

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, June 6, 1972

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

The Lord stood with me and strengthened me.—II Timothy 4: 17.

Eternal God, our Father, conscious of Thy presence and ready to do Thy will may we face the responsibilities of this day confidently, courageously, and with a complete trust in Thy loving care.

By the fairness of our decisions, by the justice of our acts and by our reliance upon democratic processes may we affirm our faith in the greatness of our Nation.

May no anxiety drain our strength, no fear deplete our energy, and no trouble dim our faith as we face the experiences of these hours.

We pray again that stress and strain and strife may cease among our people, that divisions may disappear and that all may unite in seeking the ways of peace and prosperity for all.

In Thy holy name we pray. 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 with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7088. An act to provide for the establishment of the Tincum National Environmental Center in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes.

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. 3384. An act to amend the Water Resources Planning Act to authorize increased appropriations.

The message also announced that Mr. TUNNEY is appointed as a conferee on the bill (S. 2770) entitled "An Act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act" in lieu of Mr. BAYH, excused.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

MRS. ROSE THOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2067) for the relief of Mrs. Rose Thomas.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

MARIA LUGIA DI GIORGIO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2070) for the relief of Maria Luigia Di Giorgio.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

MRS. ANNA MARIA BALDINI DELA ROSA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3713) for the relief of Mrs. Anna Maria Baldini Dela Rosa.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, by request, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? There was no objection.

CHARLES COLBATH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4310) for the relief of Charles Colbath.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? There was no objection.

MRS. CARMEN PRADO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6108) for the relief of Mrs. Carmen Prado.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

RENE PAULO ROHDEN-SOBRINHO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5181) for the relief of Rene Paulo Rohden-Sobrinho.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? There was no objection.

CATHERINE E. SPELL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7312) for the relief of Catherine E. Spell.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? There was no objection.

DONALD L. BULMER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1994) for the relief of Donald L. Bulmer.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

MRS. MARINA MUNOZ DE WYSS (NEE LOPEZ)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5579) for the relief of Mrs. Marina Munoz de Wyss (nee Lopez).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? There was no objection.

CARMEN MARIA PENA-GARCANO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6342) for the relief of Carmen Maria Pena-Garcano.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? There was no objection.

WILLIAM H. NICKERSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4064) for the relief of William H. Nickerson.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? There was no objection.

ANTONIO BENAVIDES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2394) for the relief of Antonio Benavides.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? There was no objection.

MRS. CONCEPCION GARCIA BALAURO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2703) for the relief of Mrs. Concepcion Garcia Balauro.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

ALBINA LUCIO Z. MANLUCU

The Clerk called the bill (S. 559) for the relief of Albina Lucio Z. Manlucu.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MARGARIDA ALDORA CORREIA DOS REIS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6504) for the relief of Margarida Aldora Correia dos Reis.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

EMILIA RUFFOLO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10142) for the relief of Emilia Ruffolo.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

JERRY L. CHANCELLOR

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7946) for the relief of Jerry L. Chancellor.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

DONALD P. LARIVIERE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8952) for the relief of Donald P. Lariviere.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MR. AND MRS. JOHN F. FUENTES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11045) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John F. Fuentes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ARLINE LOADER AND MAURICE LOADER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 341) for the relief of Arline Loader and Maurice Loader.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MARIA BADALAMENTI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 513) for the relief of Maria Badalamenti.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

FREDI ROBERT DREILICH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2725) for the relief of Fredi Robert Dreilich.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

DENNIS YIANTOS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 65) for the relief of Dennis Yiantos.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MARIA ROSA MARTINS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5158) for the relief of Maria Rosa Martins.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 5158

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Rosa Martins shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(25) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Rosa Martins may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provision of that Act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That a suitable and proper bond or

undertaking, approved by the Attorney General be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

PERMISSION FOR THE COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

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

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

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION OF POSTMASTER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Postmaster of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
May 16, 1972.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On June 30th, I am retiring after forty and one half years on Capitol Hill, and therefore tender my resignation as an Officer of the United States House of Representatives effective June 30th.

It has been a distinct pleasure to have served under your leadership as Speaker and please accept my sincere gratitude for your many courtesies and best wishes for your continuing success. This body will always have a very special place in my memories and it has been a distinct honor and privilege to have served as an Officer of the House for almost eighteen years.

Warmest personal regards and highest esteem,

Sincerely,

H. H. MORRIS.

WILLIAM H. NICKERSON

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL) has seen fit to object to Private Calendar No. 106, the bill H.R. 4064, for the relief of William H. Nickerson. The official objectors on the minority side, in deference to the Judiciary Committee, had indicated that they were not disposed to make an objection because they had considered the facts in this case of a man in World War II who committed a relatively minor offense of borrowing money which he did not pay back to some of the men in his company, a man who had had a brilliant military record, who was then court-martialed and drummed out of the Army with a dishonorable discharge.

He suffered cruel economic and social hardships as a result of this dishonorable discharge, and was denied for 16

years all Federal and State veteran's benefits because of the dishonorable discharge.

Later on the Army Board for the Correction of Military Records heard his plea to change the record that Nickerson's service was honorable, and gave this man an honorable discharge. All this bill, reported out of the Judiciary Committee after careful consideration and long hearings would do, is give this man \$5,000. He is dying of cancer in a few months and it would seem we could indulge in a little consideration to this man who gallantly served his country.

I do hope my distinguished friend from Missouri will consult with some of his colleagues, including members of the Court of Military Appeals and others knowledgeable in this matter, and will allow the payment to this man who bravely served his country, for all the loss and anguish he has unjustly experienced, the amount he could have recovered in the Court of Claims.

THE MASSACRE AT LYDDA INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT IN TEL AVIV

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, like many of my fellow Americans, I am outraged over the massacre of innocent civilians last week in Tel Aviv.

In the carnage, more than 70 persons were injured and 25 people were killed—including a 3-year-old girl, a leading Israeli scientist, and 12 Christian pilgrims from Puerto Rico on their way to Jerusalem.

Travelers, relatives, bystanders, and employees at the busy Israeli International Airport were hit in the fusillade of gunfire and explosions loosed by the three gunmen who disembarked from a Paris-Rome-Tel Aviv flight and started firing into the crowd.

Such a cowardly deed, directed against innocent victims by hired killers, is one that has hurt the entire world community, and as such, deserves universal condemnation. These acts of fanaticism do not resolve the basic issues, nor do they create a climate conducive to resolving the basic issues.

It is ultimately the responsibility of all nations, including the United States and the Soviet Union, to redouble diplomatic efforts to resolve the Middle East crisis. It is apparent from this most recent terrorist attack that resolution of the Palestinian problem must be an integral part of any negotiated peace settlement—otherwise there will be no permanent security for either Israel or the Arab States.

I urge, therefore, not only that all governments and airlines tighten security over passengers and baggage, with particular emphasis to flights scheduled for arrival in turbulent parts of the world, but that every available forum be utilized to bring to fruition Israeli and Jordanian efforts to settle down conditions in the West Bank and Gaza and to resolve the Palestinian problem. The creation of a mutually tolerable situation in this re-

spect will go a long way toward laying the foundation for a lasting peace in the Middle East.

ARE COMMUNISTS ABOVE THE LAW?

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, apparently there is no way to convict a Communist in the United States whether the charge be murder, conspiracy, or whatever, even when a superior court judge is the victim. The farce which accompanies jury trials for Communists is nothing less than disgusting. Long drawn out trials in which the defense resorts to every known subterfuge and technicality can be counted on to confuse the jury and with the help of planted fellow travelers to secure a hung jury or a verdict of not guilty. Apparently it is now the vogue for jurors to join in the victory celebration after one of these ridiculous miscarriages. It is notable that the world Communist press and their U.S. friends duly record the proceedings as "proper justice." No wonder the American people have lost confidence in the process of justice in the courts of the United States.

THE HIGHER EDUCATION GIFT ACT

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

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, within a few days we are to consider once again a highly controversial and very expensive measure on higher education. Yet more modest proposals which do not involve large cash payments by the Government, but rather would assist the individual citizen to pay his own way, languish in committee without action, so far as I am presently advised.

I refer to H.R. 6115, the Higher Education Gift Act, offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON), of which I am a cosponsor, and H.R. 3610, introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COUGHLIN), which I likewise cosponsor.

The one bill would give a tax credit against Federal income tax for charitable contributions made by the taxpayer to institutions of higher education; the other would give a tax credit for college tuition payments made by the taxpayer.

These are bills with a beneficial purpose and, in my judgment, a basically sound approach, and I urge their early consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the fol-

lowing Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 190]

Abbitt	Gallfianakis	O'Konski
Abernethy	Gallagher	Passman
Abourezk	Gibbons	Pelly
Abzug	Goldwater	Pettis
Andrews,	Gray	Podell
N. Dak.	Green, Pa.	Pryor, Ark.
Ashley	Griffin	Pucinski
Badillo	Griffiths	Railsback
Baring	Grover	Rangel
Bell	Gubser	Robinson, Va.
Biaggi	Gude	Rodino
Bingham	Hagan	Rogers
Blackburn	Halpern	Rooney, N.Y.
Blanton	Harrington	Rousselot
Blatnik	Harsha	Roybal
Boland	Hastings	Runnels
Brasco	Hathaway	Ryan
Broomfield	Hawkins	Sandman
Brown, Ohio	Hebert	Sarbanes
Burton	Helstoski	Scheuer
Byrne, Pa.	Holifield	Schmitz
Caffery	Howard	Shoup
Chappell	Karth	Springer
Chisholm	Keating	Stanton,
Clancy	Kemp	James V.
Clark	Kyros	Stubblefield
Clawson, Del.	Leggett	Stuckey
Clay	Lloyd	Talcott
Collins, Ill.	Long, La.	Teague, Calif.
Conyers	Lujan	Teague, Tex.
Daniels, N.J.	McClary	Thompson, N.J.
Danielson	McCloskey	Van Derlin
Davis, Wis.	McDonald,	Vanik
DeLums	Mich.	Veysey
Denholm	McKinney	Waldie
Dent	McMillan	Whitten
Diggs	Macdonald,	Wilson, Bob
Dowdy	Mass.	Wilson,
Dulski	Metcalfe	Charles H.
du Pont	Miller, Calif.	Wright
Edwards, Calif.	Minish	Wylder
Esch	Mizell	Zion
Eshleman	Nix	
Frelinghuysen	O'Hara	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 307 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 11417, AMENDMENTS TO THE RAIL PASSENGER SERVICE ACT OF 1970

Mr. STAGGERS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 11417) to amend the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 to provide financial assistance to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation for the purpose of purchasing railroad equipment, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 92-1111)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11417) to amend the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 to provide financial assistance to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation for the purpose of purchasing railroad equipment, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the House bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

That (a) section 303(d) of the Rail Passenger Act of 1970 (45 U.S.C. 543(d)) is amended by inserting immediately after the second sentence thereof the following new sentence: "No officer 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 of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation on the date of enactment of this Act shall have his rate of compensation as such officer reduced solely by reason of the enactment of the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section: *Provided, however*, That compensation to any officer of the Corporation in excess of level I of the Executive Schedule, shall be paid only from net profits of the Corporation.

Sec. 2. Section 305 of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 (45 U.S.C. 545) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" immediately before the first sentence thereof;

(2) by inserting immediately after the second sentence thereof the following: "Insofar as practicable, the Corporation shall directly operate and control all aspects of its rail passenger service."; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) The Corporation shall take such actions as may be necessary to increase its revenues from the carriage of mail and express. The Corporation is authorized and directed to acquire the equipment or modify existing equipment for the efficient carriage of mail and express. Upon request by the Corporation, Federal departments and agencies shall, consistent with the provisions of existing law, provide such assistance as may be necessary in carrying out the purposes of this subsection."

Sec. 3. (a) Section 306(a) of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 (45 U.S.C. 546(a)) is amended by striking out "all provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act" and inserting in lieu thereof "all provisions, including the provisions of section 22(1), of the Interstate Commerce Act".

(b) Section 306 of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 (45 U.S.C. 546) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(f) All departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government shall, in authorizing travel in the continental United States for their employees or for members of the Armed Forces or commissioned services, treat travel by train (whether or not extra fare trains) on the same basis as travel by other authorized modes.

"(g) The Corporation shall be subject to the provisions of section 552 of title 5, United States Code."

Sec. 4. Section 308 of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 (45 U.S.C. 548) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 308. REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS.

"(a) (1) Not later than the eightieth day following the end of each calendar month, the Corporation shall transmit to the Congress and release to the public the following information applicable to its operations for such calendar month:

"(A) Total itemized revenues and expenses.

"(B) Revenues and expenses of each train operated.

"(C) Revenues and total expenses attributable to each railroad over which service is provided.

"(2) Not later than the fiftieth day following the end of each calendar month, the Corporation shall transmit to the Congress and release to the public the following information applicable to its operations for such calendar month:

"(A) The average number of passengers per day on board each train operated.

"(B) The on-time performance at the final destination of each train operated, by route and by railroad.

"(b) The Corporation shall transmit to the President and to the Congress by January 15 of each year (beginning with 1973), and at such other times as it deems desirable, a comprehensive and detailed report of its operations, activities, and accomplish-

ments under this Act, including a statement of receipts and expenditures for the preceding year. At the time of its annual report, the Corporation shall submit such legislative recommendations as it deems desirable, including the amount of financial assistance needed for operations and for capital improvements, the manner and form in which the amount of such assistance should be computed, and the sources from which such assistance should be derived.

"(c) The Secretary and the Commission shall transmit to the President and to the Congress by March 15 of each year (beginning with 1974) reports (or, in their discretion, a joint report) on the effectiveness of this Act in meeting the requirements for a balanced national transportation system, together with any legislative recommendations."

Sec. 5. Section 402 of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 (45 U.S.C. 562) is amended—

(1) by inserting "within ninety days after application by the Corporation," immediately after "Interstate Commerce Commission shall," in the second sentence of subsection (a); and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) To facilitate such operations by the Corporation as may be deemed by it to be necessary in an emergency, the Commission shall, upon application by the Corporation, require a railroad to make immediately available tracks and other facilities for the duration of such emergency. The Commission shall thereafter promptly proceed to fix such terms and conditions as are just and reasonable including indemnification of the railroad by the Corporation against any casualty risk to which it may be exposed."

Sec. 6. Section 403(a) of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 (45 U.S.C. 563(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Corporation may provide intercity rail passenger service in excess of that prescribed for the basic system, either within or outside the basic system, where the Corporation, based on its own or available marketing studies or other similar reports or information, determines that experimental or expanded service would be justified, if consistent with prudent management. In determining the establishment of the additional routes, the Corporation shall take into account the current and the estimated future population and economic conditions of the points to be served, the adequacy of alternative modes of transportation available to those points, and the cost of adding the service. The Corporation shall cooperate with State, regional, and local agencies to encourage the use of trains established under this subsection and shall make reasonable efforts to assure high quality of customer services. Any intercity rail passenger service provided under this subsection for a continuous period of two years shall be designated by the Secretary as a part of the basic system."

Sec. 7. (a) Section 405(a) of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 (45 U.S.C. 565(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) A railroad shall provide fair and equitable arrangements to protect the interests of employees, including employees of terminal companies, affected by a discontinuance of intercity rail passenger service whether occurring before, on, or after January 1, 1975. A 'discontinuance of intercity rail passenger service' shall include any discontinuance of service performed by railroad under any facility or service agreement under sections 305 and 402 of this Act pursuant to any modification or termination thereof or an assumption of operations by the Corporation."

(b) Section 405(b) of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 (45 U.S.C. 565(b)) is amended by inserting the following words after the words "affected employees" in the

last sentence thereof: ", including affected terminal employees."

(c) Section 405(c) of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 (45 U.S.C. 565(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Upon commencement of operations in the basic system, the substantive requirements of subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall apply to the Corporation and its employees in order to insure the maintenance of the protective arrangements specified in such subsections, except that nothing in this subsection shall be construed to impose upon the Corporation any obligation of a railroad with respect to any right, privilege, or benefit earned by any employee as a result of prior service performed for such railroad. The Secretary of Labor shall certify that affected employees of the Corporation have been provided fair and equitable protection as required by this section within one hundred and eighty days after assumption of operations by the Corporation."

Sec. 8. Section 405 of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 (45 U.S.C. 565) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The Corporation shall take such action as may be necessary to assure that, to the maximum extent practical, any reduced-rate employee eligible to receive free or reduced-rate transportation by railroad on April 30, 1971, under the terms of any policy or agreement in effect on such date will be eligible to receive, provided space is available, free or reduced-rate transportation on any intercity rail passenger service provided by the Corporation under this Act, on terms similar to those available on such date to such railroad employee under such policy or agreement. However, the Corporation may apply to all railroad employees eligible to receive free or reduced-rate transportation under such policies or agreements, a single systemwide schedule of terms determined by the Corporation to reflect terms applicable to the majority of such employees under those policies or agreements in effect on April 30, 1971. The Corporation shall be reimbursed by the railroads by way of payment or offset for such costs as may be incurred in providing transportation services to railroad employees under any policy or agreement referred to in the first sentence of this subsection, including the costs of implementing and administering this section. Within ninety days after the enactment of this sentence, each railroad shall enter into an agreement with the Corporation for the payment of such expenses. If the Corporation and a railroad are unable to agree as to the amount of any payment owed by the railroad under this subsection, the matter shall be referred to the Commission for decision. The Commission, upon investigation, shall decide the issue within ninety days following the date of referral, and its decision shall be binding on both parties. If any railroad company which operates intercity passenger service not under contract with the Corporation notifies the Corporation and railroads which have entered into the agreement specified above that it will accept the terms of the systemwide schedule of terms and the compensation specified in the agreements, such railroad company shall be reimbursed for services to railroad employees in accordance with the agreements. As used in this subsection, the term 'railroad employee' means (1) an active full-time employee, including any such employee during a period of furlough or while on leave of absence, of a railroad or terminal company, (2) a retired employee of a railroad or terminal company, and (3) the dependents of any employee referred to in clause (1) or (2) of this sentence."

Sec. 9. Section 601 of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 (45 U.S.C. 601) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 601. FEDERAL GRANTS.

"(a) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary in fiscal year 1971, \$40,000,000, and in subsequent fiscal years a total of \$225,000,000, these amounts to remain available until expended, for payment, pursuant to terms and conditions prescribed by the Secretary, to the Corporation for the purpose of assisting in—

"(1) the initial organization and operation of the Corporation;

"(2) the establishment of improved reservations systems and advertising;

"(3) servicing, maintenance, repair, and rehabilitation of railroad passenger equipment;

"(4) the conduct of research and development and demonstration programs respecting new rail passenger services;

"(5) the development and demonstration of improved rolling stock;

"(6) essential fixed facilities for the operation of passenger trains on lines and routes included in the basic system over which no through passenger trains are being operated at the time of enactment of this Act, including necessary track connections between lines of the same or different railroads;

"(7) the purchase or lease by the Corporation of railroad rolling stock; and

"(8) other corporate purposes.

"(b) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary \$2,000,000 annually, for payment, pursuant to terms and conditions prescribed by the Secretary, to the Corporation for the purpose of assisting in the development and operation of international rail passenger services between the United States and Canada and between the United States and Mexico. Such international rail passenger services shall include intercity rail passenger service between points within the United States and—

"(1) Montreal, Canada;

"(2) Vancouver, Canada; and

"(3) Nuevo Laredo, Mexico.

For the purposes of section 404(b) of this Act, international rail passenger services provided under this subsection shall be deemed to be included within the basic system."

Sec. 10. (a) Section 602 of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 (45 U.S.C. 602) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 602. GUARANTEE OF LOANS.

"(a) The Secretary is authorized, on such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to guarantee any lender against loss of principal and interest on securities, obligations, or loans (including refinancings thereof) issued to finance the upgrading of roadbeds and the purchase by the Corporation or any agency of new rolling stock, rehabilitation of existing rolling stock, reservation systems, switch and signal systems, and other capital equipment and facilities necessary for the improvement of rail passenger service. The maturity date of such securities, obligations, or loans, including all extensions and renewals thereof, shall not be later than twenty years from their date of issuance.

"(b) All guarantees entered into by the Secretary under this section shall constitute general obligations of the United States of America backed by the full faith and credit of the Government of the United States of America.

"(c) Any guarantee made by the Secretary under this section shall not be terminated, canceled or otherwise revoked; shall be conclusive evidence that such guarantee complies fully with the provisions of this Act and of the approval and legality of the principal amount, interest rate, and all other terms of the securities, obligations, or loans and of the guarantee; and shall be valid and incontestable in the hands of a holder of a guaranteed security, obligation, or loan, except for fraud or material misrepresentation on the part of such holder.

"(d) The aggregate unpaid principal

amount of securities, obligations, or loans outstanding at any one time which are guaranteed by the Secretary under this section—

"(1) may not exceed \$150,000,000 before July 1, 1973, and

"(2) may not exceed \$200,000,000 after June 30, 1973.

The Secretary shall prescribe and collect a reasonable annual guaranty fee.

"(e) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such amounts, to remain available until expended, as are necessary to discharge all his responsibilities under this section.

"(f) If at any time the moneys available to the Secretary are insufficient to enable him to discharge his responsibilities under guarantees issued by him under subsection (a) of this section, he shall issue to the Secretary of the Treasury notes or other obligations in such forms and denominations, bearing such maturities and subject to such terms and conditions, as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. Redemption of such notes or obligations shall be made by the Secretary from appropriations available under subsection (e) of this section. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities during the month preceding the issuance of such notes or other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury shall purchase any notes or other obligations issued hereunder and for that purpose he is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchase of such notes or obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations as acquired by him under this subsection. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States."

"(b) Section 602 (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f) of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970, as amended by subsection (a) of this section shall also apply to guarantees made by the Secretary prior to the enactment of this Act. The amendment of section 602(a) shall not affect the legality of guarantees made by the Secretary prior to the enactment of this Act, but such guarantees shall continue in effect until discharged by payment of the loan guaranteed, together with interest, after such date.

Sec. 11. Section 805 of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 (45 U.S.C. 644) is amended—

(1) by inserting "AND CERTAIN RAILROADS" immediately before the period at the end of the section heading; and

(2) by redesignating paragraph (B) of subsection (2) as paragraph (C) and inserting immediately after paragraph (A) the following new paragraph:

"(B) To the extent the Comptroller General deems necessary in connection with audits as he may make of the financial transactions of the Corporation pursuant to paragraph (A) of this subsection, his representatives shall have access to all books, accounts, records, reports, files, and other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by any railroad with which the Corporation has entered into a contract for the performance of intercity rail passenger service, pertaining to such railroad's financial transactions and necessary to facilitate the audit, and such representatives shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by deposi-

ries, fiscal agents, and custodians. All such books, accounts, records, reports, files, papers, and property of such railroad shall remain in the possession and custody of the railroad."

Sec. 12. Title VIII of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 (45 U.S.C. 641-644) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 806. REPORT BY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION

"(a) The Secretary shall, on or before March 15, 1973, transmit to the Congress a comprehensive report on the effectiveness of this Act in achieving and promoting intercity rail passenger service and on the effectiveness of the Corporation in implementing the purposes of this Act. Such report shall include an evaluation by the Secretary of the intercity rail passenger service operations assumed by the Corporation including, but not limited to, adequacy and effectiveness of services, on-time performance, reservations and ticketing, scheduling, equipment fare structures, routes, and immediate and long-term financial needs.

"(b) In addition to the general evaluation and assessment required under subsection (a) of this section, the report by the Secretary shall include—

"(1) recommendations for the orderly assumption by the Corporation of the operation and control of all aspects of its intercity rail passenger service, including the performance by the Corporation of all full-time functions solely related to the intercity rail passenger service provided by it under this Act;

"(2) an assessment of whether the board of directors of the Corporation adequately and fairly represents the public who utilize intercity rail passenger services and, if necessary, recommendations for appropriate changes in the composition of such board of directors;

"(3) estimates of potential revenues for the Corporation from the transportation of mail and express on intercity passenger trains;

"(4) a detailed analysis of the on-time performance of intercity rail passenger service operations assumed by the Corporation, together with such recommendations as the Secretary may deem advisable to eliminate delays in such intercity rail passenger service operations caused by freight train operations;

"(5) recommendations with respect to the establishment of the optimum intercity rail passenger service system as soon as possible after July 1, 1973, taking into account economic feasibility, requirements as to public convenience and necessity, and the ability of the Corporation to provide adequate service over the total system, which optimum system shall include recommended routes and discontinuances; and

"(6) recommendations with respect to the improvement of tracks and roadbeds on routes over which the Corporation operates intercity passenger trains.

"(c) Such report shall contain such additional recommendations as the Secretary may deem advisable to assist the Corporation in carrying out the purposes of this Act, including recommendations for legislative enactments or administrative actions which would enable the Corporation, after July 1, 1973, to discontinue more rapidly and efficiently those routes which do not meet the criteria recommended by the Secretary for the establishment of the optimum intercity rail passenger service system.

"(d) In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Secretary may use available services and facilities of other departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government with their consent and on a reimbursable basis.

"(e) Departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government shall exercise their powers, duties, and functions

in such manner as will assist in carrying out the provisions of this section."

SEC. 13. The amendments made by this Act shall be effective upon enactment.

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to title of the House bill and agree to the same.

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,

JOHN JARMAN,

JOHN D. DINGELL,

WILLIAM L. SPRINGER,

SAMUEL DEVINE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,

VANCE HARTKE,

ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,

J. GLENN BEALL,

LOWELL P. WEICKER,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11417) to amend the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 to provide financial assistance to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation for the purpose of purchasing railroad equipment, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendments struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text and provided a new title for the House bill, and the House disagreed to the Senate amendments.

The committee of conference recommends that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the House bill, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the text of the House bill and the Senate amendment to the text of the House bill. The committee of conference also recommends that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the House bill.

The differences between the text of the House bill, the Senate amendment thereto, and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below, except for clerical corrections, conforming changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached by the conferees, and minor drafting and clarifying changes.

SALARY LIMITATION

House bill

Subsection (a) of the first section of the House bill amended section 303(d) of existing law (the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970) to provide that no officer of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak) could 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 (currently \$60,000 per annum).

Subsection (b) of the first section of the House bill stated that the salary limitation imposed by subsection (a) would not operate to reduce the compensation of individuals serving as officers of Amtrak on the date of enactment of this legislation, provided that compensation to any Amtrak officer in excess of level I of the Executive Schedule must be paid only from net profits of Amtrak.

Senate amendment

The first section of the Senate amendment imposed the same salary limitation on Amtrak officers as that contained in the House bill. The Senate amendment neither specifically exempted individuals serving as officers of Amtrak on the date of enactment of this

legislation from the application of such salary limitation nor permitted payment of compensation in excess of \$60,000 from net profits of Amtrak.

Conference substitute

The conference substitute is the same as the House bill. The conferees agreed that the provision relating to excess salary payments from net profits of Amtrak is not intended to serve as an incentive to discontinue any part of the nationwide system of intercity passenger service for the purpose of creating such net profits for Amtrak.

AMTRAK OPERATIONS

House bill

No provision.

Senate amendment

Section 2 of the Senate amendment amended section 305 of existing law to require that Amtrak directly operate and control all aspects of its rail passenger service, insofar as practicable.

Conference substitute

The conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

MAIL AND EXPRESS

House bill

Section 2 of the House bill amended section 305 of existing law to require Amtrak to take such steps as may be necessary to increase its revenues from the carriage of mail and express. Amtrak was authorized and directed to acquire or modify existing equipment for such purpose. Federal departments and agencies, upon request by Amtrak and consistent with provisions of existing law, were required to provide assistance as necessary to carry out the purposes of this amendment.

Senate amendment

Section 5 of the Senate amendment amended section 308 of existing law to require Amtrak to prepare and submit, on or before November 1, 1972, a comprehensive report on the potential for transportation of mail and express on intercity passenger trains.

Conference substitute

The conference substitute is the same as the House bill.

FREE OR REDUCED-RATE TRANSPORTATION FOR ATTENDANTS FOR THE BLIND

House bill

Section 3(a) of the House bill amended section 306(a) of existing law to include a specific reference to section 22(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act as one of the provisions of that Act under which Amtrak is deemed to be a common carrier by railroad. Such section 22(1) authorizes common carriers by railroad to provide free or reduced-rate transportation to certain classes, including seeing-eye dogs or other attendants for the blind.

Senate amendment

No provision.

Conference substitute

The conference substitute is the same as the House bill. The conferees agreed that the provision permitting Amtrak to continue the policy followed by common carriers by railroad of providing free or reduced-rate transportation to certain classes, including seeing-eye dogs and other attendants for the blind, does not alter in any way the provisions of section 306(a) of existing law such as that specifically exempting Amtrak from the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act pertaining to regulation of rates, fares, and charges.

GOVERNMENT TRAVEL

House bill

Section 3(b) of the House bill amended section 306 of existing law to add a new subsection requiring all Federal departments and

agencies, including the Armed Services, to treat travel by train on the same basis as other authorized modes of travel when authorizing travel in the continental United States for their employees or for members of the Armed Forces.

Senate amendment

No provision.

Conference substitute

The conference substitute is the same as the House bill.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

House bill

No provision.

Senate amendment

Section 3 of the Senate amendment amended section 306 of existing law to add a new subsection providing that Amtrak be subject to the provisions of section 552 of title 5, United States Code, the so-called "Freedom of Information Act", which requires that certain information relating to descriptions of organization, policy statements, and other matters be made available to the public.

Conference substitute

The conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

REPORTS

House bill

Section 4 of the House bill amended section 308 of existing law to require Amtrak to make detailed monthly reports to the Congress and to the public with respect to revenues and expenses, patronage, and on-time performance of Amtrak trains and operations. In addition, this section provided that, beginning in 1973, Amtrak must make its annual report on January 15 of each year and, beginning in 1974, the Secretary of Transportation and the Interstate Commerce Commission must make their annual reports by March 15 of each year. Existing law provides that these annual reports must be made on the anniversary of the enactment of existing law, which was October 30, 1970. This section also provided that the Secretary and the Commission could, in their discretion, file a joint report.

Senate amendment

Section 4 of the Senate amendment also amended section 308 of existing law to require Amtrak to make detailed monthly reports to the Congress and to the public with respect to revenues and expenses, patronage, and on-time performance of Amtrak trains and operations. The Senate amendment neither altered the annual reporting dates for Amtrak, the Secretary of Transportation, and the Interstate Commerce Commission, nor permitted the Secretary and the Commission to file a joint report.

Conference substitute

The conference substitute is the same as the House bill.

AMTRAK USE OF TRACKS AND FACILITIES

House bill

No provision.

Senate amendment

Section 6 of the Senate amendment amended section 402(a) of existing law to require the Interstate Commerce Commission to act within 90 days on application by Amtrak to fix reasonable terms and conditions for the use of tracks and other facilities of railroads to carry out the purposes of existing law.

Conference substitute

The conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

EMERGENCY OPERATIONS

House bill

Section 5 of the House bill amended section 402(b) of existing law to provide that the Interstate Commerce Commission require

a railroad to make its tracks and other facilities immediately available for Amtrak operations when Amtrak deems such action to be necessary in an emergency and makes application to the Commission. The Commission would be required to act promptly to fix just and reasonable terms and conditions, including indemnification of the railroad by Amtrak against any casualty risk to which the railroad may be exposed.

Senate amendment

No provision.

Conference substitute

The conference substitute contains provisions identical with those contained in the House bill except that the conference substitute adds a new subsection (c) to section 402 of existing law to deal expressly with emergency operations and leaves the existing section 402(b) unchanged. The existing section 402(b) contains similar provisions relating to the availability of tracks and facilities of railroads "to facilitate the initiation of operations by the Corporation within the basic system". The conferees agreed to leave the existing section 402(b) unchanged to cover the situation where Amtrak may initiate operations within the basic system.

EXPERIMENTAL SERVICE

House bill

No provision.

Senate amendment

Section 7 of the Senate amendment amended section 403(a) of existing law, relating to the authority of Amtrak to provide service beyond the basic system, to authorize experimental or expanded service where justified on the basis of marketing studies or similar information. In the establishment of additional routes, Amtrak would be required to take into account current and estimated future population and economic conditions of points to be served, adequacy of alternative modes of transportation available to such points, and cost of adding the service. Amtrak would also be required to make reasonable efforts to assure high quality of customer service and to cooperate with State and local agencies to encourage use of the service.

Conference substitute

The conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

LABOR PROTECTION

House bill

No provision.

Senate amendment

Section 8 of the Senate amendment amended section 405 of existing law, relating to labor protective arrangements for employees affected by a discontinuance. Under the Senate amendment, employees of terminal companies are specifically included among employees to be accorded labor protective arrangements under existing law. The Senate amendment also defines a "discontinuance of intercity rail passenger service" to include any discontinuance of service performed by a railroad under any agreement with Amtrak or pursuant to any modification or termination thereof or an assumption of operations by Amtrak.

The Senate amendment also amends section 405(c) of existing law to provide that Amtrak is required to provide fair and equitable arrangements to protect its employees affected by a discontinuance. The amendment to section 405(c) of existing law contains an exception which provides that nothing in such section 405(c) shall be construed to impose upon Amtrak any obligation of a railroad with respect to any right, privilege, or benefit earned by any employee as a result of prior service performed for such railroad.

The amendment to section 405(c) of existing law further provides that the Secretary of Labor is required to certify, within 180

days after any assumption of operations by Amtrak, that employees of Amtrak affected by a discontinuance have been provided the required labor protective arrangements.

Conference substitute

The conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

PASS PRIVILEGES

House bill

Section 6 of the House bill added a new subsection (f) to section 405 of existing law requiring Amtrak to take such action as may be necessary to assure, to the maximum extent practicable and on a space-available basis, that railroad employees, as defined in the new subsection, will be eligible to receive free or reduced-rate transportation on terms not less favorable than those available for such employees under the terms of any policy or agreement in effect on April 30, 1971, when Amtrak began operating intercity passenger service. Amtrak was required to be reimbursed by the railroads for furnishing such service. The term "railroad employee" was defined to include existing and retired employees of railroads and terminal companies and their dependents.

Senate amendment

Section 9 of the Senate amendment also added a new subsection (f) to section 405 of existing law requiring Amtrak to grant free or reduced-rate transportation, on a space-available basis, to active or retired railroad employees and their dependents who were eligible for such privileges on April 30, 1971.

The Senate amendment differed from the House bill in the following respects:

First, Amtrak was required to furnish transportation on terms "similar to" those in effect on April 30, 1971, rather than on terms "not less favorable than" those in effect on such date as under the House bill.

Second, Amtrak was permitted to apply a single systemwide schedule of terms to the furnishing of such transportation, which terms would be determined by Amtrak to reflect the terms applicable to a majority of railroad employees on April 30, 1971.

Third, the Senate amendment specifically provided that the railroads would reimburse Amtrak for "such costs as may be incurred" in providing such transportation. The House bill provided that the railroads reimburse Amtrak "for providing transportation services" to employees.

Fourth, the Senate amendment required each railroad to enter into an agreement with Amtrak within 90 days after enactment of this legislation providing for payments to Amtrak by the railroad and, if Amtrak and the railroad could not agree on the amount of any payment owed by the railroad, the matter would be referred to the Interstate Commerce Commission, which would be required to render a decision within 90 days after such referral and such decision would be binding on both Amtrak and the railroad.

Fifth, the Senate amendment provided that, if any railroad operating passenger service (not under contract with Amtrak) notified Amtrak and the railroads with which Amtrak has entered into agreements described in the preceding paragraph that such railroad would accept the systemwide schedule specified in such agreements, then such railroad would be reimbursed for providing free or reduced-rate transportation services to railroad employees in accordance with such agreements.

Sixth, the Senate amendment contained a definition of "railroad employee" similar to that contained in the House bill, except that it specifically provided that an active full-time employee included any such employee while on furlough or leave of absence.

Conference substitute

The conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

FEDERAL GRANTS

House bill

Section 7 of the House bill amended section 601 of existing law, relating to direct Federal grants to Amtrak, to authorize the appropriation of \$170 million (in addition to the \$40 million previously authorized for fiscal year 1971) for the purpose of making grants to Amtrak to assist it in (1) the initial organization and operation of Amtrak; (2) the establishment of improved reservations systems and advertising; (3) servicing, maintenance, repair, and rehabilitation of railroad passenger equipment; (4) the conduct of research and development and demonstration programs respecting new rail passenger services; (5) the development and demonstration of improved rolling stock; (6) essential fixed facilities for the operation of passenger trains on lines and routes included in the basic system over which no through passenger trains were being operated at the time of enactment of existing law, including necessary track connections between lines of the same or different railroads; (7) the purchase or lease by Amtrak of railroad rolling stock; and (8) other corporate purposes. Under the House bill, of the total funds from all sources available to Amtrak prior to July 1, 1973, \$147.5 million could be expended only for the capital expenditures enumerated in clauses (3) through (7) above.

The House bill also authorized the appropriation of \$2 million annually for grants to Amtrak for the purpose of assisting in the establishment of three international routes between points within the United States and Montreal and Vancouver, Canada, and Nuevo Laredo, Mexico.

Senate amendment

Section 10 of the Senate amendment also amended section 601 of existing law, relating to direct Federal grants to Amtrak. It authorized the appropriation of \$270 million (in addition to the \$40 million previously authorized for fiscal year 1971) for the purpose of making grants to Amtrak to assist it in carrying out the same activities enumerated under the discussion of the House bill above. It also authorized the appropriation of \$2 million annually to assist in the establishment of the same three international routes described above under the discussion of the House bill.

The Senate amendment did not contain the limitation contained in the House bill providing that of the total funds from all sources available to Amtrak prior to July 1, 1973, \$147.5 million could be expended only for certain enumerated capital expenditures. Section 11 of the Senate amendment, discussed below in connection with the loan guarantee authority, limited the expenditure of the proceeds of loans guaranteed in the future to certain enumerated capital expenditures.

This provision of the Senate amendment also authorized the appropriation of \$15 million, to remain available until expended, for grants to Amtrak to assist in the development of experimental service in accordance with the amended section 403(a) of existing law.

Conference substitute

The conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment except that—

(1) the authorization for grants to Amtrak under the revised section 601(a) is reduced from \$270 million to \$225 million; and

(2) the authorization of \$15 million in grants to assist Amtrak in the development of experimental service is omitted.

GUARANTEE OF LOANS

House bill

Section 8 of the House bill amended section 602 of existing law, relating to the guarantee of loans made to Amtrak, to provide that the Secretary of Transportation

could guarantee any lender against loss of principal or interest on loans (including refinancing thereof) for the upgrading of roadbeds, the purchase of new rolling stock, rehabilitation of existing rolling stock, and "for other corporate or related purposes." All such guarantees would constitute general obligations of the United States backed by the full faith and credit of the Government. No such guarantee could be terminated or otherwise revoked, except for fraud or material misrepresentation on the part of a holder. The aggregate unpaid principal amount of loans outstanding at any one time could not exceed \$100 million. Appropriations were authorized of "such amounts as are necessary" to enable the Secretary to discharge his responsibilities under the loan guarantee section. The Secretary of Transportation was authorized to borrow from the Treasury to honor his obligations in the event of default and notes issued to the Treasury for such purpose would bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, which rate was required to be "not less than" the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities during the month preceding the issuance of such notes.

The House bill also provided that the amendment to existing law described above would apply to guarantees issued under existing law before its enactment.

Senate amendment

Section 11 of the Senate amendment also amended section 602 of existing law, relating to the guarantee of loans made to Amtrak, to provide that the Secretary of Transportation could guarantee any lender against loss of principal or interest on certain loans (including refinancings thereof). Unlike the House bill which permitted the guarantee of loans made for certain specified purposes and "for other corporate or related purposes", the Senate amendment limited the guarantee authority to loans made for the purposes similar to those specified in the House bill plus loans for the purchase of "reservation systems, switch and signal systems, and other capital equipment and facilities necessary for the improvement of rail passenger service". All such guarantees would constitute general obligations of the United States backed by the full faith and credit of the Government. No such guarantee could be terminated or otherwise revoked; would be conclusive evidence that it complied fully with the provisions of existing law and of the approval and legality of the principal amount, interest rate, and all other terms of the guarantee; and would be incontestable in the hands of a holder except for fraud or material misrepresentation on the part of such holder. The aggregate unpaid principal amount of loans outstanding at any one time could not exceed \$250 million. Like the House bill, the Senate amendment authorized appropriations of "such amounts as are necessary" to enable the Secretary to discharge his responsibilities under the loan guarantee section. The Senate amendment also authorized the Secretary of Transportation to borrow from the Treasury to honor his obligation in the event of default, but notes issued to the Treasury for such purpose would bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury "after taking into consideration" the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities during the month preceding the issuance of such notes.

The Senate amendment provided that, except for the amendment to the loan guarantee section of existing law limiting the guarantee authority to loans made to finance certain enumerated capital expenditures, the amendments to the loan guarantee section of existing law would apply to

guarantees issued before enactment of the Senate amendment. It further provided that the portion of the Senate amendment which limited the type of loans which could be guaranteed in the future did not affect the legality of guarantees issued before the enactment of the Senate amendment. Such guarantees would continue in effect until discharged.

Conference substitute

The conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment except that the aggregate amount of loans which may be outstanding at any one time is reduced from \$250 million to \$150 million through June 30, 1973, and thereafter may not exceed \$200 million.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE AUDIT

House bill

Section 9 of the House bill amended section 805 of existing law to authorize the Comptroller General to audit the financial transactions of any railroad with which Amtrak has a contract to perform intercity rail passenger service. Such audit could be made for any fiscal year during which Federal funds were available to finance any portion of Amtrak operations. The Comptroller General would also be required to report to the Congress any financial transaction of the railroad which, in his opinion, adversely affects the financial condition of the railroad or lessens its ability to perform services under its agreement with Amtrak. Copies of each report were required to be furnished to Amtrak and to the Secretary of Transportation.

Senate amendment

Section 12 of the Senate amendment also amended section 805 of existing law to authorize the Comptroller General to audit the financial transactions of any railroad with which Amtrak has a contract to perform intercity rail passenger service, but such authority was limited to an audit of the financial transactions of such railroad deemed necessary by the Comptroller General to facilitate an audit of the financial transactions of Amtrak for any fiscal year during which Federal funds were available to finance any portion of its operations.

Conference substitute

The conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

REPORT BY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION

House bill

Section 10 of the House bill added a new section 806 to existing law requiring the Secretary of Transportation to transmit to the Congress, on or before March 15, 1973, a comprehensive report on the effectiveness of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970, the effectiveness of Amtrak in implementing that Act, and an evaluation of the adequacy and effectiveness of services, on-time performance, reservations and ticketing, scheduling, equipment, fare structures, routes, and immediate and long-term financial needs. The Secretary was also required to report on recommendations concerning (1) the orderly assumption by Amtrak of the operation and control of all aspects of intercity rail passenger service; (2) specific changes in work rules deemed advisable for efficient and economical operations by Amtrak, including excessive manning requirements, daily compensation rates, and the development of appropriate protective measures for rail employees adversely affected by any such changes in work rules; (3) an assessment of whether the board of directors of Amtrak adequately and fairly represents the members of the public; (4) estimates of potential revenues from the transportation of mail and express; (5) a detailed analysis of on-time performances together with recommendations to eliminate those delays caused by freight train operation; (6) recommenda-

tions with respect to the establishment of the optimum intercity rail passenger service system as soon as possible after July 1, 1973, taking into account economic feasibility, requirements as to public convenience and necessity, the ability of Amtrak to provide adequate service over the total system, which optimum system was required to include recommended routes and discontinuances; and (7) recommendations as to improvements of tracks and roadbeds.

The report was required to contain legislative and other recommendations which would enable Amtrak to discontinue more rapidly and efficiently those routes not meeting the criteria recommended by the Secretary for the establishment of the optimum intercity rail passenger system.

In carrying out this provision, the Secretary was authorized to use services and facilities of other Federal agencies with their consent and on a reimbursable basis. Other Federal agencies were required to assist in carrying out this provision.

Senate amendment

No provision.

Conference substitute

The conference substitute is the same as the House bill except that the requirement that the Secretary of Transportation report on recommendations concerning changes in work rules is omitted.

URBAN CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

House bill

No provision.

Senate amendment

Section 14 of the Senate amendment added two new sections (sections 603 and 604) to title VI of existing law, relating to Federal financial assistance to Amtrak.

The new section 603 authorized the appropriation of not to exceed \$50 million, to remain available until expended, for the purpose of enabling the Secretary of Transportation to make loans to Amtrak for the development, improvement, and construction of rights-of-way, terminals, and vehicles to be used for intercity transportation along fixed guideways within urban corridors. Such loans were required to be made in conformance with comprehensive regional transportation plans made in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, Amtrak, and the Governors and to the extent practical, elected representatives from standard metropolitan statistical areas within the region. In allocating loans to Amtrak, the Secretary would be required to consider the potential revenue to be generated by the planned improvements and the numbers of passengers to be served.

The new section 604 authorized the Secretary of Transportation to guarantee any lender against loss of principal or interest on loans to finance urban corridor improvements described above in the discussion of the new section 603. Guarantees were required to be made in conformance with regional transportation plans and the Secretary was required to consider potential revenue and the numbers of passengers served, in the same manner as in the case of direct loans made by the Secretary under the new section 603. The maturity date of guaranteed loans could not be more than 25 years from their date of issuance; the amount of guaranteed loans outstanding at any one time could not exceed \$50 million; and the cumulative amount of such loans could not exceed \$100 million. Appropriations were authorized in such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the loan guarantee section.

Section 13 of the Senate amendment amended section 102 of existing law to define the term "urban corridor" to mean a densely populated area containing a series of two or more standard metropolitan statistical areas not more than 500 miles apart.

Conference substitute

The provisions of the Senate amendment relating to urban corridor improvements are omitted from the conference substitute.

*EFFECTIVE DATE**House bill*

No provision.

Senate amendment

Section 15 of the Senate amendment provided that the amendments to existing law made by the Senate amendment would be effective upon enactment.

Conference substitute

The conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
JOHN JAEMAN,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
WILLIAM L. SPRINGER,
SAMUEL DEVINE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
VANCE HARTKE,
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
J. GLENN BEALL,
LOWELL P. WEICKER,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15259) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to not to exceed 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 15259, with Mr. FASCELL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at this time we submit for your approval the annual District of

Columbia appropriation bill for fiscal year 1973.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia Budget, it is a distinct honor for me to serve with Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin; Mr. CHAIMO of Connecticut; Mr. SCHERLE, of Iowa; Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas; Mr. McEWEN of New York; Mr. OBEY of Wisconsin; Mr. MYERS, of Indiana; Mr. STOKES of Ohio; and Mr. McKAY of Utah. We are fortunate to have Earl C. Silsby and Americo S. Miconi as our staff assistants.

For the ninth consecutive year the Congress has been presented a budget for the District of Columbia that is out of balance. We submit to the House of Representatives a balanced budget.

For fiscal year 1973 we recommend a budget of \$875,662,000 for the District of Columbia; \$716,124,000 of this amount is for operating expenses, \$28,144,000 for debt service, and \$131,394,000 for capital outlay.

It is estimated that a total of \$1,179,369,200 will be available to the District government during the fiscal year 1973. This amount includes the appropriation of \$875,662,000 in District of Columbia funds which we recommend today, and Federal grants totaling \$291,924,800 and \$11,782,400 from reimbursements from Federal or other sources and from private donations. The census for 1970 showed that we had 756,510 people in the city of Washington and by estimate today the total population for our Nation's Capital is 741,000. This shows a loss of 15,510 since the census was completed in 1970. A city with 741,000 certainly should be operated in an excellent manner with the sum of \$1,179,369,200 available.

The amount requested for fiscal year 1973 was \$900,888,000. The recommendation that we submit today reduces the amount requested \$25,226,000; \$18,536,000 of this amount is in capital outlay and \$6,690,000 is in operating expenses. For fiscal year 1972 the total amount appropriated was \$1,014,230,700. Our committee has reduced Federal fund requests \$11,000,000. In order to present a balanced budget a number of adjustments and necessary actions had to take place to bring the budget into balance. A revenue gap of \$12,300,000 in the budget submitted by the Commissioner to the City Council required action by the Council to raise the property tax rate as well as water and sewer charges. The Council by resolution on May 16, 1972, committed itself to increase the real property tax rate by 12 cents for each \$100 of assessed valuation which will raise \$4.8 million for the general fund as well as increasing the water and sewer charges to produce another \$5.1 million. The committee has included these estimated additional revenues in arriving at the amounts recommended. The increase in real estate taxes will then increase the tax from \$3.20 per hundred to \$3.32 per hundred. The total, of course, is still not high when you compare the amounts from the 50 States.

The budget as submitted which appeared to be in balance and was so testified to by the city officials assumed that Congress would appropriate \$4 million

in the second supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1972 which would not be expended during the fiscal year 1972 but would be carried over into the 1973 budget which to that extent would place the budget in balance. Another action to balance the proposed budget transferred the financing of a number of items currently within the general fund to the highway fund. Our committee questioned the legality of these transfers which totaled \$9,515,800 and requested the Commissioner to secure a ruling from the Corporation Counsel as to the propriety of the transfers in funding. It was found that the bulk of the transfers \$8,231,000 are proper, and that \$1,284,800 are not, and our committee relied upon the finding of the Corporation Counsel and has transferred the questionable items totaling \$1,284,800 back to the general fund which created a deficit of \$310,000 in the proposed budget for that account. Before the hearings were concluded, the city officials agreed that the budget as submitted was out of balance and made every effort to work with the committee to see that the budget was placed in balance.

Our committee recommends the appropriation of \$185,000,000 to the general fund as the 1973 payment by the United States toward defraying expenses of the government of the District of Columbia. A total of \$190,000,000 was authorized for 1973 in the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1971 (Public Law 92-196) and the amount requested in the budget totaled \$190,000,000. In addition, the committee also recommends \$4,074,000 as requested as payment for water and sewer services rendered the Federal establishment. The additional Federal payment to the general fund of \$11,346,000 over the 1972 amount has been approved to partially finance a net increase of \$53,750,000 over 1972 appropriations for operating expenses and debt service. Over 90 percent of this increase is for mandatory items and staffing of facilities. The remainder of this increase will be financed from additional general and special fund revenue accruing to the District, including the additional amounts that will be derived from the committed increases in the real property tax rate and water and sewer user fees.

In 1963 the Federal payment totaled \$30,000,000. Now we recommend to the House a Federal payment totaling \$185,000,000. The \$185,000,000 figure represents 23.24 percent of the general fund appropriations recommended in this bill. When you add the estimated \$291,924,800 to be received by the District in Federal grant assistance, and the \$11,782,400 in Federal reimbursements and private donations, the percentage, of course, increases.

In its report last year, our committee expressed its increasing concern that Federal assistance money is not being used properly. The committee continues to have this concern and reiterates its statement of last year. There have been instances where Federal grants have been used to carry out programs specifically denied by the Congress. Federal

moneys have been used in some cases to duplicate existing services rather than to supplement existing programs or to close gaps in services now available which results in waste of the city's limited resources. In response to the city government's shortcomings in the use of grant funds, the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1971 contains a requirement for full reporting by District officials within the annual budget transmission of Federal grants-in-aid. Our committee concurs in the desirability of the Congress receiving complete information in this area. The information referred to was furnished the Congress. However, to be more useful to the committee it should be incorporated into the detailed justifications in comparative form effective with the presentation of the fiscal year 1974 budget.

Our committee is also concerned with the apparent lack of controls over Federal grant funds by both the Federal and District governments. Two examples in particular have come to the committee's attention. Apparently, no effort was made to insure that the terms of the Narcotics Treatment Administration contract with the Blackman's Development Center were complied with. Another example is the longtime practice of the District of Columbia Teachers College in depositing Federal grant moneys in a commercial checking account rather than in the Federal Treasury as required by law. Safeguards must be built into the system to maintain a closer surveillance over the use of these Federal grant funds.

The committee has been advised of plans to enter into lease-purchase agreements for the construction of two municipal office buildings on sites adjacent to Judiciary Square. The following statement was presented to the committee by the Director of the Department of General Services:

The District has had plans to centralize its administrative offices in the vicinity of Judiciary Square, the area designated for the seat of the municipal government, but has been unable to obtain the capital funds needed for this purpose, though the principle for this consolidation has been accepted by Congress. We now propose to accomplish this purpose through the authority granted by Congress to enter into lease purchase agreements for the construction of two office buildings on sites now available adjacent to Judiciary Square. The device to accomplish this purpose involves the creation of a non-profit corporation, which would have the authority to raise money by the sale of nontaxable bonds. This nonprofit corporation would then construct the buildings and lease them to the District of Columbia government for 20 years, at the end of which the District would have possession of the buildings. If these plans are successful, construction on these buildings could start by the end of this calendar year with delivery of the buildings in 2 years. This means that the major portion of the District's administrative offices would be clustered in an efficient municipal complex by the end of calendar year 1974. This action could be accomplished using the rental funds currently in the District of Columbia budget.

The committee does not concur in this proposal. Requests for the construction of public buildings should be presented in the usual way and none of the rental

funds in the accompanying bill are to be used for any lease-purchase agreements.

This committee is greatly concerned about the manner in which the District of Columbia government is carrying out its capital improvements program. This concern is twofold: First, the magnitude of the capital program and projected impact on the District's dollar resources; and, second, weakness in procedures for determining scope of work, initial cost estimates, and the apparent lack of control over cost escalation.

The capital outlay appropriation for fiscal year 1972, including supplemental requests, will exceed \$300 million. As a result the committee recommended a \$150 million level for the District's request for fiscal 1973. However, the problem of payment for these construction projects remains. The committee has continually supported essential public physical facilities for the city. But it is of utmost importance that the District government clearly provide and justify the benefits of such facilities to this committee. This has not always been done.

The deferral of projects to the \$150 million level is desirable not only in terms of ability to pay the overall cost but also to wait until there are some assurances that there is true competitive bidding and construction costs are not out of line.

Each year the District government appears before this committee and speaks of its financial difficulties and describes measures taken to fit the operating budget request within resources available or being sought from the Congress or other sources. Concurrently, the city is describing possible cutbacks in operating programs with the probable reduction to effective delivery of services. At the same time the city proposes an ambitious and extensive capital program that will in the future require a substantial portion of the city's financial needs. This year the District has presented projections of debt service costs for present and planned capital improvements.

The District government's request for repayment of loans and interest associated with its public works projects is \$28 million for fiscal year 1973. An estimated \$75 million from operating expenses will be required annually for this repayment, after borrowing for funds now authorized.

The District government's fiscal years 1973-77 multiyear program and financial plan estimates that debt service will exceed \$130 million for completion of current projects and several new projects planned to be included during this program period. All future capital budget requests submitted to this committee must include the projected cost to the operating budget including the debt service.

Within the framework of the city's total capital improvements program, there are continuing problems of cost escalation on individual projects. The committee is also disturbed by this aspect of the capital program. Total costs often grow at an alarming rate between the time the committee first approves funding for a particular project and the time the project is completed.

We have been told the forces of inflation are largely responsible for increasing costs. Certainly, this is a valid factor. But the committee is not of the opinion that escalation in construction costs have reached the point indicated by some of the project costs considered. A number of the construction requests have been reduced accordingly. The city must develop a better process for building these inflationary pressures into cost estimates and it should shorten the time it now takes to complete a project so that inflationary pressures can be minimized.

During the course of the hearings, we have also been told that the cost increases are due to changes in the scope of the work performed. In effect, the committee is being asked to continue funding for a project that may differ substantially from the project the committee first approved. The Receiving Home for Children, Dunbar Senior High School, Morgue Building, District Courthouse, Glenn Dale Hospital, and the Campsite at Scotland, Md., are examples that show the extent of the problem of cost escalation. Four of these projects are included in the bill, but at lesser amounts than requested. In the instance of the Morgue, \$150,000 has been included for planning purposes, but not for a building costing \$3,016,000. The committee recognizes the need for the facility but not at that cost. The original proposal in 1969 was \$1,850,000.

The committee is concerned with the scope and magnitude of some of the new projects planned. An example is a \$25 million junior-senior high school in the Fort Lincoln New Town. This project was estimated to cost \$50 a square foot and envisioned a nine-story building. The project, which was requested in a supplemental, was subsequently withdrawn pending further study. It appears that all new or modernization and renovation projects for elementary schools include prekindergarten facilities though the Board of Education does not at this time plan a prekindergarten program in all elementary schools. Other features are included in many projects which while desirable could be eliminated in the effort to provide some financial restraint.

The District government must develop the capability to provide cost estimates that are more reliable than the ones now presented to the committee. The city must also improve the process for determining the features to be included in the new structures so that the trend of project scope changes is brought to a halt. Improvements must be made so that the committee will be able to base its decisions on reliable cost and project scope data.

The committee believes that a prerequisite to overcoming the problems in the capital improvements program is the increased centralization of executive level control of the program. This committee looks to the Commissioner to establish better control over the capital improvements program and to insure that the problems pointed out by the committee are corrected.

As has been noted above, construction

funds have been reduced in a number of instances. Construction services requests have also been reduced accordingly. A further reduction has been made to reflect the continuance of the limitation of 10 percent on construction costs for all projects for construction services instead of the increases requested in the general provisions section of the bill.

In the past, funds for construction projects have been requested as supplements, which in most instances do not meet the criteria of being in either an urgent or emergency category. Future capital improvement requests should be limited to the regular budget and the current limitation of \$150,000,000 on the capital outlay program should be continued into fiscal year 1974.

A number of changes were requested in the budget which are not approved. The committee's recommendations are outlined in the paragraphs that follow.

Section 7: The budget proposed deletion of the prohibition on the use of funds for studies by the Public Service Commission regarding meters in taxicabs. The committee recommends that the prohibition be retained. The following appeared in the joint statement accompanying the conference report on the 1972 bill:

In considering the subject of meters in taxicabs the managers on the part of the House and Senate feel that a study of the matter is in order and that such should be conducted by the Legislative Committees on the District of Columbia.

Sections 9 and 16: These sections relate to chauffeurs and the use of official automobiles. The budget proposed restoring automobiles and chauffeurs, including overtime pay, to the Deputy Commissioner and the Chairman of the City Council. The committee recommends that these requests be denied and that only the Commissioner of the District of Columbia be authorized a chauffeur-driven automobile, and that the limitation on the payment of overtime be retained.

Section 13: The budget proposed an increase in the construction services limitation from 10 percent of the construction cost of all projects to 15 percent for projects costing \$1 million or less and 20 percent for permanent improvement type construction projects, and that on projects exceeding \$1,000,000 it would continue at 10 percent. The committee does not recommend approval of the changes proposed.

Section 17: The budget proposed deletion of the limitation of 5 percent of the total of all funds appropriated for personnel compensation for costs of overtime or temporary positions. The committee recommends the limitation be retained.

Section 18: The budget proposed a reduction in the travel and per diem limitation from \$300,000 to \$200,000. The committee concurs.

Section 19: The committee has included a new section in the bill which has the effect of continuing in fiscal year 1973 the personnel ceiling set for 1972 in the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1971. This is a restriction on the maximum number of appropriated positions

that may be filled by the District government. The recommended provision, which relates to both permanent authorized positions and temporary or part-time employees is as follows:

Sec. 19. Appropriations in this act shall not be available, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, for the compensation of any person appointed—

(1) as a full-time employee to a permanent, authorized position in the government of the District of Columbia during any month when the number of such employees is greater than 39,619; or

(2) as a temporary or part-time employee in the government of the District of Columbia during any month in which the number of such employees exceeds the number of such employees for the same month of the preceding fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, we must have freeways, express buses, and a rapid transit system. In order to meet the tremendous day-by-day growth of traffic, the freeway system must be carried out along with the present rapid rail transit system that is now under construction. The Highway Acts of 1968 and 1970 must be complied with. Both systems must proceed together.

President Nixon has emphatically stated time after time that we must have a balanced system of transportation for our Nation's Capital and that the Highway Acts of 1968 and 1970 will be enforced. On August 12, 1969, President Nixon directed the following letter to me:

DEAR BILL: Your diligent efforts through the years to insure that the District of Columbia will enjoy a balanced transportation system are very much appreciated by all of us who are concerned with the welfare of our Capital City. As you know, I have previously expressed my desire that a fair and effective settlement of the issues involved in the transportation controversy be reached to serve the interests of all those concerned—central city dwellers, suburbanites, shoppers, employees and visitors. It is my conviction that those steps necessary for a fair and effective settlement have been taken.

The City Council of the District of Columbia has now voted in favor of a resolution to complete the requirements of a Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968. Immediately thereafter, the Commissioner of the District of Columbia directed the Department of Highways to implement immediately the requirements of the Act. The Secretary of Transportation has directed the Federal Highway Administrator to rescind the letter of his predecessor dated January 17, 1969, thus placing these projects back into the Interstate System. Furthermore, the Federal Highway Administrator has been directed to work closely with the Highway Department of the District of Columbia in order to continue work until completion of all projects and the study called for in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968. I trust that these actions will fulfill the criteria which you set forth in your statement of August 11, 1969.

The District of Columbia Government is firmly committed to completion of these projects as the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968 provides. I join the District of Columbia Government in that commitment, and I have directed the Attorney General and the Secretary of Transportation to provide assistance to the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia to vigorously defend any lawsuits which may be filed to thwart the continuation of the projects called for by the Act.

A balanced transportation system is essential for the proper growth and development

of the District of Columbia. I hope that this evidence of tangible progress would permit us to assure the citizens of the District of Columbia that your Subcommittee will be in a position to approve the \$18,737,000 deleted from the Supplemental Appropriation bill together with the \$21,586,000 in the Regular Appropriation bill for the District of Columbia for Fiscal Year 1970.

With cordial regards,
Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

Still maintaining that the Highway Acts of 1968 and 1970 are the law and must be enforced, the President on April 27, 1971, directed the following letter to me:

DEAR BILL: The regional rail rapid transit system (Metro) project stands today at a critical point in its history. Construction work is evident in downtown Washington. The first suburban construction will begin this summer. Interruption in the downtown construction work now underway penalizes both residents and merchants, the latter of whom have already suffered business losses due to Metro construction, and delays the first day of operation.

Unfortunately, previous delays and inflationary pressures in the economy have increased the original construction cost estimates by approximately \$450 million. In my recent message to the Congress on District affairs, I have reaffirmed my commitment to Metro and proposed a plan which would solve its new financial problems without increasing the net financial drain on the Federal Treasury.

I know of your commitment for a balanced transportation system for the nation's capital. I fully share that commitment. Because of this concern, I have reviewed the status of the D.C. Interstate highway projects mandated by the Federal Aid Highway Acts of 1968 and 1970. My review indicates that the District Government is in full compliance with the requirements of these Acts within the constraints of judicial actions. I reaffirm my pledge to you to insure that the Federal agencies involved with these projects continue to work diligently to facilitate progress on these interstate projects. I have asked the Secretary of Transportation to make a presentation to you and other interested Members of the Congress at your earliest convenience as to the current status of the Three Sisters Bridge and other projects named in the 1968 and 1970 Highway Acts. We are taking, and will pursue, all necessary and appropriate action within the law to expedite the construction of the Bridge.

I believe these actions provide tangible evidence of both the District and Federal Governments' commitment to complete these highway projects. I request that your Subcommittee give favorable consideration to the \$34.2 million fiscal year 1971 supplemental for the District's contribution to METRO.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

On November 18, 1971, the President issued the following statement concerning the rapid rail transit—freeway impasse.

This statement is as follows:

Late in its second century of life as the Nation's Capital, the Washington metropolitan area is suffering severely from hardening of vital transportation arteries. The nearly three million people in the District of Columbia and its Maryland and Virginia suburbs are acutely aware of this worsening problem as they struggle to move about the area pursuing business or pleasure or the work of government. So are the eighteen million visitors who come here each year from across the country and around the world, expecting magnificence—and finding

it, but finding also, in the simple matter of getting about the city, more frustrations than they deserve in the Capital of a Nation that has sent men to the moon.

In recent months, though Washingtonians have also become increasingly aware that something is being done about the transportation tangle, METRO—our superb area-wide rapid rail transit system of the future—is already a fact of life for all who use the downtown streets, as construction pushes ahead on the first 8 miles of the project. Streets are dug up, ventilation shafts have been dropped, tunnels are being bored. Over \$863 million has already been committed by the eight participating local jurisdictions and the Federal Government. At the same time, a coordinated interstate highway system for the region is progressing toward completion, as many thousands of detouring commuters know.

We need these freeways, and we need the Metro—badly. I have always believed, and today reaffirm my belief, that the Capital area must have the balanced, modern transportation system which they will comprise. Yet now, almost incredibly in light of the manifest need for both of them, the future of both is jeopardized by a complex legal and legislative snarl.

To save them, here is what has to happen:

1. The local highway actions mandated by the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1968 and 1970 must go forward immediately.

The question whether the District of Columbia and the Federal Government, in their efforts to carry out this mandate, are presently in compliance with statutory requirements, has been the subject of lengthy litigation. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia has recently ruled that they are not yet in compliance, in the case involving the Three Sisters Bridge. But I am convinced that they are. Accordingly, I have ordered the Attorney General to proceed with the filing of a motion for rehearing en banc before the Court of Appeals. I have also instructed him, if that fails, to file a petition for certiorari with the Supreme Court.

2. The Metro system must move toward completion and operation as rapidly as possible.

Not only do delays in Metro work cost taxpayers heavily; they might even erode confidence and cooperation seriously enough to consign the entire project to an early grave, with all the sad consequences that could have for metropolitan development in the years ahead. I strongly urge the Congress, therefore, to take appropriate action at once to end the present delay and to prevent any more such derailments of Metro progress.

We have come to a critical juncture. Obedience to the law is at stake. A huge investment is at stake. The well-being of the Capital area is at stake. It is time for responsible men to join in responsible action and cut this Gordian knot.

On May 9, 1972, President Nixon directed the following letter to me:

DEAR BILL: As we approach the time for Congressional action on the District's 1973 budget, I want to express to you my personal hopes that we can move forward with the District's contribution to the Metro system. As we approach the July 4, 1974, initial operation date of Metro, any further delays in construction will substantially increase the cost of the system.

I believe that we share a strong, fundamental agreement about the importance of building in the national capital area a viable transportation system for our residents and visitors, including highways, the Three Sisters Bridge, buses and rapid transit. I am doing everything possible to see that all

elements of this program move forward with maximum speed.

Particularly as we approach our Bicentennial celebration, in which the national capital will play a major part, I sincerely hope that we can work together toward this goal.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

I definitely am of the opinion that President Nixon will carry out the commitment set forth in his letters to me and in the statement which I have just mentioned.

During the hearings I called this matter to the attention of Commissioner Walter E. Washington and requested a report on the action now being taken by the city of Washington, the Department of Transportation, the Corporation Counsel, and the Justice Department. The Commissioner directed a letter to me which appears on page 17 of the hearings and is as follows:

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On April 12, 1972, when I appeared before your Subcommittee on District of Columbia Appropriations, you asked for a detailed statement on the progress being made by the District of Columbia Government and by the Federal Government to carry out the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1968 and 1970.

In the Fall of 1969, the District of Columbia awarded a contract for the construction of the piers for the Three Sisters Bridge. A suit was filed challenging the authority of the District to proceed with the project without first complying with a number of provisions of the U.S. Code and the D.C. Code. The position of the government, which was accepted by the District Court, was that the 1968 Act relieved it of such responsibility.

The Court of Appeals, in April 1970, reversed the judgment of the District Court and remanded the case for a hearing on whether there had been compliance with all provisions of Title 23, U.S. Code. In a separate action, the court enjoined the District from proceeding with a construction contract for the East Leg Freeway.

The District Court, after a lengthy hearing, concluded that with the exception of a required design hearing and a finding as to safety under 23 U.S.C. S. 109, there had been compliance. Further construction of the Bridge was enjoined pending the holding of the design public hearings and making the safety finding.

The plaintiffs appealed all aspects of the case that were favorable to the government. The District cross-appealed on the safety finding, but concluded that the holding of a design hearing would produce results quicker than would further litigation. The necessary design public hearing was held in December 1970. In the Fall of 1971, the Court of Appeals, in reversing the judgment of the District Court, rejected virtually all its findings and conclusions. The Supreme Court, in March, refused to grant a writ of certiorari.

The attorneys in the Office of the Corporation Counsel, Department of Justice and the Department of Transportation, independently have examined the opinion of the Court of Appeals. They agree on the steps to be taken under the option to move all the proposed projects along, and have been working with the officials and planners in the D.C. Department of Highways and Traffic and the U.S. Department of Transportation to consolidate steps wherever possible.

A decision had to be made whether a new location hearing for the Bridge was necessary. The District Court held that the location finally selected for the Bridge deviated so slightly from that which was discussed at a public hearing, that a new location hearing was unnecessary. The Court of Appeals re-

manded this aspect of the case to the District Court "for clarification of the factual basis for its conclusion," stating:

"The District Court's opinion did not reveal a factual basis to support its conclusions that the approved location was so similar to that subject to the public hearing as to eliminate the need for a fresh location hearing."

In view of the abundance of evidence which was before the Court of Appeals on this point and the prior record in the case, those closest to the litigation are of the opinion that a new location hearing should be held to avoid another lengthy appeal. Such a location public hearing can be combined with the location public hearing on the Potomac River Freeway to be held this fall. Plans for the Potomac River Freeway have now progressed to such an extent as to make this possible. Unless a major change in location is found necessary, it is anticipated that the District will be ready for a design public hearing on the Potomac River Freeway a short time thereafter.

In the interim, the environmental statement (under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969) required by the Court of Appeals decision will be completed and plans for the ramps and approaches to the Bridge will be ready for public comment. This will respond to the Court of Appeals' suggestion that affirmative findings by the Department of Transportation under 23 U.S.C. S. 134 (pertaining to a comprehensive planning process) and 23 U.S.C. S. 138 (pertaining to the use of parklands) should be based, to the extent possible, on final plans for the Bridge. The Department of Transportation will be in a position by that time to make these assessments. The information that the Department will have as to noise, air, and water pollution in making its determination under Section 138, should be sufficient to meet the objections of the Court of Appeals to the findings made under 23 U.S.C. S. 109 (pertaining to safety).

Aside from the location hearing, the only remaining steps of substance to be taken as a condition to resuming work on the Bridge, are the making by the Department of Transportation of favorable findings under 23 U.S.C. S. 109, 134 and 138, and the granting by the Department of location and design approvals. The results of the model testing already completed clearly establish that the proposed Bridge satisfies the safety requirements of 23 U.S.C. S. 109.

A statement is attached outlining the current status of the remaining segments of the freeway system set forth in the 1968 Act. Since the Supreme Court has denied certiorari, it now becomes necessary to take those time-consuming steps which heretofore were felt unnecessary.

In preparing this statement, we have consulted the Department of Transportation and the Department of Justice.

The District Government and the two Federal departments have each reaffirmed earlier commitments to comply fully with the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1968 and 1970 and are taking the indicated next steps.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER E. WASHINGTON,
Mayor-Commissioner.

The statement referred to in the letter is as follows:

STATUS OF REMAINING SEGMENTS OF FREEWAY SYSTEM

POTOMAC RIVER FREEWAY, I-266

The Potomac River Freeway portion of I-266 was placed in a design status in September, 1969, with the concurrence of the Federal Highway Administration. The design proposed at that time was identical with that described in the Joint Conference Report for the 1968 Federal-Aid Highway Act. Concurrent with the design function,

the purchase of right-of-way was recommended. Rights-of-way have now been acquired between 31st Street extended and Key Bridge. Some buildings have been demolished.

A special study preparing a sectional development plan for Georgetown Waterfront is underway. The plan will address the socioeconomic and environmental impact aspects of the freeway and, in addition recommend guidelines for future land development appropriate to Georgetown. The study is a cooperative effort between the District of Columbia Government and the Departments of Interior, Housing and Urban Development, and Transportation.

It is being administered through the National Capital Planning Commission and guided by a Coordinating Committee which includes significant citizen representation. Data from the study will be used at a forthcoming public hearing.

CENTER LEG OF THE INNER LOOP, TERMINATING AT NEW YORK AVENUE, I-95

Construction of this facility has continued northward to Massachusetts Avenue and that portion is now scheduled to open for use in late 1972 or early 1973. Final design for the covered section immediately north of H Street is now in progress. K Street overpass of the center leg has been advertised and a contract was awarded on April 7, 1972. Temporary ramps north of K Street will be constructed to connect the facility to New York Avenue.

EAST LEG OF THE INNER LOOP NORTHWARD TO BLADENSBURG ROAD, I-295

This was the fourth project listed for immediate work in the 1968 act. Construction has continued on Interchange C and connections to Barney Circle are scheduled to open early in 1973. Northeastward of Barney Circle, bids were received on the first contract in 1970 but, as stated in the letter of transmittal, the District of Columbia was enjoined from proceeding with the contract. In light of the Three Sisters Bridge court decisions requiring full compliance with title 23, additional public hearings are required for this project. Preparation for such hearings is in process and the first is planned for the fall of 1972. Environmental Impact/4f statements will be prepared prior to the hearing.

SOUTH LEG I-695

The south leg of the inner loop was part of the study report to Congress in February 1970. The 1970 act did not require specific action regarding this project. Based upon advice received from the Federal Highway Administration officials, the District government is now completing documents for the conduct of the necessary public hearing and the preparation of the draft environmental impact statements.

The District of Columbia is financed out of five funds: The general fund, a highway fund, a water fund, a motor vehicle parking fund, and a sanitary sewage works fund.

The committee recommends a total of 40,765 permanent authorized positions to be financed from District of Columbia appropriated funds during fiscal year 1973. This allowance provides 983 new positions including 307 positions originally requested in the second supplemental 1972. Action on the request for these positions—129 for the expanded court system and 178 for the new youth center—was deferred until the regular 1973 budget was considered. The committee has continued the restriction on the maximum number of appropriated positions that may be filled during 1972 into 1973. This restriction limits em-

ployment in permanent authorized positions during any month to 39,619. Appropriations recommended for personnel compensation are based on a lapse rate of approximately 6 percent, thus funded positions are well below the personnel ceiling. The restriction limiting temporary or part-time employment to the number in the same month for the previous year is also continued into the next fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, for general operating expenses the sum of \$65,819,000 was requested and we recommend \$65,029,000. The allowance is \$3,252,000 above 1972 appropriations and \$790,000 less than requested.

For public safety our committee recommends a total of \$181,700,000 for the Metropolitan Police Department, fire department, courts, Department of Corrections, and National Guard.

For the Metropolitan Police Department we recommend a total of \$95,044,300. Mr. Chairman, if you would check our total population today of 741,000 you would find that this is probably the highest per capita expenditure for a police department in this country.

We have one of the finest fire departments in the United States, and this is recognized almost every year when we receive the highest rating possible.

Our committee recommends \$179,526,000 for the operating cost of the public school system and the three District of Columbia colleges. We recommend a total of \$146,476,600 for our public schools. This is \$4,118,600 more than was available in 1972 and \$289,500 less than requested.

The per capita expenditure is among the highest in the Nation. Based on recommendations in the bill, per pupil expenditures in 1973 will be \$1,257 of which \$1,050 will be from District funds and \$207 from Federal sources.

Today we have 143,411 students in our city schools and for 1973 it is estimated that we will have 140,700.

The committee is particularly concerned that there are not sufficient special education opportunities for the crippled and other health impaired, the deaf and hard of hearing, the blind and partially sighted, the mentally retarded, the emotionally disturbed and socially maladjusted, and those with specific learning disabilities. Accordingly, a total of \$2,073,900 is earmarked, within existing resources, to provide expanded educational services for children in those categories and school officials are urged to proceed aggressively in developing a comprehensive plan to identify and serve each child who can benefit from special education services, particularly those not now receiving them.

Testimony disclosed only minimal coordination between public school and Department of Human Resources officials in the development of special educational programs for the handicapped children under the care of the Department. A clearer delineation of responsibility is necessary in order to provide proper educational opportunities for these institutionalized individuals.

For the District of Columbia Teachers College we recommend \$3,379,600. For

the Federal City College we recommend \$20,588,700. For the Washington Technical Institute we recommend \$9,081,100.

For recreation, Mr. Chairman, we recommend the sum of \$13,860,000.

For human resources we recommend the total of \$208,709,000.

For highways and traffic we recommend the sum of \$21,711,000.

For environmental services we recommend a total of \$44,710,000.

For repayment of loans and interest we recommend the sum of \$28,144,000.

For capital outlay, Mr. Chairman, we recommend a total of \$131,394,000. This is \$192,319,000 below 1972 appropriations and \$18,536,000 less than requested.

In the main, Mr. Chairman, we recommend to the House the capital outlay projects presented to the committee. For instance, in our public schools 23 projects were presented and we recommend 21. The summary of the capital outlay recommendations by project appears on pages 31, 32, and 33 of our report.

Mr. Chairman, our committee recommends this bill to the Members of the House.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, each year I think that all of the Members of this House owe a vote of thanks to the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER). I am sure this vote of thanks which he deserves is a sentiment that is shared by all of us who attempt to share with him this responsibility which has become so onerous for him in many ways, and yet a responsibility which he fulfills so well.

He has given you the basic outline of the major decisions that we have been called upon to make.

I think it is a fair statement that this bill does represent a subcommittee bill, that each member of that subcommittee has made his contribution in terms of eliciting information and applying his experience and judgment to it, and we have come up with a bill which by and large has the support of every member of that subcommittee, certainly including myself.

I suppose that all of you are concerned, just as I am concerned, first of all with the overall size of this budget and, second, with the size of the Federal payment—\$185 million. Yet, it is \$5 million less than what was contemplated by the people in the District government and \$5 million less than was authorized by this House a year ago.

I hope you will not attribute to me great age when I remind some of the newcomers here that I can remember—and this was before I came on this particular subcommittee—when we had a \$10 million Federal payment in this bill and we debated and argued about it at length because of the feeling of a large segment of the membership of this House that that amount was too large.

Yet, we have ourselves to blame—if we feel this Federal payment is too large. It is less than this House has authorized, as I mentioned before. Each year, or each 2 years, we sit here on this floor and we pass what we call a revenue act for the

District of Columbia. The major elements of each and every one of those revenue acts have been increases in the direct Federal payment for the District of Columbia, and increases in the borrowing authority for the District of Columbia. That is what we find ourselves with here today. Those measures do not conform to my idea of what a revenue raising act ought to be. Yet, that is what we call them here year after year—and there is actually very little revenue raised by any one of them.

So we do have a \$185 million Federal payment in this bill. We also have substantial increases from year to year, and our chairman has pointed out to you the basic nature of those increases this year.

But there again I hope you will not blame us, for each Member of the House must take the responsibility. I do not quarrel with the merits of these various measures which have affected and do affect the cost of government in the District of Columbia. I merely think that we ought to reflect upon ourselves, as Members of this House, and not reflect upon the members of this subcommittee for the increases that we find, for the bulk of the increases can be found in the cost of the reorganization and the vast expansion of the court system here in the District of Columbia, as well as the legislation that we have passed related to the correctional system here in the District of Columbia. You can look at our report and you will find that a majority of all the staffing people, the new staffing people in the District of Columbia, that are allotted and approved in this bill can be found in those two categories: The expansion of the courts and the expansion of the correctional systems which we have authorized.

There are 2,000 more policemen in the District of Columbia today than when I went on this subcommittee in 1965.

There have been two new institutions of higher education authorized, and you cannot do that without money.

There has been a rapid expansion of welfare costs here in the District of Columbia, just as there has been a rapid expansion of welfare costs throughout the entire country. Yet we have set the rules. We have approved the standards, and the courts have gone beyond some of the things we thought we were doing here in increasing the cost of welfare here, and even though we have denied some of the substantial proposed increases in the way of new standards, yet nevertheless there is a very substantial increase in the cost for the Department of Human Resources.

Last year we talked to you at some length about waste, ineligibility, and illegality that accounted for some of the increased welfare cost here in the District. We now have a new Director of the Department of Human Resources. I think in good faith he is attempting to deal with some of these problems which this subcommittee and other committees of the Congress have pointed out.

There is a reduction of \$1 million in this welfare appropriation based upon the results of the investigations that are now in progress. But that rejuvenated investigatory system did not go into effect until shortly after the beginning

of this calendar year. So we cannot arbitrarily say that we are going to save that much next year. So that bill has been reduced \$1 million, which Mr. Yeldell himself estimated that he could not account for based upon investigations which have been completed.

I believe we can do better in future years, but we would only be opening ourselves to further problems and supplementary requests and further argument, it seems to me, to attempt to reduce that figure more than we have already done.

This Congress has set higher environmental standards applying to the District of Columbia; so you will find a substantial amount of new money reflected in that legislation. We passed pay increases. We authorized Pay Board increases. There is not anything we can do about that. These people are entitled to those increases based upon the action of this House as a whole. So we simply have to check their mathematics and go along with the increased sums that are included.

So I hope that none of you will use the subcommittee as the whipping boy when this matter of the increasing cost and the increasing Federal payment for the District of Columbia comes up for discussion.

I think the greatest single item of concern here in the District revolves around the educational program of the District. I suspect that if we were to pick out any program here for a vote of lack of confidence, we would find it there.

I suggest that the failures of the educational system here are not due to the lack of money. The per student cost of education here in the District is among the highest that will be found anywhere in this country. But when we compare the results based upon national achievement tests, we will find them among the lowest that will be found anywhere in this country. I suggest that this has to be on the basis of administrative and instructional failures. It cannot be because of lack of money.

Even within the amounts that have been allotted, this subcommittee had to take the responsibility of earmarking some of the funds approved in an area which has been too long and too greatly ignored, and that has been the matter of special education. Members will find language relating to that earmarking in our report.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER) mentioned to the Members that the funds for the continuance of the subway are in this bill—every dollar—in accordance with their estimates. We have followed the wishes of the House of Representatives. Just this last year we followed what we thought were the wishes and what the law said was the mandate of this Congress in leaving the money out. But the Members expressed themselves. They said despite the fact that the District Government and the subway authority were cooperating in violating the mandate of this Congress, the Members told us they wanted the money for that subway to go in, so this year we put it in—\$33.5 million.

In addition to this massive project—the most expensive single public works

project in the history of the world—every morning Members who drive here from the suburban areas or who drive to their homes, those who live there, pass building after building under construction. It is either a Federal building or a building being built for leasing to the Federal Government or else a large new private building complex that is being developed in this metropolitan area.

We know all over this country the costs of heavy construction are escalating at an alarming rate. The Engineering News index record says it is 10 to 12 percent per year right now. But because of the accumulation of this kind of construction in this area, the proposals for new construction for the District of Columbia have had to be curtailed somewhat, because the escalation here has exceeded the nationwide experience. The figures we had submitted to us reflected those projections of increased costs.

The experience has been that they are not getting any pencil-sharpening competition among the building contractors for construction projects here in the District of Columbia. So there has been a rather mild curtailment both in the sums allocated for specific projects and in the deletion of a few specific projects here in the District of Columbia.

This, we felt, was the only responsible thing we could do in order to keep the public purse from being unreasonably drained for projects, some of them even of urgency here within the District of Columbia.

I believe that our judgment overall has been good. There has been diligence and I believe effectiveness in developing this appropriation bill and bringing it to the Members here on the floor today. Many of the details to which I have made passing reference in general will be found in the report. I commend its reading to the Members.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to the chairman.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I want the members of the committee to know that the gentleman in the well, the distinguished Member from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS) is one of the able members of the Committee on Appropriations.

For a great many years now it has been my distinct honor and privilege to be permitted to serve with him on this subcommittee. He is a dedicated and able Member.

In addition to this, the gentleman in the well serves on two other subcommittees. He serves on the Subcommittee on Public Works and on the Subcommittee on Defense.

At all times since we have served on this committee he has clearly demonstrated, Mr. Chairman, that he is not only one of the great Members of the House but also a Member of the House interested in the Nation's Capital.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin has consumed 17 minutes.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO) a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation today.

I certainly want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER) who, as usual, has demonstrated his outstanding concern and awareness and real understanding of the District's problems, through his incisive questioning and knowledge of the various District agencies and the bill.

I certainly want to commend all of my colleagues on the subcommittee, and also the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS) and all other members on the minority side. Certainly the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE) tries very diligently to see to it that some of the wasteful practices which do in fact go on in the administration of this budget are curtailed.

Unfortunately, there is a great feeling of frustration for many members of the committee, because in fact there is a great deal of wastefulness.

I believe the District can live with this budget. I believe that it is well funded.

We constantly learn, when we go back home, that an impression has been given that the District of Columbia is not adequately funded by the Congress.

Do not believe it. The fact of the matter is that the District of Columbia is very well funded by the Congress.

Reference was made to the fact that Metro funds are in the budget. I am delighted to say that they are. I commend again the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS) for helping to make these funds available.

Hopefully, the Metro can proceed as quickly as possible to fruition. I think the subway system is very much needed in Washington and we should get on with the job.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIAIMO. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I have been looking in vain for some sign of activity at the site of the Three Sisters Bridge. It was the position, I thought, of the Congress that in providing funds for the boondoggling subway objection would be removed to the bridge construction. The gentleman played an active part in getting Federal assistance for the subway. I would like to ask him what has happened to the bridge that is supposed to be under construction, and what about finishing the other freeways that are only partially constructed and on which work has stopped? Drive out of this city toward Baltimore, and you are dumped off a segment of freeway that goes nowhere. Can the gentleman explain why?

Mr. GIAIMO. I will be delighted to explain to the gentleman. Let me say to the gentleman from Iowa that he is no more anxious to see an adequate highway system and bridge system constructed than I am. I would like to see the Three Sisters Bridge constructed and in operation. I think it is very necessary. I think it ties in with what Congress mandated for a balanced transportation system. However, the fact of the matter, as the gentleman from Iowa well knows, is that the circuit court of appeals for the District of Columbia knocked down the Government and the District's plans for constructing the Three Sisters Bridge.

The administration, the President, and the Department of Justice appealed the decision of the circuit court of the United States to the Supreme Court which refused certiorari, so that the decision of the two of the three judges of the circuit court stands and in order to proceed the Department of Transportation and the District government have to go through the many procedures which are required in order actually to comply with all of the required laws involving the construction of the bridge and the highway and the freeway system.

My best information is that they are in the process of doing that now. Until they comply and until they go that route they are enjoined by the decision of the circuit court of appeals from proceeding with the bridge. Hopefully we will begin to get some action in that direction shortly.

Mr. GROSS. But what happened to the quid pro quo that was implicit in the deal whereby Congress released subway funds?

Mr. GIAIMO. Well, of course, I hesitate to ask the distinguished gentleman from Iowa what quid pro quo, but I will risk it at this time and ask what quid pro quo? I am not aware of any quid pro quo.

Mr. GROSS. Every dollar you have in this bill for the subway system.

Mr. GIAIMO. It has nothing to do with the bridge and the highway system. Each stands on its own.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NATCHER. I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GIAIMO. I would like to mention one thing which I think my friend, Mr. SCHERLE, brings out in his supplemental views, that is that there are shocking examples of waste in the District government. I commend to the attention of the Members a study of a report which I had made by the Comptroller General of the United States called Activities of Blackman's Development Center, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of Labor and District of Columbia government. In this report it shows a shocking waste of Federal moneys by the Blackman's Development Center, a contractee of the Narcotics Treatment Administration, to the extent that we put into the committee accompanying the legislation on page 23 this language, which I would like to read.

A General Accounting Office report (Activities of Blackman's Development Center, dated April 28, 1972) shows a shocking misuse of funds by the Blackman's Development Center, a community organization with whom the Narcotics Treatment Administration contracted for narcotics screening and treatment. The report shows that \$81,580 of funds provided the Center is unaccounted for.

The report further found that \$66,278 in checking account expenditures were not supported by vendors' invoices or other documentation. In addition, the General Accounting Office audit revealed that \$82,900 was improperly expended by the Blackman's Development Center for such items as personal automobiles, personal expenses, and about 15 parcels of real estate.

It also shows that although the Blackman's Development Center failed to maintain a 300-patient caseload as required under the contract, the Narcotics Treatment Administration failed to remedy this situation and to terminate the contract.

Now, Mr. Chairman, why do I bring that up? If we do not have better administration of our poverty programs and our other social programs in the cities of America, we cannot justify spending taxpayers' moneys on them. Yet, here we have a shocking case of the misuse of public funds such as this. During the questioning, when I asked the Director of the Narcotics Treatment Administration if he was concerned about it, the indications were that he was not as concerned about it as much as whether the services were being performed. In fact, the services were not being performed.

The report shows that very rarely did the Blackman's Development Center actually maintain the 300-potential caseload.

Further, although this was well known to the people of the District of Columbia and to the Federal Government, subsequent to these events the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was ready to fund the same group in another city and another State, I believe in Columbus, Ohio. Yet, the Blackman's Development Center's record is well known to the Administrators of the Federal Government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I say we cannot tolerate this shocking misuse of Federal moneys and taxpayers' moneys and it behooves the Administrators of all the enforcement agencies of our Government, both Federal and District, to see to it that this stops immediately. I say this because there is all too much of this going on in all levels of the Federal Government throughout this land of ours.

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

Mr. GIAIMO. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DEVINE. First, I wish to commend the gentleman for his efforts in connection with revealing the activities of the so-called Blackman's Development Program here in the District of Columbia and the fact that there apparently has been a gross misuse of public funds for purposes never intended by the Congress.

The gentleman mentioned the fact that this agency has reached out across the Nation, and I understand headquarters are being established in about a half a dozen cities, one of which is located in my district at Columbus, Ohio. They have pending in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an application for about a quarter of a million dollars in the same area to which the gentleman has made reference, but they insist they have not and disclaim any connection with the Blackman's Development Center, although the same and specific programs involved here are involved there.

I think the interchange of telephone calls have indicated that they are part and parcel of the same package. I think that the Department of Health, Educa-

tion, and Welfare is in the process of an investigation as a result of the efforts of the gentleman in the well. I think that the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs is looking into it with reference to the granting of license for the use in the methadone treatment center and I think the General Accounting Office has just finished their investigation of this particular part of the operation.

I commend the gentleman for his efforts.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MYERS), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, every member of this subcommittee certainly is vitally interested in their Nation's Capital.

The task assumed here and undertaken by the committee is a monumental one. It is a tremendous job to try to get information that is needed by this subcommittee to accurately come to the floor and tell you what the expenditures are to be for the District of Columbia.

I think all of us should be concerned. Our job, certainly, is not an easy one, but we are not here today to ask for any sympathy from you other Members in that regard.

We are trying to give you information so that you will be able to do a better job in making the correct decisions. There have been a number of things that have come up here today which I think need to be further explained to the Membership here.

One of these is the Metro system that has been discussed. The question was raised as to why a balanced transportation system was not continuing. I think we all recognize that the highway portion of this is tied up in a court decision, and with compliance with requirements that have been laid down. But there are a few things which I think could be carried just a little bit further.

One of the chief objections brought forward by the litigants in the present suit against the building of the Three Sisters Bridge, which is a vital link in a balanced transportation system for the District of Columbia, was that this was an environmental hazard to our community. They stated that this bridge which was being built across the Potomac River was going to deny certain access to the river, and that it was going to be less than desirable as far as aesthetics are concerned, and as far as the beauty of the terrain is concerned. Some of the opponents to the construction of this bridge made such statements that they will be making a platform of concrete clear along the river; all of the Potomac will be covered by concrete.

Mr. Chairman, we discovered that there are going to be two more bridges built by the Metro system, one in the vicinity of the 14th Street Bridge, plus some tunnels under the river, and then another bridge across the Anacostia River. But how many people have you heard raising objections to the building of these two Metro bridges? It is rather strange that objections are only brought up when we are going to build a highway bridge, and yet the Metro system will be building two more bridges across

these beautiful rivers, and yet no objection is raised to them.

Then another objection that was raised was concerning the families who will be displaced, and that is too bad that these families will be displaced by the building of a highway system, but have you heard any objection about the many families that will be displaced by the construction of the Metro system? The manager of the Metro system testified that 744 families will be required to be displaced because of the construction of the Metro system—744 families will be moved out. Yet has there been any big hue and cry about that? I have not heard the first word of protest by the media.

Another objection brought forth by the District Court of Appeals judge in his opinion was that sufficient evidence did not show that any alternatives were considered against the building of this bridge. He also wrote that there was taking of much-needed park space through the building of highway bridges; that it was taking valuable parkland. But I actually wonder how much parkland is going to be taken for the building of a couple of bridge piers, possibly a few hundred square feet. But that bridge is being held up because parkland is being taken for the construction of that bridge.

Well, do you know how much parkland is being taken by the construction of the Metro system? Almost \$11 million in value of parkland is being taken by the Metro system. Construction across the river from the Pentagon, running north alongside of this beautiful area in front of the Arlington Cemetery is in parkland.

That system over there will be running above ground through this beautiful parkland. Where are the environmentalists who came in here and cried so much about the highways being built across the Potomac? And we are told that through this beautiful parkland they are going to run a railroad. Then consider the fact that in the future there is always the possibility that the Metro system might be a failure, but once you get a railroad right of way you can store boxcars up there along this beautiful parkland. Where are these environmentalists when this is being done? We have not heard the first word of objection.

I think it is time that some of us give some serious consideration about the construction of the Metro system.

Now, this does not mean, Mr. Chairman, that this committee has any great doubt that the building of a Metro system is much needed, but some of us, some of the Members of this body who have viewed the construction of the Metro, and the many factors associated with it, believe that it will have a severe environmental impact. Where is the environmental impact studies required by law for public roads programs?

It is very clear that they are not using the same standards for the construction of the Metro system that are being required today for the construction of a highway system as part of the balanced transportation system that this Congress has authorized be built.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the additional time.

Mr. Chairman, there are a few things concerning the Metro system that have gone unnoticed. We all recognize that the Metro system is going to require some type of fuel or energy, and that this is going to be electricity. Remember back just a couple of years ago when we had a brownout in the District of Columbia during August. We had to turn half of our electric lights off, and we had to turn down our air conditioners because there was not enough electrical energy available to run them? And just yesterday the media was speaking of the imminent possibility of a brownout again this year.

Do you know how much electricity this Metro system is going to require in order to run these 556 cars, and all of the stations that will be necessary, along with the need for their being air conditioned? Some stations will require a number of elevators and escalators that will have to go up from beneath the ground more than 100 feet in order to get the people riding the trains to the surface. This Metro system is going to require 90 million kilowatt hours requiring 35,000 tons of coal per month. How many coal cars will be required to transport 35,000 tons of coal and where is that coal needed to run these generating stations going to come from? It will require more than 500 coal cars per month to operate just the Metro system alone. This city and this area are being threatened when we need an additional 35,000 tons of coal to run the Metro system alone, plus all the other electricity we require.

How about the environmentalists? Where are they when this subject comes up? Where are they today? How much information concerning this has been given to the Congress? This electrical energy that is going to be required to run the Metro system alone is enough electricity to supply the States of Alaska or Wyoming, yet this electricity is going to be required just to run the Metro system here in the District of Columbia.

What I am saying is simply that yes, of course, there are some very real serious problems in the District of Columbia, but that if we are going to set standards for one segment of the economy, or for the necessities of the District of Columbia, then why do not the same standards prevail and be required in every other agency of the District of Columbia? Obviously they are not.

We have some very real problems, this is very true, but sometimes we are unable to secure the true facts, as our good friend said in his supplemental views in the report, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE). We are not getting all the facts. I think it is high time that this body, this city, and the Nation know how our tax dollars are being spent, and there are a number of cases of double standards.

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

Mr. MYERS. I yield to the gentleman.
Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Did the committee make any effort to ascertain where the \$5 million to \$6 million in school funds of the District of Columbia disappeared? Were those funds ever located?

Mr. MYERS. Yes, there was some time given to the school board, to the superintendent of schools on that subject.

Frankly, I do not think we were given any help—more than the fact that the discrepancy is being accounted for or being worked out with the General Accounting Office.

This is just another example—and this is not the only one that was discovered, I might advise the gentleman from Iowa.

Also, in questioning the superintendent of schools, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE) discovered that the superintendent was not sure as to how many school buildings the District of Columbia had. He is not sure how many teachers he has. He is not sure how many students he has. He is not very much aware of what the school system is doing or what is going on in the school system.

Mr. GROSS. Is he living in another world?

Mr. MYERS. Well, he is fretting right now because of the fact that he lost his chauffeur. It takes so much time driving to the schools that he may have to go to because of losing his chauffeur, and he just does not have the time to investigate trivial matters like \$3 million and \$5 million shortages.

Mr. GROSS. Five million dollars just does not disappear without some assistance.

Mr. MYERS. In answer to the gentleman, the superintendent did testify that this was a bookkeeping entry mistake more than anything else and that there was not any money that disappeared. They just do not know how to keep books—until they hired Price Waterhouse, this accounting firm to do the work for them, and now they have an expert in bookkeeping.

Mr. GROSS. It is hard to believe they did not know how to keep books that would show an expenditure of \$5 million.

If they did not know how to keep books on the \$5 million, how can they say with any degree of assurance where any part of the money went? Perhaps it went down the same drain as did those thousands of dollars that were handed over to General Abdulah Kabula, or whatever his name, at the Blackman's Center.

Mr. MYERS. This is one of the things or frustrations of the committee, or at least myself as a member of the committee trying to find out where the money goes and how much is spent.

Last year, or this fiscal year that we are still in, it was estimated that the District of Columbia would have \$644 million in Federal money from all sources of slightly over a billion dollar total expenditure. This year it must be well over \$700 million, coming from the taxpayers throughout the United States.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, as you know, the House Committee on Appropriations is composed of 13 subcommittees, and one of them is the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia. It is one that is quite difficult to serve on at times. On this subcommittee at the present time, Mr. Chairman, we have Mr. GIAIMO, of Connecticut; we have Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas; we have Mr. OBEY, from the State of Wisconsin, who is sitting here at the committee table; we have Mr. STOKES, of Ohio; and we have Mr. McKAY, of Utah, who is one of our new members.

On the Republican side, as I pointed out a few minutes ago, we have the ranking minority member (Mr. DAVIS) who has been on this subcommittee a great many years, along with Mr. SCHERLE, of Iowa, who is serving his second year on this subcommittee, Mr. McEWEN, of New York, who also is serving his second year, and Mr. MYERS, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, who just left the well of the House.

Mr. Chairman, all of these members are able, outstanding Members of the House. This year it took about 3 weeks of hearings almost every day, usually morning and afternoon, to complete this bill. These members attended the hearings. They have come in and they have given of their time. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I want to commend them for the fine work they have done on this bill.

We have Mr. Silsby as our administrative assistant. He has been with our committee for a number of years. You can ask them downtown what kind of job he does, Mr. Chairman, and I think they will agree with me that he is an able administrative assistant. He is assisted by Mr. Miconi, who is sitting with us on the floor, and is also of great help to us.

Mr. Chairman, in all justice to these members and the staff, I want to make this statement at this time.

We have no further requests for time on this side, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa, a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, before I begin, I would like to pay tribute to both my chairman, Mr. NATCHER from Kentucky, and the ranking member from Wisconsin, Mr. DAVIS also to my committee colleagues on both the majority and the minority sides, as well as our very capable staff for their outstanding work on this bill. The committee has been very diligent and conscientious in trying to reach a decision concerning the amount of money needed to run the District of Columbia government.

I would urge the Members of the House to take the time to read the committee reports, and particularly the hearings. You will then have a more complete answer to the question of whether or not the District should have home rule. Home rule to me is a lot of baloney. The District of Columbia has home rule now with the school system—do you know of a worse mess? There will be no home rule, as far as I am personally concerned, for awhile. They could not afford it. If the present

District of Columbia government is an example of what home rule would be like, then I feel sorry for the citizens of the District of Columbia, particularly those who pay the bills.

The District of Columbia, as our chairman mentioned a moment ago, is made up of 740,000 people living on 69.3 square miles.

The unemployment rate in the District is 2 percent, one of the lowest in the Nation. There are pockets, scattered through the District, where, of course, unemployment ranks higher. There will be approximately 135,000 people on welfare at the end of this fiscal year. This area has \$22 billion worth of construction. There are help wanted signs all over these buildings. The newspapers are full of "help wanted" ads. But because of the lucrative welfare system in the District, we do not find many people who want to go to work.

The various District of Columbia problems we have uncovered in the District of Columbia government are atrocious. One thing that concerns me as a member, more than anything else, is the lack of candor, the half-truths, and the hypocrisy pervading this governmental body. This committee has tried to make an informed decision about appropriate funding levels but was frustrated because there is more to be told than we actually heard.

I would like to enumerate some of the obstacles as I experienced them. Some are major, some minor, and some completely ridiculous.

The District of Columbia government is probably the greatest employment agency in the United States, employing practically 50,000 people at both the Federal and District level. In fact, when I stop to visualize the huge number of employees, it reminds me of the story that used to go around the defense plants during World War II.

When the supervisor walked up to an employee and asked "What are you doing?" the employee said, "Nothing," to which the supervisor replied, "Get a wrench and look busy."

Some of the requests made to our committee were incredible examples of boondoggles and waste.

The District of Columbia government requested \$90,000 to plant 480 trees at a cost of \$200 a tree. Yet these same tiny maples, oaks, and elms could have been purchased locally for considerably less.

One employee of the District with a salary of about \$32,000 a year attends law school 4 hours a day, and claims to work an additional 17 or 18 hours for the Government. The remaining 3 or 4 hours he contends are used to sleep not counting eating or commuting or anything else. And for this he receives \$32,000 a year.

Dr. Hugh Scott, the Superintendent of Schools, as I mentioned earlier, did not even know how many schools were under his jurisdiction. The school system here, unfortunately, even with all of the money we appropriated, does not do the job. In view of the vast resources available, the results are disappointing to say the least.

A member of the School Board took students from their classes at Eastern High School, over the objections of the

principal, brought them to the Capitol to demonstrate. Some even vandalized a Congressman's office.

This is not what schools are for. They exist only to educate. They are for children to learn and for teachers to teach. Playing politics with schoolchildren during school hours, is not appropriate or ethical, and it will not be tolerated.

The District has selected a new Director for the Department of Human Resources, Mr. Yeldell. Let me give the Members an idea of the present welfare caseload, and the increases anticipated for the future. The alarming rise in welfare cases is dramatically illustrated by recent statistics. In July 1970 there were 50,000 people on welfare. One year later in July 1971, 75,000 people were on the dole. By September 1971, 92,000 people were living at government expense. By fiscal year 1973, it is estimated that 137,000 people in the District will be on welfare—an average annual increase of 25,000 to 30,000 people.

Our committee discovered, sad as it may be, that facilities for handicapped children here in Washington are either inadequate or nonexistent. I asked, in the committee, who bears the responsibility for these children. Mr. Yeldell did not acknowledge it nor did Dr. Scott; 18,000 children in this District are incapacitated in some way, but only 8,000 of them are being helped. What will happen to the other 10,000? Does anybody know? Does anybody care?

This committee took it upon itself to earmark \$2.07 million for special education for the handicapped children of the District. We also directed the Director of Human Resources and the Superintendent of Schools to coordinate a balanced special education program.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, it is a sad commentary on the District of Columbia government's priorities when such children are neglected. It is inexcusable but expresses once again the heartless attitude of District officials for the handicapped, particularly when the taxpayers of this Nation are willing to provide the money.

In another area, the deputy mayor Mr. Watt, now in Europe, has been out of town most of the year. Yet he continues to draw a salary of about \$36,000 a year. He also asked the taxpayers to provide \$300 for parking privileges for his Government-owned car at his apartment. As I told the District of Columbia budget officer, if the Deputy Mayor is that poor, we should pass the hat and take up a collection for him. Fortunately, the committee has not approved that expenditure.

Furthermore, this car is loaned to him on a 24-hour basis. Since he is out of the country so much of the time, perhaps we ought to give that automobile to someone who needs it, at least until the gallivanting Deputy Mayor comes back.

Our committee found out once again belatedly, because of a lack of informa-

tion, that a profitmaking organization, caring for 52 troubled young wards of the District, apparently is operating without any experienced child guidance personnel. This service is costing the Government \$373,000.

The most shameful thing about all this was brought out when I asked Mr. Yeldell how he found out about it. Mr. Yeldell, director of the Department of Human Resources, said that he learned of the existence of the CRC contract by reading the Washington Post articles. It is incredible that a department head has to read the newspapers to know what is going on in his own bailiwick. My comment was, "Mr. Yeldell, it is a shame that you as Administrator rely on the news media to find out what is happening in your own department."

Now for the institutions of higher learning. In questioning Dr. Cook the president of the District of Columbia Teachers College. I asked:

Is there any problem with the college you wish to discuss with the committee?

"None at all," was the reply. Yet at that time the GAO was investigating some serious charges against the administration of the college. That report shows gross negligence, and mismanagement, at the school which requires immediate correction.

The charges are based on a questionable deposit of funds, overobligations of appropriated funds, control of equipment and supplies, noncollection of tuition, procurement practices, and other irregularities. I include this GAO report for the RECORD:

PROBLEMS IN FINANCIAL AND PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION AT THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS COLLEGE

(By the Comptroller General of the United States)

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, Washington, D.C.

B-167006.

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SCHERLE: In accordance with your request, we have reviewed selected areas of financial and property administration at the District of Columbia Teachers College. The results of our review are set forth in this report.

We did not obtain written comments from the District of Columbia Government on the contents of the report. The contents were discussed, however, with Teachers College officials.

As agreed with your office, copies of this report are being sent to the Chairmen of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations; Chairmen of the House and Senate Committees and Subcommittees on the District of Columbia; the Director, Office of Management and Budget; the Commissioner, District of Columbia; the Chairman of the Board of Higher Education; and the President, District of Columbia Teachers College.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER B. STAATS, Comptroller General of the United States.

DIGEST

WHY THE REVIEW WAS MADE

Congressman William J. Scherle requested the General Accounting Office (GAO) to make a review at the (1) Federal City College, (2) the District of Columbia Teachers College, and (3) the Washington Technical Institute of the—

Authority for the receipt and deposit of all funds,

Procedures for control over the obligation and expenditure of appropriated funds,

Accountability for supplies and equipment, and

Procedures for the collection of tuition and fees owed by students.

This report concerns the District of Columbia Teachers College. GAO did not obtain written comments from the District of Columbia Government on the contents of this report. The contents were, however, discussed with Teachers College officials.

GAO transmitted its report on the Federal City College to Congressman Scherle on October 27, 1971. GAO's report on the Washington Technical Institute will be issued shortly.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

GAO's review at Teachers College disclosed management weaknesses which require the attention of the Board of Higher Education; District Government accounting, budgeting, and legal specialists; and Teachers College officials.

1. Deposit of funds

During fiscal year 1971 Teachers College revenues consisted of student cooperative fees of about \$290,000—of which, we believe, about \$245,000 should be considered tuition unless the college can clearly establish that the Congress has acquiesced to the longstanding practice of the college regarding the use of these fees; grants of about \$275,000; reimbursements of about \$440,000 for services provided to other District agencies; and miscellaneous income of about \$45,000.

These funds were deposited in a commercial bank account rather than in the U.S. Treasury as required by applicable laws and accounting procedures.

The college's administrative controls over the funds deposited in the commercial bank account were inadequate, and the funds, in certain instances, were used for questionable purposes.

Teachers College should deposit all revenues in the U.S. Treasury.

Tuition and miscellaneous receipts to the credit of the District of Columbia general fund.

Grant receipts to the credit of District trust accounts, and

Reimbursements for services provided to other District agencies to the credit of the applicable appropriation. (See pp. 7 to 11.)

2. Overobligations of appropriated funds

District Accounting Office records showed that Teachers College had overobligated its fiscal year 1971 apportionment of funds by about \$250,000. These overobligations resulted from a misinterpretation of reports on the status of available funds.

Proper use of available obligation-apportionment information and familiarization of officials and employees with procurement regulations, policies, and procedures should prevent overobligations of available funds in the future. (See pp. 12 to 14.)

3. Control over equipment and supplies

Teachers College does not maintain adequate control over its equipment and supplies. Steps which should be taken to establish effective control over these assets are detailed in the report. (See pp. 15 to 17.)

4. Collection of tuition

Although students attending Teachers College who were not residents of the District of Columbia were required to pay tuition, GAO found that tuition had not been collected from many nonresident students because either tuition bills had not been prepared or efforts had not been made to collect unpaid bills.

GAO found also that foreign students on student visas had not been charged tuition because Teachers College officials erroneously

had considered them to be residents of the District of Columbia.

Teachers College should identify nonresidents at the time of their application for admission to the college and should collect tuition from such students at the time of registration before permitting them to register for classes. Teachers College also should adopt the necessary policies and procedures for collecting tuition from foreign students. (See pp. 18 to 22.)

5. Procurement practices

District of Columbia agencies generally are required to obtain at least three price quotations before ordering goods or services costing over \$500 and to formally advertise for bids when the cost exceeds \$2,500. GAO found that Teachers College had not complied with these requirements and as a result, might have incurred excessive procurement costs.

GAO believes that, although the president of Teachers College recently directed its employees to adhere to applicable procurement requirements, the District's Office of Municipal Audits should periodically review Teachers College procurement practices to determine whether the president's directive is being followed. (See pp. 23 to 25.)

CHAPTER 1—INTRODUCTION

In accordance with a request by Congressman William J. Scherle, the General Accounting Office made a review at the District of Columbia Teachers College of (1) the authority for the receipt and deposit of funds, (2) the procedures for control over the obligation and expenditure of appropriated funds, (3) the accountability for supplies and equipment, and (4) the procedures for the collection of tuition and fees owed by students. (See app. I.)

The District of Columbia Teachers College, as it presently exists, was formed on July 1, 1955, by merging Miner and Wilson Teachers Colleges. Its primary purpose is to prepare students for teaching in preschools, early-childhood education centers, and elementary and secondary schools.

The Teachers College apportionment of the District's education appropriation for fiscal year 1971 was \$2,967,000. It received \$1 million additional in the form of fees, grants, reimbursements from other District agencies, and miscellaneous income. As of September 1971 the college had 132 full-time faculty, 1,636 day students, 803 evening students, and 38 administrative and clerical staff members.

Board of higher education

Title I of the District of Columbia Public Education Act, approved November 7, 1966 (31 D.C. Code 1601-1606), established, among other things, the Board of Higher Education. Section 103 of the act described the powers and duties vested in the Board and provided for it to assume control of Teachers College from the Board of Education when agreed upon by both Boards and approved by the Commissioner of the District of Columbia. The effective date of transfer for policy and supervisory purposes was January 1, 1969, and for all other purposes, including administrative and fiscal, was July 1, 1969.

Internal audits

The District of Columbia Office of Municipal Audits is responsible for reviewing the operations of District agencies, including Teachers College. At the request of the president of Teachers College, the Office of Municipal Audits made a review of Teachers College obligations for fiscal year 1971. We were advised by an Office of Municipal Audits official that the last review at Teachers College had been made over 5 years ago and had been limited to examining nonresident tuition rates.

CHAPTER 2—MONEYS ERRONEOUSLY DEPOSITED IN A COMMERCIAL BANK

District agencies are required to deposit receipts in the U.S. Treasury—tuition and

miscellaneous receipts to the credit of the District of Columbia general fund, grant receipts to the credit of District trust accounts, and reimbursements for services provided to other District agencies to the credit of the applicable appropriation.

During fiscal year 1971 Teachers College's revenues consisted of student cooperative fees of about \$290,000—of which, we believe, about \$245,000 should be considered tuition unless the college can clearly establish that the Congress has acquiesced to the long standing practice of the college regarding the use of these fees; grants of about \$275,000; reimbursements of about \$440,000 for services provided to other District agencies; and miscellaneous income of about \$45,000. These funds were deposited in a commercial bank account rather than in the U.S. Treasury as required by laws and accounting procedures pertaining to the deposit of the funds. Our review of disbursements from this account revealed that the administrative control over the deposited funds was inadequate and that the funds had been used, in certain instances, for questionable purposes.

Student cooperative fees

Teachers College charges each day student a cooperative fee of \$35 a semester, and each evening and summer student a cooperative fee of \$10 a credit hour. These fees are in addition to fees charged for expenses directly related to individual courses, laboratory fees, and fees for such miscellaneous items as locker rental, transcripts, and library fines. The revenues from the cooperative fees are allocated for use as follows:

Type of student	Purpose			
	Cooperative fee	Student activities	Student government association	Budget administration ¹
Day.....	\$35	\$6	\$9.67	\$19.33
Evening and summer.....	10	10.00

¹ Used by the college to pay operating expenses not covered by its appropriation.

In fiscal year 1971 the cooperative fees totaled about \$290,000. These fees were deposited in a commercial bank account. Of this \$290,000, about \$45,000 was used for student activities and the Student Government Association and about \$245,000 was used to pay Teachers College operating expenses. According to a college official, this type of fee has been in effect for more than 30 years and has not been treated as tuition during that period.

Teachers College is authorized (31 D.C. Code 311) to change its students tuition whether or not they are District residents. The term "tuition" is defined as a fee charged a student at a college or university for (1) the privilege of attendance at the institution (Ballentine Law Dictionary) and (2) the price of, or payment for, instruction (Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary). In the absence of express congressional intent to the contrary, words used in a statute are intended to be given their common meaning. It is our view, therefore, that the portion of the student cooperative fees allocated to budget administration (that is, paying operating expenses not covered by the college's appropriation) should have been considered as tuition payments.

Inasmuch as Teachers College has not considered any portion of the cooperative fees to be tuition for over 30 years, we are not questioning the past use of these funds to pay operating expenses without the express prior approval of the Congress. We believe, however, that in the future the part of the cooperative fees allocated to budget administration should be considered as tuition payments unless the college can clearly

establish that the Congress has acquiesced to the long standing practice of the college regarding the use of these fees. Further, as required by existing statutes (31 D.C. Code 307 when construed with 31 D.C. Code 311 as well as with 47 D.C. Code 126 and 301), tuition collected from students attending Teachers College should be deposited in the U.S. Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia.

Grants

The District of Columbia Accounting Manual directs that each District agency disclose in its budget submissions the estimated amount of grants to be received and requires that the grant funds be deposited in the U.S. Treasury to the credit of District trust accounts and that all grant expenditures be charged against the accounts.

Teachers College disclosed the estimated amount of grants in its budget submission for fiscal year 1971 but did not deposit the grant funds in the U.S. Treasury to the credit of District trust accounts. Grant funds of about \$275,000 received in fiscal year 1971 were deposited in the college's commercial bank account. About \$250,000 was disbursed from the account during the year and charged against the grants.

Reimbursement of costs for services provided to other District agencies

The District of Columbia Code (1 D.C. Code 244k) authorizes District agencies to place orders with other District agencies for any goods or services such agencies can provide. The District of Columbia Accounting Manual provides that each District agency (1) disclose in its budget submissions the estimated reimbursements to be received for services or goods provided in other agencies, (2) deposit the reimbursements to the credit of its appropriations, and (3) charge all expenditures incurred in providing the services or goods against the appropriation.

Contrary to the above instructions, Teachers College did not disclose in its budget submission the estimated reimbursements to be received for fiscal year 1971 and did not deposit the funds received to the credit of its appropriation. Reimbursements of about \$440,000 received in fiscal year 1971 under contracts and agreements with other District agencies were deposited in the college's commercial bank account. During the year expenditures of about \$320,000 were made from the account and charged against contracts and agreements.

Miscellaneous income

The District of Columbia Code (47 D.C. Code 301) requires that all revenues be deposited in the U.S. Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia. In fiscal year 1971 Teachers College's miscellaneous income—interest, laboratory fees, etc.—totaled about \$45,000. These revenues were deposited in the college's commercial bank account and were used to pay operating expenses.

Inadequate control over and questionable uses of funds in commercial bank

The college's administrative controls over the funds deposited in the commercial bank account were inadequate. Many payments were made on the basis of vouchers without such supporting documentation as invoices or receipts. The signature of only one official was required on checks drawn against the account. More effective control over disbursements would be provided by requiring that checks signed by disbursing officers be countersigned by other designated officials.

We believe that in certain instances these funds were used in a questionable manner. Interest-free loans and salary advances were made to faculty and staff members. Outstanding loans and advances amounted to about \$5,560 at November 30, 1971. Also the college permitted its employees to exchange personal checks for college checks drawn

on its commercial bank account to vendors of their choice, so that they could obtain the same discounts and tax exemptions available to the college. This practice should not have been permitted because it was unfair to the vendors and resulted in illegal tax exemptions.

The president of Teachers College told us that the depositing of the various revenues—cooperative fees, grants, reimbursements, and miscellaneous income—in the commercial bank account was a long-standing practice and that he was unaware of the previously described legal and accounting requirements. He stated that he would obtain guidance from District accounting officials on these matters.

Conclusions

We believe that Teachers College should deposit all receipts in the U.S. Treasury to the credit of the appropriate accounts. (See p. 7.)

CHAPTER 3.—OVEROBLIGATION OF FISCAL YEAR 1971 FUNDS

The Anti-Deficiency Act (31 U.S.C. 665), which is applicable to the District of Columbia Government, provides in part, that no officer or employee authorize or create any obligation or make any expenditure under any appropriation in excess of the amount available thereunder. The District of Columbia Procurement Manual states that, before any procurement action, such as issuing purchase orders or requisitions is taken, it must be established that funds are available.

Reports received by Teachers College from the District central accounting office showed the amounts of the college's apportionment of funds, its cumulative obligations, and its unobligated or overobligated funds. The reports for May and June 1971 showed the following unobligated or overobligated funds.

Month ended	Period report received by college	Unobligated or overobligated (—) funds
May 31, 1971	1st week in June	\$333,000
June 30, 1971 (tentative)	1st week in July	161,000
June 30, 1971 (final)	Last week in August	—250,000

A Teachers College official told us that he had misinterpreted the reports received from the District's central accounting office. He said that, although the college had been receiving the report after sometime in 1970, he did not fully understand them. He said that he thought that the column showing unobligated funds of \$333,000 was the amount that the college had available to spend in June and that June salaries and other expected expenses had already been deducted.

On August 5, 1971, the District of Columbia's Executive Office of Budget and Program Analysis advised Teachers College that it had overobligated its fiscal year 1971 apportionment of funds by about \$250,000 and that the overobligation had to be brought within the available apportioned funds by August 10, 1971. After we discussed the overobligation with the president of Teachers College and with the District's Budget Office, the president requested the District Office of Municipal Audits to make a review and analysis of the college's fiscal year 1971 obligations.

A report issued by the Office of Municipal Audits on March 31, 1972, recommended various adjustments of Teachers College's fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972 obligations, which, when made, will reduce the college's fiscal year 1970 overobligations from \$532,020 to \$522,642; the fiscal year 1971 overobligations from \$283,401 to \$9,528; and the fiscal year

1972 unobligated funds as of January 31, 1972, from \$1,826,899 to \$1,559,681. The recommended adjustments of obligations recorded in fiscal years 1970 and 1971 included the cancellation of some unfilled purchase orders and the transfer, for a variety of reasons, of obligations between fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972. We have not examined into the propriety of the recommended adjustments.

In its audit report the Office of Municipal Audits cited the following major underlying causes for the over-obligation by Teachers College for fiscal year 1971.

1. The college's financial records were not reconciled on a daily or monthly basis with the financial reports furnished by the District's central accounting office.

2. College management officials were not aware of the correct amount of funds available for expenditure at the end of the fiscal year.

3. College employees responsible for the procurement functions were not familiar with applicable policies, procedures, and regulations relating to procurement activities.

The audit report recommended that the president, District of Columbia Teachers College, take administrative action to have the daily and monthly reports on the status of apportioned funds furnished by the District Accounting Office reconciled to the financial records of the college and to ensure that all employees responsible for the procurement function are familiar with the applicable policies, procedures, and regulations relating to procurement activities.

In a letter to the Chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, Senate Committee on Appropriations (B-118638, Mar. 13, 1972), we cited 18 cases in which the District's records indicated that reportable violations of the Anti-Deficiency Act had occurred in fiscal year 1971. One of the 18 cases was Teachers College's overobligation of its fiscal year 1971 apportioned funds by about \$250,000. The District, in responding to this letter on March 17, 1972, stated that the accounts of Teachers College were under review and expressed the belief that adjustments to correct accounting errors would result in showing that Teachers College's apportioned funds were not overobligated. As requested by the Chairman, we will report further on reportable violations of the Anti-Deficiency Act by the District of Columbia Government.

Conclusions

The District Accounting Office reports on the status of the college's funds provided the necessary information to have avoided the authorization of obligations in excess of the amounts available. The misinterpretation by college officials of the District Accounting Office reports and, as pointed out by the District auditors, the unfamiliarity of college officials and employees with procurement regulations, policies, and procedures were the basic reasons for the overobligation of fiscal year 1971 funds.

Teachers College, in addition to adopting the recommendations by the Office of Municipal Audits, should have its officials instructed as to the meaning of the District Accounting Office's periodic reports on the status of the college's funds. Further, we believe that the Office of Municipal Audits should make reviews to determine whether its recommendations have been implemented.

CHAPTER 4.—INADEQUATE CONTROL OVER EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES

The District of Columbia Accounting Manual directs that District agencies having custody of property maintain detailed property records and general ledger control accounts. Teachers College, however, does not maintain complete and accurate information on its equipment and supplies.

A function of financial property accounting is to provide reliable and systematically

maintained records of an agency's investment (at cost) in property. These records should be designed to be of maximum assistance in procurement and utilization of property, including the identification of excess property and its use, transfer, or disposal. Property accounting procedures should provide for:

Recording in accounts all transactions affecting investments in property—the acquisition and use, consumption, and disposal of property.

Maintaining appropriate records of quantities of property and its location.

Independently verifying the accuracy of the accounting records through periodic physical inventories.

The Teachers College maintains no accounting records for equipment and supplies and has no written procedures for the control over such items. A college official explained that the procedures for controlling equipment were as follows:

"When equipment is acquired, its description and location are recorded on a master equipment record card. This information, plus the name of the person charged with the equipment, is recorded on an equipment record card. Near the end of the fiscal year, the equipment record cards are sent to the persons charged with the equipment, who indicate the status of the equipment. Changes in status, such as equipment lost, condemned, or stolen, are noted on the master equipment record cards."

To determine whether these procedures were being followed, we selected for review, from purchase orders and available inventory records, 145 items of equipment which cost \$125 or more each and which had a total cost of \$81,300. Our review showed that only 37 of the 145 items had been recorded on the master equipment record cards and that individual equipment record cards were not on file for any of the 145 items.

With regard to supplies, no records are maintained to show the quantities purchased, used, or on hand. College officials said that physical inventories of supplies were not taken and that supplies were ordered when a visual examination of items on hand indicated that more were needed. We were told that the custodial staff was responsible for issuing and controlling supplies and that a written requisition form, approved by an administrative officer or department chairman, was required before supplies would be issued.

The custodial staff did not have a listing of persons who could approve the requisitioning of supplies. We noted that 32 of the 58 requisitions on hand had been filled at the time of our review had not been signed by administrative officers or department chairmen.

We discussed the lack of control over equipment and supplies with college officials in December 1971 and March 1972. They agreed that inventories had not been taken and that accurate records had not been maintained. We suggested, and they agreed, that assistance in establishing controls over these property assets be sought from the District Office of Municipal Audits.

Conclusions

Teachers College does not have adequate control over its equipment and supplies. To establish and maintain effective control over these items, the following steps should be taken.

First, general ledger control accounts and subsidiary records should be established for equipment and a general ledger account should be established for supplies. Secondly, written procedures should be developed and implemented for (1) recording all transactions in the general ledger control accounts, (2) maintaining subsidiary records showing the quantity, cost, and location of items of equipment, and (3) taking physical inventories periodically. Thirdly, a listing of persons authorized to requisition supplies should

¹ The recording of additional obligations had resulted in increasing the overobligations as of June 30, 1971, from \$250,000 to \$283,401.

be provided to the staff responsible for issuing and controlling supplies.

CHAPTER 5—ALL TUITION NOT COLLECTED

Students attending Teachers College who are not residents of the District of Columbia are required to pay tuition. Teachers College's present nonresident tuition rate of \$33.75 a semester hour was established in 1968 by the Board of Education.

Teachers College has not collected tuition from all nonresident students because bills had not been issued or because efforts had not been made to collect unpaid bills. Also foreign students on student visas had not been charged tuition because the college officials erroneously had considered them to be residents of the District.

Nonresident tuition

The District of Columbia Nonresident Tuition Act (31 D.C. Code 307d) requires the payment of tuition (1) for each child (a person under 21 years of age) who attends a public school¹ of the District of Columbia and who does not have a parent or guardian who resides in the District and (2) by each adult who attends such a public school and who does not reside in the District. The act requires also that tuition collected be deposited in the U.S. Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia.

The act also provides that a child be exempt from the payment of tuition upon submission of evidence that the care, custody, and substantial support of the child are supplied by the person or persons with whom the child is residing in the District of Columbia and that the parent or guardian of the child is unable to provide such care, custody, and support, or that the child is self-supporting.

Teachers College officials told us that the college had no written procedures relating to the billing and collection of nonresident tuition. They said that, when they registered at the beginning of each semester, students were required to complete forms showing, among other things, their ages and residences. They said also that officials of the college's business office subsequently examined these forms to identify nonresident students, computed the tuition for each nonresident student on the basis of the number of semester hours for which he had registered, and prepared bills. Copies of the bill are mailed to the students who are notified by the college to remit their payments, together with the copies of the bill received, to the District of Columbia Treasury. Upon receipt of payment, the District Treasury mails copies of the paid bill to Teachers College.

Our review of registration forms for students registering between February 1969 and August 1971, copies of tuition bills, and tuition payments received by the District Treasury showed that the above procedures had not been followed; that nonresident tuition of \$61,675 should have been billed and collected; and that, of the \$28,836 that had been billed, only \$12,700 had been collected. Many of the bills were prepared up to 1 year late, and no attempts had been made to collect unpaid bills.

College officials told us that when the college was under the control of the Board of Education, the college prepared the tuition bills and the Board of Education had collected the tuition. They said that after control of the college was transferred to the Board of Higher Education in 1969, they were unsure as to what the nonresident tuition charge should be and were uncertain as to how the billings should be handled. They said that consequently no nonresident tuition billings had been prepared for the 1969 summer sessions.

In November 1969 the Board of Higher Education notified Teachers College officials

that it had no objection to continuing the established nonresident tuition rates. The officials stated that they had learned later that new billing forms were needed and that a revenue account to which tuition collections could be credited had to be established by the District of Columbia Treasurer. They said that they had obtained the number of the account in January 1971 and that subsequently the billing forms had been ordered. The officials offered this as the reason why billings for other semesters had been prepared late.

The college officials were unable to explain why tuition billings had not been prepared for all nonresident students. They indicated that some nonresident students might have been exempt from paying tuition because they were under 21 years of age, self-supporting, and living in the District. We advised the officials that our review of the records had not disclosed any documentation indicating that any of these students had requested exemptions under the Nonresident Tuition Act. In December 1971 we provided the officials with a listing of the nonresident students who had not been billed. The officials said that they would make a review to determine the tuition-paying status of these students. As of March 3, 1972, we had not been informed of the results of that review.

Teachers College officials expressed the view that the collection of delinquent tuition should be accomplished by the District Treasury. District Treasury officials, however, advised us that the collection of tuition was a responsibility of the college. They said that, if the college's collection efforts failed, the college should so advise the District Corporation Counsel so that further collection action could be taken. As of March 3, 1972, Teachers College had not done this, and, as a result, no effort had been taken to collect unpaid tuition bills.

We discussed these matters with college officials in December 1971. The president of the college subsequently issued guidelines stating that the college would collect tuition from nonresident students at the time of their registration and that those students who are unable to pay at that time would be required to sign notes agreeing to pay immediately upon being billed.

We evaluated the effectiveness of the new tuition policy when students registered for the spring 1972 semester. We noted that during registration only three nonresident students had been identified and only one had been billed. A few weeks later, employees in the registrars office identified 35 additional nonresident students. A business office official told us that billings had been sent to all 37 nonresident students but that as of March 4, 1972, tuition had been collected from only nine.

Conclusions

Teachers College should identify nonresidents at the time of their application for admission to the college and, at the time of registration, should collect tuition from such students before permitting them to register for classes. The Board of Higher Education should direct Teachers College to adopt a procedure which would ensure the collection of nonresident tuition and which would avoid incurring costs involved in preparing and mailing tuition bills and in collecting the tuition.

Foreign student tuition

The act of April 23, 1958 (31 D.C. Code 301a), permits 25 foreign students who are in the United States on valid, unexpired student visas to attend Teachers College on the same basis as do residents of the District of Columbia, so far as the payments of tuition and fees are concerned. Thus 25 foreign students may attend Teachers College upon payment of only the cooperative fee. (See p. 7).

None of the foreign students in attendance at Teachers College are paying tuition. During the fall 1971 semester, 148 foreign students were enrolled. Assuming that these students were attending Teachers College on a full-time basis—that is, taking courses totaling at least 12 credit hours—and considering the existing nonresident tuition rate of \$33.75 a semester hour, the tuition that should have been collected from 123 of these students would amount to about \$50,000.

Teachers College officials said that they were of the opinion that foreign students who were 21 years of age or older and who lived in the District of Columbia were considered District residents for tuition purposes.

In our opinion, the act of April 23, 1958, created a special exception from other provisions of law which prohibited the use of District appropriations for free tuition to students who were not District residents. This provision was considered necessary because foreign students on student visas are not considered District residents, regardless of their ages.

Conclusions

No more than 25 foreign students, regardless of their ages, who are in the United States on valid, unexpired student visas may be permitted to attend Teachers College on the same basis as do District residents, insofar as the payment of tuition is concerned. Accordingly, we believe that the Board of Higher Education should direct Teachers College to adopt the necessary policies and procedures for collection of tuition from foreign students.

CHAPTER 6—IMPROPER PROCUREMENT PRACTICES

District of Columbia agencies generally are required to obtain at least three price quotations before ordering goods or services that cost between \$500 and \$2,500 and to advertise for bids when the cost exceeds \$2,500. Teachers College has not followed these requirements and, as a result, may have incurred unnecessary costs in its procurements.

The act of March 2, 1861, as amended through August 28, 1958 (41 U.S.C. 5), directs that agencies, including those of the District of Columbia Government, issue purchase orders or award contracts for supplies and services only after advertising for proposals, except when (1) the amount involved in any one case does not exceed \$2,500, (2) public urgency requires immediate delivery, (3) only one source of supply is available, or (4) certain services must be performed by a specific contractor. The District of Columbia Procurement Manual permits District agencies to select vendors without formal advertising for purchases costing less than \$2,500, but, when the cost is more than \$500, requires the agencies to obtain at least three informal price quotations. The Procurement Manual emphasizes that an agency's procurement needs should be combined to the extent possible and acquired under a single purchase order and that the splitting of purchase orders to stay under applicable dollar limitations is a violation of these procedures.

Teachers College procurements were financed from appropriated funds and from funds in its commercial bank account. In many instances the above procurement requirements were not followed by Teachers College.

Purchase orders issued by Teachers College and financed from appropriated funds are submitted to the District's Bureau of Procurement. A Bureau official advised us that all purchase orders in amounts of \$500 or more were examined to determine, among other things, whether the required number of price quotations or advertised bids had been obtained.

We found several examples where two or more purchase orders for similar items, each for less than \$500 but totaling more than

¹ Elementary, high schools, and higher educational institutions.

\$500, had been issued to a single vendor. By splitting purchases in this manner, Teachers College evaded the necessity for obtaining price quotations and avoided the examination by the Bureau of Procurement.

Our review of college purchases financed from funds in its commercial bank account and our discussions with a college official disclosed that in many instances the required price quotations or advertised bids had not been obtained. For example, between August 1970 and November 1971, the college issued 30 purchase orders in amounts ranging from \$500 to \$38,685 and totaling about \$152,000 to one construction firm without obtaining the price quotations or advertised bids that were required.

Unnecessary costs may be incurred when only one price quotation is obtained, as demonstrated by Teachers College plans to procure video equipment at a cost of \$14,510. A proposal in this amount was obtained from a single vendor in July 1971. A comparison of the prices proposed for certain items of the video equipment with manufacturers' price lists showed that the prices did not include allowances for price or time discounts. In view of this, we contacted three other companies in the Washington metropolitan area that sold the particular items of video equipment. When shown a list of this equipment, the firms indicated they would have given price discounts ranging from 5 to 17 percent and time discounts ranging from one half of one percent if paid within 30 days to 2 percent if paid within 20 days.

Teachers College had prepared 17 purchase orders for the acquisition of the video equipment. Of these 17 orders, one was for \$7,255 payable from grant funds in the college's commercial bank account and 16, each for less than \$500 and totaling \$7,255, were payable from appropriated funds. Of the 17 orders, six had been issued when we discussed the splitting of purchase orders with college officials. The president of Teachers College directed that the 11 orders not be issued. Also he subsequently issued a policy statement directing responsible procurement personnel to adhere to applicable laws and regulations when spending Teachers College funds.

CONCLUSIONS

Teachers College, because of its noncompliance with sound procurement practices, may have paid prices that exceeded those that could have been obtained by consolidating requirements and securing competitive bids or quotations. Adherence to applicable laws and regulations, as recently directed by the Teachers College president, should correct this deficiency. We believe, however, that the Office of Municipal Audits should periodically review Teachers College procurement practices to ascertain whether the president's directive is being followed.

APPENDIX I

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 12, 1971.

Comptroller General ELMER B. STAATS,
General Accounting Office,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STAATS: It has come to my attention that the General Accounting Office recently completed a report at the request of Senator William Spong on financial and property management at Federal City College. As a member of the District of Columbia Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, I am concerned about the operations of this and other institutions of higher education in the District of Columbia which are supported by federal funds.

Specifically, it is requested that your office review the operations of the Federal City College, the Washington Technical Institute and the District of Columbia Teachers College. We ask that you examine the following areas in particular: the authority of the receipt and deposit of all funds; the procedures for control over the obligations and expenditures of appropriated funds; the accountability for supplies and equipment; and the procedures for collection of tuition and fees owed by students. Your prompt cooperation in this investigation would be greatly appreciated.

With kind regards,
Sincerely,

BILL SCHERLE,
Member of Congress, Seventh Iowa
District.

We also found out, much to our dismay, that there were several other irregularities at Federal City College. The exact details have yet to be released. However a figure of \$100,000 has been mentioned. Whether it was misuse, mismanagement, or perhaps funds siphoned off for personal use, we do not know. This is another example of the lack of information given to us as a committee.

Mr. Chairman, if I had the time this afternoon, I could elaborate on many subjects. However, I do want the House to know that a multitude of changes have to be made in the District government. If we hold their feet to the fire, hopefully we can obtain the factual information we need to do a better job of making accurate decisions.

THE CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

MR. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, may I have 2 additional minutes?

MR. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

MR. SCHERLE. There was an article in the paper last Saturday by the mayor containing comments that were certainly beneath the dignity of his office. What disturbs me most is the attitude of the District of Columbia government with regard to criticism. They think they are above criticism. Mayor Washington said in regard to the criticisms I have made that if he were to reply, the budget would be cut another \$1 million.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is not the nature of this committee to act vindictively. We do not operate in that manner. The greatest friend and supporter of the citizens and the District of Columbia government is the chairman of the House District Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. BILL NATCHER and all of the members of the subcommittee have been more than generous. The chairman has given all of us an opportunity to present our case, and I feel privileged to have had this time this afternoon to describe my experiences.

I, for one, am sick and tired of unnamed District officials always trying to make him and our committee the whipping boy for the ills of the District of Columbia government. The problems are created at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue and not by our distinguished chairman and our subcommittee.

This bill contains many good suggestions, and I hope the folks downtown get the word and start to shape up.

MR. GROSS. Will my colleague from Iowa yield?

MR. SCHERLE. I will be glad to yield if I have the time.

THE CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

MR. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

MR. GROSS. Does the gentleman know of any other municipality of 740,000 population that has 481 employees drawing from \$25,000 to \$40,000 a year?

MR. SCHERLE. To answer my colleague, I know of none. This salary range on a per capita basis is unique.

MR. GROSS. That is the situation in the District of Columbia; is it not?

MR. SCHERLE. Yes, it is.

MR. GROSS. Up to \$40,000. I do not know whether it is more than \$40,000 or not, but at least it is up to \$40,000 a year.

MR. SCHERLE. If I may take the opportunity, I would like to compliment my distinguished friend from Iowa, the dean of our delegation, for the release of information concerning the Redevelopment Land Agency, which is about to sell an \$8-million tract of land at Fourth and K Streets for only \$2.5 million.

MR. GROSS. In other words, a \$6 million loss to the taxpayers.

MR. SCHERLE. Yes, a \$6 million loss to the taxpayers.

MR. Chairman, another fiasco of great concern is the low rent housing built at a cost of \$76,000 per unit. Anyone can purchase a much better townhouse for around \$50,000 in the nicest part of our Nation's Capital. The average taxpayer cannot afford either one.

MR. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further I want to commend him for the information he has given the House. I noted in the Washington newspapers last week that the number of families in Washington, D.C., with incomes of more than \$15,000 a year tripled from an estimated 7,000 in 1959 to about 21,000 in 1969.

When is the District of Columbia going to assume its share of taxpaying on the basis of these figures?

MR. SCHERLE. That subject was covered quite capably by our ranking Member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Davis). Until a decision is made downtown as to how much real-estate taxes they are going to pay, we will not know if they will ever pay an amount comparable to that paid throughout the Nation.

The median family income in the District is \$10,500. That ranks very favorably on the national scale. Yet residents of the District pay only 23 cents for each Federal grant dollar. In Iowa the taxpayer coughs up \$1.17 in Federal taxes for each dollar of Federal aid. Other States pay proportionately more in taxes for what they get back in Federal grant dollars than the District of Columbia.

THE CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

MR. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

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

MR. SCHERLE. I will be happy to yield to my colleague from Indiana.

MR. LANDGREBE. The gentleman cited some statistics with reference to the increase in the welfare rolls which were rather interesting and alarming, really.

MR. SCHERLE. Startling, is the word.

MR. LANDGREBE. Has the gentleman noticed in his travels around the District, in the District, and in the suburbs

recently signs reading "carpenters wanted"? Has the gentleman seen any signs such as that? Can the gentleman answer "yes" or "no"?

Mr. SCHERLE. I have seen many of these signs scattered throughout the District.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Has the gentleman seen signs reading "laborers wanted"?

Mr. SCHERLE. I have seen that, too.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Has the gentleman seen signs reading "waitresses wanted"?

Mr. SCHERLE. Yes, many of those.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Has the gentleman seen signs reading: "Store managers wanted. Will train"?

Mr. SCHERLE. I have seen those also.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Is it not rather strange that the welfare rolls are skyrocketing at the very time that there is such a demand for unskilled and skilled labor in this community?

Mr. SCHERLE. It is completely baffling to me that with all the opportunities for employment we have so many people on relief, particularly when people throughout the country are bearing such a heavy tax load to provide the almost half a billion dollars in Federal support the District receives each year.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Does the gentleman feel that this Congress dare appropriate additional funds and encourage more people to go on welfare when there are important and necessary employment awaiting the willing hand?

Mr. SCHERLE. We must take care of those in need. This committee has never opposed giving money to people who are actually in need, nor have the other Members of the House, but we are totally opposed to giving it to people who do not need it.

We need forceful administrators in every department to administer this government. That is the problem today—lack of efficient management in the District particularly insofar as welfare is concerned.

Mr. LANDGREBE. In my home State, Indiana, my people pay \$1.61 in Federal taxes for each Federal grant dollar. That makes it the highest tax burden in proportion to Federal aid of any State in the Union. That is why I am so concerned about Government waste in our Nation's Capital.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the ranking minority member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN).

Mr. NELSEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First, I want to express my thanks to the committee. I know that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER) have over a period of years done a very careful job, a very conscientious job, in trying to meet the needs of the District while at the same time policing the use of the taxpayers' money utilized here from all over the United States.

Those of us who are on the Committee on the District of Columbia sometimes wince a bit when some of the charges are made because maybe we are to blame for some of the things that have

gotten out of hand, as indicated by the statements which have been made.

I want to call your attention to the fact that we find at times that we have made some of the problems. For instance, we have set up by statute independent agencies around this town, and as we proceed with the business of the city one agency can veto what another one recommends, and vice versa, all the way around. I recall one evening down at the Board of Trade dinner. Some of the folks were calling attention to the fact that you can drive out of the city about 50 miles, and find city developments occurring almost overnight. But in the District of Columbia, because of the red tape involved, trying to bring some investor capital into the District to produce some tax base is almost impossible because of all of the red tape. This situation almost kills the idea of trying to do anything about development in the District of Columbia.

So what am I saying? I am saying that those of us on the Committee on the District of Columbia believe, as I personally believe, that we should have a better plan of attack. We have been searching for some answers to these problems.

I am sure you will recall the so-called Nelsen Commission, sometimes called the Little Hoover Commission. Our Commission began with the idea "OK, let us take a look at the city, step by step by step, and decide where the mistakes are." Now we have come up with some recommendations that will improve the situation. My point here is that we should continue what we have been trying to do. I wish that the Delegate for the District of Columbia, its very eloquent representative, were here today, as he should be, to listen to these remarks and to listen to the committee's report, as to what we have done in this Commission study. Presently, we are waiting for the Public Printer to print our report. It has taken more time than we anticipated because of the volume of work. But the Commission has gone into education, we have gone into administration, and we have gone into personnel. We find one of the major problems, as I mentioned, involves the independent agencies. They are set up by law all over this town, with one vetoing another. Part of what we have been trying to do is to establish procedures that would lead to orderly, efficient decision-making.

Somewhere, some place, somebody ought to be in charge. Someone ought to be able to umpire this ball game and say "Now, this is it, let us go."

So we have really tried to do something about the problems that have been cited here today. And, of course, when the blistering attack comes some of us who are on the committee occasionally feel that it lands in our own laps a little bit uncomfortably because, what has our committee done in the past to try to improve the practices?

Turn back the pages of history a little bit. Remember when we had the reorganization proposal which was sent up by President Johnson? I opposed the reorganization plan of President Johnson where the City Council and the Mayor were set up to operate under the present

system because some of the major problems were not met through this reorganization plan. This assessment proved to be true. The problems have not been met.

So I just wanted to call these facts to the attention of the Members who are here today, and also to ask for the support of the Members in trying to enact into law some of the recommendations that our Commission will make. There are some recommendations that I will thoroughly endorse. But on some of them I do have objections. In any case, I think that the various groups and organizations in the District of Columbia have the right to express their ideas, which will be outlined in print, and I think the city will be better served because of it.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. I would like to refer to one additional matter. There is at least one success story that has the accolades of everybody in this House, and that involves the job being done by the Washington Technical Institute, an educational institution for the vocational training of people to give them a craft and to qualify them to hold a job.

At the first graduation that I attended out there, 87 percent of the young people had a job the day they graduated.

We have a hangar out at the airport where Washington Tech is training mechanics, and everyone of them has a job.

The school has 700 or 1,000 students—I do not have the exact number at the tips of my fingers, but there are both part-time students and full-time students. Every one of them is learning to be a productive individual with a job, qualified to fill the needs of industry in this area.

I hope that some of the other institutions of learning here will shape up and follow the example set by the Washington Technical Institute. I want to compliment the school, and I am sure that the chairman and the minority and majority members of our committee share my sentiments.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I would like the members of the Committee to know that this bill contains no provisions that represent legislation on an appropriation bill.

Also, Mr. Chairman, it has been a distinct honor for me to serve with the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN), the ranking minority member of the House District Committee and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. McMILLAN), the chairman of that Committee during all the time I have been a member of the District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee. These gentlemen work hard. They have been on the legislative committee for a number of years, and certainly, it has been a pleasure for me as chairman of this subcommittee to work with them.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HUNGATE).

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

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the remarks of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN). I would say that I am happy that all Republicans are not like our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, because if they were—then I think I should have to be a Republican. He provides distinguished leadership on the District of Columbia Committee. He is a balance wheel on that committee—he is a tower of patience. If you will follow his leadership and advice on District of Columbia matters, you will not make any mistake.

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

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and as I understand there is no request for time on either side, and I would suggest that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FASCELL, 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. 15259) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

APPOINTMENT AS DELEGATES TO INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 965, 92d Congress, the Chair appoints as delegates to attend the International Labor Organization Conference in Geneva, Switzerland, between June 7, 1972, and June 27, 1972, the following members of the Committee on Education and Labor: Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey; and Mr. ERLBORN, of Illinois; and as alternates to attend said conference, the following members of the committee on Education and Labor: Mr. CLAY, of Missouri, and Mr. ESCH, of Michigan.

SECRETARY CONNALLY'S TRIP TO LATIN AMERICA

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that former Secretary of the Treasury John Connally is going to visit several countries of Latin America in the course of his globe-spanning mission for the President.

As perhaps the chief architect of President Nixon's new economic policy—at least of its international part—Mr. Connally may have quite a bit to communicate to our friends in this hemisphere.

He may, for one, be able to answer their questions about the general outlines

of the new international monetary order which President Nixon hopes to achieve.

He may also give them some idea about the timing of negotiations which may produce such a new monetary order.

And, finally, he may be able to enlighten them about the role which the administration would like them to play in that process.

We must not forget that the measures which President Nixon took last August 15 to protect the U.S. balance of payments are temporary at best. They must, at some point, be followed by far-ranging adjustments in the international machinery which facilitates economic and financial relations between nations of the world.

The role which the International Monetary Fund will play in the future will have to be redefined.

A new system for the adjustment of exchange rates between different currencies will have to be agreed upon.

More effective methods for clearing trade balances, and for transferring resources to the developing countries, will have to be devised.

All of these issues—and some others—are of great importance to the United States as well as to the countries of Latin America.

As the continuing huge deficits in our balance of trade and payments show, the basic problems of adjusting international economic relations have not been solved by the drastic actions which the United States unilaterally imposed last August.

We are still in deep trouble and, as Dr. Arthur Burns, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, said just a few days ago, time may be running out on us. Unless the administration moves to work out some new multilateral arrangements, our economic problems may well continue to multiply.

I, therefore, welcome Mr. Connally's trip and I sincerely hope that its objective is the advancement of effective, lasting solutions to international monetary and payments problems.

Our friends in Latin America have a large stake in those solutions. They have been shocked, and possibly hurt to some extent, by the New Economic Policy of August 15, 1971. And they are deeply concerned about what the United States may do in this field in the future.

To the extent that Mr. Connally may be able to alleviate those concerns, and further the development of new, equitable international monetary and related arrangements, to that extent his trip may serve the long-range interests of the United States and the world community.

ALBERT RAINS SPEECH CONTEST WINNERS

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

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD each year I have served in Congress the three winning speeches in the annual Albert Rains speech contest held at Snead State Junior College in my congressional district.

This contest is sponsored by my good friend, Albert Rains, who served with great distinction in the U.S. House of Representatives for many years.

These speeches are always interesting and well prepared. They reflect a genuine interest and concern for many of the problems and challenges facing our Nation today.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I would like to have placed in the RECORD copies of the three winning speeches.

This year's winners are: First place, Charla Keith, Oneonta, Ala.; second place, Victor Polarin, Nigeria, Africa; third place, Joyce Hughes, Albertville, Ala.

The speeches follow:

[First Place]

WOMEN'S LIBERATION—GOOD FOR THE USA
(By Charla Keith, 1972)

If it is not good for the U.S.A. then all men and women are in the same boat. Surely it must be good for the U.S.A. because we have so much of it. Women jockeys, blacksmiths, plumbers and even baseball umpires.

Since the death of the long-time Director of the F.B.I., J. Edgar Hoover, the man named by President Nixon as the new director, L. Patrick Gray, has stated that the Justice Department would accept applications leading to the appointment of women to the position of Special Agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Department of Justice.

This, I believe, is a position no woman is qualified to hold. Why do I feel this way? My father was a member of the F.B.I. two years. From what he has told me, women are not physically fit to stand up to the vigorous routine. Also, many assignments given to F.B.I. agents are not for women.

I understand that the lady who was so dedicated and zealous in her efforts to be an F.B.I. Agent—once the opportunity presented itself, she quickly stated that she did not desire to be an F.B.I. Agent. I wonder, then, if it was on her part at least, Women's Liberation or just women's talk.

It seems you cannot pick up a newspaper today without finding something on the subject. A recent issue of the *Birmingham News* published an article entitled "Myths and Realities About Women Jobs" by Sylvia Porter. There are many unjust myths that are circulated about women and why some people say they do not make good employees. There are three examples:

Myth: Women switch jobs more frequently than men.

Reality: Labor Department studies show that men's job changing rates are just slightly higher than rates for women. Men are more likely to change occupations than women.

Myth: Training women is a waste of money since they quit when they marry or have children.

Reality: The separations are only temporary. Even taking into account her child-rearing, non-working years—the average woman worker has a work-life expectancy of twenty-five years. For a single woman, the average is forty-five years, versus an over-all average of forty-three years for men, married or single.

Myth: Women are absent from their jobs because of illness more often than men are.

Reality: Single women on an average, are absent from their jobs 3.9 days a year against 4.3 days for men. And women age sixty and over, according to a U.S. Civil Service Commission study, also have lower absenteeism rates than men in this age bracket.

There are some jobs women are certainly more qualified to hold based on past experience and education. However, if that cer-

tain exceptional man should come along, I would have no objections. After all, I am not against men's liberation.

I don't feel I need to be liberated. Women are now taking their rightful places in society—a far cry from the way things were during the days when women were trying to obtain suffrage. There is no doubt about it—"We have come a long way, Baby."

I think we women need to step back and examine the question carefully. If we try to push this women's liberation issue too far we might lose our feminine image. I personally don't want that. I would hate to see the day when I would be expected to open a door for a man.

[Second Place]

WOMEN'S LIBERATION

(By Victor A. Polarin, Nigeria, Africa, 1972)

Panel of judges, co-speakers, fellow students and members of the staff and faculty of Snead State Junior College. It is my intention, this morning to establish, contend, and convince you that the Women's Liberation Movement is nothing but a barrier to the development of the nation; a threat to the well-being of the society and a headache to the government. Consequently, it should be banned from operating; totally eradicated and completely discouraged.

The other day, I was watching a television commercial. At the end of the commercial, a man asked "How is your headache America? Tip-Tip-Tip-Top." This question seemed funny but taken seriously, it had a deeper meaning and implication than indicated.

It is a well known fact that America, like any other nation has its headaches and if the intensity of headaches are judged by the size of the head, then America will perhaps possess the most intense headache in the world. However, what are the things that constitute a headache for America? A day in the big city is enough to tell us what these things are: Crime, murder, rape, elections, the search for peace and a civilized environment where the human life can really mean something to the society; just to mention a few. All these and many more are problems which the government is facing daily and working hard to solve. Then came the Women's Liberation Movement to revolt against: dressing to please men, being treated as sex objects; being manipulated as consumers in a Madison Avenue motivated Capitalist Society, being treated as guinea pigs in the use of birth control pills, not being free to decide whether or not to have an abortion and being treated as chicks by their male colleagues in the peace and campus radical movements.

They are questioning the natural traditional values of marriage and family, of capitalism, of the precept that a woman should devote most of her time to rearing children, of the idea that a married woman has a duty to spend much of her time in manual labor such as cooking and cleaning, of the notion that a single girl's main preoccupation should be getting a man, in short, they are questioning the whole social and economic fabric of which the United States today is woven. They are questioning the role of man as the bread winner. All these and other unreasonable ideas constitute the main demands or objects of the Women's Liberation Movement. These are what they want the government to do for them, but it still beats me why they did not ask the government to choose and live their lives for them. Maybe it is going to be their next demand. Who knows!

The future of the nation depends solely on the youth of today, but to my surprise and to the disappointment of the elders, the youth is not measuring up to expectations. The majority of the crimes committed today are attributed to the youth and almost everything evil is initiated by the expected leader of tomorrow. Why?

This reminds me of a saying down in my home town. Literally translated to English,

it goes thus: "A group of observers once looked at a K-legged man carrying a load on his head. The one man from the group said, 'Hey you crooked man, don't you see that the load you are carrying on your head is crooked?' Then the man replied and said 'My dear young man, you are good at observing things but I must confess to you, you need to be better. Don't you see that the whole thing has been crooked right from the bottom?'"

Such is the case with the youth of America. The mothers had forgotten that according to Dr. Spock a child is a unique individual, full of potentials: that with careful molding and continuous attention, to his rearing, he could be fashioned into a well rounded human achiever. Conversely, without that attention, he could be crippled for life. They did not realize that the rearing of a child is the most challenging thing a woman could do which would give her a sense of fulfillment far beyond any other occupation. Men of course, have a role in this child rearing too, but it was recognized that the family could not be as all consuming for them since they still had their careers and their role of the bread winner. The women forgot that it is to them that the over-riding challenge of molding the child into a fearless personality fell. They also forgot that to do this, they had to sacrifice not just a career, but also themselves and a large part of their outside interests.

What they should have done, they have left undone, doing what they should not have done; coming together to fight for an undeserved "liberty." To me, their movement is not worthy of its cause and they will surely fail.

They are quarrying the natural position of "helper" which has been bestowed upon them since their creation. They want to be "free," live their own lives, and be equal to men in everything. A condition which the creator did not make for them during creation. The Bible tells us in Ephesians 5: 22-24, "Let wives be subject to their husbands as to the Lord; because a husband is head of the wife, just as Christ is head of the church, being himself savior of the body. But just as the church is subject to Christ, so also let wives be to their husbands in all things." The object of the Women's Liberation Movement is a sharp contrast to these words of the Bible. They want to make a new Bible. They want to turn the world upside down and fashion it into whatever they want. This is fanatical and meaningless.

Should the government support them and give them the power to do what they want? NO! It should not happen in our time. Their mothers had known their duty, and they had done it, but they had built a fence around themselves to prevent them from doing theirs.

Let us break down this wall and make them realize that their place is in the home where they have to take care of the children and make out of them good citizens of tomorrow who will one day look back with pride and say, "Oh, I remember my mother." Let us make them realize that good memories are made of good works done by good people. That it is not fighting for an undeserved freedom that makes the world peaceful but building a peace-loving and law abiding citizen out of their children.

The acceptance of the Women's Liberation Movement and all it stands for by the government will not bring peace and solution to the world's problems; instead it will bring social disruption, unhappiness, and increasing rates of divorce and desertion. This is a contrast to what the Bible tells us in First Corinthians 7: 10-11, "But to those who are married, not I, but the Lord commands that a wife is not to depart from her husband, and if she departs, that she is to remain unmarried or be reconciled to her husband. And let not a husband put away his wife."

The Bible contains the words of God and if America is "A Nation under God," will

she not be seeking her own destruction by going against the commandment of God? On these grounds, I am sure you will agree with me that the Women's Liberation Movement should not only be banned by the government, but also be completely eradicated and totally discouraged.

Thank you.

[Third Place]

IS WOMEN'S LIBERATION GOOD FOR AMERICA?
(By Joyce Hughes, May 26, 1972)

Men—I hate 'em! Arrogant, selfish, egotistical men! They think they rule the earth with their masculinity. They force us to be their slaves—cook their dinner, scrub their floors, and have their babies. Then what thanks do we get? "Where's my shirt?" "The least you can do is have dinner ready when I get home. After all, a man has to work for a living." (At least he gets paid for his work.)

"YOU—run for city council? Why, you dingbat women don't even have sense enough to vote."

Men—I hate 'em! And what's more, I'm tired of being pushed around by them. You know what I think we ought to do? I think we ought to Revolt! Overthrow! Men—I hate 'em!

If I were to boldly state that I am for Women's Liberation, this is the attitude that you might expect me to take toward men. To borrow a colloquial expression, "taint necessarily so." The hostility of the radical members of Women's Liberation may prove to be more damaging than helpful in attaining the ultimate goals of the organization. People with sufficient intelligence and breeding have learned to maintain control of their faculties, hence they do not stoop to radicalism which is the trademark of ignorant (though often educated) extremists. In our eagerness as women to break away into new areas of development we must not overstep our bounds and thus deprive ourselves of that which we most greatly desire—respect.

Being for the advancement of women in society is not synonymous with being against the male in his position of leadership and authority. The male status does not necessarily have to be lowered in order for the female status to be raised. Israel's famous grandmother and plain-speaking stateswoman Golda Meir, has proven that a woman may also possess the qualities of leadership.

While there is an active Women's Liberation Organization, it is interesting to note that there is no comparable Anti-Women's Lib movement from the male aspect of our society. As a whole, today's men seem willing to accept women into their ranks in the business world, professional occupations, and the educational fields. Their practical minds find competence, self-assurance, and intelligence attractive in feminine attire.

A woman does not have to be "manish" to be a part of the man's world, nor does she have to speak their language. They don't expect it because, after all, she's a woman. It is not only possible for a woman to maintain her femininity while at the same time performing her duties with executive efficiency, but also to her advantage.

All of this seems to indicate that women are waging psychological warfare, not against men, but against themselves. A woman's worst enemy is her concept of what is socially acceptable femininity. Because of suspicion and envy it is difficult for women to accept the fact that one of their number has mustered up enough courage to cast from her neck the Victorian Albatross. This image problem, coupled with the desire to be accepted by the members of one's own sex has washed many talents and ambitions down the kitchen sink along with the dirty dishwater.

There appears to be three main stumbling blocks to feminine progress. The first is the Victorian concept of femininity which conditions the child from infancy to accept the role of wife and mother as her ultimate goal

in life without alternatives. Secondly, this conditioning drives many young girls to early marriage because of insecurity and the desire to identify with someone else. The third, soap operas, may seem trivial but serves as an indication of a deeper problem. Daytime dramas lead many women to be content to shroud their own dull and uneventful lives with televised fantasy. This is a disease which not only robs them of valuable time, but also of emotional energy that could be spent more constructively in endeavors of reality.

The causes behind these stumbling blocks are lack of courage to break away from outdated traditions and venture into new fields of endeavor. Also lack of self-respect which causes one to exist like a parasite, unable to establish her own identity. And finally, lack of initiative, or in "cotton patch" language, plain old laziness. Many women are afraid to honestly admit to themselves what they really want from life. They are unwilling to set meaningful goals and put forth sufficient effort to reach those goals.

As tradition would have it when Adam and Eve were cast out of Eden it became necessary for them to share their fight for survival in whatever way seemed best suited for the circumstances. Even in our modern society, life outside of Eden is difficult and it is still, as Darwin defined it, a struggle for survival. The circumstances are different, but the need to share responsibilities remains the same. Sharing is not only a pragmatic and defensive mechanism, but when flavored with respect, understanding and often romance, it becomes a very rewarding human experience.

As women we must find our true identity and self-expression without humiliating, emasculating, or making enemies of our men. Success is a word which has no gender. It is only as each of us develops to our full potential as individuals that our nation will be able to realize its true strength. We were created male and female, not to strife with each other, but rather to compliment each other by our very existence.

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT NIXON ON RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY

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

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to the statement issued by President Nixon on May 10 regarding Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. The President issued his statement at the time authorizing legislation for the radios for fiscal year 1973 was submitted. I am happy to see that the legislation has been introduced by Chairman MORGAN and assigned the number H.R. 15002.

In view of the difficulty which the two Houses of Congress had in arriving at an agreement for authorizing legislation for the current fiscal year, I commend the approach which has been taken in the new submission and in the President's statement about it. In the course of the actions in the two Houses, it became apparent that there was a strong majority favoring continuation of the broadcasting activities of these two valuable organizations. It was also the majority opinion, as expressed in legislation passed by this House and in a resolution passed by the other body, that a study should be undertaken of the activities of the two radios and of their funding to assist us in formulating a

permanent legislative framework for them.

The President's statement announces his intention to appoint a Presidential Study Commission for that purpose. This Commission, which will have a limited life, is to be specifically charged with the responsibility to consult exhaustively with the Congress in drawing up its recommendations. In drawing up these recommendations, the Commission will be expected to take into consideration the relationship of the broadcasting operations of the radios to the national interest and to this Nation's foreign policy objectives. I believe these points are worth noting particularly.

I hope that the appointment of the Commissioners will soon be announced and that they can begin their work. We have had to consider the legislation for fiscal year 1972 and the authorization now being requested for fiscal year 1973 as interim arrangements because we were unable to reach agreement on the form which a longer term framework for the two radios should take. The Presidential Study Commission should go a long way toward helping us overcome those difficulties. I am sure Members will be interested in the President's statement, which follows:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT THE WHITE HOUSE, MAY 10, 1972.

Under Public Law 92-264, which I signed on March 30, 1972, grants in support of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty were authorized through the end of fiscal year 1972.

The decision to continue Government support for these radios was approved by large majorities in Congress and reflects the judgment that has been expressed overwhelmingly by newspapers throughout this country and by leading citizens in all walks of life that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty continue to perform a unique and valuable service. As I stated in a recent letter to the Chairman of the Radio Free Europe Fund, "... we have followed closely the work of RFE and are satisfied that it continues to serve a fundamental national interest."

I also said that "... the free flow of information and ideas among nations is indispensable to more normal relations between East and West and to better prospects for an enduring peace."

I have therefore asked the Secretary of State to submit today a bill which would continue Government support to the radios through fiscal year 1975. As with the fiscal year 1972 authorization, this bill would make the grants to the radios through the Secretary of State under such terms and conditions he deems appropriate.

A number of different views have been expressed in Congress as to how the radios might best be funded for the future. No consensus on this important matter has emerged. The House version of the fiscal year 1972 authorization and Senate Resolution 272 make clear that majorities in both Houses believe this should be given further study before a definitive solution is adopted.

To this end, I plan to appoint a Presidential Study Commission with instructions to render its report and recommendations by February 28, 1973, so that the Administration and Congress can take them into consideration in formulating authorizing legislation for fiscal year 1974. In making its study, the Commission will be particularly concerned to consult exhaustively with members of Congress.

In undertaking the task, the Commission

will have the benefit and will take full account of the in-depth studies of each radio that were prepared by the Congressional Research Service at the request of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee together with companion studies recently completed by the General Accounting Office. Two subsequent studies by the Congressional Research Service—one a survey and analysis of the available options with respect to future funding methods and the other an examination of the foreign policy aspects of these broadcasting operations—will also materially assist the Commission.

It is evident that the choice of the method or mechanism for future funding of the radios must depend upon a proper perception of the relationship of those operations to the national interest and specifically to this nation's foreign policy objectives. In my view, that relationship exists for one fundamental reason, but one reason only: namely, that it has always been and must always be part of our national purpose to promote free, responsible communication among nations, not just at the government level, but at all levels. Thus, these radios are not spokesmen for American official policy—that role belongs in broadcasting to the Voice of America. Rather, they are expressions of our profound conviction that a responsible, independent and free press plays an indispensable part in the social and political processes that look to better understanding and more effective cooperation, not only within a nation, but also among nations.

It is this conception, I believe, that lies at the base of the article of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which declares it to be the right of everyone "to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers." International broadcasting is of course only a part of that process; our international exchange programs are another important part.

The Commission will render a great service by undertaking a critical examination of this subject and by providing the best possible basis for determining the methods by which support for these valuable organizations can be maintained without impairment to the professional independence upon which their present effectiveness depends.

While this Commission produces its recommendations, it is essential that the authorization providing support to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty be extended for fiscal year 1973. While I continue to believe that the Department of State is not the appropriate channel for grants to the two radios, I believe that discussions of the alternatives should be deferred until we have the benefit of the recommendations of the Commission. I therefore strongly recommend that the bill which we are submitting to Congress for a 1973 authorization be given favorable consideration before the beginning of the new fiscal year.

MR. JAMES G. STAHLMAN STEPS DOWN

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

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, after three score years of service, Mr. James G. Stahlman, president and publisher of the Nashville Banner, has retired effective June 1, 1972.

Mr. Stahlman, rightfully known as the Dean of Southern Newspaper Publishers, has left an indelible mark on American journalism and a gap in the ranks of American newspaper publishers which will be impossible to fill.

A staunch individual of independent mind and judgment, Mr. Stahlman has carved a respected and esteemed name for himself for his forthright expression of editorial view and as a successful publisher who has led the Nashville Banner to notable journalistic achievement over his years of stewardship.

With the announcement of his retirement, Mr. Stahlman stepped out with the promise that he will continue to be heard from as he prepares the first of at least two books on the people, places, and events in his life.

Mr. Stahlman disclosed his retirement in an open letter to "my friends and readers of the Nashville Banner" which appeared on the front page of the June 1, 1972, edition of the Banner and I include it in the RECORD at this point, commending his words and comments to the attention of my colleagues. Mr. Stahlman was and is a powerful voice in American journalism, but his daily presence will be missed.

The article follows:

STAHLMAN COMPLETES 60 BANNER YEARS—
PLANS TWO BOOKS ON PEOPLE, PLACES,
EVENTS IN HIS EXCITING LIFE

(By James G. Stahlman)

To my friends and readers of the Nashville Banner:

By the grace of God, the tolerance of a fickle and sometimes intolerant newspaper constituency and the faithful and devoted support of cherished members of what has become affectionately known as "The Banner Family," I have come to one of the most emotionally difficult days of my life.

Today I complete sixty years of service to The Nashville Banner, forty-two of it as president and publisher, with every day dedicated to the cause of free and responsible journalism.

I had firmly charted my present course prior to the conclusion of my sale of this beloved newspaper to the Gannett Group. I had made it perfectly clear to my long-time friend, Paul Miller, whose personal and journalistic integrity had prompted me to select him and his able associates in the Gannett Group as my successor owners, that I would end my duties as president and publisher on the day that I had completed 60 years as an employee of this newspaper.

This is it!

These three-score years have taught me much. They have afforded me world travel, world friendships, world service.

They have placed me in high positions of honor and responsibility.

They have given me the opportunity to play a part in the history of this beloved country of ours, of this neighboring hemisphere which we have shared with Canadians to the North and our Latin brothers South of the border.

And in more far-reaching portions of the earth I have been privileged to serve my country in times of war as well as peace in numerous capacities.

I have witnessed and actively participated in some of the important scientific and industrial developments from the horse-car to Americans on the moon; from the early filament bulb to the devastating laser beam; from Marconi to Telstar; from Kitty-Hawk to the SST; from a reverent pulpit to a distressing era of agnosticism.

This has been the most exciting period of advance in the world's history—culturally, scientifically, industrially, sociologically, economically, politically.

Our progress has wrought much havoc. It has played hob with stable homelife, produced a disdain for the fundamentals, destroyed respect for law, order, the courts and

constituted authority. It has brought the United States to a dangerous divisiveness and the world to the brink of self-destruction.

Through all these years, I have clung steadfastly to the belief that this blessed country of ours is still worth saving; that the freedoms of our people can be preserved; that there is more good than bad in mankind and that a forgiving, omnipotent Father can and will save those men and nations willing to defend that faith implicit in our national motto: "In God We Trust."

As I relinquish The Banner's helm, I shall not retire to some secluded beach. I turn over the flagbridge to a competent team—Wayne Sargent, Jimmy Armistead and Ken Morrell—all experienced in their respective fields, the two latter gentlemen in my long-time, valued associates, indoctrinated in and dedicated to the journalistic principles which have made The Nashville Banner the potent, independent, conservative voice of this region during its ninety-six years of service to Nashville, the State of Tennessee and the United States, ninety-one of which have had the Stahlman imprint dominant in its policies.

I commend them to all who read, respect and trust the Nashville Banner, confident that these gentlemen and their equally dedicated associates—all of whom I hold in highest esteem and deep personal affection, will uphold the editorial policies and journalistic traditions which have characterized the Nashville Banner since its founding nearly a century ago.

They are the inheritors of a precious legacy bequeathed by men like Dr. William Martin Clark, Major Edward Bushrod Stahlman, Gideon H. Baskette, Edward Claiborne Stahlman, Richard H. Yancey, George Harrison Armistead and Alvand C. Dunkleberger.

Their legates would not, could not betray this sacred trust.

For me there are days and years of serious work ahead.

I have two or more books to write, before my memory fades.

I have things to say and things to tell about places I have visited, men I have known, events in which I have participated, many of them having had something to do with where we are today, how we got there, where we could be headed and how we may arrive at our respective destinies. Some of this might be fairly interesting. None of it will be dull.

Stick around and I'll try to convince you.

And remember this—on April 10, 1976, the Nashville Banner will celebrate its one-hundredth anniversary.

Meet me there!

RETURN TO ROBERT F. KENNEDY: JUNE 6, 1972

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

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, these words are inscribed on the cover of the folk missal for the memorial Mass for our late Senator from New York Robert F. Kennedy:

Each time a man stands up for an ideal he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope.

The Mass at Arlington National Cemetery sponsored by Mrs. Ethel Kennedy and her family was celebrated by Rev. Albert Pereira, pastor of Saint Luke's Church, McLean, Va., of which Senator Robert Kennedy's family are members.

The inscription speaks the sense of hope and peace among those who today return to Arlington to join in annual tribute to Robert F. Kennedy.

The choral of voices, young and seasoned sang in the liturgy of the morning Mass a reminder; in the words of Saint Augustine—"For those who live in the Lord, life does not end it merely changes."

The sound of the voice of Senator Kennedy is remembered and restates his call for change, for compassion, for an end to suffering, a halt to war, a new birth of hope.

The joining of hands, the giving of the sign of peace among those who returned to Arlington was more than a ritual. It was a binding that peace among men is still the cause we serve, the course we seek. It is the commitment that Senator Kennedy lived for and that we must work for in return for his life of sacrifice.

To return to the life and times of Robert Kennedy is not to visit with the past. We know that when we see gathered the Kennedys of now and the Kennedys of tomorrow.

I refer not to the distinguished Americans of the Supreme Court, former Members of the Cabinet, of the Congress and the American leaders of all races, creeds, and realms who returned to Arlington this morning. The Kennedys of now and tomorrow are the children of Robert and Ethel Kennedy and the other nephews and nieces of our late President and Senator. They are in fact, all the children of the world.

As their day dawns let us hope that there will be a real and lasting return to Robert Kennedy and his ideals.

To the guardian and symbol of those ideals, Ethel Kennedy, we owe our tribute. Her strength, her joy, her love of sincerity and the sincerity of her love for all men is quietly evident as we join with her and the children of Robert F. Kennedy in one more return to Arlington.

A verse his family chose for the communion song this morning is drawn from the speeches of Senator Robert F. Kennedy. As a message of hope and peace it needs to be heard and I offer it here:

WHICH OF THEM?

1.

As we stand here today
Young men are fighting 'cross the sea
They are dying far away from their home.

2.

To seek a change in a world
Which yields most painfully to change
They are dying far away from their home.

(REFRAIN)

Which of them would have taught a child?
Or built a bridge? Or cured disease?
Which of them would have brought peace to our land?

Which of them? Which of them? Which of them?
Which of them? Which of them?

Which of them would have brought peace to our land?

3.

The battle's not that far away
It's closing in more everyday
As countless dreams are dying here in our home.

4.

Some men see things as they are
And ask why they are so
Let us dream of what could be and ask,
"Why not?" (Refrain)

5.

Surely the world has seen enough
Of hatred, violence and pain
It is time to bring peace to our land.

6.

We can learn, at last, to look
At our fellowmen with hope
And begin to bind the wounds that tear our
land.

(REFRAIN)

Which of us will teach a child?
Or build a bridge? Or cure disease?
Which of us will bring peace to our land?
Each of us. Each of us. Each of us. Each of us.
And together we'll bring peace to our land.

SOME QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ABOUT THE EDUCATION CON- FERENCE REPORT

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

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, as one of the House conferees on S. 659, the education conference report on which the House will vote next Thursday, June 8, I have been asked a number of questions about the bill by colleagues in the House.

I therefore take this opportunity to list some of the most frequently asked questions about the conference report together with the answers to these questions.

Because this legislation is so important to colleges and universities throughout the United States and to the students who attend them, I hope that Members who have questions about the bill will avail themselves of the opportunity to review this compendium of questions and answers.

Mr. Speaker, in particular, I want to note that the new basic educational opportunity grants program in the bill is not restricted to low-income students, as some Members have mistakenly thought, but is open to students from middle- as well as low-income families, and was, indeed, designed to be open to both.

Moreover, the deletion in S. 659 of the low-income preference from the present college work study program means that middle-income students will now be able to participate in this existing program as well as in the new basic educational opportunity grant program.

The second point to which, Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw particular attention, touches on the institutional assistance to be received under the bill by private colleges and universities.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, under the bill, all accredited institutions, both public and private, would benefit from the new direct institutional aid assistance provision. Private colleges and universities, which enroll 26.4 percent of all students, will receive, according to estimates of the U.S. Office of Education, at least 37 percent of the institutional aid provided.

I might also note, Mr. Speaker, that some Members have mistakenly thought the institutional aid provided in the bill must be used only for remedial programs for needy students. This is not true; the institutional aid funds may be used for any instructional expenses incurred in academically related programs of the college or university. No other restrictions, excepting of course a prohibition against use of the funds for sectarian activities, are imposed.

Mr. Speaker, following the insertion

of the questions and answers about S. 659, I am also providing a listing of the highlights of the education provisions of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this legislation will be strongly supported by Members of the House on both sides of the aisle. It is legislation crucial to the future of higher education in the United States. The materials follow:

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 659, THE EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1972, AND ANSWERS

(1) How will the institutional aid authorized by the bill be apportioned among colleges and universities?

The Conference Report authorizes a three-part formula for distributing institutional aid funds:

(1) Forty-five percent of the funds will be distributed according to the number of Basic Educational Opportunity Grant recipients enrolled at each institution;

(2) Forty-five percent of the funds will be distributed according to the amount of Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant, College Work-Study and National Defense Student Loan funds paid to students enrolled at each institution; and

(3) Ten percent will be distributed according to the number of graduate students enrolled at each institution.

The specific provisions of this formula are explained in greater detail on pages 223-228 of the Conference Report.

(2) Will private colleges and universities receive an equitable share under this formula?

Yes. Private colleges and universities in the United States enroll 26.4 percent of students who attend institutions of higher education. Under the formula contained in the Conference Report, however, it is estimated that 37 percent of the institutional aid funds will go to private institutions which, according to all the evidence received by the Committee, are in greater financial difficulty than most public institutions.

(3) What restrictions will be placed upon the use of institutional aid funds by colleges and universities?

Institutional aid funds paid to colleges and universities must be used for instructional expenses incurred in academically related programs of the recipient institution. No other restrictions (aside from a prohibition against use of the funds for sectarian activities) are imposed—colleges and universities are free to use the funds as they see fit.

(4) How does the size of the institutional aid program contained in the conference report compare with the program contained in the House-passed bill?

Both formulas would require approximately the same amount—\$1 billion annually—to pay each institution the full amount to which it is entitled.

(5) Does the institutional aid formula in the conference report contain any of the provisions of the institutional aid formula approved by the House last fall?

Yes. Under the Conference Report 55 percent of the money will be distributed in accordance with provisions contained in the House-passed bill. The other 45 percent will follow provisions contained in the original Senate-passed bill.

(6) How will the so-called "basic grant" program for students work?

Each student enrolled at an accredited institution of higher education, or an accredited post-secondary proprietary school, will be entitled to receive an annual grant of \$1400, minus the amount which his or her family could reasonably be expected to contribute for education purposes. However, no grant could exceed the amount necessary to attend the institution at which the student is enrolled, nor could a grant exceed 60 percent

of the amount a student needs beyond his expected family contribution to attend an institution.

(7) Who will decide what a student's expected "family contribution" is?

As in present practice, the financial aid officer at the institution which the student attends will make this decision in accordance with generally established principles for making student aid awards. The Conference Report requires that the financial aid officer consider, among other factors, the amount of the family's income, the number of dependents in the family, the number of children in the family attending college and any unusual expenses of the family such as unusual medical expenses.

(8) Will basic grants be available only to low income students?

No. Middle income students as well as low income students will be able to receive Basic Grants, with the only difference being that middle income students' grants will naturally tend to be smaller.

(9) What limitations does the conference report place on funding of the basic grant program?

The Conference Report provides that Basic Grants may not be paid until the National Defense Student Loan and College Work-Study programs are funded at a level equal to FY 1972 appropriations, and the Educational Opportunity Grants program is funded at a level equal to 75 percent of FY 1972 original appropriations. This provision was included at the unanimous insistence of the House conferees.

(10) What about existing student aid programs?

All existing student aid programs, including Educational Opportunity Grants, College Work-Study, National Defense Student Loans and the Guaranteed Loan program, will be continued for three years. The Conference Report substantially follows the eligibility amendments in the House-passed bill which will provide greater access to these programs for students from middle-income families, particularly those attending private colleges and universities, where costs are normally higher than at public institutions.

The Conference Report also contains a new National Student Loan Marketing Association for the purpose of providing greater liquidity for student loan paper, thus enabling banks and other lending institutions to substantially enlarge their student loan programs. The \$15,000 annual family income limitation on the Federally subsidized loan program is deleted—all students, regardless of family income, will be able to receive a Federally subsidized loan through a bank or other lending institution so long as a student can show that he or she is in need of the loan.

CONFERENCE REPORT HIGHLIGHTS—HIGHER EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1972 STUDENT ASSISTANCE

All existing programs, including College Work-Study, National Defense Student Loans, Educational Opportunity Grants, and Guaranteed Student Loans, continued for three years.

New program of Basic Educational Opportunity Grants, under which each student would be entitled to \$1,400 per year, less expected family contribution. No grant could exceed 60 percent of what a student needed to attend a particular institution for any year.

Creation of a National Student Loan Marketing Association to buy, sell and warehouse Guaranteed Student Loans, and thereby stimulate new capital for such loans.

INSTITUTIONAL AID

\$1 billion annually in direct aid to institutions, both public and private. Note: 45 percent of the aid would be based on the number of Basic Grant recipients at each institution; 45 percent on the aggregate amount of (Supple-

mental) EOG, Work-Study and NDSL funds paid to students at each institution; and 10% on the number of graduate students enrolled at each institution.

\$40 million annually in emergency grants to institutions in severe financial distress.

Veterans Cost-of-Instruction Grants to institutions in the amount of \$300 for each veteran enrolled, and an additional \$150 for each veteran who is in a special or remedial program.

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Start-up and expansion grants for community colleges. Authorization: \$275 million over three years.

OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

New program to help the States design, establish and operate post-secondary occupational education programs. Authorization: \$850 million over three years.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

New agency established within HEW to support, conduct, and disseminate the products of research at all levels of education. Authorization: \$550 million over three years.

HIGHER EDUCATION INNOVATION

New program of grants to institutions to encourage reform and innovation in higher education. Authorization: \$135 million over three years.

EXISTING HIGHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

All existing categorical aid programs, including facilities construction, extended for three years.

INDIAN EDUCATION

\$95 million over three years in grants to local education agencies for programs to help meet the special educational needs of Indian children.

EMERGENCY SCHOOL AID

New program of grants for local education agencies to facilitate desegregation and the elimination of minority group isolation. \$2 billion authorized over two years.

CAN BUSINESS SURVIVE GOVERNMENT BY CRISIS?

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

INTRODUCTION

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, we in the United States have been blessed with the highest standard of living of any nation in the world. Under our free enterprise system, the jury of American business is not a court of law or a legislative chamber but the dollars of millions of free citizens who judge products and services as they choose between them.

At the same time that our citizens have enjoyed the fruits of free enterprise, millions throughout the world live in nations which, through the economic slavery of communism, are hardly able to feed their people.

Yet recently, our free enterprise system has come under increasing attack and harassment by the Government which, too frequently, operates under the assumption that "government by crisis" can cure ills.

I had the opportunity recently to discuss "government by crisis" with members of the Illinois Manufacturers Association at their 56th annual dinner meeting in Chicago. I would like to expand on those remarks at this time.

Henry David Thoreau said:

Government never of itself furthered any enterprise, but by the alacrity with which it

got out of its way. . . . The character inherent in the American people has done all that has been accomplished; and it would have done more, if the government had not sometimes got in the way.

FALSE ASSUMPTIONS

Three transparently fallacious assumptions, all interrelated, threaten the survival of American business, a free market economy, and, ultimately, our free institutions.

The first is the hysterical claim that our Nation is beset with "crises" requiring costly, crash solutions to avert national disaster.

The second is that free institutions—and more specifically free enterprise—is the insidious culprit.

The third, rarely articulated in a forthright manner, but implicit in the foregoing analyses, is that Government regulations and control of the American economy can remove the causes of the crises and resolve them.

One need not look far for examples of the "Chicken Little" syndrome. We are told the sky is falling in on us at every turn. The Friends of the Earth hint darkly that all mankind will perish before the end of the century through pollution of our environment. Zero population growth, on the contrary, alerts us to the prospect of billions upon billions of people standing upon one another's shoulders by the end of the century.

Others warn of a crisis in health care or suggest that millions of Americans are starving to death and lacking adequate housing.

To ridicule such absurdities is not to say that we do not have unresolved problems in every one of these categories and more. Further, we all know the hyperbole often attends successful promotion efforts. But the same people who dun us daily with horror stories of this nature are usually in the vanguard of the "truth in advertising" campaign.

"Cherchez la femme," as the French police used to say. Look for the motive. Behind much of this rhetoric are those types whom Margaret Cole once observed "do their donkey work in the shadows." They are ideologues who reject the premises of a free society, the elitists who would play God with our lives.

The natural silly putty for such ideologues are self-serving politicians always eager to find a hobby horse to ride on to fame and fortune. These snake oil salesmen, posturing as saviors of the public, are little more than malicious mischiefs. But their ability to exploit an irresponsible media generates the climate of the "big lie," which repeated oft enough comes to gain credibility.

But the most threatening of all is the sincere, honest, idealistic, misguided reformer. He is the one who, out of a sense of exasperation and a lack of understanding of history, turns impatiently to Government to relieve all the ills of mankind. His motives are not self-serving, but generous and charitable. Still, he probably represents the greatest threat to free institutions in our society.

Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis described him in the *Olmstead* case:

Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the government's purposes are beneficent. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel

invasion of their liberty by evil-minded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachments by men of zeal, well meaning, but without understanding.

God spare us such men.

Those who accept the proposition that we have impending national disasters requiring "crash" solutions are naturally led to find causes before prescribing remedies. With the capable tutoring of the anticapitalist mentalities, free institutions and free enterprise become convenient scapegoats. To listen to some of the more paranoid allegations against the business community, one would almost suppose that the businessman lives in another world than our own. The theater of the absurd produced by some of our crisis mongers accuses the businessman of a calloused unconcern for the air we breathe, the water we drink and recreate in, our wildlife, our purple mountains and our fruited plains. Worse than the businessman's alleged unconcern is the suggestion that he actively promotes pollution of the environment in a reckless pursuit of self. The self-righteous have ever been guilty of overlooking human imperfection. Base motives are substituted for ignorance and human frailty. Presumably, such businessmen have found another environment for themselves and their children to live in.

Beyond the conspiracy of wicked businessmen, according to this analysis, is the inherent deficiency of the free enterprise system, which such critics have attacked since the advent of the industrial revolution. There is a romantic longing for the blissful era of medieval feudalism. Such reactionaries would not only repeal the 20th century—in the name of progress—but would repeal half a millennium. There is a horrifying logical consistency between the goals of people of this persuasion and those of Zero Population Growth, as there are roughly 3 billion more people on this earth today than could be sustained on a feudal economy.

Having defined the crisis and established the cause, the solution that immediately springs into the simplistic minds of the kneejerk statists and collectivists is to launch a preemptive strike by the Federal Government with massive infusions of taxpayer dollars.

TODAY'S LUNACY IS TOMORROW'S LAW

If the fruits of this cacophonous coalition were not so portentous, we might dismiss them with a knowing grin or a bored yawn. But we live at a time when today's lunacy is tomorrow's law. And when national hysteria is thus generated, it is easy to provoke an overreaction; in effect, to run the risk of throwing out the baby with the bath water.

Beyond this, there is invariably great waste and excessive expenditure of tax money in fighting crises instead of addressing problems. Further, there is an enormous increase in the role government plays in our lives when we marshal the forces of the Federal bureaucracy to attack national issues. After the dismal experience of the past 40 years of Federal involvement in such areas as agriculture, welfare, housing, Indian affairs, or the postal system, one might suppose that we would have learned some painful lessons of history. On the basis

of that history we might safely formulate a law: Problems increase in direct proportion to the degree of attention given them and the amount of money spent on them by the Federal Government.

The Founding Fathers viewed the role of government in negative terms. Its primary function was to prevent trespass and otherwise stay out of our way.

A wise and frugal government—

Jefferson said—

which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government.

Even as late as the 20th century, this view of the role of government obtained. Woodrow Wilson held that government's function was to preserve a free field with no favors. Nevertheless, the collectivist pathogenesis dates from this period. Artful advocates of "positive" government called for government to serve as an engine of social reform.

It is the work of the state to think for the people—to teach them how to do, and to sustain them in doing—

Declared Frank Munsey early in this century. By the 1960's, an Indiana Senator could publicly announce that—

The people should depend upon the Government like children depend upon their mothers.

To the extent that many Americans were willing to permit power to gravitate to the banks of the Potomac on the assumption that Washington held magical solutions, irresponsibility was transformed into dependency. The Federal mammary began to nurse us all.

Today we are beginning to feel the outrageous consequences of the policies of well-intentioned men who lack understanding. American business is bearing the brunt of the attack.

We have been told that selfishness and lack of concern on the part of businessmen are, in effect, responsible for most of our social ills—from pollution to inflation.

As a result of the analysis which holds that free enterprise and its practitioners are the culprits, and the remainder of the American society are the victims, we have seen the creation of inordinate rules and regulations under which business must operate.

The bureaucratic assaults upon free enterprise which have been instituted thus far, together with those which have been proposed and may be advanced in the future are, in effect, a declaration of war against capitalism as we know it.

A BRIEF REVIEW OF THE "HORROR FILE"

Before considering the merits or demerits of the proposition that free enterprise is the cause of our problems, let us briefly review some of the constraints which are now being imposed or proposed against American business.

EXAMPLE 1: THE EEOC

One of the most shocking and least discussed is a recommendation set forth in a memorandum approved by three top officials of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission last July.

According to that memorandum, any business should be considered in violation of the civil rights statutes if "the community from which an employer moves has a higher percentage of minority workers than the community to which he moves," or "the transfer affects the employment situation of the employer's minority workers more adversely than it affects his remaining workers."

The memo also suggests that the law should be interpreted so that any employer "who relocates to the detriment of the minority work force is clearly in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act." The extraordinary recommendation continues:

It should be noted that it is not necessary for the relocation to have been completed in order for Title VII liability to attach. Section 703(a) states that it is unlawful for an employer to deprive or tend to deprive any individual of employment opportunities.

This memorandum—a recommendation for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to take companies to court on this novel legal theory—suggests that court orders should be sought against businesses planning to relocate, charging them with prima facie violations of the civil rights acts. Companies so charged would have to prove an overwhelming business consideration before being permitted to transfer locations.

One business leader commented about this proposal in these terms:

This recommendation to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission smacks less of civil rights than it does of fascism. It would seem an elementary freedom to be able to relocate one's own company without having to justify it to a bunch of bureaucrats.

Nevertheless, this proposal received the support of Stanley P. Hubert, then General Counsel of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, together with John de J. Pemberton, Jr., now Acting General Counsel, and Martin I. Slate, attorney in the General Counsel's office. This proposal is not yet the law, but it provides some indication of the direction in which Government control of business and of the economy may go.

Let us consider briefly some things which are not proposals, but actual facts of business life today.

EXAMPLE 2: THE FTC

Under the chairmanship of Miles Kirkpatrick, an appointee of President Nixon, the Federal Trade Commission has broadened its powers in an unprecedented manner.

One of many companies which have felt its wrath has been the du Pont Co., makers of Zerex antifreeze. The Federal Trade Commission charged that Zerex was falsely advertised in a television commercial, charges which have since been proven to be untrue. The company, nevertheless, lost sales in 1971 and public confidence because of unfavorable publicity.

What the Federal Trade Commission did was to call a press conference in November 1970, and make a "proposed complaint" against du Pont, alleging, without proof, that the television commercial was misleading, that the antifreeze actually damaged automotive cooling systems and that it had been

inadequately tested. The Federal agency then publicly threatened to ban the product.

The commercial in question showed a man stabbing a can of Zerex and streams of antifreeze gushing out and then sealing up. After the FTC charged that this demonstration was phony, newspapers across the country carried stories of the Commission's condemnation of Zerex.

Officials of du Pont were not even informed of the FTC's action before the Washington press conference. Equally important is the fact that the FTC turned out to be wrong. It dropped the charges of false advertising. It dropped the charge that the product could cause damage. The FTC, in fact, found nothing wrong with the product in any way.

To cover its own tracks, however, the FTC issued a formal complaint alleging that the antifreeze had been inadequately tested before it was put on the market and could have caused damage to cooling systems when first sold in 1969. It said nothing of any possible damage to be caused by the product in 1970, 1971, or 1972. It provided no proof of any damage having occurred in 1969.

The financial damage to du Pont, of course, had already been done. Du Pont counted 160 newspaper stories after the initial FTC accusation and only 80, half as many, a year later when the agency admitted that it had been wrong. Twenty front page stories appeared the first time. The FTC's error received no first page placements a year later.

Discussing the current tactics being used by the Federal Trade Commission, Prof. Yale Brozen of the Graduate School of Business at the University of Chicago declared that:

The F.T.C. has come up with the technique of unilaterally deciding what is deceptive, conducting a trial by press release, and demanding that the advertiser, run ads admitting the deception. The burden of proving innocence is left to the advertiser, if he can survive the trial by accusation and publicity—a complete turnabout from our judicial system in which an accused is regarded as innocent until proved guilty.

The FTC is now calling on advertisers, industry by industry, to file with it documentary proof of all claims.

Perhaps—States Professor Brozen—

F.T.C. should be forced to substantiate its claims before issuing press releases which greatly mislead consumers.

In the long run, Professor Brozen notes, to advertise at all may become a sin:

The Federal Trade Commission is leveling a barrage of unsubstantiated claims against advertising which, if it prevails, may well cause a withering of advertising.

Government's effort to curtail the efficiency and effectiveness of free enterprise comes in many shapes and forms.

EXAMPLE 3: OSHA

Consider, for example, the Occupational Safety and Health Act. This act invests authority in the Secretary of Labor, for the first time, to set job safety standards for the bulk of the Nation's 80 million working men and women. Only coal miners, railroad workers and Government employees, who are covered by other regulations are exempt. This act has

opened the door to harassment of business in its daily operation, a harassment which promises to grow greater in the future.

The act covers every business "affecting commerce," and every aspect of the operation from washroom to storage yards to assembly lines, from the clerk in the shoe store to the farmhand driving a tractor. Although the Secretary of Labor may consult with other Federal agencies, he is under no obligation to consult with businessmen; he, alone, determines what is "safe and healthful employment and places of employment."

Among other things, the Secretary is given authority to enforce the safety standards he may issue, and under his broad delegation of power can enter any "factory, plant, establishment, construction site, mine or other area or workplace or environment" to inspect it; close down any operation he finds dangerous; move to cancel Government contracts; and ask courts to impose fines and/or jail sentences for violators of his standards.

One wonders what ever happened to the fourth amendment guarantees against unwarranted search. One wonders what ever happened to fifth amendment guarantees of the security of private property.

It is interesting to reflect upon the fact that in Europe safety programs are nationalized and minimum uniform standards are set by law, yet the safety standards of American industry, prior to this act, were far better. For example, the record of U.S. chemical companies is seven times better than similar companies in the United Kingdom, and in the steel industry the frequency accident rate of U.S. firms is 10 times better.

Our previous system based on State-determined standards, education, and cooperation produced safety statistics which were the best in the world. This, however, has been abandoned in the interest of a nationalized, bureaucratically run system of harassment of private business.

In the current session of Congress I have proposed a bill which includes some of the amendments necessary for a responsible reform of the 1970 act.

As a result of the 1970 Occupational Safety and Health Act, businesses are deluged with a multitude of so-called health and safety requirements with which they must comply or face sanctions that include civil and criminal penalties and even the closing down of businesses. These requirements have been imposed without any administrative determination that will improve occupational health and safety, that they are necessary, or that they are the best means of achieving the desired result.

Thirteen amendments are included in the bill I have introduced. The first amendment would exempt small employers, both agricultural and nonagricultural, from the act. Businesses of 25 or fewer employees would be exempted, as they are from the provisions of the Equal Employment Opportunities Act. Another amendment would require the Secretary of Labor to evaluate all of the regulations, distinguish between the various facets of a given general form of busi-

ness, and determine if the rule should apply to each facet. A case in point are the real differences in the construction business between heavy construction and light residential construction.

Another amendment would require the Secretary of Labor to publish for each present and future rule the maximum estimated cost of compliance and to determine that it is possible to comply. A further amendment would require the Secretary of Labor to provide technical advice and consultation to employers of 100 or fewer employees to assist them in complying with the act. Each of the 13 amendments attempts to restore to individual businessmen at least a portion of the control over their own businesses which the act itself takes away.

EXAMPLE 4: WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

In other areas, such as that concerning water pollution, business has been told that correction of this problem is a matter not for our entire society to deal with, but one for business to cope with virtually alone.

This year the Congress has passed a bill which, its sponsors have told us, will produce clean lakes and rivers all across America. The bill provided a clear-cut timetable: By June 30, 1974, municipal sewage pollution facilities will provide the equivalent of secondary treatment. By July 1, 1974, construction grants for treatment facilities will be made on a regional, or areawide basis, rather than on a city or town basis as in the past. By January 1, 1976, industrial sources of pollution will be required to have the best practical control technology. By January 1, 1981, industry will cease water pollution discharges. By 1985, the discharge of all pollutants from all sources into navigable water will be eliminated.

Despite the fact that administration and industry representatives argued that the setting of these goals and deadlines was unrealistic and could lead to a new undermining of the confidence of the citizens in their Government when the expectations were not fulfilled, the Congress passed the legislation.

Environmental Protection Agency Administrator William Ruckelshaus said that the provision for the elimination of all discharges into waterways by 1985 was not technically feasible. The demands made upon American industry may not be only unreasonable, but also impossible.

In its issue of January 31, 1972, Barron's notes that:

Industry is . . . disturbed over the logistical problem of meeting the Phase I January 1, 1976, deadline, since Environmental Protection Agency regulations defining the treatment facilities will not be available until 1973. The design and installation of sophisticated treating facilities for large or complex manufacturing plants involve a lead time of several years.

Beyond this, notes Barron's:

Phase II will see a separate and more stringent standard for treating facilities. Thus, after massive investment in Phase I facilities, industry may quickly find that they do not satisfy the act's requirements.

Another aspect of this legislation which is of growing concern is the fact that under this bill any citizen would have the right to initiate a civil suit

against any party who is alleged to violate an effluent limitation or a Federal or State abatement order, or against the EPA Administrator for failure to perform a nondiscretionary act. Businessmen, on the other hand, are unfairly denied the right to challenge the Administration's actions in civil or criminal enforcement proceedings.

The AFL-CIO indicated that passage of this measure could well cause unemployment to millions of American workers. Despite this fact, the AFL-CIO supported the measure. Indeed, it had a solution of its own for the problem of unemployment. It would put the entire burden of sustaining welfare costs upon the employers for everyone thrown out of work because of the application of this law, or anyone allegedly thrown out of work because of the law.

It is unusual that a Congress which is concerned with unemployment and the fact that American industry is becoming less and less competitive in the world market would place such new restrictions and limitations, as well as expense, upon business. Economist Paul McCracken warned that the impact of this legislation could "turn out to be proportionately heavy on industries and products that are important to our foreign trade" and lead to enlarged structural unemployment, the most difficult to control because it is caused by disappearing markets.

Ironically, the very day the House of Representatives passed the bill the newspapers announced that our balance of trade deficit for the preceding month was the second largest in our Nation's history.

In many instances it seems clear that the imposition of Government controls and regulations cannot help but feed our inflation, increase our unemployment, and make it certain that we no longer compete in world markets.

Government regulations, more often than not, tend to be counterproductive and often appear devised not to meet the needs of the public, but instead, to fulfill the desires of the very Government employees who do the regulating and administering.

The point is made very persuasively by Prof. James Q. Wilson of Harvard University. Writing in the Public Interest, Professor Wilson notes that:

. . . by now we should have learned that the existence of a federal power stimulates demand for its use, and thus what begins as an ultimate weapon for extreme cases becomes a ready weapon for everyday cases.

EXAMPLE 5: AIR POLLUTION

Recently, the U.S. Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C., held that a television station which shows a commercial for high-powered automobile or leaded gasoline can be compelled to show programs, free of charge, about the dangers of air pollution.

Professor Wilson points out that:

It is obvious that pollution is a problem and that cars contribute to it; but the implication of this decision is that showing anything about a controversial public issue creates an obligation to show something on the other side—free if necessary, and even if the other side has already expressed its views on other stations or in other media. If the purpose of this decision was to insure

vigorous public debate, its effect, if it stands, is likely to be the opposite. Vigorous debate arises from boldness, while the decision is likely to inspire timidity.

American business suffers from control and regulation. No industry is more subjected to control, and no industry is more vital for the well-being of our economy, for example, than that of electric power.

While prices are rigidly controlled, the additional costs imposed by regulations are not. In 1971, Commonwealth Edison Co. was forced to spend nearly \$38 million for higher priced low sulfur fuel in order to reduce sulfur emissions in the Chicago area. The ultimate annual cost of this action appears likely to approach \$100 million.

In testimony before the U.S. Price Commission, Gordon R. Corey, chairman of the Finance Committee on the Commonwealth Edison Co. declared that—

The U.S. faces a shortage of electrical power which could severely curtail future improvements in industrial productivity, impede environmental clean-up and retard urban renewal.

He notes that—

In our modern society, electric power is almost as vital as air and water. Lack of it is darkening homes and offices in England and throwing billions out of work. Yet we seem determined to make it impossible for the electric power business to meet its responsibilities. Never has the industry been faced with so many different requirements and obstacles.

The current regulations may, in the long run, impede the ability of the electric power industry to provide us with the means through which the lives of all Americans can be improved. Our power needs are increasing dramatically, and the money must be invested today to provide for these power needs of the future. If, through regulation, we make it impossible for such reinvestment to occur, it will be the society at large which pays the price.

Congress has the responsibility to pass "general" rather than "specific" legislation. Obviously, this leaves a wide latitude for subjective and arbitrary interpretations by the people who have been given the power to execute the laws. But even before this danger, it is highly questionable assumption that the Congress can grasp the full implications of its handiwork when it obtrudes itself into a market as complex as our own.

THE NATURE OF BUREAUCRACY

Perhaps it is in the nature of bureaucrats to be martinets. Of one thing we can be sure, bureaucrats are not bound by the profit discipline of businessmen. As a result, they are inclined to be impractical theoreticians rather than pragmatic realists. Further, they have a vested interest in self-perpetuation and growth. Unlike business imperatives, where a man's progress depends upon his ability to demonstrate efficiency, the prestige of a bureaucratic chief is determined in part upon the basis of how many Indians he has in his department.

But the greatest danger to be apprehended is the ofttimes heavy-handed capriciousness of bureaucrats in their war against the businessman and free markets. Since all the presuppositions of

bureaucratic interventionism are alien to the concept of free enterprise, it is not surprising to find covert and overt hostility within the bureaucracy. Just as a stagnant pond breeds bacterial life, bureaucracy develops and attracts the germs and parasites that feed at the expense of free institutions.

Herbert Hoover summarized the case most succinctly when he observed that—

In all bureaucracies there are three implacable spirits—self-perpetuation, expansion and an incessant demand for power. These are human urges and are supported by a conviction, sometimes justified, that they know what is good for us. Nevertheless these spirits are potent and possess a dictatorial complex. . . . Power is the father of impatience with human faults, and impatience breeds arrogance. In their mass action, they become veritable exponents of political tyranny.

EXAMPLE 6: FDA

In 1969 the Congress passed the Toy Safety Act, a well-intentioned piece of legislation designed to protect children against hazards. Under the provisions of this act, children were to be protected, amongst other things, from thermal hazards. Manifestly, all such hazards could not be banned without doing violence to other cherished concepts since books do not meet the flammability standards established under the act. Paper was thus one of those potential hazards exempted by the Congress.

But in 1972, on the eve of the Easter season, the Food and Drug Administration—without any warning—announced publicly that "Easter grass" was a thermal hazard and was going to be banned by the FDA. Two weeks after Easter the FDA notified a handful of Easter grass manufacturers that it would prohibit the production for the 1973 season. One of the major producers of Easter grass happens to be an Illinois firm. It was never notified by the FDA of the latter's new regulations. The firm did, however, hear of the public attack on Easter grass that was televised before the Easter season of 1972. After considerable effort, the manufacturer finally managed to contact the appropriate authority within the Food and Drug Administration to request an appointment to discuss the problem.

The agency was reluctant to set up an appointment, but finally consented in May. The problem in the case of this manufacturer was that he produced Easter grass on a year-around basis and was already into production for the 1973 season when he learned of the ruling. He had a quarter of a million dollars of inventory stockpiled for the 1973 season, pre-season orders for almost half of his inventory, and 150 employees whose jobs had suddenly been put in jeopardy if the manufacturer were forced to close down.

The manufacturer, even before coming to see the members of the FDA, had contacted laboratories throughout the country to attempt to develop a substitute or a treatment for the cellophane paper used in producing Easter grass that would meet the FDA flammability standards. But this did not solve the problem of his inventory, his ability to promise delivery to his customers for the next season, and his employees.

Despite the fact that the FDA was un-

aware of a single instance of a child having been burned with Easter grass, and despite the fact that within the business no one was aware of a single such incident in the 40 years of Easter grass production, the FDA took the position that it could not permit continued sale of the product beyond the moment it discovered that Easter grass did not meet the flammability standards of the department.

In the case of an imminent hazard to children, the economic injury to a manufacturer and his employees should not be a consideration. But in a case such as this, where there is no demonstrable imminent hazard based upon the history of the product, reason would certainly dictate prior notification to manufacturers and a season to dispose of inventory as a means of preserving a tax paying industry and 150 jobs. Instead, the bureaucrats almost seemed to delight in the knowledge that they were removing a business and jobs from existence since under their interpretation of the law these people were public criminals. And perhaps the most ironic twist of all is that Congress specifically exempted paper from consideration as a thermal hazard under the law, and the substance involved—cellophane—is defined in the Dictionary of Paper as paper. Surely, this is but one more of the "insidious encroachments" against our liberties about which Justice Brandeis spoke, an encroachment by "men of zeal, well meaning, but without understanding."

EXAMPLE 7: WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS

Added to all of these controls, regulations and harassments of business is the recently imposed system of wage and price controls.

Clearly, the problem of inflation is one which concerns all Americans and it is the goal of all Americans to stem the tide of increasing wages and prices.

But there are some who argue that the best way to stop inflation is, in effect, to ignore its causes, which include deficit spending by Government and an increase in the money supply through the Federal Reserve Board. While ignoring the causes, such spokesmen would treat the symptoms: namely, the increase in wages and prices. They would, in effect, outlaw such increases through compulsory controls enforced by Government.

Discussing the danger of price controls, economist Henry Hazlitt writes that—

The first thing to be said about wage and price fixing is that it is harmful at any time and under any conditions. It is a giant step toward a dictated, regimented and authoritarian economy. It makes impossible arrangements that both sides are willing to agree to. It sets aside contracts that have already been made in good faith.

The question which is often asked today is whether the administration's policy of wage and price controls is "fair" and "equitable?" To such a question, economist Hazlitt responds this way:

There is no right way of doing it. There is no right way of doing a wrong thing. . . . Instead of talking of "fair" profits, and "fair" wages, we ought to be talking about functional wages and functional prices. Prices have work to do. What they do in effect is to give the necessary signals to production. They direct production into the things that

are most wanted . . . Price-fixing destroys the signals on which this ever-changing balance depends.

In order to achieve its goal of lower prices, the Government should be pursuing a policy far different from the policy of compulsory wage and price controls upon which it has embarked. It should, instead, encourage producers, and not place them in a straitjacket. Price fixing does the opposite. The Pay Board, for example, gave the coal miners a 16.8-percent increase for the first year; then when the first coal company asked for an increase in price, the Price Commission allowed it only a 4-percent increase in price to meet the 16-percent increase in wages. What this will produce is a squeeze on profits and the result will be to discourage investment and therefore to increase unemployment. That was certainly not the original object of the policy controls.

EXAMPLE 8: FOOD STAMPS FOR STRIKERS

Government, however, has been one-sided in still other ways. A serious problem facing our country and its long-established system of collective bargaining is that, in recent days, we have witnessed a situation in which workers on strike have become the recipients of Federal and State financial assistance.

In West Virginia, a coal strike caused 15,000 new families to be added to the food stamp program, a fact which swelled the State's total food stamp role by 20 percent. In 1 week, the West Virginia State Welfare Department distributed \$1.7 million in food stamps to the miners' families and declared that the Federal Government had paid for the program.

In a recent statement, Dr. Herbert Northrup, chairman of the Labor Relations Council and director of the Industrial Research Unit of the Wharton School of Finance at the University of Pennsylvania, pointed out that during the General Motors strike:

We figured that almost 30% of the General Motors employees in Michigan were on food stamps and 20% on welfare . . . We've made studies of local situations such as the long Westinghouse strike at the Lester plant outside of Philadelphia. We found out the Welfare Department took on 10 people to take care of this situation.

In cases such as these, the agencies of Government have provided workers with their sole "strike benefits." The labor unions themselves, in such situations, paid no strike benefits at all.

Such a state of affairs tends to discourage and prolong strikes. Dr. Northrup notes that—

It enables the union to hold out without pressure from the rank and file. If there is one thing that was clear in both the General Electric and General Motors strike, it is that there was no pressure on the rank and file to settle the strike.

When no pressure exists to settle a strike, the strike tends to continue, costing all concerned, workers, management, and the taxpayers huge sums of money. In addition, it makes a big difference in the character of the result, and its inflationary impact is much greater.

Collective bargaining is based, at least in part, upon the assumption of governmental neutrality. Dr. Northrup declared that—

The collective bargaining system in the United States cannot work satisfactorily if the public purse becomes an extension of the union treasury for paying strike benefits.

It is beyond any doubt that Government, today, is in the position of regulating, harassing, and controlling American business. Such policies, it is clear, can lead only to further inflation, to further unemployment, and to less and less ability on the part of American business to compete in world markets.

It is essential that labor unions be brought under the same antitrust legislation which today applies to business. It is illegal, for example, for several businesses in a particular industry to set prices, yet it is legal for a single industry-wide labor union to set wage rates for an entire industry.

EXAMPLE 9: UNION POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

More than this, labor has used its position in a partisan political manner, in clear violation of existing statutes. Section 610 of the Criminal Code, to cite one, prevents both national corporations and labor unions from making any campaign contributions or expenditures. Yet, AFL-CIO President George Meany has been quite frank in exploding the myth that union political activities in Federal elections are restricted by this act, or by the Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

Last September, Mr. Meany stated that—

You know we have these laws on the books—and they have been there for many, many years—Corrupt Practices Act and so forth—and honored, so far as I am concerned, they have been honored by everybody in the breach. I don't know of any candidate for office anywhere that gives a damn where he gets the money so long as he gets it when he gets into a campaign.

In the 1968 presidential race, labor officially reported contributing a whopping \$7.6 million to all candidates, double what it admitted spending in 1964. Others place an even higher price tag on labor's political efforts. Columnist Victor Reisel notes that—

America's labor leaders poured out over \$60 million for Hubert H. Humphrey.

Theodore H. White details some other AFL-CIO campaign activities in his book, "The Making of the President, 1968":

72,225 union men and women canvassing house to house, 94,457 Election Day volunteers serving as car-poolers, baby-sitters and poll-watchers; 55 million pamphlets and leaflets mailed by the AFL-CIO from Washington, 60 million from local unions.

Unless and until we apply the same antitrust and antipolitical contribution laws to labor unions that we have rigorously applied to business corporations, we will continue to have the kind of one-sided, antibusiness atmosphere under which American industry has struggled for so many years. Rather than solving any of our economic problems, the intervention of a huge governmental bureaucracy on the side of those who oppose free enterprise and oppose business initiative, has produced a large part of the real problems we face.

FRAGILITY OF FREEDOM

Perhaps more important is the fact that once our economic freedom is challenged, our political freedom becomes increasingly tenuous. Too few of those who

have endorsed a Government-controlled economy seem to have considered the intrinsic link between economic freedom and political freedom. Many seem to believe that it is possible to lose our economic freedom while remaining free in other aspects of our lives. Such a view, unfortunately, is repeatedly challenged by the facts of history.

In his important volume, "Capitalism and Freedom," Prof. Milton Friedman points out that—

The kind of economic organization that provides economic freedom directly, namely, competitive capitalism, also promotes political freedom because it separates economic power from political power and in this way enables the one to offset the other.

Professor Friedman noted that—

Political freedom means the absence of coercion of a man by his fellow men. The fundamental threat to freedom is power to coerce, be it in the hands of a monarch, a dictator, an oligarchy, or a momentary majority. The preservation of freedom requires the elimination of such concentration of power to the fullest possible extent and the dispersal and distribution of whatever power cannot be eliminated—a system of checks and balances. By removing the organization of economic activity from the control of political authority, the market eliminates this source of coercive power. It enables economic strength to be a check to political power rather than a reinforcement.

Today there are many, in both parties and regardless of their previously stated political and economic philosophies, who would eliminate the checks and balances to which Professor Friedman referred and provide Government with the power to set the wages of workers and the prices of businessmen—thereby giving Government total power over the economic life of the Nation. In a recent editorial, the Wall Street Journal stated that—

Without wanting to sound apocalyptic, we find rather dismaying the ease with which the business community and a Republican Administration have accepted—and often welcomed—the prospect of a controlled economy.

IS CAPITALISM EVIL?

It is important that we deal with the question posed by New Left activists and their older supporters in the Congress, the media, and elsewhere. That is this: Does capitalism produce pollution, decay, fraud, and the host of other problems which such critics hope to solve by expanding the power and authority of Government?

Those who advance such a view argue that under socialism there would be no pollution of the air, for the State would be in control and if the "people" are in control there would be no greed, and thus the proper precautions would be taken to insure pure air, clean rivers, and the like.

This argument makes internal sense, as all ideological arguments do, but it has one major flaw. It is simply not true. A look at the world's environment shows the fallacy of such thinking.

In fact, it is interesting to note that there is a great similarity between the approaches used by those who are fighting environmental and ecological problems in the United States and those who are doing so in the Soviet Union.

Academician Andrey Sakharov published an illegal pamphlet, launched

through the Soviet "underground" to demand radical political reforms and blamed the country's economic system for causing damage to the environment and thus "changing the face of the earth."

The issue has moved out of the Soviet underground and into the state-controlled press, much as the question of pollution has moved from being a concern of student activists to being a part of the President's state of the Union message.

An article in Pravda pointed to the contradiction between the "unrestrained" growth of industrial production on the one hand, and outdated technology of Soviet industry on the other. The organization of industry was also to blame. The author was saying, in effect, that Soviet industry was so preoccupied with growth targets that it neglected to keep its own house in order—which is what has so often been said of capitalists.

Victor Zorza, the Eastern European correspondent for the British newspaper, *The Guardian*, makes this point:

In the West, the strength of the profit motive is often said to drive capitalists to press on with production regardless of damage to the environment. In Russia, it is the weakness of the profit motive that gets the blame.

The Pravda article notes that "tremendous material losses were caused" by the failure of the oil industry to develop the necessary procedures to remove water and salt from the oil. The price paid for the oil remained the same, whether these unwarranted constituents had been removed or not.

In the United States, motor vehicles are responsible for 60 percent of air pollution. Russia, which has relatively few autos, has an air pollution problem as well. The Soviet press often boasts that the air in Moscow is cleaner and sweeter than in any comparable capital city. But most of Russia's industry is outside of Moscow. Pravda confessed that—

We are turning the atmosphere of our major industrial Regions and large cities into a dump for poisonous industrial wastes.

This already made it "difficult to breathe" for the people who live there, and the trend of industrial development would "inevitably" cause even greater pollution unless something were done to avert this.

In spite of government directives, new factories in the Soviet Union are still being built without any purification plant, for water or smoke. Indeed, where smoke filters are provided they often "work badly, or not at all." More than half of the Soviet towns discharge their sewage, untreated, directly into nearby rivers.

It is clear that whatever environmental problems we face in the United States are also being faced throughout the world, in countries which are capitalist and Communist and socialist. The fault, it would appear, is not who controls the modern technology, but with the technology itself.

WE SHOULD BE PROUD OF OUR SYSTEM AND
DEFEND IT VIGOROUSLY

Far too long American businessmen have tended to apologize for their suc-

cesses, to sit silently by as capitalism was attacked by those who argued that, somehow, Government control of the economy would produce a more "equitable" sharing of the Nation's resources.

They failed to point out that capitalism was simply freedom applied to economics, that under a system of free enterprise it was the consumer, the individual, who voted with his dollars in the marketplace and determined in this manner exactly what would be produced in the economy. In the socialistic, communistic and fascistic economies supported by the advocates of collectivism it is a small band of bureaucrats who make this decision.

Under capitalism people not only decide for themselves what the economy is to produce, but they are able to procure for themselves a far larger share of that production than under any other system. Capitalism is the best economic system for those at the lowest level as well as for those at the highest. In fact, those at the lowest levels in our own country and in the capitalist societies of Western Europe and of Japan would find themselves in the upper levels of collectivist societies—where a radio, a television, and indoor plumbing are still considered to be luxuries.

Unless businessmen tell this story—forcefully and vocally—it will be unknown to a new generation of Americans. Thus far, they have failed in the important task of communicating to this new generation a knowledge of and respect for a free society.

There is no way to increase our standard of living, improving our competitive standing in world markets, ease the problem of unemployment, defeat inflation, and really give consumers the choice they desire except by taking government out of the economy, not giving it control over the economy as we now appear to be doing.

The best consumer advocate is not a new law or Government agency, but free enterprise itself. Under capitalism, the consumer votes with his dollars for the kinds of products he wishes to purchase. The jury of American business is not a court of law or a legislative chamber but the millions of free citizens who judge its products and services as they choose between them.

There is an old saying that if you want to be seen, stand up; if you want to be heard, speak up; and if you want to be appreciated, shut up. For too long the business community has apparently wanted to be appreciated. It is high time the outraged businessmen—speaking not just in their own interest, but in the interest of their employees as well as the consuming public—express their sense of indignation over this unrelenting assault upon the concept of a free market. They must get directly involved in this battle and provide the leadership which is so sorely lacking.

Business and industry, if it is to restore economic freedom, must not apologize for itself or for its profits. It is American business and industry which has provided all of our citizens with the highest standard of living in the world. It has done this through economic freedom. The rest of the world, through economic slav-

ery, has hardly been able to feed its people.

The choice is ours, and businessmen must speak up in behalf of economic freedom before it is compromised away in the maze of considerations about what is politically possible. Once freedom is lost, it is difficult, if not impossible, to restore.

Beyond this, we must guard against leaving the field to the enemy out of a sense of despair over how far down the garden path we have trod. To those who shrug their shoulders and say it is hopeless, that nothing can be done, I would only remind you that this can become a self-fulfilling prophecy if enough Americans believe it. What if George Washington had taken such a point of view at Valley Forge? What if Lincoln had in the dark days of the War Between the States, What if our Nation had after Pearl Harbor?

One of my alma maters is Hillsdale College, which at the time I attended had an enrollment of only 500 students. Often, Hillsdale competed in football with colleges and universities having enrollments of several thousand. I remember a slogan over the door of the locker room which read:

It's not the size of the dog in the fight,
but the size of the fight in the dog!

To be sure, we are fighting against enormous odds. But that is no reason to suppose that this battle cannot be won and that we cannot reverse the dangerous direction we are headed today. And let us always remember that despair is the one unpardonable sin.

One of the ways in which corporations can make a positive contribution is by educating their stockholders to a better understanding of the principles of a free market economy and why it is the most humane, productive, and morally justifiable system. In addition, stockholders should be constantly alerted to legislation under consideration which does violence to their interests both as stockholders and consumers. Under the changes in the law that came out of the Campaign Spending Reform Act of 1972, nationally chartered corporations may legally engage in such activities with corporate moneys. Be assured that the unions have for years been using Treasury funds in this activity. Such an educational effort can help to generate those pressures necessary to influence the course of legislation in Washington.

Finally, we should mobilize our limited resources behind rifleshoot efforts to affect the greatest changes. There are somewhat over 100 Members of the House of Representatives—the body responsible for initiating money bills—who are economy-minded and opposed to the drift toward a regulated economy. At the other extreme there are slightly over 100 Members who will vote for virtually any spending measure and who totally support the idea of a controlled economy. Of the 200 odd Members in between—all of whom are responsive to pressure—we should identify the 100 closest to our position and focus our efforts on them.

It is wholly unrealistic to suppose that we will ever have a Congress comprised of talents of the magnitude of those

statesmen who laid the foundation of our Republic. Under the circumstances, while still working to upgrade, qualitatively, our representation in the Congress, a more important task is to devise the ways and means of accomplishing our goals with the raw materials at hand. An important aspect of this involves understanding the psychology of the politician. When we have done all this, we should be able to concentrate our efforts more effectively to produce the votes in Congress that will reinvigorate free institutions and preserve the world's last best hope for ourselves and our posterity.

Woodrow Wilson, who was a keen student of history, stated:

The history of liberty is a history of limitations of governmental power, not the increase of it. When we resist, therefore, the concentration of power, we are resisting the powers of death, because concentration of power is what always precedes the destruction of human liberties.

Today we are witnessing the most unprecedented concentration of such governmental power in our national experience.

On the last day of the convention in Philadelphia in 1787, Benjamin Franklin prepared a speech urging all of the delegates at that convention to sign the document that had been drafted. Some members had reservations on the grounds that to deposit the power of the sword and the power of the purse in one level of Government was to sow the seeds of ultimate despotism.

Franklin acknowledged that the proposed Constitution was not a perfect document, but that there was a way of remedying defects through the amendment process. However, in the final analysis Franklin contended, it mattered little what form of government was created because this Government, as all governments before it, would degenerate into a despotism when the people needed a despotism.

I am convinced that the American people do not need a despotism today any more than they have in the past and hopefully and prayerfully they never will in the future. To guarantee that hope and prayer, we must all unite our efforts and reconsecrate ourselves to that end.

THIRTY-ONE MEMBERS INTRODUCE COMPREHENSIVE TAX REFORM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, today 30 Members of the House are joining me in introducing legislation that would terminate virtually all tax exemptions and deductions by January 1, 1974, unless Congress reenacted them. This proposal is very similar to the one introduced last week by our distinguished colleague from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS), the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, and the Senate majority leader (Mr. MANSFIELD).

Our legislation, which I originally introduced on March 7, and Mr. MILLS' proposal embody the same approach for achieving meaningful tax reform. Our bill would terminate \$47 billion worth of tax deductions and exemptions by 1974, thus forcing Congress to reenact those provisions it wanted to keep. The Mills-Mansfield proposal would terminate 54 provisions over a 3-year period starting in 1974. It is important to note that support for our bill is essentially support for the Mills-Mansfield bill.

Both of these proposals are far more sweeping than they first appear and, if passed, will likely lead to the most comprehensive reform and simplification of the Federal tax system ever. Many of the more blatant tax exemptions, deductions, and loopholes that have built up over the years would, I believe, simply fall by the wayside if Congress were forced to vote on them again.

I also believe that either of these proposals would, if they reached the floor, easily pass the House. This legislation has a definite appeal not only to tax reformers but to fiscal conservatives because it is based on the premise that, if Congress is forced to review every dollar in the Federal budget every year, it should at least occasionally review tens of billions of dollars of potential tax loopholes. The problem with the present system, as many of my colleagues know, is that these tax exemptions and deductions get passed by Congress for an indefinite period of time and may never come up for review.

In short, it is fiscally irresponsible for us not to periodically review tax exemptions and deductions which cost the Treasury tens of billions of dollars each year. Both our legislation and the Mills-Mansfield proposal would force Congress to take a close look at these provisions and decide which of them still make sense, which of them may have made sense when originally passed but do not

any more, and which of them probably never did make any sense. This would be a great step forward.

PART II—CHILDREN'S ALLOWANCES

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, my bill, H.R. 5633, is patterned after the Canadian program except that the allowance payments would be taxable under my proposal so that the net amount of payment to the family would depend upon its income tax bracket. It would provide \$8 for preschool children and \$12 for those aged 6 through 16, and would be administered by the Social Security Administration.

The existing programs vary according to social policy, as the Haanes-Olsen article indicates in the following excerpt:

SIZE AND COMPOSITION OF BENEFITS STRUCTURE AND ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

In the countries studied, the benefit structure of children's allowances programs varies with social policy. Canada and Sweden pay allowances beginning with the first child (table 1). As noted earlier, the Canadian aim was to provide a family income supplement of general scope. In Sweden the universality of coverage, together with the view that the burden of raising a family should be shared, led to allowances beginning with the first child.

Other countries start allowances with the second, third, or fourth child. West Germany, for example, pays allowances beginning with the third child, with a means-tested benefit available for the second. Some systems have rates that rise with each additional child; others feature rates that decline as the number of children rises.

Benefits are generally paid up to school-leaving age. The basic age limit in the five countries studied ranges from age 14 in the United Kingdom to age 17 in West Germany. The application of the limit may be deferred for further schooling, apprenticeship, or vocational training—from 2 years (Canada) to 7 years (West Germany). Age may also play a role in benefit size. This factor is particularly important in Canada and France, as later comparisons of the relative amounts paid in each country make clear.

As table 1 shows, the last years in which allowances are generally paid (the basic age limit in the chart) dovetail with the number of years of required schooling and minimum working age. Under certain circumstances, the age limit for receiving children's allowances is extended, notably when the child continues his schooling or enters an apprenticeship program. The extreme limit is the extension through the 24th year in West Germany.

TABLE 1.—STRUCTURE OF CHILDREN'S ALLOWANCES PROGRAMS IN 5 COUNTRIES, 1969

Country	Means test	Benefits start with—	Age limit ¹		Residence requirements	Minimum working age	Required school age (in last year)
			Basic	Maximum			
Canada	None	1st child	15	17	1 year	15-16	14-15
France	None ²	2d child ⁴	15	19	All residents	16	15
Sweden	None	1st child	15	18	do	16	15
United Kingdom	None	2d child	14	18	6 months ⁵	16	15
West Germany	None ⁶	3d child ³	17	24	3 years	18	17

¹ Last year of eligibility. See text for distinction between basic and maximum age limits.

² According to Province.

³ As of Jan. 1, 1971, the single-wage and mother-at-home allowances have been discontinued for some families; for others the rates were doubled.

⁴ The single-wage and mother-at-home programs provide allowances for the first child.

⁵ 26 Weeks' residence in preceding 12 months (3 years' residence for aliens).

⁶ Means test applies to two-children families only.

⁷ Benefits payable for the second child when the family earns less than 7,800 DM a year.

⁸ For full-time work.

Source: UNESCO Yearbook and national legislation.

Residence is for all purposes the sole eligibility requirement for children's allowances in the countries discussed. Only in France and Sweden do the residence requirements fall to set a time limit. Permanent residence in "metropolitan" France is stipulated, and aliens must be gainfully employed on a permanent basis. In Canada, the child must have had 1 year's residence or one of the parents must have lived in the country for 3 years before the child's birth. The United Kingdom requires 26 weeks' residence during the preceding 12 months (3 preceding years for aliens). In West Germany, 3 years' residence is the common requirement.

Size of benefits

Three basic approaches emerge when the size of children's allowances is related to family composition: (a) Rates per capita rise with the number of children on the theory that the older child requires larger expenditures than the younger, (b) rates per capita become smaller as the number of children grows since each additional child adds relatively less to family expenditures, or (c) rates per capita are constant since expenses remain approximately the same with each additional child—that is, the effects of the first two factors tend to equalize each other.

The five countries selected for analysis illustrate these varied approaches. The range is from a uniform rate for all children in Sweden to a complex system in France that takes into account both the number of children in the family and their ages.

Sweden's uniform rate dates back to 1948, when the present system began. Although the rate has been changed infrequently, each increase has been more than enough to keep the allowances ahead of the consumer price index every year since 1952.⁶

A per capita rate, graduated by age group, has existed in Canada since children's allowances began in 1945. The rate schedule established in 1957 provides a basic amount for each child under age 10, increased for ages 10-15, and again for those aged 16-17 who are in school or are invalids. No adjustment has been made in the rates since 1957, but a reorganization is under discussion.⁷

In the United Kingdom, the system began in 1946 with benefits for the second and succeeding children, all at the same rate. For almost 25 years, the only structural change increased the rate for the third and subsequent children. The amounts were adjusted infrequently, and as a result they often trailed the consumer price index for long periods of time. The price index, for example, climbed by about 70 percentage points during 1956-66 (with 1945 as a base year), while the allowances remained fixed. Subsequent increases in 1967 and 1969 have kept the allowances ahead of the rise in prices.⁸

In 1971, the United Kingdom introduced a family supplement program—in addition to its children's allowances program—that is designed to aid workers at the lowest income level. The basic income level is £15 a week for a family with one child; the level rises by £2 a week for each additional child up to a maximum of £25 per week with six or more children. When a family's income is below the statutory minimum for its size, the Government makes up one-half the difference up to a maximum of £3.

In the program that emerged in West Germany after World War II, coverage started with the third child. In 1961, coverage was extended to the second child in families with yearly incomes below 7,200 Deutsche marks with this part of the program financed from general Federal revenue. Under 1964 legislation the Federal Government assumed the entire burden of financing the program. The income limit for the two-child family was

raised to 7,800DM, and an increasing benefit rate was made applicable for the third to the fifth child.⁹ In 1965, families with three or more children became eligible for the lower-rate, second-child allowance, regardless of the amount of the family's income.

The French children's allowances program—considerably more complex than that of most countries—has three main components: basic children's allowances, single-wage allowances (*salaire unique* for wage or salary earners), and mother-at-home allowances (*mère au foyer* for the self-employed). The nonbasic allowances are both designed to encourage mothers to stay home and aid in their children's upbringing. Originally related to regional monthly average wages, the basic allowances were later made a percentage of the hourly minimum wage of manual workers in the metals industry. This amount has been adjusted periodically by decree. All three types of benefits are fixed for five cost of living zones in France.¹⁰

Under the French basic program, benefits start with the second child at the rate of 22 percent of the base wage. The rate is 37 percent for the third and fourth children and drops to 33 percent for the fifth and subsequent children.¹¹ These rates, in turn, are increased by 9 percent of the base wage when the child reaches age 10 and by 16 percent at age 16, except for the two youngest children in the family.¹²

In 1969, France discontinued the practice, begun in 1951, of granting young childless couples an allowance under the single salary program. Instead, the allowance to children under age 2 was raised to 50 percent of the base wage (97.25 francs in 1969) under both the single-wage and mother-at-home programs, and having a young child was thus more attractive.¹³ Since January 1, 1971, these allowances have been abolished for families with monthly income above 5,550 francs and the rates have been doubled for families with monthly income below 1,300 francs. The allowance rates remain unchanged between these two income limits. With average monthly earnings approximating 950 francs, in practice the single-wage and mother-at-home allowances have doubled for most families and the upper limitation has become almost academic.

RELATIONSHIP TO EARNINGS AND OTHER MEASURES

Because of variations in currency values, a multicountry assessment of the relative size of children's allowances must be made in terms common to all. In this study, therefore, comparisons have been developed on the basis of individual income, consumer prices, and the gross national product (GNP) of each country. Comparing allowances with average monthly earnings in manufacturing provides a measure of the benefit paid to the individual family. Even when comparable figures are thus arrived at, the method of financing may be important because of possible income redistribution effects. Relating benefits to the GNP measures the relative cost to each country, and comparison with the consumer price index, of course, indicates whether the allowances have retained their relative value.

Average Earnings

Table 2 presents for each of the five countries the relationship between children's allowances (in families with 1-5 children) and monthly average earnings in manufacturing. For simplification, the allowances for Canada and France are shown at the minimum levels and increases based on age are omitted. The ratios of allowances to average earnings range from 1.3 percent to one Canadian child to 50.8 percent for five children in France (about 61.5 percent when the most advantageous age combination is used).

Generally, France has the "highest" allowances under any family combination (ex-

cept that, for a family with one child aged 2 or older, the Swedish allowance is slightly higher). Sweden ranks next to France in all other family combinations indicated in table 2. With respect to families with two, three, and four children, the United Kingdom ranks behind France and Sweden but ahead of West Germany, although the two rates converge as the family grows and draw even with five children in the family. Canada ranks last. Note that the gap between that country and the others grows with the size of the family, since Canadian allowances are increased at a much slower rate. Although Sweden's rate is considerably higher than the United Kingdom's or West Germany's through the whole family range, these countries draw closer as family size increases. With three children, the Swedish rate is almost twice as high as that of the United Kingdom; with five children it is only 50 percent larger.

TABLE 2.—CHILDREN'S ALLOWANCES AS PERCENT OF AVERAGE MONTHLY EARNINGS IN MANUFACTURING, BY SIZE OF FAMILY, 5 COUNTRIES, 1969

Country	Number of children				
	1	2	3	4	5
Canada ¹	1.3	2.5	3.8	5.0	6.3
France ²	(9)	9.8	22.8	36.8	50.8
Sweden ³	5.7	11.4	17.0	22.7	28.4
United Kingdom ⁴		4.5	9.5	14.6	19.6
West Germany ⁵		2.8	5.5	12.0	19.7

¹ Percentages relate to benefits for children under age 10 and are based on average weekly wages in January-June 1969. For children aged 10 to 15, add 0.4 percentage points; for children aged 16 to 17, add 0.9 percentage points.

² Percentages overstated to the extent that 1969 benefit rates are applied to 1968 average earnings. For families with more than 1 child: add 10.8 if 1 or more of the children are under age 2; 8.6 if there are 2 dependent children aged 2 or older; and 10.8 if there are 3 or more dependent children regardless of age, in addition, add 3.6 for each dependent child aged 10 to 14 and 6.0 for each dependent child aged 15 or older.

³ Percentage is 10.8 for child under age 2; it is 4.3 for child aged 2 or older.

⁴ Percentages overstated to the extent that expected 1970 benefit rates are applied to average earnings in January-June 1969.

⁵ Based on average weekly earnings as reported in April 1969. Income data for men and women are reported separately; they have therefore been weighted on the basis of the number of men and women reported in total employment to obtain comparability with data for other countries.

⁶ Percentages overstated to the extent that 1969 benefit rates are applied to 1968 average earnings.

⁷ 2d child eligible for basic allowance if family earnings are less than 7,800DM a year; otherwise, allowances start with 3d child.

Source: Canada—The Labour Gazette, December 1969, table C-6, p. 771; France and Germany—Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor; Sweden—Allmän Manadstatistik, 1968-69; United Kingdom—Monthly Digest of Statistics, December 1969, table 15, p. 17, and Employment and Productivity Gazette, January 1970, table 122, p. 75.

When the age factor is considered with the number of children, the French program stands out even more than the figures in the table indicate.¹⁴ In a French family with three children aged 8, 10, and 12, children's allowances would amount to 40.8 percent of average earnings in manufacturing—that is, the basic rate of 22.8 percent plus 10.8 percent for three children plus an additional 3.6 percent for each of the two children in the 10-14 age group—or more than twice as much as the next highest country, Sweden.

FOOTNOTES

¹ In 1948, the annual allowance was 260 kronor per child. This amount was raised to 550 kronor in 1952 and to 700 kronor in mid-1964. The rate later reached a level of 900 kronor and went to 1,200 kronor as of Jan. 1, 1971. (One U.S. dollar equaled 4.868 kronor as of Dec. 31, 1971.) *Statistisk Årsbok For Sverige, 1970* (Statistical Abstract of Sweden), National Central Bureau of Statistics, Stockholm, table 208.

² The monthly rates when the program started in July 1945 were \$5 for each child under age 6, \$6 for ages 6-9, \$7 for ages 10-12, and \$8 for ages 13-15. In 1957, the rates

became \$6 for each child under age 10, \$8 for the group aged 10-15, and \$10 for those aged 16-17 who were in school or were invalids.

⁸ The Family Allowances Act of 1945 (effective August 1946) provided 5 shillings per child a week, starting with the second child in the family. The amount was increased to 8s. in 1952 and to 10s. for the third and subsequent children in 1956. In 1967, the benefits were raised to 15s. for the second and 17s. for the third and subsequent children; and in late 1969 they were increased to 18s. and 20s., respectively. (As of December 31, 1971, one U.S. dollar equaled 3.916 pounds.)

⁹ In 1961, monthly rates had been 25DM for the second child (when eligible) and 40DM for the third and subsequent children. The rates were increased in 1964 to 50, 60, and 70DM for the third, fourth, and fifth and each subsequent child, respectively; the rate for the second child remained unchanged. (As of December 31, 1971, one U.S. dollar equaled 3.260 Deutsche marks.)

¹⁰ The base wage for basic allowances in Paris (the highest cost-of-living area) is now 377 francs a month, that for the single-wage or mother-at-home allowances, 194.50 francs. (On December 31, 1971, one U.S. dollar equaled 5.22 francs.)

¹¹ In the basic program, a 1953 law established the rate of 22 percent of the base wage for the second child and 33 percent for the third and later children, increased from the previous rates of 20 percent and 30 percent, respectively. For changes in benefit levels and laws, see Jean-Jacques Dupeyroux, *Sécurité Sociale* (3d edition), Dalloz, 1969, pages 455 and 481. For pre-1954 rates, see also "Le régime général de la sécurité sociale" in the series *La documentation française; notes et études documentaires*, September 1949. For history of changes in the mother-at-home and single-wage allowances, see *Journal Officiel de la République Française*, Dec. 12, 1956, page 11872.

¹² *Journal Officiel* . . . Aug. 8, 1957, page 7811. Law of Aug. 7, 1957.

¹³ A family is limited to total allowances of 50 percent of the base amount under either of the two programs, regardless of the number of children in the family. For children aged 2 or older, the rates are: Under the single-wage program, 20 percent of the base for one child, 40 percent for two children, and 50 percent for three or more children; under the mother-at-home program, 10 percent for two dependent children, with an increase of 10 percentage points for each additional child, and up to 50 percent for six or more children.

¹⁴ For a different approach, used in a 1967 study relating the significance of family allowances in terms of average total income to the size of the family, see *Les Conditions de Vie des Familles*, Paris, March 1967. Lack of data prevent a similar approach for an intercountry study.

REPRESSION IN GREECE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the United States has earned a bitter reputation as the world's most ardent supporter of reactionary dictatorships. In Vietnam, our support of General Thieu is a continuing stumbling block to peace. In Cambodia, through the American-supported Lon Nol regime, we are repeating the mistakes of Vietnam. In Rhodesia, we support Ian Smith's racist government by importing chrome despite a United Nations resolution prohibiting such trade. The list is long, and near

its head is the military regime of the Greek colonels.

The dictatorship in Greece has met revulsion from every democratic people and government in the world. In the United States, too, we have been saddened by the destruction of liberty in Greece. Perhaps, the American people have been even more saddened by their own Government's support of these fascists with arms and money against the express will of Congress—just as the President has defied the express will of Congress by refusing to set a date for our withdrawal from Indochina.

The determination of our Military Establishment to maintain a safe and secure base for its activities in the Mediterranean area is causing unbelievable hardship for the very people with whom we could establish warm and productive ties of friendship. Instead, we work with the most hated segment of the Greek power structure to turn Greece into a naval base for the American 6th Fleet, an aircraft carrier for NATO.

The Greek people, crushed beneath the weight of the American-supported dictatorship, know that if we take our heel off their necks, they can take care of their colonels on their own.

I have received a document that was smuggled out of Greece and which reached the Greek News Agency in London. It is an appeal from a young woman whose whole family—father, mother, brother, and husband—have fought as proud Greek patriots against the Nazis and against the internal fascists. The letter from Eleni Voulgari-Golemas should awaken the conscience of America, and I insert it here in the RECORD together with a covering letter from her 80-year-old mother, Eftihia Voulgari:

LETTER FROM MRS. EFTIHIA VOULGARI, MOTHER OF ELENI VOULGARI-GOLEMAS

DEAR SIR: For years now I walk up and down the staircase of the Ministry of Justice but my dramatic pleas find no sympathetic ear. I cannot find any sympathy, compassion, understanding and for that reason I urge you to publish my letter so that my drama can be brought into the open.

I am an old mother, almost 80 with a number of serious diseases. I live alone with my 4-year-old grandson, Milton, born in Averoff prison. His mother, my daughter Eleni, and her husband, are political prisoners. My two other daughters have been living outside Greece for the past 20 years against their wishes.

My name is Eftihia Voulgari. From the first years of my marriage my life has been a tragedy. Metaxas' dictatorial regime arrested my husband, an educator, threw him in their dungeons for his political beliefs and later, desperately ill, turned him over to the Nazis who executed him. From the end of the war and during, my family was totally destroyed, all our property confiscated, our house burned three times. My three little girls and I were constantly without food or roof. I myself have suffered many persecutions and humiliations, lived in exile for many years and in prison 8 years as a political prisoner. Yet, with my advanced age and the tortured life I've had, on April, 1967 I found myself exiled again on the island of Youra.

My daughter, Eleni Voulgari-Golemas, is a political prisoner at Korydallos Prison. She was court martialed in Larissa in 1966 and sentenced to 10 years under the law 375/36

with the manufactured accusation of "spying" which not only is a lie, but an insult to my daughter and our entire family, honored by my husband's blood. At the time of her trial, others accused under the same law were freed with the new law 4496/66. Her "crime" originated when she was a mere schoolgirl, in 1954. The accusation was proven false, and though the new law superseded 375/36, and she was 5 months pregnant, she was sentenced to 10 years because of her answer to the judge about her ideas.

Eleni's husband, Babis Golemas, was in jail for 13 years with the same law but was freed in 1966 with law 4496/66. Because he is against the military regime he is now again in jail, in Aegina.

This is the entire truth. What the authorities say about not keeping any political prisoners in Greece, is a lie. They should then tell me why they are holding my children in jail! My 4-year-old grandson who first saw light behind bars, misses his parents, the security, embrace, love and affection only his parents can give him. He is a small child, and I cannot offer him all these. I am, as they say, with one leg in the grave; I am frightened that I may die before I see my children again, and if I do, what will happen to my grandson with no one to care for him?

I never imagined that human agony could be met with such callousness and hate. When will my drama finally end? This drama of mine and all political prisoners?

Hoping that you will publish my letter, I thank you.

EFTIHIA VOULGARI.

AN OPEN LETTER FROM: ELENI VOULGARI-GOLEMAS

From the Korydallos Prison where I am kept as a political prisoner with 15 other women fighters for peace and democracy, living in utter isolation under unbearable conditions, I send this appeal to national and international organizations, politicians, intellectuals, and democratic people to relate my family's tragic story in detail.

I was arrested in October of 1966 and convicted by the Military Court of Larissa to the unbelievably harsh sentence of 10 years. Since I was convicted for a crime "manufactured" fifteen years before, in 1954, when I was a young high school girl, the trial was clearly a political maneuver. During the trial the accusation was proven unfounded. My "crime" was that I had accompanied my brother-in-law, Nicos Genas, at the time hounded by the security forces for his activities in the democratic movement, from Athens to Larissa.

In reality, and this may surprise you, the cause of my conviction was my reply to the military judge's question about whether I still adhered to my political convictions. My reply was: "If I am tried for my ideas, that is to say, for which the Nazis executed my father, an example of a man, patriot, democrat, scholar, held in the dungeons of the fascist dictator Metaxas and desperately ill, turned over to the Hitlerites to be executed, if for these ideals I am tried today, then I must reply with pride: Yes, I still cherish those ideals of all humanity."

That was enough for the extreme penalty of 10 years in prison to be imposed on me. The fact that I was at the time five months pregnant was not taken into account. It must be noted further that my sister's husband for whose sake I was being tried, was in that same room, a spectator at my trial having been freed by an amnesty though he had been sentenced to death five times. That was the kind of "justice" meted out.

What my orphaned family has suffered ever since my father's execution is beyond description. Our house was repeatedly burned down by the Nazi occupiers and bands of lawless Greek collaborators who at the time plagued the land. My mother was left home-

less to raise three small girls; but she continued my father's patriotic work, heroically and fully honoring his memory. For her many sacrifices, she was rewarded with eight years in prison and the same number of years in barren exile islands. Before she could recover, the colonels' tyrannical regime in 1967 flung her into the crowded prison ship and onto the infamous prison island of Youra. Fortunately, thanks to Greek and international outcry, she was released and is free today. Her courage, kindness, patriotic and moral values and the example of my father's supreme sacrifice, influenced the shaping of my character and early filled my youthful heart with love for my people, for democracy and peace.

My little boy was born in prison now lives with my aged and sick mother in her village. They are alone with no one to care for them.

My husband, Babis Golemas, is also a political prisoner of the Junta, serving a 16-year-term imposed on him by the Athens Special Court Martial for his antidictatorship activities.

I have petitioned repeatedly for justice under the laws that could be beneficially applied to my case. All my petitions were automatically, and typically, rejected by the government. I do not beg for clemency; I ask for justice. I ask for my freedom of which I have been deprived illegally and unconstitutionally. I am asking for an end to the crime they committed and continue to commit against me, against a small child, against my family and the entire Greek people.

This drama which has lasted for many years, together with thousands of similar dramas of Greek patriots, this special harshness, reflects the martyrdom and suffering of the Greek people and the brutal reversal of moral values in our country where patriots, instead of bread are given bile, while traitors are honored and today rule Greece.

I believe that honest people everywhere cannot remain silent confronted with such political crimes. They must raise their voices, strongly and decisively to end the torments and persecutions of the Greek political prisoners. It is time now to stop this tragic situation, to achieve a general political amnesty that will perhaps be the foundation for the establishment of democracy in the land in which it was born.

In the conviction that my cry will bring the necessary response, I thank you warmly.

ELENI VOUGIARI-GOLEMAS,
Political prisoner, Korydallos Prison.

NOW IT IS DR. ROGERS

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is heartening to note that a distinguished colleague in the House has been highly honored for his contributions in a most important field. Hon. PAUL G. ROGERS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, has been awarded an honorary doctor of laws degree by George Washington University for his outstanding contributions in the field of health. This award followed his address to the medical graduates of George Washington University in Washington, D.C., on May 28, 1972.

In his speech he pointed to the current problems of health and offered suggestions for solving them. He said the first item of business is redirecting the health efforts of our Federal Government. He spoke on the goal of developing a new

health in America and urged the creation of a Cabinet-level Department of Health.

I am confident that our colleagues in the House share Mr. ROGERS' concern over the problems of health which Americans face in every corner of our Nation today. It has been recognized by many that much of our national effort in the area of health has been fragmented and without a goal. There has been a need for stronger leadership on the national level to insure a high priority for health programs.

I have found Mr. ROGERS' comments most interesting and submit them for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I offer my warm and sincere congratulations to Congressman ROGERS and I am sure this sentiment is shared by the Members of the House.

SPEECH BY HONORABLE PAUL G. ROGERS OF FLORIDA BEFORE THE MEDICAL GRADUATES OF GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 28, 1972

It is a distinct pleasure to be invited to speak to this graduating class and a particular honor to one who does not hold a doctor of medicine degree.

I have spoken at commencements before, but this occasion is noticeably different. Before, I could look out at the bright faces with a degree of curiosity, wondering just what these people would be doing. Some maybe would be designing building, others building them. Some would be teaching, and many would be joining the business world.

You look like a more serious group and I guess that this could be attributed to the fact that you have had some very intense on-the-job training, and you are more fully aware of what you are getting into because you have already been there.

I feel that anyone who is intimately familiar with our health service system in this nation has good reason to look serious.

I doubt that any of you subscribe to the theory which Dr. Nolen put forth in his book "The Making of a Surgeon", that a surgeon is just another kind of mechanic, but I would venture to say that until Mr. Nader intercedes with a higher source to initiate a recall procedure for biological shortcomings, there will always be a need for men and women of medicine. Despite our advances, that need is growing, not diminishing.

Next to Freedom—and we hold this above all else—our health is our most precious possession. Because of this, we have given special status to men and women of medicine. The gift of preserving life, of preventing death, is almost mystic to the average man.

Because you will have this special training you will be given a special status among your fellow man. And because of your special training, you will have a special responsibility to your fellow man. There are few of you here who could not establish material security within three years of your residency. I wish you well, but I wish you more than material status.

There are many now, and I am one, who believe that physicians are more than individuals with a profession. Physicians are a national resource, just as the colleges which train them are a national resource. The Federal Government has a responsibility to insure and promote the health of all its citizens, and the foundation of any and all health services is health manpower.

You represent the more fortunate ones in medical training. You have been accepted. This afternoon you are graduating. Your training will be extended and then you will embark on careers.

This fall, there will be room in our medical schools for only one in three who apply. If you accept the premise that manpower

is the backbone of our health system, you will agree that our posture is bending under the burden of an increasing medical crisis.

The lack of manpower, the problem of distribution of available manpower are just two of the many problems confronting those of us who are deeply concerned over this nation's health policy—or more aptly, the lack of a national health policy.

Because health is the most common of all denominators, we see both the rich and the poor, the educated and the uneducated, and the young and the old as potential victims of ill health. No one is subject to exemption, no status, no wealth can insure against ill health.

For this very reason, the health of our citizens should be of the highest priority to our leaders. The litany of familiar statistics which point to our failures in health are so common as to not bear repeating.

No one will deny a crisis in health, from the President on down. But to date, no one has adequately acted to solve that crisis.

Instead of formulating a national plan for unifying our health efforts, we are now laboring under a fragmented, unguided patchwork of programs which have become crisis-oriented.

This fragmentation and lack of leadership has even further diluted and diminished our efforts.

Lest I sound as though I do not have pride and confidence in our achievements in medicine, let me add that I firmly believe that this nation is the greatest storehouse of medical knowledge in the world today. Our shortcoming is passing that knowledge from the laboratory, from the college to the practicing physicians and then on to our citizens.

It matters little if a Dr. Klein in Buffalo, New York arrives at a breakthrough for skin cancer if we cannot disseminate that information throughout the nation. It matters little if a Michael DeBakey develops a new method for heart surgery if the heart physicians across the nation continue to lose their patients by using cumbersome and less effective procedures. And it matters little if we can prevent polio but do not take the steps to inoculate children against this disease.

I recall the phrase "Bring Us Together." Well, I can think of no other segment of our life today that needs bringing together more than this nation's health efforts.

A new system of health must evolve for the people of this nation. We must pick and sort out those functions of our existing health system which are relevant to the problems of today and cast aside those which are no longer relevant. We must build on the foundation of valid practices a system of health more responsive to all Americans, a system which can be reached by all Americans and can be afforded by all Americans.

We are, I believe, on the verge of developing a New Health in America. This New Health is not sitting there ready to be plugged in. It is more complicated than that. We are not yet agreed on what this New Health should be.

But the outflow of legislation in the Congress attests to the fact that many now realize that our existing system needs change. We need a new prescription for health.

Within the coming Congress I think we will see a national debate over what form this New Health will take.

The focal point of that effort will be the creation of a new, cabinet level Department of Health. We vitally need to bring in all our health efforts, take stock of our needs, and then develop a national health policy which sets out a national health goal.

We must think of the national health. And we must then plan to be at a point certain at a time certain. The year-to-year mentality which has gerrymandered our existing system should be junked for long-

range planning. We can no longer tolerate piecemeal programs.

So long as health lies buried in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare under the weight of such social problems as education and welfare, it will remain disjointed, the stepchild of a massive and uncontrollable department. What we need is a man to sit at the President's table, a man directing a cabinet level department who will speak to the problems of health. A man responsible for all of this nation's health programs.

Lincoln said of politics: "The tired dogmas of the past are no longer adequate to the problems of the stormy present."

We are almost to the crossroads. I think it would be error to discard completely all elements of our existing health system. But it would be error of equal magnitude to think that it can carry us through the troubled present and improve what certainly will be a more demanding future.

You are the present and the future of medicine. A time will come when you will see yourself as an individual. It will be your practice, your patients, your responsibility in a hospital or classroom.

I challenge you never to forget that while you are an individual, you are also a part, an integral part, of a national health system which is responsible for all Americans. It will be easier to think individually, to simply concern yourself with your patients, your hospital, your teaching college.

But—if you do not concern yourself with the problems of your unknown colleagues elsewhere, if you do not concern yourself with the problems of those unknown patients elsewhere, if you do not concern yourself with the state of the nation's health system, then we as a nation will not realize the New Health which is necessary if we are to fulfill our responsibility of providing the American public with the best medical care possible.

You are becoming doctors at the most exciting time in the history of medicine. To provide a New Health for our nation is the challenge. The challenge is great. There are few who are capable of responding to this challenge. But you are among that select group. This is part of that special responsibility. I hope you will accept it. Congratulations and God speed.

FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF 6-DAY WAR

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, on the fifth anniversary of the 6-day war, the brave nation of Israel remains constantly vigilant against the always present threat of invasion and terrorist activities. Only days ago, innocent people were slaughtered at Tel Aviv Airport by Palestinian terrorists. Israel has continually offered to directly negotiate a settlement in order to establish a lasting peace in the Middle East. Her enemies have refused to negotiate or even to accept the fact of her existence.

Israel represents a bastion of democracy in an area of the world dominated by virtual dictatorships or elements dedicated to the destruction of all the ideals which we hold dear in this country. It is an oasis of freedom in that part of the world where feudal entities still exist and where terroristic tactics are a way of life. It is a bright, living example of the axiom: "It is better to light one candle than to curse the darkness." No other country in the Middle East—against such

overwhelming odds—has developed its economic and agricultural potential to the extent to which Israel has done so.

It rivals the United States in its ability to deal with a "melting pot" society—refugees from all parts of the globe, who have come there to escape the oppression to which they have been subjected for many years. Israel is their hope for the future, and the world could do well to follow its example of dedication to the principles of humanity and justice for all its citizens.

Every effort this dynamic country has made to bring to an end the continuing hostilities on the part of its neighboring countries has been thwarted by the continuing support of those countries of the Palestinian terrorist groups who make no distinction in their senseless slaughter of innocent people. Instead of using the funds for armaments and weapons of destruction, these arid countries should be expending such sums for constructive purposes. They deliberately compound the Palestinian refugee problem, still attempting to play on the sympathy of world opinion, and have been so engaged for almost a quarter of a century. These hostile nations have been using these refugees, creating and encouraging a sense of bitterness, instead of using peaceful avenues of approach for a resolution of the issues.

Israel has more than earned the right to peace. Yet, the Middle East today still remains a dangerous area of the world, with great potential for conflict that could draw the great powers into a devastating and needless global war. Our only alternative is to supply Israel with the necessary aid to preserve her dearly earned freedom, and we must make our continuing support of Israel unquestionably clear. Only a balance of power in the Middle East will keep the avowed enemies of Israel from attempting to destroy her today as they attempted to do, unsuccessfully, 5 years ago today.

Israel is a force to be reckoned with, and she will never turn the other cheek. But peace is what she seeks—and peace is what she intends to achieve—whatever the cost.

CHESTER S. DISHONG

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on April 25, 1972, at Wauchula, Fla., one of the greatest and bravest and wisest men I have ever known died. He was Chester S. Dishong. He was like a brother to me and like a member of my family to my family. He was fearless, honest, indefatigable, dedicated to the performance of his public duty, a patriot, a generous man, a charming gentleman, a man who had the genius of friendship.

He came of a family of law enforcement officers, dedicated to law enforcement. His father was sheriff of old DeSoto County in Florida before it was divided up into many other counties. His brother, Les Dishong, was sheriff of the DeSoto County which still survived. He, himself, was the first elected sheriff of Hardee County and later was appointed

a U.S. marshal for the southern district of Florida.

When I began to campaign for the U.S. Senate in 1934, I began to hear of a man who was already a legend through all of central and southern Florida. He was the best sheriff that could be found. He gave nearly everything he made to help the poor. He was the greatest hunter and fisherman in central and southern Florida. He was a captain in our Armed Forces on the Mexican border. He was the Paul Bunyan on that part of the State. I solicited and secured his support in 1938. After I was elected to the U.S. Senate, when a vacancy occurred, I recommended him for U.S. marshal for the southern district of Florida. My colleague, Hon. Charles Andrews, agreed. The Department of Justice advised me that they had discovered that Mr. Dishong was a splendid law enforcement officer, honorable beyond reproach, that he gave away nearly everything he made helping the poor, but they had discovered that he had some of the weaknesses to which many men are subject. I responded that he was a very human man and very much a man but that if he were appointed he would be the best U.S. marshal in the United States. President Roosevelt appointed him. Marshal Dishong vindicated my confidence. He received the tribute of every law enforcement officer with whom he worked and with every Federal judge under whom he discharged his duties, as well as the court officials with whom he labored. He was U.S. marshal until 1951 when he retired. Thereafter, he worked for the State of Florida but spent his declining years with his beloved family: his wife, Hallie Hendry Dishong, and his two daughters, Mrs. Donna Mae Downing and Mrs. Catherine Garrison, who lived beside him.

Ches Dishong had little formal education but I never met a brighter, sharper mind, a keener wit, or better mental ability. If this man had had a formal education he might have merited the prophetic lines of Thomas Gray in "Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard" when he said:

"Th' applause of list'ning senates to command
The threats of pain and ruin to despise
To scatter plenty o'er a smiling land
And read their history in a nation's eyes."

As long as memory survives Ches Dishong will ever be close to me. I shall treasure the happy times I spent with him in travel, in the performance of his duty, on the hunt, or fishing.

I was privileged to attend his funeral and to share the tribute of a host to him and to see him laid away in serene beauty. This man brightened many a life, cast many flowers by the way along which he walked, uttered many words of cheer to those who faltered, taught respect for law to those who defied it, extended the hand of compassion to countless needy. His principal monument will be in the memories of those who knew him, who loved him, and cherished his friendship.

"He was a man, take him for all and all I shall not look upon his like again."

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD immediately following my remarks an article from the Herald-Advocate about Ches Dishong.

[The Herald Advocate, April 27, 1972]

PROMINENT HARDEE COUNTIAN DIES

Lifelong law enforcement officer Chester S. Dishong, 82 died at his home early Wednesday morning.

Dishong was the first elected sheriff of Hardee County and in 1938 was appointed a U.S. Marshall for the Southern District of Florida.

He was a member of the First Baptist Church, the Methodist Men's Bible Class, the Masonic Lodge and the Florida Peace Officer's Association.

U. S. Rep. Claude Pepper, 71, called from his Washington office Tuesday to praise the late Dishong, a long-time friend.

"He was one of the best law enforcement officers who ever lived. He had a natural aptitude for law enforcement," said Pepper, who pointed out Dishong was Wauchula police chief and Hardee County sheriff before he became a U. S. Marshall in 1938, a position he held until 1951.

Pepper recommended Dishong for the federal position serving south Florida, while he was U. S. Senator. Dishong was appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt and confirmed by the Senate.

Pepper said Dishong came from a "family tradition of law enforcement. His father was sheriff of old DeSoto County, before it was split up, and his brother, Les, was also sheriff of DeSoto County."

The Congressman said he got to know Dishong in 1934 in the early days of his campaign for Senate.

"At that time he was already a legend in law enforcement in southern and central Florida. He was also a legend as a hunter and fisherman."

"He wasn't afraid of anyone. He had a warm and magnificent personality. He had a heart as big as a mule. He gave away a great part of his salary to the poor people," said Pepper, who has been a U. S. Representative for 10 years. He was also a U. S. Senator for 14 years.

"Ches had a distinguished record. His outstanding service was recognized by federal judges in Florida with whom he worked and by the Department of Justice in Washington."

"Everybody knew Chester Dishong was the best hunter and fisherman in the county. Everybody loved him. He was like a brother to me up until his death. I would call him up from time to time. I have his photograph on my office wall right now."

Pepper said he plans to put Dishong's obituary, a recent feature article about him from The Herald-Advocate, and "my own statement" into the Congressional Record in the next few days.

"Mrs. Pepper and I are profoundly sorrowful at his death. He was a great man. I regarded him as one of the great men I've known," added Pepper, who said he planned to attend the funeral Friday.

Dishong's survivors are his widow, Hallie Henry Dishong; two daughters, Catherine Garrison, and Mrs. R. B. Downing Jr.; two sisters, Mrs. Edna Palmer of Tampa, and Mrs. Stella Ebert of Seffner; four grandchildren and seven great-grandchildren.

Funeral services will be held at the Chapel of Coker Funeral Home at 3 p.m. with Rev. Dow Durrance, Rev. Charles Granger, and Rev. Harrison Conley officiating.

Burial will be in Wauchula Cemetery with Masonic rites at graveside.

Masonic members will serve as pallbearers.

HONOR AMERICA DAY

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the Fourth of July is being celebrated this year as "Honor America Day" in an extended patriotic observance beginning on Flag Day, June 14, 1972.

In this crucial election year, it is very appropriate, I think, to emphasize the patriotic aspects of American life. The democratic freedoms we enjoy are the result of the devotion of the many patriotic men and women who have gone before us. The obligation to preserve American liberty for future generations is ours, and this carries with it a responsibility to inculcate in our young people a feeling for the land in which they were born.

The celebration of the period from Flag Day to Independence Day is a patriotic event which deserves the support of all Americans who love freedom and the land of the free.

BAD GUYS ARE NORTH VIETNAMESE

(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, it is most unusual these days to read anything in the newspapers unfavorable to the enemy. But there was a refreshing departure in the Columbus, Ohio Citizen Journal on Monday, June 5, under the byline of Don Tate.

Those who are always deep breathing about and deploring "escalation," would do well to read the following:

NORTH VIETS LOSE BATTLE FOR PEOPLE— INSTILL TERROR (By Don Tate)

DA NANG, SOUTH VIETNAM.—"Yes, they intend to liberate us, even if they have to kill us all," says Nguyen Van Khanh, a white-haired farmer and former village chief, now a refugee.

It is hot and sticky and depressing and Khanh talks about the North Vietnamese.

He had fled with his family of eight, but three didn't make it. One was killed by a Communist shell, two disappeared in the confusion of retreat from Cam Lo to Quang Tri two months ago. Then more shelling and the chaotic plunge from Quang Tri to Hue a month ago, then on to Da Nang, walking, running, hobbling.

"The old men are the saddest ones," says a Vietnamese interpreter, a college student on the run from Hue.

He follows the eyes of Nguyen Van Khanh down rows of tents of the camp toward a Buddhist cemetery. The gray stone tombs of the cemetery stand amid piles of garbage, a few old tires and rusted war scrap thrown over the barbed wire.

Whom do the people blame for their latest miseries? The Americans, perhaps? Not this time, no matter how it's twisted.

Do they blame the North Vietnamese, who say their moral imperative is to liberate the south?

Says Nguyen Van Khanh, rubbing his arm, traces of a sneer on his lips, "that sounds too noble, too noble for my weak stomach. We just wish they would go away."

For years it has been said the battle for the hearts and minds of the villagers was the essential one in South Vietnam, not the count of North Vietnamese dead.

It is clear Hanoi's insistence the South Vietnamese are seeking to "liberate" themselves is the biggest fake in this war. There

is nothing to back it anymore but North Vietnamese.

Once there was the Viet Cong. They drew sympathy from liberation lovers. But terror, not sympathy, is evoked when North Vietnamese come rolling across borders and plastering tiny towns with thousands of shells.

The battle for the people is one the North Vietnamese have lost in this offensive. Life had been going along pretty well for people like Nguyen Van Khanh. Now they are losing it all again—their homes, their businesses, their families—because a handful of men in Hanoi have to have a victory.

If the communists had the support of the people they are always claiming there would be little fighting in Vietnam today. The war would be over. Communist flags would wave from housetops. The people would embrace liberators joyously. But it never happens, not in 1968, not now.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Ohio) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. QUIN, for 1 hour, on June 7.

Mr. CRANE, for 1 hour, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CURLIN), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ASPIN, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ, today, for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ABZUG, today, for 5 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MICHEL in two instances.

Mr. SCHERLE to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Ohio and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DICKINSON.

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mr. HALL.

Mr. DERWINSKI in four instances.

Mr. BAKER.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. LATT.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. WYATT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CURLIN), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. HAGAN in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. FRASER in five instances.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS.

Mr. PUCINSKI in 10 instances.

Mr. ASPIN in 10 instances.

Mr. MOSS.

Mr. ROGERS in five instances.

Mr. HUNGATE in two instances.

Mr. FUQUA.

Mr. MINISH.

Mr. HARRINGTON in three instances.

Mr. BOLLING.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.
Mr. DANIEL of Virginia in two instances.
Mr. REUSS in two instances.
Mr. SATTERFIELD.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1140. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands of the Southern Ute Indian Tribe, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CURLIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 7, 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:

2057. A letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for an increase in the amounts authorized to be made available in fiscal year 1972 for support of South Vietnamese and other free world forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2058. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics), transmitting notice of the proposed transfer of the submarine U.S.S. *Roncadore* (ex-AGSS-301), to the American Society of Military History, Canoga Park, Calif., pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7308; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2059. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens found admissible to the United States, pursuant to section 212(a) (28)(I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2060. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in section 212(d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of certain aliens, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 212(d) (6) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2061. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens under the authority contained in section 13(b) of the act of September 11, 1957, pursuant to section 13(c) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2062. A letter from the board of trustees of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance and disability insurance trust funds, transmitting the 1972 annual report of the board of trustees of the trust fund, pursuant to section 201(c) of the Social Security Act, as amended (H. Doc. No. 92-307); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

2063. A letter from the board of trustees of the Federal hospital insurance trust fund, transmitting the 1972 annual report of the board of trustees of the trust fund, pur-

suant to section 201(c) of the Social Security Act, as amended (H. Doc. No. 92-308); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

2064. A letter from the board of trustees of the Federal supplementary medical insurance trust fund, transmitting the 1972 annual report of the board of trustees of the trust fund, pursuant to section 201(c) of the Social Security Act, as amended (H. Doc. No. 92-309); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

2065. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the annual report on welfare programs under the Social Security Act, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. chapter 7; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2066. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a further report on the delay in submission of the systems analysis of national health care plans required by Public Law 91-515; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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 of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 11417. (Rept. No. 92-1111). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1010. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 10792. A bill to amend the Small Business Act. (Rept. No. 92-1112). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1011. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 14149. A bill authorizing continuing appropriations for Peace Corps, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-1113). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1012. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 14424. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Institute of Aging, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-1114). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DOW, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GAYDOS, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. MIKVA, and Mrs. MINK):

H.R. 15346. A bill to provide that existing Federal tax subsidies will terminate on January 1, 1974, and to provide for a maximum duration of 2 years for Federal tax subsidies hereafter enacted; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REES, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. UDALL):

H.R. 15347. A bill to provide that existing Federal tax subsidies will terminate on January 1, 1974, and to provide for a maximum duration of 2 years for Federal tax subsidies hereafter enacted; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself, and Mr. KUYKENDALL):

H.R. 15348. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to World War I veterans and widows, subject to \$3,000 and \$4,200 annual income limitations; to provide for such veterans a certain priority in entitlement to hospitalization and medical care; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 15349. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Northern Palute Nation by the Indian Claims Commission in docket No. 87, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROTZMAN (for himself, Mr. BELCHER, Mr. BETTS, Mr. BURLINSON of Texas, and Mr. CONABLE):

H.R. 15350. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to certain charitable contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 15351. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional personal exemption for taxpayers who rent their principal residence, to provide a tax credit for real property taxes and mortgage interest on the taxpayer's principal residence, to increase the portability of pension benefits, and to reform the tax treatment of oil and gas wells; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODLING (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, and Mr. FINDLEY):

H.R. 15352. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended and reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, to authorize marketing orders for apples; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 15353. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide that where violations are corrected within the prescribed abatement period no penalty shall be assessed; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 15354. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to World War I veterans and their widows, subject to \$3,000 and \$4,200 annual income limitations; to provide for such veterans a certain priority in entitlement to hospitalization and medical care; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 15355. 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. STAGGERS:

H.R. 15356. A bill to protect the orderly marketing of cattle hides, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 15357. A bill to authorize the President, through the temporary Vietnam Children's Care Agency, to enter into arrangements with the Government of South Vietnam to provide assistance in improving the welfare of children in South Vietnam and to facilitate the adoption of orphaned or abandoned Vietnamese children, particularly children of U.S. fathers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. SCHEUER presented a bill (H.R. 15358) for the relief of Perla Selcer, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.