porter Homer, President, Public Technology, Inc.; Dr. Detlev Bronk, President Emeritus, The Rockefeller University; Dr. Paul M. Pitts, Jr., Vice President, ARCO Chemical Company.

General Discussion.

Afternoon activities: 2:00 p.m.-5:00 p.m.

Location—Cumberland Room.

Presiding—Dr. John E. Mock.

Georgia Science and Technology Commission.

"An Effective Action Program"—Congressman John W. Davis, Georgia.

Summary of the Conference—Congressman George P. Miller, California.

Afternoon activities: 4:00 p.m.-5:00 p.m.

Resolutions Committee—opening meeting—2:00 p.m.

Official conclusion of the Conference—3:00 p.m.

Continued deliberations, Resolutions Committee as necessary.

RED CROSS TRAINING PAYS OFF— ONCE AGAIN

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to call the attention of my distinguished colleagues to an act of mercy by one of my constituents, Mr. Clair D. Henry of Johnstown, Pa. This gentleman has been named to receive the Red Cross Certificate of Merit, the highest honor bestowed by the Red Cross.

On January 27, 1972, Mr. Henry and a fellow workman, both trained in Red Cross first aid, came upon an automobile accident in which the driver had received severe head injuries and suffered amputation of the left leg below the knee. The two rescuers called for an ambulance, applied a tourniquet to the victim's leg and gave immediate first aid for other injuries. The attending physician stated that their knowledge and skills had undoubtedly saved the victim's life.

I am certain that my fellow Congressmen join me in my praise for this gentleman. Furthermore, we should all be aware of and extend our deepest appreciation to the never-ending efforts of the American Red Cross to preserve human life.

ARE WE LOVING OUR NATIONAL PARKS TO DEATH?

(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, it has been almost 20 years, but I vividly remember the day when the former Director of the National Park Service, Mr. Conrad L. Wirth, sat in my office and decided—gently, to be sure—my dire predictions about future crowding in our national parks. I did not have any "hard facts" to go on, but the mobility of our population started during the Second World War, the "baby boom," and even the—then—tentative projections of increased leisure time, were in my mind when I said that the day would come when permits would have to be issued for the citizenry to visit our national parks.

I wish I had some documentation to be able to say "I told you so," but it is really not necessary. The parks are currently bursting at the seams with year-round visitors and every official of the Service, from the Director to the ranger, will tell you that the situation will get worse before it gets better.

I recalled my conversation with Director Wirth after a recent talk with Michael Frome, the outstanding writer on all subjects related to America's natural areas. Mr. Frome brought me one of his recent articles wherein he tells us that the critical point has already been

reached, and surpassed, concerning the ability of the park system to handle the flood of visitors.

In an article appearing in the spring issue of the *Sohioan* Mr. Frome asks:

Are we loving our national parks to death?

His thesis is much the same as I put forward some time ago, to wit: "Something must be done to protect our national parks." That "something" can only be done by the Congress of the United States inasmuch as it is our responsibility to preserve and protect and expand the park system for the total population of the country, present, and future.

I do not want to lay out a detailed plan for entry restriction into our parks; I do, nevertheless, wish to urge our colleagues to seriously consider the alternatives if we do not do something to regulate the degradation of our beautiful park system, brought on simply by those who wish to visit them.

Population has increased, mobility has increased, leisure time has increased, travel vehicles are bigger and more elaborate, yet the national park system is trying to cope with these facts on a piecemeal, case-by-case, park-by-park basis. The time has come for Congress to examine the situation in-depth.

Congressional responsibility for the future of the national park system is clear: We owe it to future generations to provide for orderly maintenance and proper use of the system we created. We must not, we cannot, leave it to the "boys downtown" to solve the problem of overcrowding in the national parks.

To emphasize the critical nature of the problem, I strongly recommend Mr. Frome's article to each Member's attention.

The article follows:

[From "The *Sohioan*," spring 1972]

ARE WE LOVING OUR NATIONAL PARKS
TO DEATH?

(By Michael Frome)

(No man loves our national parks more than Michael Frome, conservation editor of *Field & Stream* magazine and author of *Rand McNally's National Park Guide*, as well as the prize-winning *Strangers in High Places*, a portrait of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. His affectionate writings have inspired many to visit the parks and to share the natural wonders they offer. Now in this centennial year of the national parks system, he ponders the price of their popularity. He is not alone. The National Park Service is actively seeking public advice in its efforts to solve the dilemma posed by people versus preservation. Do you have a helpful idea? The park service invites you to send suggestions to park headquarters in Washington, D.C.)

In the western wilds of Wyoming in the fall of 1870 a group of explorers, accompanied by a small military escort, spent a month amid the high mountains, majestic waterfalls, plunging canyons, and amazing geysers of the Yellowstone country. They gave names to many of the features, including Old Faithful. Then came the question of what to do with the area. Around a campfire one night they pondered claiming it for themselves, as they had a legal right to do but the longer they talked the more they realized they must share these treasures for the benefit of all people.

Out of that expedition came the establishment of Yellowstone National Park, through action by Congress, and signature of President Ulysses S. Grant on March 1, 1872. There had never been a national park before,

not in the United States, nor in any other nation. It was a new idea that has since flowered the world over.

Yellowstone is still a magic word. I think of it as the symbolic representation of all places kept free as God made them, unfettered by machines and marketplaces, where young and old can exercise their minds and bodies, and by so doing appreciate the integrity of the land.

This to me is the focal issue in the national parks centennial—a time for celebration and serious thought as to what the Yellowstone and Yosemite and Grand Canyons mean in the context of our time and of times still to come.

Certainly as we look at them today, these national parks represent an endowment of riches that makes the United States the envy of the world. The national park system has grown to embrace more than 280 units in all parts of the country, from Alaska and Hawaii to the Virgin Islands. With their hundreds of museums, trailside exhibits, and guided walks, the parks constitute the single most important influence in cultivating the art of intelligent travel.

But times are changing rapidly, and all is not well. Popularity is not enough to assure survival of the parks for the next 50 years, let alone another century. When the National Park Service was organized in 1916, the handful of regions it administered was scattered across remote areas of the West. Few Americans could afford to visit the parks, and then only by long train trips. Now, the tempo of transportation has quickened. Population has soared. Millions of people have an abundance of leisure and seek relief from urban blight and noise.

Consider these statistics. In 1946 the number of visitors throughout the national park system totaled 92,160,000. In 1972 it is expected to be 183,900,000—probably a greater volume of visitors in this single year than in the entire history of the parks up to and including World War II. Little wonder that Superintendent Jack Anderson of Yellowstone, who I know to be hospitable by nature, is forced to plead, "We don't want more people to come for the centennial year. We can't handle the ones we get in an ordinary year of trying to save the wilderness."

The parks are overvisited and critically understaffed. There have been heavy expenditures for roads to make it easier for millions to enter, but not corresponding increases in expenditures for park personnel to supervise the crowds or to protect the natural values. As a result, both the resources and the public have suffered.

"Crime is running rampant," a feature article in the Billings (Montana) Gazette, reported, using Yellowstone as a prime example. "The drug problem is as serious as in any city. And there are simply too many people using the park. Campers are quickly destroying the land, and automobiles are gravely polluting the air."

"Also, there are a number of people entering the park who think this wilderness is another Disneyland. They have provoked bears into violent attacks. They are destroying the natural wonders in various ways, such as by sliding on algae found around geysers. They are tossing coins and assorted junk into thermal pools, especially the once-beautiful Morning Glory pool. They have no idea about how to perform in a wilderness."

So it goes in virtually all the national parks. Air pollution, water pollution—people pollution—are prevalent. Only degree and form vary, ranging from overuse and overcrowding to litter, defacement, vandalism, crime, traffic jams, lack of sanitation, pollution of streams, erosion of soil. In one park alone, Shenandoah, in Virginia, over 700,000 pounds of garbage—including styrene plastic cups, paper plates, throwaway beverage cans, and sewage from the storage tanks of camping vehicles—are disposed of at five

landfill dumps inharmoniously placed in wilderness. As for crime, the old helpful park ranger has been changed into a tough policeman coping with a rising tide of murder, manslaughter, rape, assault, drunkenness, disorderly conduct, drug law violations. The most widespread crime is "car-clouting"—stripping automobiles of valuable parts and contents.

Why does it happen and what can we do about it?

Adventures in the outdoors are essential to appreciation of the mechanism of the land. There is no higher or more exciting sport than that of ecological observation. But when people come into the national parks they find scant emphasis on self-reliance or on the need to respect the environment of nature.

In one sense, Congress is responsible by granting appropriations virtually in direct ratio to the rising volume of visitors, and so spurring the park service into devising crowd-pleasing and crowd-attracting devices.

Certainly the time is at hand to stop regarding national parks as common playgrounds with space unlimited. There are too many people in the parks at a given time.

There is too much space given over to trailers and large luxury vehicles, and to profit-making concession operations, consuming valuable real estate which should be protected for more appropriation purposes.

The National Wildlife Federation and the National Parks and Conservation Association have proposed that any new tourist facilities be placed outside the national parks, where they would bring revenue to local communities and preserve the wilderness atmosphere of the parks.

We can no longer allow parks to be used as outdoor amusement centers. The primary role should be to preserve choice and representative specimens of land forms in America. Through such preservation, the parks can serve as laboratories for learning and as reservoirs of animal and plant life which may be threatened elsewhere; they can be used to interpret how these systems operate to the benefit of man as a part of nature.

"Yellowstone should be closed to all vehicular traffic for at least five years. Only persons willing and able to walk into the park should be allowed entry during this time," urges Kimbert Larsen, of the Billings Gazette. "It is sorrowful that such a suggestion has to be made, but Yellowstone has to be closed for several years."

He may well be right; his comment recalls the position taken by John Muir many years ago in the debate over opening Yosemite to auto traffic. "Good walkers," he said, "can go anywhere in these hospitable mountains without artificial ways."

This approach does not mean the exclusion of people, but rather insures the protection of trail and campfire country—the true park wilderness experience—for optimum use and enjoyment by people over a longer period of time. It also means the planned enlargement of regional vacation areas, with more surrounding state parks, private campgrounds, and private resorts absorbing and serving the rising tide of recreational travelers. It should also lead to a new emphasis on "close-in parks" and clean streams, run by cities and counties, filling the needs of people as part of the wholesome environment of life, and freeing the national areas for other uses.

"As a country of sightseers, it is without parallel. As a field for scientific research it promises great results," reported Lt. Gustavus Doane, military leader of the 1870 Yellowstone expedition. "In the branches of geology, mineralogy, botany, zoology, and ornithology it is probably the greatest laboratory that nature furnishes on the surface of the globe."

Here may be the most significant role of the national parks in America's tomorrow: as classrooms for scientific and environ-

mental education. When the parks were new, there were fewer Americans and lots more elbowroom. National parks are ideally suited for use as ecological centers for the urban young, who have no exposure to the natural systems.

That many youngsters are shut off from healthful outdoor experiences undoubtedly contributes to the rising tide of crime, violence, frustration, and discontent. Fortunately, the national parks already have a network of "environmental study areas" for the continuing use of school groups. And in 1971 Congress established a Youth Conservation Corps, on a limited pilot-program basis, as a means of providing summer work and outdoor education. Youth Corps work is not a goal in itself but, rather, a means of generating understanding of the individual's role in the greater world around him.

Exactly what form the National Park Service of tomorrow will take one cannot foresee. Sometimes I feel there should be a new agency, a United States Wilderness Service, to insure saving the few remaining fragments of primeval places as our legacy to the future. In any event, our forebears included men of rare insight, who could look forward to our needs. This generation has a duty to sustain them by looking still further ahead.

When Congress set Yellowstone aside, it asserted that while utilization of the earth's resources may be necessary, there must also be sanctuaries where kinship with all nature can be constantly renewed. Such is the everlasting value to recognize and perpetuate in celebration of the National Parks Centennial.

CONSTANT VIGILANCE—THE PRICE OF SAVING OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK

(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, when we enact a law creating a new national park, there is always the temptation to congratulate ourselves of having "saved" the area once and for all. Actually, nothing could be more inaccurate, because every national park that we have established by act of the Congress has continued to be under assault by pressures for development. In one park, the miners are out to destroy the land. In another, the road-builders want to ribbon the mountains with concrete.

Looking back on my experience in the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I believe the prize for the most persistent assaults on the national parks system has to be awarded to the loggers. They never give up.

As long as there are big trees in a national park, we shall never hear the end of the loggers' demands that they be allowed to cut them down. But not for profit. Never for the quick buck. That is what they would have us believe. No—the loggers always have the highest, altruistic aims in mind when they talk about logging in the national parks. During World War II they wanted to log the big spruces in Olympic National Park and they said it had to be done to build airplanes. More recently, it is the shortage of public housing that provokes their pious concern.

As long as we keep these proposals for dismemberment of the parks in perspective, I am confident the Congress of the

United States will not allow such violations to occur in the national park system.

The history of the continued assaults on Olympic National Park, in the State of Washington, was outlined in the May issue of "Not Man Apart," published by Friends of the Earth. An article by Philip H. Zalesky, entitled "The Continuing Battle for Olympic National Park," documents the series of battles to save the Olympic forests since 1909. I heartily recommend this timely analysis to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

THE CONTINUING BATTLE FOR OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK

(By Philip H. Zalesky)

Olympic Park Associates takes the position that Olympic National Park is first and always a wilderness national park. That concept must come first in any master plan promulgated. In fact, although other national parks have considerable wilderness within their boundaries, we feel that Olympic National Park is still unique within the system. We do not accept the founding principles of the National Park Service as being an adequate expression of this wilderness concept.

We do not take this statement of concept lightly. Olympic Park Associates considers this position to be one not of opinion, but of historical fact. The founders of Olympic Park Associates were among the leaders in this movement to establish a park. The position they emphasized was that they were interested in protecting this as the "last wilderness." They were not sold on the management of this area by the National Park Service because they feared it would be developed as Mount Rainier had been developed—extensive roads and concessionaire developments. Only when they were convinced the Park Service intended to make it a wilderness national park did they give their full support to the project.

Testimony to this fact is given by a briefing of the Director, Arno Cammerer, by the Regional Director, Frank Kittredge of a Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs meeting taking place September 1937. The letter is dated September 8, 1937, and Regional Director Kittredge states in part as follows:

"... I was glad to note that the predominant feeling was in favor of Mount Olympic National Park... However, there was very considerable showing of opposition, to my surprise. One man went out of his way to express fears for the area if it came under the National Park Service, and his confidence that, if it was left in the Forest Service, it would be kept wilderness... He stated that his experience with the National Parks indicated that the area would immediately upon receiving National Park status be 'developed' and 'improved.'"

"There is considerable sentiment for inclusion in the bill of authority to locate lodges, or low cost development of cabins and camps, at present road heads just within the boundaries of the Monument, with provisions in the law that roads cannot be carried beyond these stipulated points. This, they say, will permit hikers and horseback riders to radiate from these camps out into the primitive wilderness that will never permit their devastation by roads."

"There is a feeling with respect to the proposed Mount Olympus National Park that there must be guarantee of protection, and a statement of principles and policies by the Park Service before these people as a whole would endorse the present Wallgren Act."

"The disconcerting feature of these hearings was the fact that even our friends and those that have stood behind the National Park Service in years past are doubting our

thoroughness and sincerity as conservationists, and with the increased activities of the Forest Service along these lines are wondering which Bureau to support."

Much of the distrust engendered toward the National Park Service came as a result of its excluding a clause that was in the original bill that "Mount Olympus National Park shall be permanently reserved as wilderness..."

The National Park Service argued this clause was unnecessary because the law establishing the Park Service and their policies precluded the need for such a clause. An example was a letter from Director Arno Cammerer to Paul Thiess, president of F.W.O.C. dated July 7, 1938: "The provision you suggest for a wilderness park is in line with purposes already covered in the law creating the National Park Service." The archives show that several score of letters went out to people who questioned the sincerity of the Service. Those letters went out for nearly two years. The wilderness intent was absolutely clear in both the original bill and the Park Service's answers to inquiries.

These letters from the Director, linked with the statements of his boss, Secretary of Interior Harold Ickes, leave a clear statement of wilderness intent.

Two quotations from Secretary Ickes emphasize this intent:

"Visitors will come to it (Olympic National Park) from all over the world. In view of this it is timely to reflect that fame has its drawbacks as well as compensations. A national park, praised by everybody, thronged to by the great traveling public, needs the same protection from its too enthusiastic admirers that a man needs when fame descends upon him. Society offers little, if any, protection to the man seeking to escape from those who adulterate today only to forget tomorrow. It is simpler and easier to protect a national park, provided that the right kind of start is made. In the case of a wilderness area like Olympic National Park, the solution can be stated in three words. Keep it wilderness."

(Ickes speech at Olympic Park Victory Banquet, Olympic Hotel, Seattle, Washington, August 26, 1938, as recorded from the National Archives.)

"Since 1938 the Olympic National Park has been established and most of the lands have been acquired for the authorized Isle Royal National Park. Both will be maintained as wilderness areas. The problem of administration arising in connection therewith... point to the need for a greater stability of policy than can be insured by administrative orders. Areas dedicated as wilderness national parks should be protected forever by provisions of law designed for the purpose; this in addition to the protection all National Parks receive by law against commercial activities."

"Ickes Urges Park Wilderness Policy," *American Forests Magazine*, Vol. 45, No. 2, February 1939.

Furthermore, testifying at the hearing on H.R. 7086 in April 1936, National Park Service Director Cammerer, quoting his own letter to Robert Sterling Yard of the Wilderness Society, said, "I favor keeping the area a wilderness park."

Senator Mon Wallgren, author of the bill, speaking of this wilderness intent at the same hearing said the assignment to National Preservation—use for all time—of this resource as against destructive, immediate, local use is the conclusion of every consideration of common sense and humanity.

Superintendent O. A. Tomlinson of Mount Rainier National Park played a large role in the local promotion. In a letter September 8, 1936 Tomlinson wrote to Miss Harlean James: "You have caught the right impression that the Monument should be enlarged and made a national park and its main objective is its wilderness aspect." Again in November 24, 1936, Tomlinson stated

that "... it has been the thought of the Service that the Wilderness aspect of the area should be emphasized in any plan of development."

An even more forceful statement of the "Keep it wilderness" theme came from Superintendent Tomlinson to the Port Townsend Chamber of Commerce, March 21, 1935: "The movement to restore part of the original monument and to establish a national park is the outgrowth of the universal desire to permanently preserve the primeval conditions of the Olympic mountains, and to withhold from commercial development and exploitation part of the beautiful and rugged and forested territory for the pleasure and enjoyment of all the people of the present generation, also to assure that future Americans may have the same privilege which is their rightful heritage."

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

For the first time in man's history on earth, open predictions of impending biological calamity are now being accepted as reality by nearly everyone—because everyone can see daily what is happening to our environment. The universal fouling of the air with poisons and noises of industry and urbanization, the biological destruction of rivers and forests, lands and oceans with the poisons we dump have made the preservation of those tiny corners of uncontaminated America of such importance we can do no less than fight with everything we have for their continued preservation.

Olympic National Park, as one of those last biologically uncontaminated sections of the country, offers a unique opportunity to continue in perpetuity a section of primeval America. But it also offers an opportunity to look at the past, how it came to be preserved and why. The scientific community which is now leading the fight for the survival of mankind also led the fight for the protection of Olympic Wilderness and even for the creation of the National Park Service itself.

THE CREATION OF THE PARK SERVICE

When Gifford Pinchot finally assumed administrative control over the federal forest reserves and began the process of stopping the wanton and corrupt destruction which had marked their prior history, he completely misread a surging undercurrent in pre-World War I American society. While he relegated every use of the new National Forests, other than full economic exploitation, to a minor role, he openly began an attack on the national parks, demanding the granting of a permit to flood Hetch Hetchy Valley in Yosemite and even demanding a policy of logging the existing national parks.

By 1911 when these attacks again showed up the lack of a federally defined policy towards the parks, a second National Parks Conference was called to discuss what policy should be and if an agency should be created to administer the parks. By then Henry Graves had succeeded to the Forest Service throne, but Pinchot remained the life force of its policies. Continuing with the Pinchot attack, Graves sent a forester to the conference to define what the economic utilization of the parks should be—Forest Service style—along with a specific plan for the logging of the Lake McDonald area of Glacier Park.

Here was the Forest Service's challenge: "The mature, dead standing and windblown timber in the national parks should be sold and utilized wherever possible..." And even as late as the following year in hearings on the Park Service bill and before public opinion had had a chance to solidify, Secretary of the Interior Fisher testified that "it is desirable to have that timber harvested and have it harvested in such a way as will interfere as little as possible with the beauty of the park." In 1913 the successful campaign of San Francisco to gain access to Hetch

Hetchy insured the passage of the Park Service bill and, also, silenced once and for all the public debate about the manner in which the parks would be preserved. The public and the scientific community now had an agency around which it could rally its support for preservation. The report on HR 5522 to establish the Park Service in 1916 settled the matter: "The segregation of National Park areas necessarily involves the preservation of nature as it exists." So completely and overwhelmingly had been this public response in favor of maintaining the parks as wilderness that nearly two years after the passage of the Park Service bill, Secretary of the Interior Lane wrote a public memorandum to Park Service Director Mather to placate residual fears:

"For the information of the public, an outline of the administrative policy to which the new Service will adhere may now be announced. The policy is based on three broad principles: First, that the National Parks must be maintained in absolutely unimpaired form for the use of future generations as well as those of our own time. Second, that they are set apart for the use, observation, health and pleasure of the people; and third that the national interest must dictate all decisions affecting public or private enterprise in the parks.

In 1915 the exact boundaries devised by the three Seattle businessmen were presented to President Wilson in a Forest Service-prepared proclamation and accepted by him. No doubt the elimination occurred to ensure Forest Service jurisdiction over lands that were loggable.

In spite of the original Monument proclamation which proclaimed that "the National Monument hereby established shall be the dominant reservation (in relation to Olympic National Forest) and any use of the land which interferes with its preservation or protection as a National Monument is hereby forbidden," the Forest Service proceeded as if it did not exist. By 1929 it had rationalized its economic utilization policies to the point that it could and did authorize a permit for mining within the Monument, routinely allowed sheep grazing which destroyed the forage for countless thousands of native fauna including the elk for which the Monument was created, secured the elimination of another part of the Monument which was blocking the development of a power dam on the Elwha River.

Contrary to all prior interpretations of what Monuments were for, it also began preparations for timber cutting in the Monument and had roads designed for bisecting the Monument over Anderson Pass and over Low Divide. As officially stated by the Forest Service the policy read: "It is evident from President Roosevelt's original proclamation creating the Mount Olympus National Monument that he believed and intended that the preservation of the Roosevelt elk could and should be accomplished, allowing at the same time the use and development of the timber, water, and recreational resources of the monument."

"Every activity of the Service is subordinate to the duties imposed upon it to faithfully preserve the parks for posterity in essentially their natural state. The commercial use of these reservations, except as specially authorized by law, or such as may be incidental to the accommodation and entertainment of visitors, will not be permitted under any circumstances."

Somehow the distrust remained and Director Mather in his report for 1920 reviewed the Lane charge to him. Speaking to the doubters, he made this statement: "It was particularly made clear that every activity of the Service is subordinate to the duties imposed on it to faithfully preserve the parks for posterity in essentially their natural state. Could our national park policy be more clearly enunciated? In other words, it is basic

that these wonderful scenic areas are to be left forever in their natural state for the enjoyment of present and future generations. . . ." The doubters, strong in Congress and elsewhere remembering past testimony and vacillation, were beginning to believe that what they had created might work.

The creation of the Park Service and the definition of its basic policies helped create groups centered in the civic association and scientific communities who provided a forum around which public opinion could be expressed. When the organic act creating the Service itself seemed lacking, the Service responded by defining policy and intent far beyond the basic law of its existence.

MOUNT OLYMPUS NATIONAL MONUMENT

The first successful attempt to preserve a part of the Olympic Forests was the creation of the Mount Olympus National Monument by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1909. This area of 610,560 acres was strongly urged by The Mountaineers, The National Association of Audubon Societies, the Biological Survey, the Forest Service, and Congressman William Humphrey. Immediately, the commercial and mining interests began the process of attempting to undo the "locking up" of the resources which under the Antiquities Act of 1906 had closed the monument to further settlement, mining, and lumbering. Under the proclamation itself warning was given "not to appropriate, injure, remove, or destroy any feature of this National Monument." By 1912 a committee of three men from the Seattle Chamber of Commerce had drawn up a new boundary which eliminated from the Monument all the forests which were considered accessible by contemporary logging technology.

It was evident to many that with this policy there would be little flora or fauna left to be preserved if the policy then in practice prevailed.

WILDERNESS PRESERVATION IN THE OLYMPICS

With the Olympic scene becoming known, the New York Zoological Society, the American Museum of Natural History, the Boone and Crockett Club, and other eastern groups began to respond to rumors about what was occurring. By 1928 the Park Service began to receive a long series of letters from scientists, board members of scientific institutions, citizen and civic groups. The Park Service was then so out of touch with the situation and the public concern that it rejected out of hand all inquiries. National park status had been recommended for the Olympics as early as 1890 and since 1904 Congress rarely had been free of bills attempting to protect parts of it, but the National Park Service was indifferent to the public's reaction to the Forest Service's administration. A sampling of the handling of the letters will give a feeling about this attitude of the Park Service.

Albright to Sawyer 1929: (because of) "the fact that the mountain and surrounding area to a large extent would duplicate Mt. Rainier in the same state, we have consistently recommended against its establishment as a national park."

Mather to Madison Grant 1928: "At the present time this area consists of perhaps one of the greatest untouched mountain and forest areas in the United States, is entirely isolated from roads, and I believe it is the intention of the Forest Service to continue to maintain it in its original natural condition."

Cammerer to Mrs. F. R. Hill 1932: "The matter of establishing a national park has been brought to the attention of the National Park Service many times. It is a very beautiful region, but thus far it has not been demonstrated that it comes up to the standards set for national parks. However, the Forest Service, as you know, now administers the Mount Olympus National Monument there,

which is a real wilderness area. This area is given full protection by the Forest Service."

When agitation for protection of the elk and forests would not be placated by the Park Service's insistence that the Forest Service was offering full protection to the area, Madison Grant sent Dr. Willard Van Name of the American Museum of Natural History to do a field study of conditions in the Olympics. Van Name had ties with nearly every major scientific organization and was a permanent member of the Museum's scientific staff. In early 1933 the Museum Board, which was interlocked with nearly every conservation organization in the country, was presented with an official recommendation that "A National Park for the Olympic Peninsula seems to be the only solution, as only in National Parks does the law exclude commercial exploitation and require natural conditions to be preserved."

Six months later the National Park Service found itself in an embarrassing position when President Franklin Roosevelt's executive reorganization handed it the management of Mt. Olympus National Monument. Thus it ended up with a staff and an administration on the Olympic Peninsula through no effort of its own and after proclaiming to all its unworthiness.

Since that time a chronology of the events of Park Service administration will provide an insight into the nature of its tenure there:

1933: Willard Van Name writes, prints, and distributes at his own expense a pamphlet, *The Proposed Olympic National Park* which causes a sensation by calling for the protection of the climax forests west of the existing Monument.

1934: Park Service responds with an official park boundary recommendation to Secretary Ickes which barely enlarges the existing Monument and included not one acre of what was later defined scientifically as rain forest. They charged that Van Name's boundary "includes much valuable timber on areas that are not National Park caliber." Park Service recommendation rejected by Ickes as not worthy of legislative support from the department.

1935: HR 7086 for large forest park with boundaries nearly identical with today's park passes House unanimously without debate after lengthy hearings on the Park Service policies, the Forest Service, and the timber industry. This bill contains a specific wilderness clause.

1936: Park Service responds by preparing new boundary recommendations eliminating 140,000 acres of the most valuable forest included in the House-passed bill. They claim the following objectives: avoidance of unnecessary interference with the well-ordered management plans of the National Forest Service; avoidance of unnecessary interference with economic interests such as lumbering and mining.

1937: Park Service induces Congressman Wallgren to introduce HR 4724 embodying reduced boundary recommendations of its internal Horning Report.

1937: Reaction to Park Service's HR 4724 and to Forest Service primitive area proposal is so hostile that HR 4724 is amended to include all of area in previous bill HR 7086 plus area of Forest Service Primitive Area not included in bill and plus corridors to the sea and an ocean strip.

1937: President Roosevelt visited Olympic Peninsula on personal inspection and evidence suggests that he encouraged Wallgren to push for larger park against the wishes of his own National Park Service.

1938: H.R. 10024 re-introduced on opening of Congress with passage assured.

1938: Park bill passes providing for 648,000 acres and presidential authority to enlarge the park to 892,292 acres and with the additions being with the consent of the state governor.

1938: Ickes reassures that park will be administered as wilderness park in victory banquet to assure those who fought for and won on the basis of wilderness.

1939: Park Service's Olympic staff places Bogachiel-Calawha rain forests 18th among 18 priorities for addition to park. Washington, D.C. staff concurs knowing that Ickes will reverse their recommendation. Knowing this, they permit it to remain under threat of veto of their whole plan.

1940: President brings park to approximate boundary of first park bill on the advice of his personal emissary, noted author Irving Brant, and after receiving testimony personally from all sides and Forest Service economic impact studies.

1940: Park Service prepares secret logging plan in cooperation with timber industry representatives for area added in 1940 proclamation.

1941: Regional Park Service committee secretly recommends boundary revision plan to eliminate Bogachiel-Calawha and Quinault area.

1943: Park Service committee again recommends elimination of Bogachiel-Calawha and Quinault rain forest areas.

1943: For first time in history of any national park, Olympic Park superintendent signs logging contract for economic utilization of resources in park.

1946: Park Service writes bill to eliminate forest areas pursuant to its 1943 internal recommendation.

1947: Public outcry forces Park Service to reverse itself on elimination at public hearing of Congressman Jackson's committee.

1952: Park Service begins full-blown logging program in Olympic Park on a high-grading and salvage basis. The volume is so great that the state of Washington officially adds National Park Service logging volume to its annual statistical report.

1953: Timber industry representatives on Governor Langlie's Review Committee publicly congratulate Park Service on its logging program.

1956: Conservationists force stopping of logging program in the park.

1966: Through its Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Department of Interior recommends deleting 69,000 acres from Park, parts of Bogachiel-Calawha, Quinault, Hoh, and Queets. Testimony and letters to Senator Jackson's committee are 20 to 1 opposed to plan. Plan put on shelf.

1972: Master plan prepared for Olympic National Park.

Concerned conservationists have developed "knee jerk" toward Olympic National Park over the years. Can it be any wonder they are again apprehensive as the Service goes through its proceedings to prepare a wilderness plan and a master plan for the public's prime treasure? We truly desire to believe in the Park Service's sincerity. However, every twisting of the principles enunciated in the Park Service organic act we have documented from the National Archives or from the files of the persons involved. It is time for the Park Service to begin to live up to and accept and implement Secretary Lane's memorandum on the administration of the National Park System. Either implement it regarding Olympic National Park or reject it publicly so the rejection can be dealt with. It is time for the Park Service to live up to the Interior Department's and its own prior statements about wilderness administration for Olympic. And it is time for all of us to work together and plan together to protect for posterity this tiny segment of primeval America which can never be replaced once damaged. Olympic Park Associates has requested before and now requests again that a place be made on the planning team for a noted conservationist and a distinguished member of the scientific community.

Let's do as Harold Ickes said: "Keep it wilderness."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. JONES of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. BLATNIK (at the request of Mrs. HANSEN of Washington), from June 3 through June 23, on account of official business.

Mr. CORMAN, for Thursday, June 1, 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:

Mr. BADILLO, for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Ohio), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MCKINNEY, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS, today, for 20 minutes.

Mr. KEMP, today, for 5 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, today, for 5 minutes.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LINK), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of New York, today, for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ABZUG, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. COTTER, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANIELSON, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, today, for 30 minutes.

Mr. PODELL, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. WOLFF, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, today, for 10 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. DEVINE, to extend his remarks following the special order of Mr. QUIE today.

Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. BARRETT) to extend his remarks following those of Mr. BARRETT, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Ohio), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STEELE, in two instances.

Mr. BURKE of Florida.

Mrs. DWYER in three instances.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.

Mr. SCHMITZ.

Mr. DU PONT.

Mr. KEATING in two instances.

Mr. QUIE.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. HALPERN in three instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan.

Mr. KEITH.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida in five instances.

Mr. ROUSSELOT.

Mr. RAILSBACK.

Mr. FISH.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. POFF.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in two instances.

Mr. PRICE of Texas.

Mr. DENNIS.

Mr. NELSEN.

Mr. HOGAN in 10 instances.

Mr. CLANCY in two instances.

Mr. THONE.

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. DELLENBACK.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. SHOUP in two instances.

Mr. McKEVITT.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LINK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BADILLO.

Mr. BYRON in 10 instances.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS.

Mr. CONYERS in 10 instances.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in two instances.

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

Mr. ROBINO.

Mr. BOGGS.

Mrs. GRASSO in 10 instances.

Mr. ASPIN.

Mr. JOHNSON of California.

Mr. NICHOLS.

Mr. HUNGATE in two instances.

Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. BRASCO.

Mr. HARRINGTON.

Mr. HANLEY.

Mr. SYMINGTON.

Mr. WALDIE in six instances.

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. RONCALIO in two instances.

Mr. CHAPPELL in two instances.

Mr. BRINKLEY.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania in three instances.

Mr. ECKHARDT in two instances.

Mr. VANIK in three instances.

Mr. LEGGETT in five instances.

Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. RYAN in three instances.

Mr. ROGERS in five instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1478. An act to regulate interstate commerce by requiring premarket testing of new chemical substances and to provide for screening of the results of such testing prior to commercial production, to require testing of certain existing chemical substances, to authorize the regulation of the use and distribution of chemical substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 13150. An act to provide that the Federal Government shall assume the risks of its fidelity losses, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 31, 1972, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

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 numbered 255 and 124-C, dockets numbered 256, 124-D, E, and F, and dockets numbered 131 and 253, and of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma in docket numbered 251-A, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8116. An act to consent to the Kansas-Nebraska Big Blue River compact; and

H.R. 13361. An act to amend section 316 (c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair is now going to declare a recess until the two Houses meet in joint session to hear an address by the President of the United States. The House will stand in recess until approximately 9:10 p.m.

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 9 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 625 TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER of the House presided.

The Doorkeeper (Hon. William M. Miller) announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Boggs; the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. O'NEILL; the gentleman from Texas, Mr. TEAGUE; the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. GERALD R. FORD; and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. ARENDT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to the order of the Senate, the following Senators are appointed to escort the President to the House Chamber: The Senator from Louisiana, Mr. ELLENDER; the Senator from Montana, Mr. MANS-

FIELD; the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD; the Senator from Utah, Mr. MOSS; the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. FULBRIGHT; the Senator from Florida, Mr. CHILES; the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. SCOTT; the Senator from Michigan, Mr. GRIFFIN; the Senator from Maine, Mrs. SMITH; the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. COTTON; and the Senator from Vermont, Mr. AIKEN.

The Doorkeeper announced the Ambassadors, Ministers, and Charges d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Charges d'Affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 9 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m., the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. My colleagues of the Congress, I have the distinct privilege and the high personal honor of presenting to you the President of the United States.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

SPECIAL REPORT TO THE CONGRESS—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. No. 92-305)

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Members of the Congress, our distinguished guests, my fellow Americans, your welcome in this great Chamber tonight has a very special meaning to Mrs. Nixon and me. We feel very fortunate to have traveled abroad so often representing the United States of America, but we both agree after each journey that the best part of any trip abroad is coming home to America again.

During the past 13 days we have flown more than 16,000 miles and we visited four countries, and everywhere we went, to Austria, the Soviet Union, Iran, Poland, we could feel the quickening pace of change in old international relationship and the people's genuine desire for friendship for the American people, everywhere new hopes are rising for a world no longer shadowed by fear and want and war. And as Americans we can be proud that we now have an historic opportunity to play a great role in helping to achieve man's oldest dream, a world in which all nations can enjoy the blessings of peace.

On this journey we saw many memorable sights, but one picture which will always remain indelible in our memory—the flag of the United States of America flying high in the spring breeze above

Moscow's ancient Kremlin fortress. To millions of Americans for the past quarter century the Kremlin has stood for implacable hostility toward all that we cherish, and to millions of Russians the American flag has long been held up as a symbol of evil. No one would have believed, even a short time ago, that these two apparently irreconcilable symbols would be seen together as we saw them for those few days.

Now, this does not mean that we bring back from Moscow the promise of instant peace, but we do bring the beginning of a process that can lead to a lasting peace.

That is why I have taken the extraordinary action of requesting this special joint session of the Congress, because we have before us an extraordinary opportunity. I have not come here seeking to make new announcements in a dramatic setting. This summit has already made its news. It has barely begun, however, to make its mark on our world. And I ask you to join me tonight while events are fresh, while the iron is hot, and start to consider how we can help to make that mark what we want it to be. The foundation has been laid for a new relationship between the two most powerful nations in the world, and now it is up to us—to all of us here in this Chamber, to all of us across America—to join with other nations in building a new house upon that foundation, one that can be a home for the hopes of mankind and a shelter against the storms of conflict.

As a preliminary, therefore, to requesting your concurrence in some of the agreements we reached, and your approval of the funds to carry out others, and also as the keynote to the unity in which this Government and this Nation must go forward from here, I am rendering this immediate report to the Congress on the results of the Moscow summit.

The pattern of United States-Soviet summit diplomacy in the cold war era is well known to all those in this Chamber. One meeting after another produced a brief, euphoric mood—the spirit of Geneva, the spirit of Camp David, the spirit of Vienna, the spirit of Glassboro—but without producing significant progress on the really difficult issues. And so early in this administration I stated that the prospect of concrete results, not atmospheric, would be our criterion for meetings at the highest level. And I also announced our intention to pursue negotiations with the Soviet Union across a broad front of related issues, with the purpose of creating the momentum of achievement in which progress in one area could contribute to progress in others. This is the basis on which we prepared for and conducted last week's talks. This was a work summit.

We sought to establish not a superficial spirit of Moscow, but a solid record of progress on solving the difficulties which so long have divided our two nations, and also have divided the world. Reviewing the number and the scope of agreements that emerged, I think we have accomplished that goal.

Recognizing the responsibility of the advanced, industrial nations to set an example in combating mankind's common enemies, the United States and the Soviet Union have agreed to cooperate in efforts to reduce pollution and enhance environmental quality. We have agreed to work together in the field of medical science and public health, particularly in the conquest of cancer and heart disease. Recognizing that the quest for useful knowledge transcends the differences between ideologies and social systems, we have agreed to expand United States and Soviet cooperation in many areas of science and technology. We have joined in plans for an exciting new adventure—a new adventure in the cooperative exploration of space which will begin, subject to congressional approval of funds, with the joint orbital mission of an Apollo vehicle and a Soviet spacecraft in 1975. By forming habits of cooperation and strengthening institutional ties in areas of peaceful enterprise, these four agreements to which I have referred will create on both sides a steadily growing vested interest in the maintenance of the good relations between our two countries. Expanded United States-Soviet trade will also yield advantages to both of our nations. When the two largest economies in the world start trading with each other on a much larger scale, living standards in both nations will rise, and the stake which both have in peace will increase.

Progress in this area is proceeding on schedule. At the summit we established a Joint Commercial Commission which will complete the negotiations for a comprehensive trade agreement between the United States and the U.S.S.R., and we expect the final terms of this agreement to be settled later this year.

Two further accords which were reached last week have a much more direct bearing on the search for peace and security in the world. One of these is the agreement between the American and Soviet navies, aimed at significantly reducing the chances of dangerous incidents between our ships and aircraft at sea; and, second and most important, there is the treaty and the related executive agreement which will limit for the first time both offensive and defensive strategic nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the United States and the Soviet Union.

Three-fifths of all the people alive in the world today have spent their whole lifetimes under the shadow of a nuclear war which could be touched off by the arms race among the great powers. Last Friday in Moscow we witnessed the beginning of the end of that era which began in 1945. We took the first step toward a new era of mutually agreed restraint and arms limitation between the two principal nuclear powers. With this step we have enhanced the security of both nations. We have begun to check the wasteful and dangerous spiral of nuclear arms which has dominated relations between our two countries for a generation. We have begun to reduce the level of fear by reducing the causes of fear for our two peoples and for all peoples of the world. The ABM treaty

will be submitted promptly for the Senate's advice and consent for ratification and the interim agreement limiting certain offensive weapons will be submitted to both Houses for concurrence, because we can undertake agreements as important as these only on a basis of full partnership between the executive and legislative branches of our Government.

I ask from this Congress and I ask from the Nation the fullest scrutiny of these accords. I am confident such examination will underscore the truth of what I told the Soviet people on television just a few nights ago, that this is an agreement in the interest of both nations. From the standpoint of the United States, when we consider what the strategic balance would have looked like later in the 1970's if there had been no arms limitation, it is clear that the agreements forestall a major spiraling of the arms race, one which would have worked to our disadvantage since we have no current building programs for the categories of weapons which have been frozen, and since no new building program could have produced any new weapons in those categories during the period of the freeze.

My colleagues in the Congress, I have studied the strategic balance in great detail with my senior advisers for more than 3 years; and I can assure you, the Members of the Congress and the American people tonight, that the present and planned strategic forces of the United States are without question sufficient for the maintenance of our security and the protection of our vital interests.

No power on earth is stronger than the United States of America today, and none will be stronger than the United States of America in the future.

This is the only national defense posture that can ever be acceptable to the United States, and this is the posture I ask the Senate and the Congress to protect by approving the arms limitation agreements to which I have referred. This is the posture which, with the responsible cooperation of the Congress, I will take all the necessary steps to maintain in our future defense programs.

In addition to the talks which led to the specific agreements which I have listed, I also had both very frank and extensive discussions with General Secretary Brezhnev and his colleagues about several parts of the world where American and Soviet interests have come in conflict. With regard to the reduction of tensions in Europe, we recorded our intentions of proceeding later this year with multilateral consultations looking toward a conference on security and cooperation in all of Europe.

We have also jointly agreed to move forward with negotiations on mutual and balanced force reductions in central Europe.

The problem of ending the Vietnam war which engages the hopes of all Americans was one of the most extensively discussed subjects on our agenda. It would only jeopardize the search of peace if I were to review here all that was said on that subject. I will simply say this: Each side obviously has its own point of view and its own approach to

this very difficult issue. But at the same time both the United States and the Soviet Union share an overriding desire to achieve a more stable peace in the world.

I emphasize to you once again, this administration has no higher goal—a goal that I know all of you share—than bringing the Vietnam war to an early and honorable end. We are ending the war in Vietnam, but we shall end it in a way which will not betray our friends, risk the lives of the courageous Americans still serving in Vietnam, break faith with those held prisoners by the enemy, or stain the honor of the United States of America.

Another area where we had very full, frank, and extensive discussions was the Middle East. I reiterated the American people's commitment to the survival of the State of Israel, and to a settlement just to all the countries in the area. Both sides stated in the communiqué their intention to support the Iran peace mission and other appropriate efforts to achieve this objective. The final achievement of the Moscow conference was the signing of a landmark declaration entitled "Basic Principles of Mutual Relations Between the United States and the U.S.S.R."

As these 12 basic principles are put into practice, they can provide a solid framework for the future development of better American-Soviet relations. They begin with the recognition that two nuclear nations, each of which has the power to destroy humanity, have no alternative but to coexist peacefully, because in a nuclear war, there would be no winners, only losers.

The basic principles commit both sides to avoid direct military confrontation and to exercise constructive leadership and restraint with respect to smaller conflicts in other parts of the world which could drag the major powers into war. They disavow any intention to create spheres of influence or to conspire against the interest of any other nation, a point I would underscore by saying once again tonight that America values its ties with all nations, from our oldest allies in Europe and Asia, as I emphasized by my visit to Iran, to our good friends in the third world and to our new relationship with the People's Republic of China.

The improvement of relations depends not only, of course, on words, but far more on actions. The principles to which we agreed in Moscow are like a road map. Now that the map has been laid out, it is up to each country to follow it.

The United States intends to adhere to these principles. The leaders of the Soviet Union have indicated a similar intention. However, we must remember that Soviet ideology still proclaims hostility to some of America's most basic values. The Soviet leaders remain committed to that ideology. Like the nation they lead, they are and they will continue to be totally dedicated competitors of the United States of America.

As we shape our policies for the period ahead, therefore, we must maintain our defenses at an adequate level until there is mutual agreement to limit forces.

The time-tested policies of vigilance and firmness which have brought us to

this summit are the only ones that can safely carry us forward to further progress in reaching agreements to reduce the danger of war.

Our successes in the strategic arms talks and in the Berlin negotiations which opened the road to Moscow came about, because over the past 3 years we have consistently refused proposals for unilaterally abandoning the ABM, unilaterally pulling back our forces from Europe, and drastically cutting the defense budget. And the Congress deserves the appreciation of the American people for having the courage to vote such proposals down and to maintain the strength America needs to protect its interests.

As we continue the strategic arms talks, seeking a permanent offensive weapons treaty, we must bear the lessons of the earlier talks well in mind. By the same token, we must stand steadfastly with our NATO partners if negotiations leading to a new detente and a mutual reduction of forces in Europe are to be productive. Maintaining the strength, integrity, and steadfastness of our free world alliances is the foundation on which all of our other initiatives for peace and security in the world must rest.

As we seek better relations with those who have been our adversaries we will not let down our friends and allies around the world.

And in this period we must keep our economy vigorous and competitive if the opening for greater East-West trade is to mean anything at all, and if we do not wish to be shouldered aside in world markets by the growing potential of the economies of Japan, Western Europe, the Soviet Union, and the People's Republic of China. For America to continue its role of helping to build a more peaceful world we must keep America No. 1 economically in the world.

And we must maintain our own momentum of domestic innovation and growth and reform if the opportunities for joint action with the Soviets are to fulfill their promise. As we seek agreements to build peace abroad we must keep America moving forward at home.

Most importantly, if the new age we seek is ever to become a reality, we must keep America strong in spirit, a nation proud of its greatness as a free society, confident of its mission in the world. Let us be committed to our way of life as wholeheartedly as the Communist leaders with whom we seek a new relationship are committed to their system.

Let us always be proud to show in our words and actions what we know in our hearts, that we believe in America.

These are just some of the challenges of peace. They are in some ways even more difficult than the challenges of war. But we are equal to them, and as we meet them we will be able to go forward and explore the sweeping possibilities for peace which this season of summits has now opened up for the world.

For decades America has been locked in hostile confrontation with the two great Communist powers, the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. We were engaged with the one at many points and almost totally isolated

from the other. But our relationships with both had reached a deadly impasse. All three countries were victims of the kind of bondage about which George Washington long ago warned in these words:

The nation which indulges toward another an habitual hatred is a slave to its own animosity.

But now in the brief space of 4 months these journeys to Peking and to Moscow have begun to free us from perpetual confrontation. We have moved toward better understanding, mutual respect, point-by-point settlement of differences with both of the major Communist powers.

Now, this one series of meetings has not rendered an imperfect world suddenly perfect. There still are deep philosophical differences. There still are parts of the world in which age-old hatreds persist. The threat of war has not been eliminated. It has been reduced. We are making progress toward a world in which leaders of nations will settle their differences by negotiation, not by force, and in which they learn to live with their differences so that their sons will not have to die for those differences.

It was particularly fitting that this trip, aimed at building such a world, should have concluded in Poland. No country in the world has suffered more from war than Poland, and no country has more to gain from peace. The faces of the people, who gave us such a heartwarming welcome in Warsaw yesterday and then again this morning and this afternoon, told an eloquent story of suffering from war in the past and of hope for peace in the future. One could see it in their faces. It made me more determined than ever that America must do all in its power to help that hope for peace come true for all people in the world.

As we continue that effort, our unity of purpose and action will be all-important. For the summits of 1972 have not belonged just to one person or to one party or to one branch of our Government alone. Rather, they are part of a great national journey for peace. Every American can claim a share in the credit for the success of that journey so far, and every American has a major stake in the success of the future. An unparalleled opportunity has been placed in America's hands. Never has there been a time when hope was more justified or when complacency was more dangerous.

We have made a good beginning. And because we have begun, history now lays upon us a special obligation to see it through. We can seize this moment or we can lose it. We can make good this opportunity to build a new structure of peace in the world, or we can let it slip away.

Together, therefore, let us seize the moment so that our children and the world's children can live free of the fears and free of the hatreds that have been the lot of mankind through the centuries. And then the historians of some future age will write of the year 1972, not that this was the year America went up to the summit and then down to the depths of the valley again, but that this

was the year when America helped to lead the world up out of the lowlands of constant war and on to the high plateau of lasting peace.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 10 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m., the President, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 10 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m., the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

REFERENCE OF MESSAGE OF PRESIDENT TO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE ON THE STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 5, 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:

2046. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting the annual report and audit of the American National Red Cross for the year ended June 30, 1971, pursuant to 33 Stat. 599, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2047. A letter from the certified public accountant for the American Symphony Orchestra League, Inc., transmitting the audit report of the league for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to Public Law 87-817; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 14455. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend and revise the program of assistance

under that act for the control and prevention of communicable diseases; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-1107). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 15081. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to enlarge the authority of the National Heart and Lung Institute in order to advance the national attack against heart, blood vessel, lung, and blood diseases, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-1108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 14731. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 in order to provide for the effective enforcement of the provisions therein prohibiting the shooting at birds, fish, and other animals from aircraft; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-1109). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 14106. A bill to amend the Water Resources Planning Act to authorize increased appropriations; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-1110). 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 Mrs. ABZUG:

H.R. 15260. A bill to provide for transmittal of the Department of Defense 5-year defense program and for congressional deliberation of major mission and support functions of the 5-year defense program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 15261. A bill to prohibit Federal assistance to rental housing projects where tenants are not allowed to have dogs, or to local governments which do not permit dogs in rental housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 15262. A bill to amend title XVII of the Social Security Act to provide financial assistance to individuals suffering from chronic kidney disease who are unable to pay the costs of necessary treatment, and to authorize project grants to increase the availability and effectiveness of such treatment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 15263. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction in computing gross income for theft losses sustained by individuals, for certain amounts paid to protect against theft, for medical expenses caused by criminal conduct, and for funeral expenses of victims of crime; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 15264. A bill to establish a system of ratings for network television programs in order to warn viewers of physical violence or obscenity contained in such programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 15265. 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.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 15266. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BADILLO:

H.R. 15267. A bill to promote homeownership by low- and moderate-income families by assisting them in acquiring, rehabilitating, and improving the structures in which they are tenants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 15268. 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. BERGLAND:

H.R. 15269. A bill to establish and implement a national transportation policy for the next 50 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 15270. A bill to provide for the comprehensive development of correctional manpower training and employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 15271. A bill authorizing the President to proclaim the third week of May as "Lone Defenders Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 15272. A bill to provide for computation of pay of members of the armed services retired for permanent disability sustained in line of duty, or for years of service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CAREY of New York:

H.R. 15273. 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. COTTER:

H.R. 15274. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, relating to annuities of widows of Supreme Court Justices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT (by request):

H.R. 15275. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Social Security Act to provide a comprehensive program of health care for the 1970's by strengthening the organization and delivery of health care nationwide and by making comprehensive health care insurance available to all Americans and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 15276. A bill to amend section 591 (g) of title 18, United States Code, in order to exclude corporations and labor organizations from the scope of the prohibitions against government contractors in section 611 of title 18; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. Moss, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KEITH, and Mr. MIKVA):

H.R. 15277. A bill to provide for public ownership of the bus company in the District of Columbia, to approve amendments to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DU PONT:

H.R. 15278. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FREY (for himself, Mr. COUGHLIN, and Mr. RAILSBACK):

H.R. 15279. A bill to clarify the intent of Congress to exclude prisoners in work release programs from the provisions of Federal

law forbidding the use of convict labor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ (for himself and Mr. MOSHER):

H.R. 15280. A bill to increase the annual appropriation authorization of the National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GUDE (for himself, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, and Mr. HOGAN):

H.R. 15281. A bill to provide emergency loans to the District of Columbia to carry out the expansion and renovation of the Blue Plains Sewage Treatment Facility; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 15282. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to enlarge the authority of the National Heart and Lung Institute in order to advance the national attack against heart, blood vessel, lung, and blood diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 15283. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax simplification, reform, and relief for small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 15284. A bill to expand the membership of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to include elected school board officials and elected town and township officials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 15285. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 15286. 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. JACOBS:

H.R. 15287. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to require the Secretary of Labor to recognize the difference in hazards to employees between the heavy construction industry and the light residential construction industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 15288. A bill to amend section 103 of title 23 of the United States Code relating to additional mileage for the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. WARE, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. THONE, Mr. FORSTHE, Mr. POBELL, Mr. WYATT, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. MAZZOLI, and Mr. KEMP):

H.R. 15289. A bill to guarantee the right of criminal defendants to a speedy trial and to reduce crime and injustice by improving the supervision of persons released on bail and probation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 15290. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for tuition paid for the elementary or secondary education of dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 15291. 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. KOCH:

H.R. 15292. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to the waiver of certain grounds for exclusion and deportation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINK:

H.R. 15293. A bill authorizing the construction of certain bank stabilization works on the Missouri River below Garrison Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. ECKHARDT, and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 15294. A bill to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, to provide for the recall of certain defective motor vehicles without charge to the owners thereof, to authorize appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NELSEN (by request):

H.R. 15295. A bill to amend the law relating to the conduct of public hearings before the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 15296. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for tuition paid for the elementary or secondary education of dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 15297. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for tuition paid for the elementary or secondary education of dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 15298. 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. QUINN:

H.R. 15299. A bill to further the achievement of equal educational opportunities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 15300. A bill to amend the Judiciary and Judicial Procedure Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 15301. A bill to amend chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, to revise the special pay structure relating to members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 15302. 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. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. SPRINGER):

H.R. 15303. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, to facilitate closer Securities and Exchange Commission scrutiny of the self-regulatory processes and to make the powers of the Commission over the self-regulatory organizations consistent by conferring upon the Commission additional responsibility and authority with regard to the adoption, amendment, alteration, or rescission of rules

of self-regulatory organizations, the enforcement of rules of self-regulatory organizations, and the review of disciplinary action taken by self-regulatory organizations against their members; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 15304. A bill to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 with respect to the assignment of investment advisory contracts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 15305. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide that personal delivery of notification of death of service-men to the next of kin may only be made by officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VEYSEY (for himself and Mr. FETTS):

H.R. 15306. A bill to establish a Federal program to encourage the voluntary donation of pure and safe blood, to require licensing and inspection of all blood banks, and to establish a national registry of blood donors; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 15307. A bill to permit former members of the Women's Airforce Service Pilots to acquire, for a limited time, insurance upon the same terms and conditions, with certain exceptions as apply with respect to national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 15308. A bill to amend section 103 of title 23 of the United States Code relating to additional mileage for the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 15309. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the issuance of nonimmigrant visas to certain aliens entering the United States to perform services or labor of a seasonal nature under contracts of employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15310. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, with respect to certain employees engaged in hazardous occupations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WYMAN (for himself and Mr. CLEVELAND):

H.R. 15311. A bill to protect collectors of antique glassware against the manufacture in the United States or the importation of imitations of such glassware; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.R. 15312. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax simplification reform, and relief for small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 15313. A bill to provide that, in the administration of the School Lunch and Child Nutrition Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, within the limits which he will prescribe, permit the operation of certain food vending machines in participating schools where the proceeds of such operations

go to organizations sponsored or approved by the school; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 15314. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to assure that adequate funds are available for the conduct of summer food service programs for children from areas in which poor economic conditions exist and from areas in which there are high concentrations of working mothers, and for other purposes related to expanding and strengthening the child nutrition programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROGERS (for himself, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 15315. A bill to strengthen the Food and Drug Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 15316. A bill to construct an Indian Art and Cultural Center in Riverton, Wyo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WYLLIE:

H.R. 15317. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to require the Secretary of Labor to recognize the difference in hazards to employees between the heavy construction industry and the light residential construction industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. ABZUG:

H. Con. Res. 626. Concurrent resolution expressing the horror, shock, and dismay of Congress at the incident at Tel Aviv Airport on May 31, 1972, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.J. Res. 1214. Joint resolution to suspend temporarily the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to permit the abandonment of a line of railroad or the operation thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.J. Res. 1215. Joint resolution designating the second Sunday in June of each year as "Children's Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYATT:

H. Res. 1008. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the full amount appropriated for the rural electrification program for fiscal 1972 should be made available by the administration to carry out that program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SHOUP:

H.R. 15318. A bill for the relief of Kenneth J. Wolf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 15319. A bill for the relief of Raymond Monroe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE USE OF "MS."

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, since so much attention has been given the use of "Ms." by the women's liberation movement, I think there are many who

would appreciate hearing the other side of the story. I, therefore, bring the following letter I received to my colleagues' attention:

Congressman WILLIAM HUNGATE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HUNGATE: I recently received a letter from your office and one from you. Thanks so much for responding. Now (with tongue in cheek) I have a bone to pick with you.

You are one up on me on the Women's Lib movement, addressing my letter as Ms. Now I am sure this is a convenience in all the many letters you send out, and is probably a bouquet to your many women constituents.

I really don't care what you call anyone else, in fact it doesn't matter what I am addressed by especially by a letter.

But I wear that Mrs. proudly and feel I have accomplished a heck of a lot with that tacked in front of my name. I feel completely liberated, make no apologies for being fem-