

with statements limited therein to 3 minutes.

At the hour of 12:13 p.m., the Senate will recess and Senators will move in a body toward the House of Representatives for a joint meeting of the two Houses, to be addressed by the President of the United Mexican States. Following the joint meeting of the two Houses and no later than 2 o'clock, whichever is earlier, the Senate will resume its deliberations. The unfinished business will be laid aside temporarily and H.R. 9092, the bill by Mr. McGEE, an act to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government, will be laid before the Senate, there being a time agreement thereon.

Upon the disposition of H.R. 9092, the Senate will take up H.R. 14989—an act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary and related agencies—on which there is a time agreement. There will be rollcall votes tomorrow afternoon on both measures. It is my understanding that several amendments will likely be called up—especially to the bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce—and rollcall votes will occur on those amendments. There is a likelihood, therefore, that the Senate will be in session until a reasonably late hour tomorrow.

For the information of Senators, so that they may be alerted in time, it is anticipated that on Friday there will be at least four rollcall votes. I would anticipate, furthermore, Mr. President, and I would hope that the Senate could complete the transaction of its business on Friday afternoon by 3 o'clock or earlier.

Additionally, may I say, there will be no Saturday session by reason of the fact that the Senate will have cleared all appropriation bills from the calendar, no amendments to the unfinished business can be scheduled for Saturday, and the calendar otherwise will be pretty clear.

Finally, I believe there will be at least three rollcall votes on Monday.

When the already scheduled four amendments to the unfinished business have been disposed of on Monday, the Senate will proceed to the second track and consider the bill to strengthen and expand the Headstart program, S. 3617. It is hoped that a time agreement can be reached on that bill, but this cannot be done until Monday.

Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate—

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Is it anticipated that the vote on the pending business will be completed on Monday?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. In answer to

the very able senior Senator from Kentucky, it is not anticipated that action on the unfinished business will be completed on Monday.

Mr. COOPER. There is no time agreement, then, on amendments offered, including the Mansfield amendment?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. No time agreement has been entered into with respect to any amendment relating to the so-called Mansfield amendment.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11:30 A.M.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate today, I move, in accordance with the previous order that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 4:23 p.m. the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 15, 1972, at 11:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 14, 1972:

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Robert Lewis Sansom, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, June 14, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Lift ye up a banner upon the high mountain.—Isaiah 13: 2.

God of our Fathers, Maker and Ruler of men, we thank Thee for this day when we lift up before our eyes the flag of our Republic. Grant, O Lord, that this banner flying in the breeze may awaken in us and in our people a greater love for our Nation and a deeper devotion to the princely principles of life and liberty for all men. Make us conscious of our duties as citizens of this free land and by Thy spirit may we accept our responsibilities to keep our land strong and free and good.

Bless Thou the flag of our beloved country and continue to make it a symbol of hope to all mankind. May it fly forever over this land of free men and free women. Before it we pledge the loyalty of our lives to the United States of America. 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 agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3166. An act to amend the Small Business Act.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 1, 1972, the Chair declares the House in recess for the purpose of observing and commemorating Flag Day.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

FLAG DAY

During the recess the following proceedings took place in honor of the United States Flag, the Speaker of the House of Representatives presiding.

FLAG DAY PROGRAM, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JUNE 14, 1972

The United States Air Force Band and the United States Air Force Singing Sergeants entered the door to the left of the Speaker and took the positions assigned to them.

The honored guests, Mr. Red Skelton, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, and Leaders of the Military Women entered the door to the right of the Speaker and took the positions assigned to them. Mr. Red Skelton was seated at the desk in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The United States Air Force Band and United States Air Force Singing Ser-

geants (conducted by Major Albert Bader, USAF) presented *This Is My Country* (soloist Sergeant Charles Kulita).

The Doorkeeper (Honorable William M. Miller) announced the Flag of the United States.

[Applause. The Members rising.]

The United States Air Force Band played *Americans We*.

The Flag was carried into the Chamber by Color Bearer and a guard from each of the branches of the Armed Forces: Sergeant Edward D. Showers, USAF, Honor Guard, Bolling Air Force Base; SA Rickey L. Jones, USN, Ceremonial Guard, U.S. Naval District; Pfc. R. R. Reynolds, USMC, Marine Barracks Guard Company; Spc. 4 Steve Ruch, USA, Fort McNair; and SA Michael D. Bethel, U.S. Coast Guard.

The Color Guard saluted the Speaker, faced about, and saluted the House.

The Flag was posted and the Members were seated.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. NICHOLS).

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 25th anniversary of the United States Air Force and your Flag Day Committee is pleased to have the United States Air Force Band and Singing Sergeants conducted by Major Albert Bader participating in today's Flag Day ceremonies.

Our honored guest for Flag Day, 1972 is known and admired by all of us. When we think of Red Skelton, we think of *Clem Kadiddlehopper*, *Freddy the Freeloader*, *Sheriff Deadeye*, *Junior the Mean*

Little Kid, Cauliflower McPug and the *Little Old Man* in Red's famous pantomimes. We have all laughed at Red and his characters.

But too few of us know about Red Skelton, the *Patriotic American*—the Red Skelton who broke all records *Selling War Bonds* during World War Two, the Red Skelton who *Entertained American troops during the Korean conflict*, the Red Skelton who made all of us think about our country when he recorded *His Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag* in 1969. At this time, on behalf of your Flag Day Committee of the United States Congress, I am proud to present to you a great American—Mr. Red Skelton.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. RED SKELTON. I have been given permission to dispense with all the formalities in recognizing everyone here. I just say, "Friends, thank you very much." [Applause.]

Actually, it is quite flattering to hear applause without doing anything.

I am very proud to be standing in Congress today without a subpoena in my pocket, and it is quite an honor to be standing here knowing that I have not made one campaign promise.

I have been asked to recite the Pledge of Allegiance. To me it is rather dear, for this reason: as I have found a long time ago that patriotism is not a tradition, it is a family privilege, and it is something that we should all cherish.

And I know there have been great speeches made from this platform here. Nothing that I will say will be compared with what has been said, but I have always been fascinated with speeches.

One of the greatest speeches I think I have ever heard was when I was a small boy, and we boys and girls had just finished reciting the Pledge of Allegiance, and our teacher called us together and said, "Boys and girls, I have been listening to you recite the Pledge of Allegiance all semester, and it appears to me it has become monotonous to you, or could it be you do not know the meanings of those words? If I may I would like to recite the Pledge of Allegiance and give you a definition for each word."

I—me, an individual, a committee of one.

Pledge—dedicate all of my worldly goods to give without self-pity.

Allegiance—my love and my devotion.

To the Flag—our standard, Old Glory, a symbol of freedom. Wherever she waves, there is respect because your loyalty has given her a dignity that shouts freedom is everybody's job.

Of the United—that means that we have all come together.

States—individual communities that have united into 48 great states, 48 individual communities with pride and dignity and purpose, all divided with imaginary boundaries, yet united to a common purpose, and that's love for country.

Of America.

And to the Republic—a state in which sovereign power is invested in representatives chosen by the people to govern. And government is the people and it's from the people to the leaders, not from the leaders to the people.

For which it stands.

One nation—meaning, so blessed by God.

Indivisible—incapable of being divided. With liberty—which is freedom and the right of power to live one's own life without threats or fear or some sort of retaliation.

And justice—The principle or quality of dealing fairly with others.

For all—which means "it's as much your country as it is mine."

Since I was a small boy, two states have been added to our country and two words have been added to the Pledge of Allegiance—"under God."

Wouldn't it be a pity if someone said, "That's a prayer" and that would be eliminated from schools, too?

[Applause, the Members rising.]

While we are all standing at this time I would like for all of us to recite the *Pledge of Allegiance*.

The Members and guests, led by Mr. Red Skelton, recited the *Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag*.

Mr. RED SKELTON. Thank you, and may God bless.

[Applause.]

The U.S. Air Force Band and U.S. Air Force Singing Sergeants presented *I Am An American* (Sergeant Harry Gleason, Narrator).

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, Flag Day has become a tradition in the Congress and one of the men most responsible for making the program a success is our distinguished colleague from Missouri.

We were all saddened some weeks ago to learn of his announced retirement at the conclusion of the 92d Congress. Mr. Speaker, I know of no Member of this body who has served his State and his Nation in a more effective manner. Here is a man who truly loves the flag of the United States and the principles for which it stands.

With these thoughts in mind, I would like to recognize that gentleman today for his service to humanity and to his country—the esteemed gentleman from Missouri, the Honorable DURWARD HALL.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, distinguished guests, honored services, colleagues, and friends, we are assembled here today to renew our allegiance to the cause of freedom by paying honor to the national emblem of this Republic, and to its people.

Certainly we compliment you on continuing this recognition, and I can think of no more fitting place for such an observance than here in the "people's House," where the sanctity of the representative process is preserved.

It is somewhat difficult to put together the words that express proper feeling about our "Stars and Stripes" because in this so-called era of "relevance" such traditional words as duty, honor, country, sacrifice, patriotism and dedication, are oftentimes considered to be "old hat," or out of style. They are even ridiculed as trite words, expounded by a chauvinistic generation that has no contact with the "new wave."

We do not agree, for we know it was a dedicated people who wrote the Con-

stitution that guides the destiny of this Nation, the very document that paradoxically—and, I fear, sometimes unappreciatively—makes it possible for dissent to be heard and "peaceful protest" to be permitted, when and where responsible. Relevance in today's world is important, but there is still room for reverence—yes, reverence to the flag that has changed in design, but remains constant in representing our principles of freedom and our great Nation.

We know of the sacrifices that have been made to defend this Nation, not only from the threat of military aggression, but from crime, deterioration, and corruption from within. Many times those who criticize the loudest benefit the most from that protection.

I know it was an honorable people who sought to establish a republic out of a wilderness—a place where lovers of freedom could realize the goals, of which others only dream.

If these words sound "old hat," so be it. If they do not ring true to the beholder, that is not my problem, for during the years I have been permitted to exist on this earth, and have been privileged to live and serve in these United States, I have learned that wherever our flag flies, the people who are fortunate enough to dwell in its shadow are assured of the opportunity to drink from the cup of freedom. History teaches that each generation of responsible citizens must reach out and grasp it anew!

It has been written that, "When the hour is the blackest, the stars seem to shine the brightest." In this dark, yet emerging hour of world turmoil and distrust, it is heartening to realize that "Old Glory" has now been carried, in the quest for peace, to parts of the world that have not permitted its public display in the last generation.

And it is good to know that once again the people of the United States have extended the hand of trust in the hope that it will be accepted with a mutual desire for peace. At the same time, we do not harbor any illusions that peace between different ideologies can be easily maintained.

Ladies and gentlemen, we all know that a flag is but a piece of cloth. It has no human sense of feeling, no thought processes, no desires, character, sight, or sound. However, it is the symbol of those who do, and when it is dishonored the pain is felt by all. When it is shown disrespect, we are all affected, and when it is spat upon we are all humiliated.

It was in 1867 that Charles Sumner wrote:

There is a national flag. He must be cold, indeed, who can look upon its folds rippling in the breeze without pride of country.

It was William Tyler Page who summed it up by writing:

I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic, a sovereign nation of many sovereign states; a perfect union one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes I, therefore, believe it is my duty to my country to love it, to sup-

port its Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its flag, and to defend its against all enemies.

He best described a proper living together, the symbolism involved in love of country, second only to God. As we celebrate the birth of our flag, let the word go forth from these Chambers throughout the land, by our two-way street of representative process in the Republic; of the timeliness of patriotism, participation, and dedication to flag and country.

Thank you very much.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The Members and guests rose and sang the *Star Spangled Banner* (first verse) accompanied by the United States Air Force Band and the Air Force Singing Sergeants.

The Colors were retired from the Chamber, the United States Air Force Band playing the *National Emblem March*.

The United States Air Force Band and United States Air Force Singing Sergeants retired from the Chamber.

The honored guests retired from the Chamber.

At 12 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m., the proceedings in honor of the United States Flag were concluded.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock p.m.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING THE RECESS AND LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the *RECORD* and that all Members have permission to extend their remarks on Flag Day.

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

There was no objection.

FLAG DAY CEREMONY

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to commend the Speaker and the leadership on both sides of the aisle for giving us the opportunity to have Flag Day. This was a tremendous program. I would like to recognize the committee composed of the gentleman from Alabama, Congressman BILL NICHOLS, chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. JACK BRINKLEY, the gentleman from Maine, Mr. KYROS, the gentleman from New York, Mr. JACK KEMP, as well as the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. DURWARD HALL.

Mr. Speaker, I would especially commend Dr. HALL for the outstanding address he gave us during this Flag Day ceremony.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the great American, Red Skelton, for his part in the program.

Red's handling of the "Pledge of Allegiance" was great. The Air Force Band and the Singing Sergeants added much to this occasion.

Mr. Speaker, I wish all Americans could have seen this celebration. I again commend Chairman NICHOLS and his Flag Day Committee.

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, these are difficult times for America, times in which the ideals and values of our national heritage are severely challenged, times in which it is sometimes scorned to be patriotic. Today, as we pause to observe Flag Day, it is especially important that we take the time to consider what the flag and patriotism really mean.

The American flag was born in the troubled and uncertain days of our War for Independence. In the century and three quarters that followed, it became a beacon of light in democracy's darkest hours, stirring hearts with pride and confidence. Throughout the history of this Nation, the flag has always been a rallying point for the forces of freedom and the men who would die for it.

All sorts of objects have served as flags to the long procession of tribes and nations and armies which have moved through history from the dim centuries to the present day. The human wish to establish one's identity, to stamp one's possessions with a personal mark, to embody in a symbol the pride and hope and courage of one man or a group of men, has been the origin of flags. But among the flags of all the nations the flag of the United States of America—our flag—stands out as the most beautiful. But it is more than just a beautiful design in cloth. It is the symbol of a people united against tyranny and oppression—united for the cause of liberty and justice.

The real meaning of Old Glory is contained in the words of Franklin K. Lane:

I swing before your eyes as a bright gleam of color, a symbol of yourself, the pictured suggestion of that big thing which makes this Nation. My stars and my stripes are your dreams and your labors. They are bright with cheer, brilliant with courage, firm with faith, because you have made them so out of your hearts.

Someone has said that today America needs more salutes to the Stars and Stripes—more demonstration of Americanism. I do not mean merely an inward emotional flutter when a parade passes or when the clear notes of our National Anthem reaches our ears. I mean that America needs a continuous consciousness of the forces of freedom which are symbolized in the Red, White and Blue.

One thing we learned during the last war was that as a people we cannot take our ancient virtues for granted. We received a rude awakening when in 1941, we discovered great numbers of our citizens were substantially unaware of world events. There followed a national speculation of what we were fighting for—and a drive for slogans and symbols to keep us alert. Today, I believe that we have a more awakened citizenry; that more people are personally and actively in-

terested in the affairs of their community, State, and Nation and our relative place in world affairs. A Republic such as ours cannot function unless each and every citizen is well informed about, and takes an active part in, the affairs of the Nation. I firmly believe that good citizenship will provide an answer to many of our problems today. Citizenship is a full-time job. A day such as Flag Day is of paramount importance in our calendar of national holidays. It is a time for reverent evaluation of our obligations as citizens in these United States.

The patriotism that is aroused in us when we witness our flag must be directed to practical living. I sometimes wonder if in teaching history, especially American history, we do not over-emphasize the flavor of the spectacular and neglect the solid foundations of hardwork and continuous sacrifice which have brought into being our great country. Love of country begins with love of the land itself. It is men and women at work; the fishing boats coming into our shores; the farmer riding his machine; the dairyman going to the farm before sunrise; the lineman mending the broken wire; the miner drilling for the blast; the engineer bringing the train in on time; the pilot in the clouds. It is the clerk in the office; the housewife doing the dishes and sending the children off to school. It is the teacher and the doctor. It is small things remembered, the little corners of the land, the houses, the people.

I include the following editorial from the *New York Times*, as quoted in *Coronet*, March 1951:

We love our country because there was a tree on a hill, and grass thereon, and a sweet valley below. It is voices that are remembered only, no longer heard. It is parents, friends, the lazy chat of street and store and office, and the ease of mind that makes life tranquil.

It is stories told. It is the Pilgrims dying in their first dreadful winter. It is the Minute Man standing his ground at Concord Bridge, and dying there. It is the wagons and the men on foot going westward. It is the settlers hacking fiercely at the primeval forest on his new, his own lands. It is Thoreau at Walden Pond, Lincoln at Cooper Union, and Lee riding home from Appomattox. It is corruption and disgrace, answered always by men who have stood up in every generation to fight for the old ideals and the old rights.

It is a great multitude of people on pilgrimage, common and ordinary people charged with the usual human failings, yet filled with such a hope as never caught the hearts of any nation on earth before. The hope of liberty. The hope of justice. The hope of a land in which a man can stand straight, without fear, without rancor.

Our flag is what we make it and keep it. It means only what we make it mean. It must be rededicated day by day. There is room under the American flag for growth and change. We stand at a time in history when the Stars and Stripes can be made to represent the peak of hope and freedom. But this will not happen automatically. We must give our flag meaning as it flies peacefully over our democratic enterprises just as it was given meaning at Yorktown and at Iwo Jima and all the battles in-between.

Each generation must be dedicated and consecrated anew to the defense of

our flag; to defend it with life itself, if need be. But, above all, we must take its symbols into our lives and make from them the hope and freedom so necessary to preserve our American way of life. If we wish our flag to be honored, we, the citizens of this country, must be worthy of honor.

May each of us dedicate ourselves to all that is ennobling and enduring in this land, to all that our flag symbolizes.

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, today is Flag Day, a day wherein we pay special honor to America through the recognition of her flag and all that it stands for. It is a day for serious reflection on the American goal at a time when this Nation faces its greatest challenge since the Civil War.

The goal of many Americans today is so distorted from what our Founding Fathers envisioned that it is almost unrecognizable. Somewhere along the line, the American goal has slipped, fallen, and come to rest on the lowly depth of concern only for one's self, with little or no regard for others.

The prevailing attitude of so many seems to be, "What can I do for me? What can I do to further my personal desires and ambitions?"

By our pursuit of personal happiness alone, we are slowly robbing this country of its freedoms.

America was built on the idea of a government for which the people themselves were responsible. It was their duty to uphold their Government, or change it, as they saw fit.

The American of the late 18th century had foremost in his mind the idea of preserving American Government and its ideals. His goal in life was to protect his newly won freedoms and to do his part to maintain these freedoms.

It was this love of this country which caused the American of the late 19th century to lay down his life for his country—that you and I might continue to enjoy the self-determination he enjoyed. At Lexington, and Concord, New Orleans, and Fort McHenry—Americans laid down their lives that the goal of Americans—freedom and self-government—might be preserved.

We seem to have a different perspective today and most of it hinges on too great a love for the almighty dollar. Twentieth century Americans are caught in a whirlwind of materialism. With more leisure time than ever before, we seek all those things that money can buy—a more expensive home, the latest fashions in clothes, a bigger car, and all the other items that modern technology can produce to make living more comfortable.

As a nation, we have become too comfortable. I hope it would not take something as drastic as another depression to bring our Nation to a reexamination of its goals. For as difficult as it was for many of us, the depression made us concentrate on the really important things in life—individual creativity, togetherness, and teamwork within the family, finding ways to use leisure time without spending a lot of money, and in an abiding faith in spiritual values.

I do not say these things to sound like a prophet of doom. Quite the contrary,

I believe all Americans have the ability to bring the American goal back into proper perspective.

To accomplish this, the most important single thing we can do is for each of us to reexamine ourselves to see clearly that which we seek in life—remembering that material possessions alone cannot bring happiness nor insure self-determination, for history teaches us that nation after nation has fallen when its people became too selfish and too greedy.

Each of us needs to live in such a way that we strengthen America. We need to redevelop pride in ourselves, pride in our work, pride in our community. We must not be afraid to speak out against lawlessness and laziness and apathy. We must be always ready to speak out for those individuals, and those actions, which strengthen America.

On this Flag Day, let us rededicate ourselves to building a strong America, with the same determination and dedication of our forefathers.

Let us keep foremost in our minds "The American's Creed," written in 1916, by William Tyler Page:

I believe in the government of the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign nation of many sovereign states; a perfect union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies.

May God give to each of us the determination to project clearly the image of right embodied in our flag, and the will to fly it high, with pride and strength as a symbol of freedom to all men everywhere.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, Flag Day, June 14, 1972, begins America's enthusiastic celebration of this Nation's birthday on July 4. America will be 196 years old this year as the citizens of this country reaffirm their commitment to support their Nation and reaffirm their faith in our democratic system of government and society.

It is time for each of us to seriously consider the efforts and devotion to duty of those who have gone before us, those who have continuously made America great and strong.

Patriotism is the key word—a word which we live by daily and which we must instill in our young people as they grow and begin to take on the responsibility of serving their country in the best manner possible, while they enjoy the fruits of a free nation which were garnered for them over these 196 years by their forefathers and mothers.

With America's birthday this year also come our free elections during which our American youths will be able to flex their new decisionmaking powers with a voice in the leadership of the country. They join with the elders in helping the country to grow and remain on an even keel by electing responsible and forceful leadership.

It is every citizen's duty to participate

in the elective process in their country which has made the free choice of government possible and it is with honor that we salute and honor America.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, Flag Day is celebrated each year on June 14 in memory of that day in 1777 when the Continental Congress of our infant Nation adopted the Stars and Stripes as the official flag of the United States. These were perilous times. The American people had declared, on July 4, 1776, that these United States of America are, and of right, ought to be free. Some very brave men had signed their names to the Declaration of Independence and as a result stood to lose their liberty, their worldly possessions and most probably their lives.

As the war for independence proceeded, there were many different flags which led the Americans in battle and it has never been documented as to just how and under what circumstances, our flag was designed and ultimately manufactured. There are many undocumented stories of how the national flag came into being. The most prominent theories of the origin of our flag are those built around Betsy Ross, John Hulbert, George Washington, Francis Hopkinson, the town of Easton, Pa., John Paul Jones, Abram Markive, and the Rhode Island colonial flags. These theories are, of course, mutually contradictory. In general, they are all romantic and quite incapable of proof in one or more vital points. It does seem strange that in all the discussion by the various committees of the Continental Congress and by the Congress itself, when it adopted the Stars and Stripes as our national emblem, that there was no reference to the designer of our flag. This may not actually be too strange because it may have been the design of many different people, too many to mention—and, I suppose, there is romance in that fact, as well.

Flag Day was first officially observed in 1877 to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the selection of the flag. The Congress requested all public buildings to fly the flag on June 14 of that year. In 1885, Bernard J. Cigrand, a school teacher from Waubesa, Wis., began a lifetime effort to establish Flag Day as a day of an annual celebration. In 1897, the Governor of New York proclaimed a flag day celebration for the first time and stated that this celebration should become an annual event but it wasn't until 1916 that President Wilson established Flag Day as an annual national celebration.

During the entire history of the United States, our flag has been a flag of a country, not the personal standard of an emperor or a king. It has stood for all Americans and stands today as the symbol of liberty and not as the sign of the power of any ruler. It is and has been a national flag, a flag of the people and a symbol of the strength of a Government of, by, and for the people. Long may it wave.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, today is Flag Day, and it brings to my mind memories of my classes reciting the Pledge of Allegiance, memories of the meetings of fraternal, civic, and veterans groups, of firehouses being dedicated with

new flags that have flown over our Capitol, and of just driving down a street and seeing our flag being lovingly displayed in front of homes. But most of all, Mr. Speaker, it brings back memories of what I saw behind the Iron Curtain where the flag flying over the homes—which it had to do if the family did not want to be persecuted—was not loved.

I have been impressed during the last year by what I consider a rebirth of patriotism in our Nation, and I hope that it will continue to spread. America has her faults, but she also has the means to correct these faults. She allows her people to disagree and try a new approach if an idea does not work out. When we look at our flag, this is what we should remember. Our flag is the symbol of our Nation—not of a particular policy, but of the country which allows many policies to be expressed and the rights of all to be protected.

So I join my colleagues here today in pledging my allegiance to my flag of the United States of America. She is the symbol of our freedom and liberty and the hope of the dignity and equality that man can achieve.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, there are many symbols which stand for the American way of life. But certainly none sums up our feelings better than the flag of the United States. It is fitting that we observe Flag Day to declare and emphasize our devotion to the flag and to the ideals which it symbolizes.

The flag means different things to every American. It is the memory of a passing parade, the start of an athletic event, a childhood pledge of allegiance, or a flag flying at half-mast in a time of national sorrow.

But to all of us it is the symbol of opportunity, freedom, brotherhood, citizenship, and love of country. It is the emblem of our dedication to the "old" values which have made our Nation strong, such values as honesty, dependability, faith, respect for law, compassion, tolerance, and nonviolence in the pursuit of one's opinion.

And at the same time, the flag and what it stands for serves as the cutting edge for fruitful change and progress.

I join President Nixon in calling on all citizens to observe Flag Day, 1972, and I personally urge each American to reflect on the American ideals for which our flag stands. Let us all pledge that the flag of our country will never be lowered in our hearts and minds.

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, today we pay homage to the American flag, our beloved Stars and Stripes first adopted as our official flag 195 years ago. It is an occasion that gives us all the opportunity to pause, take stock of ourselves as citizens, and rededicate ourselves to the ideals which Old Glory symbolizes.

Our history and our future are written on that flag. The threads of our history woven together form the fabric of our flag, and each new generation adds to it its own aspirations, struggles and victories. When we gaze at the flag we can see it with George Washington at Valley Forge and with Neil Armstrong on the moon. We can see our flag flying over

foreign battlefields, and we can see it in our own hometowns at our schools and churches. It travels anywhere, always carrying with it the glory and faith of our Nation's people.

Our flag has been with us through our hardships as well as our triumphs, leading the way, guiding us in the paths of liberty and justice that our Nation was founded on.

There is none among us who can claim a special right to that flag; there is none among us, regardless of the cause, entitled to change the meaning of that flag. It belongs to us all, equally, just as this Nation belongs to us all, equally. This is the essence of our democracy. And just as the flag has preceded us all, carrying that sacred truth, it will continue long after all of us, carrying the message of all men created equal, of the right to liberty and justice for all.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, National Flag Day is a particularly significant occasion for the city of Aurora, Ill., in the 15th Congressional District, which I have the honor of representing. The nationally recognized father of this observance is Dr. Bernard J. Cigrand who was practicing dentistry in Aurora at the time he persuaded President Woodrow Wilson in 1916 to proclaim the first official nationwide Flag Day.

Dr. Cigrand, a great patriot, first observed Flag Day himself on June 14, 1885, as a young 19-year-old schoolteacher in Wisconsin. It is said that he placed a small flag on his wooden desk and told his handful of pupils the story of the flag of the United States. He chose that particular day—June 14—because it marked the anniversary of the adoption by the Continental Congress in 1777 of the Stars and Stripes as the flag of the United States of America.

I feel it is particularly fitting that we should set aside this time in the House of Representatives to pay honor to our Nation's flag—and I am glad to have this opportunity to recall the part Dr. Cigrand played in establishing this national observance. All Americans should be constantly reminded and made more aware of the symbolism of our flag—for the power of our flag, its grandeur, and the force of its very appearance have been demonstrated repeatedly throughout our Nation's history.

The spirit of the Stars and Stripes has, in fact, lifted our hopes and improved our national fortunes so frequently that we have every reason to know the value of its great symbolic beauty. The flag—our flag—is indeed a symbol of all that we, as Americans, should admire and love in this grand country of ours.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the 56th annual observance of Flag Day. Flag Day in America is a very special occasion when every American should reflect upon his heritage.

At a time when patriotism seems dim in the hearts of some of our countrymen let us be glad that there are those of us who can still celebrate Flag Day 1972 without reservation. Rather than de-emphasizing the role of patriotism in our country, now is the time to renew it. We need a new commitment to the ideals of

patriotism; one that will lead all of us to dedicate ourselves to the unfinished task of building a better America.

It is a time to reflect upon and to learn from our history, and especially to learn anew about the many blessings that come with liberty and freedom.

American historians remind us that history is not merely a great teacher of patriotism, but the one indispensable teacher. The more we know about the struggles which sustained its people in time of trial, the deeper will be our feeling for our country.

As we look up to the flag which is unfurled daily against the background of this historic and meaningful Capitol Building let us take this opportunity to review the great American story. It is a story of wonderful men, events, and documents. It is a story of a nation whose experience testifies eloquently to the faith, dedication, and sacrifice that gave us liberty, equality, and prosperity.

If we are to attain the great goals that our forefathers set for us we must develop a deeper feeling for our country than now seems to be evident.

These difficult times demand that we call forth the very best of our talents and abilities to meet this challenge.

Indeed, we must never succumb to the complacency that this life of liberty and prosperity can occasionally breed. We must constantly strive to actively exercise our freedoms. We must constantly strive to actively exercise our freedoms. We must also maintain the necessary defenses to preserve our liberties against all threats of tyranny, either from without or within.

Mr. Speaker, on this day let us not forget those gallant Americans who are presently prisoners of war in North Vietnam. We must remember that these men are examples of the type of Americans which exemplify the traditions and principles we are called upon to celebrate today.

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, today was Flag Day and as a Member of this House I felt deeply moved by the tribute that was accorded what our esteemed colleague from Missouri, Dr. HALL, referred to as the meaningful symbol of duty, honor, country. Red Skelton noted with deep humility that the "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag" was not a tradition, but a family privilege. The galleries were packed and as I looked around I could not help but notice that many of the spectators once again unabashedly shed tears of pride in their national symbol. The gentleman from Missouri who spoke so briefly and eloquently made note of the fact that the dissenters in this Nation who scorn our flag and what it stands for have benefited the most from it. Today I received two symbolic refutations of these dissenters. One was a letter written to Life magazine by a Green Beret medic on Life's coverage of the "Winter Soldiers" fiasco paid for by pro-Vietcong actress, Jane Fonda. M. Sgt. John Dryden's letter has never been published and on this Flag Day of 1972, it is fitting that a voice from Vietnam be heard by my fellow Members of Congress. The second letter is from the survivor sister of a soldier killed in action in Viet-

nam. It was published in the Mount Prospect, Ill., Herald, and written by Miss Peggy Daley Taylor. This is the day that testimony of those who really symbolize our flag should be heard. Theirs is the true story which almost never makes the front pages. The letters follow:

VIETNAM STAND BLASTED

This is in reply to your editorial of Feb. 3 entitled "Let's Leave S.E. Asia." So now the Herald has joined the ranks of bleeding hearts for the lives lost in Viet Nam. Two years ago I sent a letter of protest to Nixon when the Viet Nam Moratorium cadre used my brother's name in their picketing of the White House. The only difference between the campus crybabies then and the bleeding heart editors today is the type of communication used.

I don't speak for the lives lost in Viet Nam. I speak for my beliefs, which first and foremost is that there is no substitute for Victory. An ideologist says we should never have gotten into the mess. As a realist, I say that as long as we are there fighting a war, what in the Hell is wrong with winning?

I believe in predetermination, that is, your birth and death are set dates which God alone enters in the Book. What a man does between those dates is for his account when his time is up. My brother thanked God that he had the courage to go to Viet Nam in the name of his country and felt the defense of the principles of freedom were worth the hardship and sacrifice. My brother died with honor and bravery in saving the lives of his buddies. No greater love has a man than to lay down his life for a friend . . . that is the credential that was his at his judgment. He did not expect to die because God was with him but he wrote that if it was God's will, he would not complain. As a realist, no one wants to die but everyone does. No one wants wars either but that's mankind's own mistake. War is dirty, ugly and rotten, but our principle of freedom and liberty is why men fight for this country.

Just recently Kissinger announced that when Nixon goes to Peking he will offer 2.5 to 7.5 billion dollars in U.S. aid to "all of Indo China," including North Viet Nam. Will the bleeding heart editors get together and explain to me why my tax dollars will be handed over to the government that provided the circumstances of my brother's death?

The communists have not changed their policy of eventual world conquest and yet Nixon wants to rebuild their "war-ravaged" country. Incidentally, what is so war-ravaged about North Viet Nam? We have been fighting in South Viet Nam. The easiest way for the United States to win the war without U.S. casualties is to remove the 7th fleet from the Formosan Strait, transport the Nationalist Chinese to Viet Nam and let them show us how to fight to win. Unfortunately, the U.S. government will do everything in its power to make sure our allies lose.

Naturally, if American goods and resources are doled out to communist countries, our standard of living will gradually decrease and it will be easier for our enemies to conquer our country. That communist goal has NEVER changed. The American people are so darn apathetic and ignorant that they are willing to lose wars, feed and clothe the enemy, rebuild the threatening armies and sit idly by while every bit of our heritage is degraded, desecrated and eventually given away.

The only difference between a realist and an ideologist is that I don't have to ask why. When the last bastion of freedom sinks like a burning ship, I'll go down with it . . . fully aware that it was the captain that lit the match.

PEGGY DALEY TAYLOR.

GENTLEMEN: I read "Confessions of 'The Winter Soldiers'" in the 9 July edition of your magazine. I read it with considerable interest. I looked for lies or for stretching of the truth. I found none.

Now—a word for the opposition.

My brothers, and they are my brothers, in the Vietnam Veterans Against the War, have engaged themselves in their public flagellation. And in so doing, have again done their bit for the war effort—this time for the other side. Their brothers—the ones who came home in boxes—will appreciate again having been gutshot—this time by the very friends they loved above all men when they died.

Just how in the hell, may I inquire, does this war get to be any different than any other war? Except that in this one you get to watch your son die with his eyes shot out on the boob tube.

In 1966, I had a working arrangement with a Viet Cong medic. On Mondays I changed the dressings that he had applied on Fridays (incidentally learning a great deal about changing dressings in the process). Since I had access, at that time, to more antibiotics than he, he got in the habit of leaving notes when he felt that our joint patient required penicillin that he did not have. He never came into the villages on Monday. I never came on Friday. Our companions were armed and might not have understood a gentlemen's agreement. I never questioned the presence of a strong, healthy patient with a gunshot wound. The Viet Cong never mortared my camp.

In 1968, I had gotten in the habit of paying courtesy calls at the dispensary of a small RF-PF outpost at about the halfway point on my semi-weekly trips between a large city in the Mekong Delta and the USAF-VNAF airbase nearby. This was a short trip by jeep on a heavily travelled highway. I had the dubious honor to be one of the first medical persons to travel the highway after the first few terrible days of the 1968 Tet offensive. When I arrived at the RF-PF outpost, it was impossible not to see my friends at the outpost—all of them. Their bodies were on one side of the highway, laid out as if for inspection, their heads on the other side. It was all militarily neat and orderly. Their wives and children, as befitting mere civilians, were not in ranks. They lay where they had been shot or bayoneted—haphazardly. Every single member of the community—to include water buffalo, pigs, and dogs.

In your article, I could not find a single instance of an atrocity that I could not, by my own observation, have sworn to. But what, may I inquire, of the equal horrors perpetrated by the erstwhile gentlemen with whom our government has had the audacity to have gone to war?

My God, a war is an abomination, created in Hell. But being ordered into one by my duly elected governmental representatives, is it too much that I ask to be allowed to win it? In the election held in 1964, the candidate that dared suggest carrying the war into inviolate territory of the nation against whom we were then waging war, was defeated by the most staggering landslide in all of our national history. My government had decided to wage in the war in the territory of our sworn allies.

I am a professional soldier. But—I am also of an age to be considered a member of the Silent Majority. I share the guilts, with my fellow citizens, of this war. Guilts, plural. (1) The guilt of ignoring the conspiracy against us until we were involved in an impossible land war in Asia. (2) The guilt of obligating other men's sons to fight (and die) in a war in which we had no interest or will to win. (3) The guilt of desiring to withdraw from a war in which some 45,000-plus of our sons and brothers have died without victory. (4) And, finally, the guilt of having to acknowledge atrocities for which we are indisputably guilty.

Every war had had its atrocities, but the victor has always had the right to rewrite history to make it appear that only the vanquished had committed such abominations.

In any war, the most successful participant is inevitably the most savage, sadistic butcher involved. But we have heretofore invariably lauded him and made him a hero.

May I submit that we are all guilty? And guilty of what? Stupidity.

I am planning to marry a very lovely lady from Latvia. Where is Latvia? It doesn't exist—any more. Since it was occupied in 1941 by troops of Communist Russia, it has not even the dignity of being a Communist satellite. It is now a very small, insignificant state of Russia proper. Latvia, as an entity, has ceased to exist. But, of course, we know that in this enlightened age such things can no longer happen. My love would like to know why no one is interested that her country was swallowed in one gulp by the most voracious appetite the world has ever known. I would like to know, too. Because that same appetite caused the disappearance of Estonia, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, East Germany, Albania, Romania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, China, Tibet, Cuba, North Korea, and North Vietnam. And sundry other countries in which no one has any particular interest. When we consider how very little we cared when their insignificant countries were swallowed up, can we really be too surprised when we too disappear?

To listen to them tell it, the members of the Vietnam Veterans Against the War would have us believe that our national policy was created solely to provide them with an arena in which to practice their own private hells.

I address these questions to only the members of the Vietnam Veterans Against the War: Who organized you, my brothers? Who is most interested in your public confessions of guilt? Who benefits most by the loss of confidence and the shared guilt created by your confessions?

Hell yes, you're guilty. So am I. So were we all. But what of the monstrous guilt directed against us?

I could be guilty of all manner of atrocities against those who could make slaves of my family (who are ignorant), my sweet love who escaped from Latvia (who detests them as I do and who is not ignorant), and anyone who would wrest from me by violence or by deception all that those who have gone before me have fought and died (and doubtless committed atrocities) to assure for me.

John Stuart Mill said, "War is an ugly thing, but not the ugliest of things. The decayed and degraded state of moral and patriotic feeling which thinks that nothing is worth fighting for is much worse. A man who has nothing for which he is willing to fight, nothing he cares about more than his own personal safety, is a miserable creature who has no chance of being free, unless made and kept so by the exertions of better men than himself."

The final tortured quote of your article was to the effect of, "I have only one thing to say to the Vietnamese people, Oh God, God I'm sorry."

To paraphrase, if I may: If we lose our struggle by default, I have only one thing to say to the American people, Oh God, God I'm sorry.

M. Sgt. JOHN DRYDEN.

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, in the days when our Nation was founded, Thomas Paine wrote:

These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of his country; but he that stands it now, deserves the love and thanks of man and woman.

Tom Paine was imminently correct in 1776 when he proclaimed these words.

But how many times since then could it have rightly been said in the United States of America that "These are the times that try men's souls."

To mind quickly come thoughts of December 7, 1941, of World War I, of other great military conflicts that we have been engaged in during the almost 200 years of American history since Paine wrote the words above. And, of course, there have been other times that have tried or tested the soul of our Nation—times of conflict, turmoil, and change—times such as these we are now experiencing.

Throughout the world the American Flag has always represented hope to all mankind, and it is a reminder of the sacrifices of brave and unselfish Americans over the years—Americans who have given their life's blood that freedom should live. No other nation since the dawn of civilization has done so much for all humanity as has the United States of America.

On this Flag Day, 1972, we Americans can and should be justly proud of our heritage and its symbol. And, as we pass through these modern "times that try men's souls," let us not forget that as a Nation and as a people we have had conflict and turmoil and suffered before, and we have survived. In fact, we have always emerged triumphant, a Nation made even stronger by the healing process.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE PHILIP J. PHILBIN

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

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply saddened today as I announce to the House the death early this morning of our former colleague and chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the Honorable Philip J. Philbin. I know that my great sorrow is fully shared by practically every Member of this body.

Mr. Speaker, very few, if any, who ever served here were more highly respected and esteemed. No one was ever more beloved than he by his own people who knew him best.

Throughout his long service here, he was never a detracting critic. He was always a constructive legislative leader.

Over the years, he was so highly respected in this House because he consistently demonstrated an extraordinary depth of legislative knowledge and perfection, truly sympathetic understanding of his colleagues' individual problems, and a unique ability to promote goodwill among differing Members for the accomplishment of national progress.

In short, he was a national legislator who conducted himself in accord with the highest traditions of diligent and dedicated public and personal service.

In the integrity of his character, his devotion to country, his deep concern for his neighbors, the strength of his friendship, the pleasantness of his personality, and the wholesomeness of his disposition, he daily reflected and practiced the richest qualities of human life.

His passing is a tremendous personal

loss to me and to all who knew him. He will forever be remembered by his own people, because of his genuine compassion, his generous help, and his wise counsel to all who were troubled.

To me, and I am sure to all of our colleagues, he will forever be remembered and remain an inspiring legend of patriotic service above and beyond the normal course of duty.

I am sure all Members will join with me in praying that the good Lord will grant eternal rest to the great soul of our departed friend and colleague and in extending deepest sympathy to his bereaved children, Ann and Bamby.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONOHUE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL).

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in mourning the loss of one of the most distinguished Members that ever served in this body and one of my dearest personal friends, Philip J. Philbin.

I have known Phil as a kind, considerate, and truly dedicated public servant. For 28 years here in this House his public career was spent in untiring efforts and immeasurable contributions to the national defense and to the men and women who served in the armed services, first as a member of the Military Affairs Committee from 1943 to 1946, and later as a ranking member of the Armed Services Committee.

He served as chairman of many subcommittees of the Armed Services Committee. As chairman of the Stockpile Subcommittee and the Subcommittee on Independent Research and Development, he contributed a tremendous amount to the future of America's armed services and to the future of our country.

Phil was an affable man, loved by Members on both sides of the aisle, and particularly by the employees. It can truly be said that he was an employees' member.

Well respected by all who served under him in the Armed Services Committee and by all who knew him in the House of Representatives, Phil was an unusual individual. Erudite, learned, talented, educated, he had a fund of knowledge on all subjects.

He could talk about the history of the nations of the world. He was a real master of the classics. An accomplished musician, he was a pianist, and, as a matter of fact, a composer of music.

As for sports, he played on that famous Harvard football team in the early 1900's, that played at Pasadena in the Rose Bowl, right after World War I. He was a great center on the national football team of Harvard. Phil could really talk sports, and probably knew more sporting individuals than any other man in America.

I have never met a more well-rounded man than Phil Philbin, truly loved by everybody.

I am honored to have served with Phil. I knew him since I came here in 1952, but long before that, he was a power in Massachusetts politics.

My wife Milly joins me in expressing to his family and all his friends our deepest sympathy.

Mr. DONOHUE. I yield to the distinguished majority leader, Mr. Boggs.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished gentleman in the well and other Members gathered here to express deep sorrow and keen regret at the passing of Phil Philbin.

I believe I knew him as well as anyone outside of the Massachusetts delegation. For many years we have adjoining offices in the Cannon Office Building, then known as the Old House Office Building. I came to know him not only as a distinguished legislator but also as a man who devoted his time and his efforts to the security of our country, as a man who was meticulous about the work of his office. I believe that no letter ever went unanswered and no request from any constituent was ignored.

I also knew him as a friend, as my friend and as a friend of all those who work here, of the people who work on the Hill. He had a kind word for all of them, and he was known to all of them.

He had a disposition and a nature which was given to establishing and maintaining friendships. He shall be missed. But he lives in the deep affection of his colleagues.

Phil Philbin's death marks the end of a distinguished career in public service, spanning more than one half century, and comes as a heavy blow to all of us who were privileged to serve with him in the House.

Phil Philbin's career in Washington began in 1921 when he served as an aide to the late Senator David I. Walsh.

In 1942, the people of Massachusetts' Third Congressional District elected him to Congress and began a truly remarkable career in public office.

It was my privilege to serve with Phil through 11 Congresses, and I have never met a more dedicated public servant.

Phil Philbin found time to become an expert in the difficult field of national security legislation. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, he earned a reputation as one who spent hours studying the variety of legislation and issues which come before that important committee. He was a leading architect of the policies which made our Nation strong and which contributed to world peace during the post war years.

These are a few of Phil Philbin's accomplishments during his long and distinguished career in Congress. He will be remembered not only for his legislative contributions but also for his manner, his disposition, and spirit with which he conducted himself.

Phil Philbin leaves more than a record of legislative accomplishments. He leaves an inspiring example of what a leader can be, and that is a valuable legacy indeed in these difficult and challenging days.

I join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in expressing my deep sense of loss at the passing of this great leader and personal friend.

Mr. DONOHUE. I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, Mr. HEBERT.

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, every member of the Armed Services Committee feels a deep, deep loss on the passing of Phil Philbin.

As the Members know, he served briefly, after the death of Mendel Rivers, as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. That fact has been overlooked by many.

Phil came to the committee when it was organized in 1947, from the old Military Affairs Committee. He and the distinguished minority whip and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Price) were the three who came from that committee.

I came from the old Naval Affairs Committee. I am the last member from that committee still serving.

Mr. Speaker, Phil Philbin sat between Mendel Rivers and myself, the ranking Member on the majority side.

I do not know of a sweeter character with whom I have ever come in contact than Phil Philbin. He was a man who loved his colleagues, loved his fellow man. He avoided controversy. Yet he was of strong will. He was dependable.

Last evening the former Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable John McCormack, called me to tell me that the end was near for Phil. Of course, there are few of us here who did not know that he was terribly ill and had been so for many months.

Mr. Speaker, Phil Philbin was a man of many talents. Very few knew that he was an expert on the opera, the arts, and he, personally, was a wonderful pianist. He could entertain for hours sitting at the piano.

Another little-known fact about Phil is that he played football with Harvard, and played in the Rose Bowl many years ago. He was a great athlete. He was a great football player at Harvard.

Mr. Speaker, as we look down the years that we served together, certainly no one was more solid and stalwart at your side when you needed him than Phil Philbin.

The last correspondence I had with him was to urge him to have his portrait painted so it could hang in the House Armed Services Committee room. It was something that was his due after serving on that committee for so many years, but the chairmanship was snatched away from him. However, as we look back on it, he could have served his full term as chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I think the best manner in which I can sum it up is to say that all in all we shall not look upon his like again because this was a man, and in any language he was a great guy.

Mr. DONOHUE. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services for his kind remarks.

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

Mr. DONOHUE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the death this morning of our former colleague, Philip J. Philbin, is a great blow to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to this body where he served so long and faithfully, and to people everywhere who value fairness and decency in public service.

For 28 years, Phil Philbin represented the people of Massachusetts' Third Congressional District in the House of Representatives. That representation was marked by constant attention to the

needs and desires of his constituents, and by conscientious concern for the National Government.

As his service continued and his seniority built up, he attained great stature in this House, and particular influence in the Armed Services Committee. But the power and influence he accrued never swayed Phil Philbin.

Many words will be used today to describe our former colleague—dedicated, talented, hard-working. He was all those things. But, most of all, I will remember Phil Philbin as a good and decent man. He brought those qualities to this body three decades ago, and he left, after 28 years, with all of them intact.

Mr. Speaker, I join all my colleagues in mourning the death of this fine man. And I extend my deepest sympathy to Mr. Philbin's family.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it came as a great shock to me to learn this morning of the passing of my very good friend and former colleague Phil Philbin.

Phil served with distinction in the House for 28 years, from 1943 to 1970. He was a member of our Committee on Armed Services and made a very real contribution to the work of our committee. Phil was a quiet and unassuming person. In some respects this characteristic was disarming, for those of us who worked with him well know that he could always present his viewpoint with emphatic clarity. His capacity for leadership was repeatedly demonstrated in the work of the subcommittees on which he served as chairman.

Phil Philbin's political philosophy was different than mine. But in matters relating to national defense he never allowed a political consideration to enter into any of his decisions. In keeping with the long established policy of our committee his approach on national security questions was always nonpartisan.

Phil Philbin will be greatly missed by all of us and particularly by those of us who were privileged to work so closely with him. I extend my very real sympathy to his family. I share their loss.

Mr. DONOHUE. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONOHUE. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. DONOHUE, for yielding to me at this time.

I am greatly saddened at the loss of a close personal friend, the Honorable Phil Philbin.

It is always a great loss to the country when we see the passing of a major leader of our country. I say this because Phil Philbin was a leader, and a great American.

Mr. Speaker, what I remember best about Phil Philbin was his compassion for his fellow man, his kindness, his decency, and the fact that he never lowered his principles.

He was a cultured gentleman, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HEBERT). He was an authority on the arts.

I never met a man more cultured than Phil Philbin.

He always had great humor and great understanding. Some people might not realize his great love for his forebears, but it was borne out during the time of the Irish troubles. When some of those who were sympathizing with the problems of Ireland were raising money in the United States, Phil Philbin was a courier carrying that money over to Ireland, through the British lines, at the jeopardy of his own life.

Mr. Speaker, that was the type of man Phil Philbin was, a man ready to lay down his life for his fellow man.

Another thing that impresses me today is that his passing occurs on June 14, Flag Day, the flag that he loved so much, the flag that he defended all through his entire lifetime by a dedication and devotion to public service that is almost unequalled in the history of this great Nation.

This man's whole lifetime was a monument to class, good manners, and charm, the likes of which we will probably never see again.

In surroundings not exactly conducive to strong and lasting friendships, I will always treasure the memory of his friendship. Over the years he was a source of strength and wisdom to the entire Massachusetts delegation and it can honestly be said of him as of so few others than anyone who ever truly knew him was truly better off for having known him.

Mrs. Burke joins me in extending our sympathy and prayers to his daughter, to his grandchildren and to the other members of his family.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I join in this collective expression of grief over the passing of our beloved former colleague, Philip J. Philbin.

I know how deeply that grief bears upon the gentleman now in the well because no two men in or outside of the Congress were as friendly or as devoted to each other as the distinguished gentleman in the well Mr. DONOHUE and Phil Philbin.

Serving in the Congress for nearly three decades, from 1942 to 1970, Phil earned the respect and friendship of virtually everyone he encountered here in Washington.

Quite honestly, Mr. Speaker, he was one of the finest men that many of us have ever known. Either privately or publicly, I have never heard Phil Philbin utter an unkind word about anyone at any time.

Every member of the Massachusetts delegation, and in fact every Member of the House itself who knew Mr. Philbin, can testify personally to Phil's magnificent character.

He always found time to counsel a troubled colleague, to offer a few words of advice to a fledgling Member who was still bewildered by the legislative process and to extend a helping hand to anyone who needed it.

A quiet man—even a self-effacing man who never sought headlines—yet, he was

a diligent and painstaking worker here in the Congress, known among his colleagues on the Committee on Armed Services for his keen mind and mastery of committee work.

A ranking member of that committee, in fact, its chairman for a few days just before he left the Congress, Phil played a major role in assuring this country's military preparedness and its defense. And, equally significantly, he always tried to strike a fair and evenhanded balance between the demands of the military and the demands of its critics.

Phil's work, in an indirect way, helped lead to many of America's diplomatic triumphs over the past decade—the SALT talks, the European detente and the new exchange of views with mainland China and Russia.

Phil's service to his constituents in Massachusetts' Third Congressional District—the men and women who elected him to 14 successive terms in the House—had been truly remarkable.

No letter ever went unanswered. No plea for help was ever ignored. No constituent seeking advice was ever turned away. It is no exaggeration, Mr. Speaker, to say that Phil ran a model congressional office.

His death deeply saddens me as it saddens all of the Members of the House who knew him.

Few of us will ever match his achievements in representing a congressional district, fewer still his achievements as a man.

Mr. Speaker, I extend to his family my deepest sympathy in this hour of sorrow.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRAY).

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, Phil Philbin was one of the finest gentlemen I have ever known.

I served on the Armed Services Committee with him for more than 19 years and I have been a member of several subcommittees of which he was chairman.

Phil Philbin was a hard and conscientious worker. He was a brilliant and kindly man. He was a great American—a man of great courage and those attributes are sorely needed in our country today.

We will all miss Phil Philbin—he was a great American, a great citizen and a great patriot.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DRINAN).

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I express the profound sorrow of every Member of this House and every resident of my congressional district at the death this morning at 3:25 a.m. for former Congressman Philip J. Philbin.

The towns of Clinton and Bolton where he has resided ever since his birth on May 29, 1898, the people of Massachusetts and the countless friends of Philip Philbin in the Congress and across the Nation will mourn the passing of this devoted public servant.

Seldom in the annals of Massachusetts politics or in the history of the Congress of the United States has a person labored so long, selflessly and diligently on behalf of the people as did Congressman Philip Philbin.

After graduating from Harvard College and Columbia Law School and working for a number of years for Senator David I. Walsh of Massachusetts, Philip J. Philbin came to the Congress in 1942. From that year until the end of 1970 he served his constituents every day, on every weekend and during every recess of the Congress. He was truly a representative of the people. No problem was too complex or too simple to merit the full consideration of the Congressman and of his staff.

The stories of the devotion and dedication of Congressman Philbin are legion and legendary. In an era when more and more American citizens were allegedly being alienated from politicians the esteem, reverence and affection which the constituents of Congressman Philbin and the people of Massachusetts had for this devoted public servant was enormous and profound.

I and the countless admirers and friends of the late Congressman Philbin send to his two daughters and to all of the members of his family our profound compassion upon their great loss. His passing is a loss to the people of the congressional district which he served for almost three decades with unparalleled devotion. His passing leaves me and all of us with the prayerful hope that we may strive to emulate his devotion to his constituents, to the Congress of the United States, and to the Nation.

Mr. DONOHUE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIRNIE).

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, join in this tribute, in a very real, personal sense. Having had the privilege of serving with Congressman Philbin on the Armed Services Committee for over a decade, I glimpsed at firsthand those qualities which have been so generously noted here in the remarks that have been delivered. He was certainly a gentleman, and he brought to his work all of those qualities of consideration and fairness which gained for him admiration and respect. It is true that he watched with a kindly eye over those who were working with him and for him in the affairs of this House. He tried to keep always in mind the objective for which they were working and make it possible for a constructive result to be achieved.

We will do well to remember these qualities, for it is too easy to become careless, particularly in the field of public science and politics, of the feelings of others and the elements of fairness in the desire to press a point or perhaps to advance personal career. But when a man walks among us, as did Mr. Philbin, with this consideration and with this understanding, his example should remain an inspiration to all of us.

I can imagine no finer tribute than to be remembered by my colleagues with the affection and respect that is so manifest here today. We express our gratitude that there walked among us a man of his stature who was able to do so much for his State and his country, and to leave such wonderful memories.

Mr. DONOHUE. I thank the gentleman very much.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank the gentleman for taking the time on the House floor today so we can join in expressing our profound regret and our deepest and saddest feeling at hearing the news that Mr. Philbin has passed on.

It seems to me that everyone of us serving or attempting to serve in the capacity of a Representative has his own evaluation of himself and of his colleagues in this chore of attempting to represent a constituency. Every one of us is concentrated single mindedly to the job of discharging this serious obligation. So, therefore, it is a rare man who also takes the time to worry with the problems of some other Member's constituency.

Some 10 years ago I found myself a freshman Member of this House. Mr. Philbin was one of the ranking members of the Armed Services Committee. I had a crisis confronting me involving the Armed Services Committee, inasmuch as I had the great privilege of representing a very historic area in the national defense picture. It was Mr. Philip Philbin who proved to me forever and a day that he had this tremendous capacity for being not only a single constituency representative but also, indeed, a national one in discharging this other very little appreciated function of serving other interests in other parts and sections of the country.

I think this is just one reflection of Phil Philbin's great attributes which my colleagues who have preceded me have so eloquently brought out. I know that I sincerely join all the Members who have spoken thus far and who have invoked Phil's memories from certain perspectives.

I wish at this time to render a sincere tribute to this great American for the service that he rendered not only his constituency in Massachusetts but to each and every one of us and each and every one of our constituencies in this country during the time that he served so well, honorably, and efficiently as a Member of this House.

I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. DONOHUE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FLYNT).

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from Massachusetts in expressing my sorrow upon learning of the death of our former beloved colleague and good friend, the Honorable Philip J. Philbin of the State of Massachusetts. I associate myself with the expressions of tribute and eulogy which have earlier been made.

He was possessed of a warmth of spirit and a gentleness of heart and mind which was equaled by few and excelled by none. I consider it a pleasure and a high privilege to have been included among Phil Philbin's circle of friends.

Phil Philbin was an able and outstanding Representative. He was a dedicated and highly motivated public servant. Those of us who were privileged to know him and to serve with him are grateful for that opportunity. We miss

his service here. We will miss his presence among us on this earth.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Flynt and our children join me in extending our condolences and heartfelt sympathy to the family of the late Congressman Philbin.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONOHUE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mrs. Hicks).

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it was not my privilege to have served with Congressman Philip Joseph Philbin during his long tenure of office which extended from January 3, 1943, to January 3, 1971, but my father, Judge Day always referred to him as a great giant of a man—one of God's noblemen.

The Members of Congress knew Congressman Philbin as a man of intellect, learning and impeccable integrity—a statesman unswerving in his adherence to the Constitution. The dean of the Massachusetts delegation, Congressman DONOHUE knew "Phil" Philbin as a close lifelong friend.

I regret his passing this morning, but what day could be more fitting and appropriate for this great patriot than Flag Day, June 14.

Yes, the Nation has lost a distinguished son and America has lost a great and good man.

I join with my colleagues in expressing to the family of Congressman Philbin my sorrow in their great loss.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts yielding to me at this time.

I join with the gentleman from Massachusetts and with all our other colleagues in paying tribute to our dear and departed friend, Phil Philbin, a warm and wonderful man.

Phil was indeed a big man. He was big in stature and tremendous in heart and tremendously big in his generous way of giving his time for others. Phil had his favorite seat here on the floor at the center aisle and we could not pass that seat without having Phil cheer us up and help start our day. If a Member was looking a little worried, Phil would say to me as I knew he did to others, "What is troubling you, pal? You look a little troubled today." And if one shared one's problem with him, if Phil could, he would do something about it.

He was a big man in this Congress. He was a big man in this country. His contributions will long be noted by those of us who worked with him and by those of us who had the opportunity to see what he contributed to this country. It is my hope that we will long remember his contributions and the good that Phil Philbin did will not, as the poets say, be interred with his bones, but rather that we will deeply appreciate the good and build upon it, those of us who follow in

his footsteps and carry on here in the Congress.

Phil had a tremendous dignity about him which I think we could all emulate, he carried the position as a Member of Congress with such dignity and with such composure that it reflected nothing but credit on this great body.

I join with the distinguished Members of the Massachusetts delegation and others here in extending my sincere and deepest sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. DONOHUE. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

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

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

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, Phil Philbin had many, many great attributes. If I were to think of one today in particular, I would single out compassion. Phil Philbin was a man of great compassion—great compassion for his fellow colleagues and all the people of this great country.

I have the great privilege of working in the suite Mr. Philbin occupied in the Rayburn Building. After his retirement from Congress, many people from far and wide would still come to that office. In chatting with them, I found they always had many kind words for Phil Philbin.

As many speakers preceding me have said today, Phil Philbin made many great contributions to this country and to our defense. We are a better nation, because he served in this great body.

I join all of my colleagues in extending deepest sympathy to the members of his family and in thanking them for allowing Phil Philbin to come our way.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from Massachusetts and the rest of the House in mourning the death of our former colleague, Phil Philbin.

Phil devoted his life to public service, and his dedication to the public interest as he saw it was unquestioned. He worked hard and long for his constituents, and he was one of the first who saw the need for affirmative action to reverse the economic downturn that has affected our State.

All of us who served with him enjoyed his fellowship. No Member of the House was more deservedly popular with his colleagues. His personal warmth, his genuine concern for others, and his unflinching willingness to be helpful to his co-workers were hallmarks of his service here.

I send my sincere condolences to his relatives and the many many friends he made in a long and full life of service to his country.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I want to be recorded among those who pay tribute today to the memory of the late Philip Joseph Philbin. We wrought well as a Member of the Congress and it was an honor and privilege to serve with him. I always found him ready, willing, and able to be of service to the Committee on Appropriations in matters dealing with the

security and strength of the United States.

Others have spoken at great length. I wanted to add my own words to those which have been trusted in the memory of this distinguished American.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I am very much distressed to hear the sad news about the death of our former colleague, Phil Philbin.

We became friends shortly after I came to Congress and I was always impressed with his sincerity and his friendliness. I shall always remember the many occasions when I had the opportunity to sit with him and discuss a wide range of subjects in which we had mutual interests. I learned very early in my acquaintance with him that he was a dedicated American and devoted to the service of his country and his constituents. His labors in the interest of good government never ceased and when he departed from Congress, he left a record which is difficult to match.

Above all, Phil was a gentleman in every sense of the word. I never heard any criticism of his character or his loyalty as a friend and I, as one, will always cherish the fact that I was privileged to serve with him in the House of Representatives.

I extend to his family my deepest sympathy.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, our former colleague, Phil Philbin, was a grand fellow with a big heart. When I first came to Washington, he was particularly kind to me, and was helpful in trying to make me feel more welcome and at home with my colleagues in the House. He had no reason to be so warm-hearted, since I had never met nor known him before, but it was just typical of Phil Philbin to be so thoughtful and cooperative to a newcomer needing the help that he so kindly offered and so adequately supplied.

It was a great and interesting diversion to discuss Ivy League football with Phil. He was an outstanding football player at Harvard back in the 1920's and he would light up immediately when we talked about Harvard's current football fortunes. There were very few home games that he missed.

Phil was most charitable to his colleagues with his time, wisdom, and advice, and I shall keep fond memories in my mind about a grand fellow. We shall miss him.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, in 1943 our beloved former colleague, Philip Joseph Philbin, began a distinguished career of public service in the U.S. House of Representatives which lasted 28 years. It was my good fortune to be closely associated with Phil during the last 10 years of his service in Congress, especially in connection with our mutual service on the House Armed Services Committee.

Here was a man, Mr. Speaker, who was tall in stature, gentle in heart, and brilliant in mind. He served his country well in time of war and peace with endless devotion and dedication. Those of us who knew him and admired him can say with all sincerity that our lives were enriched, because of our association with him and that all citizens of this country

benefited, because of his service in the U.S. Congress.

It is certainly anything but a pleasant task for me to say "farewell" to my friend and colleague who was a "man among men" and a "leader among men" and a "leader among leaders."

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the Members of the Massachusetts delegation and others, and join them in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of our late and beloved colleague, Philip Joseph Philbin, of Massachusetts.

Certainly I was shocked and saddened to learn of the untimely passing of this wonderful friend, Phil Philbin. During my years of service in the Congress I have never known a more genial and warm colleague—Phil Philbin loved life and loved people.

In addition, he was an outstanding legislator and served with dedication and distinction in the House for 28 years from his beloved State of Massachusetts. He was a member of the Armed Services Committee and was dedicated to the defense and security of our great Nation.

He served his district, State, and Nation ably and well—we shall miss him.

I want to take this means of extending to members of the Philbin family this expression of my deepest and most sincere sympathy in their loss and bereavement. Mrs. Evins joins me in these sentiments.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the late Congressman Philbin was one of the real leaders, one of the real gentlemen of this House. He was an untiring supporter of every good measure that passed this House and a pillar of opposition to the bad measures which we defeated. It was a genuine pleasure to know him as a friend, and my deepest sympathy goes out to his beloved family who survive him.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened by the death this morning of my good friend, the Honorable Philip J. Philbin, of Massachusetts.

Phil, as he was known and admired by all of us, was one of the most constant Members of the House of Representatives and for that reason, and because we normally sat across the aisle from each other, we exchanged greetings and visited almost every day.

Phil was a good legislator. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, he stood always for legislation he believed to be in behalf of the security of the United States. But above all, he was a gentleman at all times.

With so many others, I have missed the presence of our friend on the House floor.

Mrs. Gross joins me in expressing sorrow that Phil has departed this life.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am truly saddened at the news that my close friend of many years, our distinguished former colleague from Massachusetts, the Honorable Philip Philbin, is dead. He came to Congress very soon after I did and we served in the early days of our congressional careers on the House Military Affairs Committee and then on the House Committee on Armed Services.

The warm friendship which we formed then has strengthened through the years and I know Phil Philbin as a man of great ability, a man of complete dedication to his State and Nation, and a man of courage who did not hesitate to express his convictions and to vote his feelings. There are not many who have served here who have been more genuinely respected than he. The lives of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle were enriched by our association with him and the Congress was a better place because Phil Philbin served here. He was a truly outstanding American. My earnest sympathies are extended to the members of his family.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I join the members of the Massachusetts delegation, and especially my colleague, Congressman HAROLD DONOHUE, in paying tribute to the Honorable Philip Joseph Philbin, a great American and a distinguished Member of this Congress.

I vividly recall when I came to Congress 8 years ago as a freshman, one of the first men I met on the floor of the House was Phil Philbin. He was a kind, gentle, and compassionate man who did not hesitate to give me a friendly hand and good sound advice.

When Congressman Philbin retired at the conclusion of the 91st Congress, he had served with great ability and genuine dedication for 28 years his constituents in the Third District of Massachusetts as well as all of the citizens in our Nation.

Phil Philbin was a patriotic American and a warm human being. He was a staunch believer in individual freedom and human dignity. He loved his country and contributed immeasurably to its continued strength and security.

His death has saddened all those who were privileged to know him. He will be missed by the people of Massachusetts, by those of us in Congress, and by his many friends. Mrs. Annunzio joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to the Massachusetts delegation and to the Philbin family on their great loss.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the news of the death early this morning of our former colleague, the Honorable Philip J. Philbin of Massachusetts, came as a great shock to me.

In my first term in Congress, the 79th, it was my good fortune to serve on the Military Affairs Committee with Phil. In those days we formed a close friendship. He was then in the second term of his 14 terms as a Member of Congress. Through the years, until he left the House, we worked together on committee assignments on the Armed Services Committee.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, Mr. Philbin's first concern was for the welfare of the serviceman. He dedicated himself to bettering the conditions under which the serviceman worked and lived. Better housing, better pay, better retirement benefits for the man in service were always uppermost in Phil's thinking and most of his efforts were directed to doing something about those things.

As a lawyer he was interested in and devoted much time to the matter of military justice. Much of the improvements

in this field can be traced to the efforts of Phil Philbin.

I join my colleagues here this afternoon in paying tribute to one of the finest men it was ever my privilege to know.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks concerning the life, character, and service of our departed former colleague, Phil Philbin.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O'NEILL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Government Procurement of the Select Committee on Small Business may sit during general debate today.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, did the gentleman consult with the minority on this?

Mr. HUNGATE. The chairman asked me to make this request. I assume he did. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BROYHILL) on the minority on that committee, has been sitting there this morning.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

FLAG DAY, JUNE 14

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, as the people of our great country prepare for the June 14 observance of Flag Day, it is appropriate we reflect on the full meaning of this solemn day.

It was none other than the great John Adams, who, on the evening of July 3, 1776, said of America's Independence Day:

This great anniversary festival ought to be commemorated as the day of deliverance, by solemn acts of devotion to God Almighty. It ought to be solemnized with pomp and parade, with shows, games, sports.

The same could well be said, at least in part, of Flag Day. Our flag is an inspiring symbol of the freedoms won through struggle and hardship by our forefathers, maintained through nearly two centuries by brave men and women who placed their lives, fortunes, and honor between America and our enemies, and who continue to do so today when our Nation is under attack from within and without.

The stars and bars which fly from flagstaves across the world serve as a daily reminder that America remains the world's best hope for peace through inspiration and example. This can continue to be true as long as we determine to remain strong in the face of adversity, and as long as we maintain the traditions which always have been associated with our flag.

Our flag flies proudly from the top of our Capitol, dipping only in mourning for the lives lost of those who have stood the supreme test of dedication to the American ideal. It flies from ships at sea, embassies in foreign lands, even in the lands of those who would see us lose our freedom. It flies from remote stations across the globe manned by dedicated men and women who have left the comforts of home to man the bastions of liberty.

Our flag should be honored by all Americans. Differences among our people should not result in stain upon our flag. It is not necessary that we stand in complete accord to respect this great Nation and its hopes for the future of mankind. It is still our flag and our country and while we work for goals which we seek as individuals for our country, our flag should and must be held in the highest esteem. The flag does not represent a government. It does not represent an administration. It does not represent a policy. It represents an ideal and even those who disagree with the means of achieving our goals have no reason to defile the ideal.

Thus it is, as we approach Flag Day, that we should take stock of that which is given particular recognition on that day—the flag of the United States of America—and all that it stands for in the dangerous world in which we live.

It stands for freedom and hope, opportunity, and security.

For us, and for all mankind.

THE ATTACK ON THE HONORABLE PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

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

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my outrage at the conduct of the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) during his special order on this floor yesterday. To launch a specious attack on a colleague in his absence is an act of cowardice that I condemn. Yet the gentleman from New York is not a coward, so I can only assume it was an act of poor judgment on his part. The obvious distortion of Mr. McCloskey's remarks is so incredible that no reasonable person could ever draw the inference suggested by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McCloskey's outstanding record of patriotism and service to his country, in war and peace, speaks for itself, and I think it is above challenge in this body.

The demagoguery participated in here yesterday by Messrs. KEMP, PUCINSKI, KING, CRANE, YOUNG of Florida, GUBSER, TERRY, HUNT, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, and Mr. SCHMITZ was unfair and I believe a discredit to the House. For 10 Members to gang up and attack another

Member in his absence is unworthy of the tradition of this great body. I commend Mr. SEIBERLING for his courage in defending the gentleman from California.

THE REAL ISSUE CONCURRING MR. McCLOSKEY

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

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the attention of the House to the actual remarks and the real issue made here yesterday and that is that this House and the wives of the POW's/MIA's and the American people deserve an explanation of the statement made by Mr. McCloskey that "and if I had 700 cities I would want to save, I would put one prisoner in each city. Again I—I think the North Vietnamese may very well do that."

It was not a personal attack. It was a request for retraction and/or explanation. The gentleman from Michigan is out of order.

When this statement first came to my attention last Thursday after watching Mrs. HANSEN on the "Today Show." I talked to Congressman McCloskey here in the House Chambers. He would not retract his statement at that time. I was astounded. Later that night I talked to Mrs. HANSEN personally and she asked me to seek some public explanation or retraction. Monday, upon my return to Washington, I called his office and was told that he was out but that my call would be returned. Tuesday, still not having had my call returned, I had a member of my staff hand carry a copy of my remarks to his office so that he and his staff would know before I spoke what I was going to say. I might add here that this goes far beyond any act of mere congressional courtesy. We were told that he would be out of town for a week. I felt this could not wait in view of the fact of the distress that this was causing among many people deeply concerned about the POW/MIA question. It should also be pointed out that I inserted the entire transcript of the interview that he had on the "Today Show" with NBC's Frank McGee so that there would be no problem about quotations out of context.

In conclusion I want to mention that the gentleman from Michigan failed to state whether he agrees or disagrees with the gentleman from California's statement.

Mr. Speaker, the National League of Families and the American people are awaiting an explanation.

COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA USE OF STATEMENTS MADE BY LEADERS IN CONGRESS AND IN GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in view of his comments, it is interesting that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) failed to notify me in advance

that he intended to mention my name in his 1-minute speech this morning.

Mr. Speaker, my participation in that special order discussed propaganda material published by the Communists, and examples of how they were using deeds and words of Members of Congress and other members of our Government as a part of their propaganda effort.

Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand several copies of those propaganda releases which I received during the last 2 weeks. If anyone desires to read them I have indexed them and indicate on the cover what the page and subject related to.

If anyone has any doubt in his mind that the Communists in fact do use the words and deeds of some of our leaders in Government, this material should answer that question and I make these reports available for all to see.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEMP. Like you I would be interested in finding out, when the book written by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) is released today, how many people he contacted or notified to the effect that he was writing about them in his book?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. It would be interesting to know.

AMENDMENTS TO BE OFFERED BY REPRESENTATIVE DENNIS TO THE HEW APPROPRIATION BILL

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

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, I expect to offer the following amendments to the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation bill tomorrow.

I propose to offer an amendment to bring about a reduction of \$20 million in salaries and expenses for the Occupational Health and Safety Administration. This will leave the figure more than \$13 million over the comparable figure for fiscal year 1972 and should serve as a message that the amendment of that act in favor of small business is a pressing necessity.

Mr. Speaker, the other amendment will be a reduction in impact aid in the program of school assistance in federally affected areas, a \$29,525,000 reduction which would bring this item down to the fiscal year 1972 appropriation level.

As the committee report says, "reform of the impacted area aid program is badly needed." However, since the legislative committee never produces the reform, I feel that we should proceed by a modest reduction in the appropriation.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the Record the text of my amendments.

The amendments referred to follow:

1. Amendment offered by Mr. DENNIS of Indiana: Page 6, line 25, strike out "\$69,207,000" and substitute therefor "\$49,207,000."

2. Amendment by Mr. DENNIS of Indiana: Page 19, line 18, Strike out "\$641,405,000" and substitute therefor "\$611,880,000."

Page 19, line 18: Strike out "\$615,495,000" and substitute therefor "\$592,580,000."

Page 19, line 22: Strike out "\$25,910,000" and substitute therefor "\$19,300,000."

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

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 13034) to authorize appropriations to carry out the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968 and the Standard Reference Data Act, and to amend the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), to make improvements in fiscal and administrative practices for more effective conduct of certain functions of the National Bureau of Standards, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, strike out all after line 2 down to and including "years" in line 5 and insert, "That there is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Commerce not to exceed \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 1973, not to exceed \$9,000,000 for fiscal year 1974, and not to exceed \$10,500,000 for fiscal year 1975."

Page 2, line 1, strike out all after "2." down to and including "years" in line 3 and insert "There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Commerce not to exceed \$3,000,000 for fiscal year 1973, not to exceed \$4,500,000 for fiscal year 1974, and not to exceed \$5,500,000 for fiscal year 1975."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O'NEILL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman if he has conferred with the minority with reference to this request?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield; yes, indeed. I conferred with the distinguished minority leader, and he informed me yesterday afternoon that he had no objection.

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. FLOOD. 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. 15417) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 3 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHAEL) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

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

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

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 368, nays 0, not voting 64, as follows:

[Roll No. 201]

YEAS—368

Abbutt	Colimer	Gubser
Abourezk	Conable	Gude
Adams	Conover	Haley
Alexander	Conte	Hall
Anderson, Calif.	Conyers	Hamilton
Anderson, Ill.	Corman	Hammer
Anderson, Tenn.	Cotter	schmidt
Andrews, Ala.	Coughlin	Hanley
Andrews, N. Dak.	Crane	Hanna
Annunzio	Curlin	Hansen, Idaho
Archer	Daniel, Va.	Hansen, Wash.
Arends	Daniels, N.J.	Harrington
Ashbrook	Danielson	Harsha
Ashley	Davis, Ga.	Harvey
Aspin	Davis, S.C.	Hastings
Aspinall	Davis, Wis.	Hathaway
Badillo	de la Garza	Hays
Baker	Delaney	Hechler, W. Va.
Baring	Dellenback	Heinz
Begich	Dellums	Helstoski
Belcher	Denholm	Henderson
Bennett	Dennis	Hicks, Mass.
Bergland	Dent	Hicks, Wash.
Betts	Derwinski	Hillis
Bevill	Devine	Hogan
Blester	Dickinson	Holifield
Blackburn	Donohue	Horton
Blatnik	Dorn	Howard
Boggs	Dow	Hull
Boland	Downing	Hungate
Bolling	Drinan	Hunt
Bow	Dulski	Hutchinson
Brasco	Duncan	Ichord
Bray	du Pont	Jacobs
Brinkley	Edwards, Ala.	Jarman
Brooks	Edwards, Calif.	Johnson, Calif.
Brotzman	Eilberg	Johnson, Pa.
Brown, Mich.	Erlenborn	Jonas
Brown, Ohio	Esch	Jones, Ala.
Broyhill, N.C.	Evans, Colo.	Jones, Tenn.
Broyhill, Va.	Fascell	Kastenmeier
Buchanan	Findley	Kazen
Burke, Fla.	Fisher	Keating
Burke, Mass.	Flood	Kee
Burleson, Tex.	Flynt	Keith
Burlison, Mo.	Ford	Kemp
Burton	William D.	King
Byrne, Pa.	Forsythe	Kluczynski
Byrnes, Wis.	Fountain	Koch
Byron	Fraser	Kuykendall
Caffery	Frelinghuysen	Kyl
Camp	Frenzel	Landgrebe
Carlson	Frey	Landrum
Carney	Fulton	Latta
Carter	Fuqua	Leggett
Casey, Tex.	Galifianakis	Lennon
Cederberg	Garmatz	Lent
Celler	Gaydos	Link
Chamberlain	Gettys	Lloyd
Chappell	Gialmo	Long, Md.
Clancy	Gibbons	Lujan
Clausen,	Goldwater	McClure
Don H.	Gonzalez	McCollister
Clawson, Del.	Goodling	McCormack
Clay	Grasso	McCulloch
Cleveland	Gray	McDade
Collier	Green, Oreg.	McFall
Collins, Ill.	Green, Pa.	McKay
Collins, Tex.	Griffin	McKevitt
	Griffiths	McKinney
	Gross	Macdonald,
	Grover	Mass.

Madden	Price, Ill.	Steele
Mahon	Price, Tex.	Steiger, Ariz.
Mallory	Pucinski	Stephens
Mann	Purcell	Stokes
Martin	Quillen	Stubblefield
Mathias, Calif.	Rallsback	Stuckey
Mathis, Ga.	Randall	Sullivan
Matsunaga	Rarick	Symington
Mayne	Reid	Taylor
Mazzoli	Reuss	Teague, Calif.
Meeds	Rhodes	Teague, Tex.
Melcher	Riegle	Terry
Metcalfe	Roberts	Thompson, Ga.
Michel	Robinson, Va.	Thomson, Wis.
Mikva	Robinson, N.Y.	Thone
Miller, Ohio	Rodino	Tierman
Mills, Ark.	Roe	Udall
Mills, Md.	Rogers	Ullman
Minish	Roncallo	Van Deerlin
Mink	Rooney, Pa.	Vander Jagt
Minshall	Rosenthal	Vanik
Mitchell	Roush	Veysey
Mizell	Rousselot	Vigorito
Mollohan	Roy	Waggonner
Montgomery	Roybal	Waldie
Moorhead	Runnels	Wampler
Morgan	Ruppe	Ware
Mosher	Ruth	Whalen
Moss	Ryan	Whalley
Murphy, Ill.	St Germain	White
Murphy, N.Y.	Satterfield	Whitehurst
Myers	Saylor	Whitten
Natcher	Scherle	Widnall
Nedzi	Schmitz	Wiggins
Nelsen	Schneebeli	Williams
Nichols	Schwengel	Wilson, Bob
Nix	Scott	Wilson,
O'Byrne	Sebelius	Charles H.
O'Hara	Seiberling	Winn
O'Konski	Shipley	Wolf
O'Neill	Shoup	Wyatt
Passman	Shriver	Wyder
Patman	Sikes	Wylie
Patten	Sisk	Wyman
Pelly	Skubitz	Yates
Pepper	Slack	Yatron
Pettis	Smith, Iowa	Young, Fla.
Peyser	Smith, N.Y.	Young, Tex.
Pickle	Snyder	Zablocki
Pike	Spence	Zion
Pirnie	Staggers	Zwach
Poage	Stanton,	
Poff	James V.	
Powell	Steed	
Preyer, N.C.		

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—64

Abernethy	Evins, Tenn.	Mailliard
Abzug	Fish	Miller, Calif.
Addabbo	Flowers	Monagan
Barrett	Foley	Perkins
Bell	Ford, Gerald R.	Podell
Biaggi	Gallagher	Pryor, Ark.
Bingham	Hagan	Rangel
Blanton	Halpern	Rees
Brademas	Hawkins	Rooney, N.Y.
Broomfield	Hébert	Rostenkowski
Cabell	Heckler, Mass.	Sandman
Carey, N.Y.	Hosmer	Sarbanes
Chisholm	Jones, N.C.	Scheuer
Clark	Karth	Smith, Calif.
Culver	Kyros	Springer
Diggs	Long, La.	Stanton,
Dingell	McClary	J. William
Dowdy	McCloskey	Steiger, Wis.
Dwyer	McDonald,	Stratton
Eckhardt	Mich.	Talcott
Edmondson	McEwen	Thompson, N.J.
Eshleman	McMillan	Wright

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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. 15417, with Mr. HOLIFIELD in the Chair.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentle-

man from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD).

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

Now, as has become commonplace, we are bringing you a Department of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill that is not only—and I want you to hear this. We better have a little better order, Mr. Chairman. I want them to hear it. This bill is not only over the current year level, but it also exceeds the budget. Now hold your hats—it exceeds the budget by \$912 million—exclamation mark.

This is the biggest Labor-HEW appropriation bill ever, totaling over \$28 billion—not millions but \$28 billion.

In addition, trust funds and the permanent appropriations available to the departments and agencies that are covered in the bill total over \$68 million, or a grand total of \$96½ billion—considerably more than the 1973 budget for the Department of Defense.

Did you ever think you would live that long?

This still does not tell the whole story because we did not act on the budget requests—and I want you to hear this—we did not act on the budget requests totaling \$5 billion because the appropriations were not authorized. So you see what is coming. I am sure we will appropriate that amount or pretty close to it before the end of this session of the Congress, and that will be in addition to the amounts in this bill.

The unauthorized requests are on page 5 of the report. As you will see, the large ones are higher education, almost \$1½ billion, OEO items totaling about \$2.2 billion, and social and rehabilitation services—largely the vocational rehabilitation program—\$929 million.

On pages 4 and 5 of the report we set forth approximately \$17.1 billion of the total appropriations of \$28.2 billion which is carried in the bill that are—and I hate this word—"uncontrollable" through the appropriation process under existing legislation. The large items included in this group are grants to States for public assistance, payments to the social security and railroad retirement trust funds, unemployment compensation for ex-Federal employees and ex-servicemen, advances to the extended unemployment compensation account, Federal workmen's compensation benefits, and special benefits for disabled coal miners.

The Department of Labor accounts for slightly over \$3 billion of the total carried in the bill. The committee made several small reductions from the Department's requests totaling about \$4,113,000,000. The larger of these reductions were \$1,250,000 in departmental management and \$1,200,000 in the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Now, do not worry about that. This still leaves an increase of \$3,899,000 for the departmental management compared with 1972, and an increase of \$7,484,000 over 1972 for the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

You will notice that the summary tables show that the total in the bill for

the Department of Labor is \$674,000,000 less than the appropriation for 1972.

Do not worry about that, for three reasons. I will tell you what they are:

First, the manpower training services are under 1972 by \$146,745,000. This is because the 1973 budget for summer job programs for youth was based on continuing the program at approximately the 1972 level that was provided for at the time the budget was prepared. Since the budget was prepared a supplemental appropriation for \$156,550,000 has been enacted in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act. The action of the committee in including only the amount of the budget request is with the expectation of a supplemental appropriation reasonably early in the next session of Congress when economic conditions and other factors affecting need can be more accurately determined.

The second big reduction is for advances to the extended unemployment compensation account. The bill includes \$120 million which is the amount of the request, but \$480 million below the amount appropriated for 1972. This reduction is due to the expiration of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1971, and estimated improvements in the unemployment situation.

The third large decrease is for benefits for unemployed ex-Federal employees and ex-servicemen. The bill includes \$475 million which is the amount requested, but \$381,600,000 below the appropriation for 1972. The committee certainly hopes that the request represents an accurate prediction of the needs, but I think the other subcommittee members agree with me in thinking that the 1973 estimate is based on very optimistic assumptions with regard to unemployment rates during the next fiscal year.

All right. Here is what most of you have been listening for. By far the largest increase over the current fiscal year appropriation for the Department of Labor is for emergency employment assistance. We get a great deal of mail on this and telephone calls when we go home. This is the relatively new program to get public service jobs for the unemployed in State and local government programs and services, but paid with Federal funds. The appropriation for 1972 was an even billion dollars and the bill for 1973 includes \$1,250,000,000 which is the amount of the request. This will not do a great deal more than annualize the 1972 program. It is estimated that 146,000 of these jobs will be filled at the end of this fiscal year, and that the 1973 appropriation will provide 154,700 man-years of employment next fiscal year.

Now, everybody wants to hear this. Every man, woman and child in the country is affected by this next one. Everybody. Of course, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is where the big—and that is capital BIG—increases over the budget occur. Why? Because Flood wanted it. No. We can't kid the troops. Remember that wonderful show "Damn Yankees" and that great number "What Lola Wants, Lola Gets?" This is what the people want. That is why it is in there. Members know that. The big increase then, over the budget, occurs here.

Before I discuss what makes up this increase I might mention that we have a handy reference to the items that have created the most interest in this part of the budget, starting about the middle of page 3 of the report and running through most of page 4. This gives, in capsule form, the answers to a lot of questions that we have been and will be getting.

With regard to the increase in the HEW budget, the committee has added—hold your seats—\$915,836,000. When we hear tomorrow, when amendments are being offered to this bill, about this penny-pinching, miserly Committee on Appropriations who could not care less about education, children, anything, put that in your pipes and smoke it. That is \$915,836,000 over the budget.

In my opinion neither the administration nor the Congress was particularly surprised; not when they saw what the increases were composed of.

Every year for the last few years the budget has greatly reduced grants for construction and Congress has consistently increased the budget. A big part of the increase over the budget, in the bill we are now considering, is in this area.

The budget had zero for construction grants for hospitals and public health centers, long-term care facilities, and modernization of such facilities—the old Hill-Burton program. The committee has put \$112,200,000 in the bill for such grants, the same amount as was appropriated for 1972.

Under the health manpower program the budget included zero for construction of health professions facilities and zero for construction of nursing facilities. The committee put \$100 million and \$20 million, respectively, in the bill, which again is the same amount as was appropriated for 1972.

For construction of community mental health centers the budget included zero. We put \$20 million in the bill, an increase of \$5 million over the appropriation for 1972.

For construction of library facilities the budget included zero. We put \$9,500,000 in the bill, the same amount as was appropriated for 1972.

The committee increases for these construction grant items, where the budget included zero, total an increase of \$261.7 million.

This bill covers literally hundreds of separately identifiable programs, so rather than try to deal with every item I will just hit the remaining high points.

Now listen to this. The Secretary of HEW, and a great Secretary, launched a drive, to combat what? To combat alcoholism. That was early this year. A statement which he made particularly attracted our attention, and I will quote it. I am quoting Secretary Richardson:

Alcohol is the most abused drug in the United States.

I will repeat that:

Alcohol is the most abused drug in the United States.

How do you like that? That should shiver your timbers.

The trouble is that the budget does not reflect any real strengthening of this program despite all the talk. The only

apparent increase of any consequence is represented by a transfer of activities that have been financed by OEO. That is not a real increase, but just a change in financing arrangements.

After hearing a considerable amount of testimony by both government and non-government witnesses and studying a considerable volume of material on the subject, we have come to a conclusion that I do not think any knowledgeable and objective person could argue with, that a very considerable increase is necessary if we really want to effectively combat this problem. In total the subcommittee has added \$59 million to the budget for a total funding program of \$156.5 million. The details concerning this start near the bottom of page 12 and run to about the middle of page 14 of the report.

For the research institutes and divisions of the National Institutes of Health the committee is recommending a total increase of \$142,785,000. Sixty million dollars of this increase is for the National Cancer Institute. When the President signed the new cancer legislation he also sent to Congress a supplemental appropriation request for \$100 million and stated that he would ask later for whatever additional funds can be effectively used. We heard a considerable amount of testimony from nongovernmental witnesses who offered convincing testimony that much more than the amount in the budget could be effectively used in fiscal year 1973.

Furthermore, in answer to a question by Mr. SHRIVER of the committee, Dr. Baker, who was the then Director of the Institute, said this, and I quote:

Yes; this extra \$100 million can be spent effectively in fiscal year 1973. Innumerable opportunities for productive expanded cancer research and development efforts have been pointed out quite recently through the 41 planning sessions held with 250 outstanding cancer scientists in connection with the development of the national cancer plan. Quite recently Congress has passed another supplemental appropriation for \$40 million, most of which will be spent after the end of this fiscal year. In addition to that the subcommittee is recommending \$60 million over the budget for 1973.

Now, I tell you what happened. After the President made that speech in which he said he was going to ask for \$100 million for cancer—next morning knocking on my door were the heart and lung people who said, "What about us?" \$100 million for cancer. Five times as many people died from heart and lung disease as died from cancer. What about heart and lung?

You cannot blame them.

However, the bill now pending before us includes an additional \$44,720,000 over the budget for the National Heart and Lung Institute. So they are not being brushed off. This will bring the total for that Institute to \$300 million. The President has indicated his strong belief that we should launch a drive in this field similar to the one in cancer. Legislation has just been reported out of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to implement such a program legislatively. We are simply recognizing the need appropriationwise and have put in an

increase for 1973 of roughly the same percentage for heart as for cancer—about 30 percent.

The remainder of the increase in the Institutes totals \$38,065,000, primarily for the purpose of restoring to the 1972 level all competing research grant programs, fellowships, and training programs where they were cut below that level in the 1973 budget.

For the health manpower program, in addition to the increase of \$120 million for construction which I have already mentioned, we have increases recommended in the bill which total another \$85 million. There are about 40 activities involved in the health manpower program, and I will not attempt to go through them all. There is a narrative explanation of the committee's action on this item beginning near the bottom of page 40 and running through page 43; and a detailed table on page 44. I would just make this overall comment that the budget cut out construction grant funds, completely, and held the other activities at pretty close to the 1972 level at a time when everybody, including the average man on the street, knows that we desperately need to increase our health manpower.

Now, for school assistance to the federally impacted areas, oh, dear, dear, dear, what a can of worms that is.

The budget, flying right in your face—and they know that this is a sacred cow up here—the budget recommended a reduction in the main part of this program, operation and maintenance under Public Law 874, of \$200,495,000 below the amount that would be required to furnish the same percentage of entitlements in 1973 as is being provided in 1972. That is what they did. Just think of it. The budget also proposed language which was obviously legislation. If the committee had adopted such language it would have been stricken from the bill on a point of order.

The committee was not favorably impressed with the budget proposal on either substantive or technical grounds, and is recommending a continuation of the program at the 1972 level. This is 73 percent of entitlement for B children, 90 percent of entitlement for A children in schools with less than 25 percent of total enrollment in this category, and 100 percent of entitlement of A children in those schools where 25 percent or more of the enrollment is in this category. This change from the budget requires an increase of \$200,495,000.

The committee also recommends \$25,910,000 for assistance for school construction under Public Law 815, an increase of \$10 million over the budget. The bill also contains what amounts to a limitation which permits the use of these funds for construction of schools operated by local authorities for children who live on Federal property. This will provide for some special needs in connection with facilities on military installations and for Indian children.

The bill includes \$143,609,000 for education for the handicapped, which is an increase of \$12,500,000 over the request. The budget had increases in other activities carried on under this appropriation,

but provided no increase for State grants which is a very basic part of the program. With the cost of doing business going up every year this really amounted to a small cutback. The \$12,500,000 increase is for these grants, which will bring the amount for that purpose to \$50 million.

For vocational education the committee is recommending an increase of \$50 million over the budget for the basic State grants. Again the budget recommends exactly the same amount for 1973 as is available for 1972—\$376,682,000. The committee thought an increase to \$426,682,000 is very reasonable for this program.

I have already mentioned the increase of \$9.5 million for construction funds for the public library services and construction program. In addition to restoring the \$9,500,000 for construction, the committee is recommending restoration of the cut for services. The 1972 appropriation for this purpose is \$49,209,000. The budget estimate was for \$32,730,000. The committee is recommending \$50 million, which restores the proposed cut of \$16,479,000 plus \$791,000 which will help in meeting increased costs.

There are other pluses and minuses in the bill, but they are relatively quite small. Also, I have not spent much time on some of the large items in the bill, like the \$13 billion-plus for grants to States for public assistance, and the fact that we will probably have to have a supplemental appropriation before the end of the fiscal year 1973. I could agonize and wring my hands over that for half an hour, but, the way things are run around here, the time for serious talk on that is when the legislative bills are before us.

I hope you will agree with my thinking that neither the administration nor the Congress could possibly be surprised at the increases we have made even though they do total to a rather startling figure of almost a billion dollars. I think they are all well justified, but on the other hand I think the committee has gone as far as is reasonable. We all know that there never will be enough money to take care of all the needs of all of the programs funded by this appropriation bill. I think we have come about as close as is possible to striking that much referred to "happy medium."

I should not close my remarks without mentioning—and I want you to hear this—I cannot close my remarks without mentioning this. Our committee report contains some "additional views". I do not recommend reading them, but in case anybody does not have anything better to do and does read them, I feel obligated to point out to you that they contain—and this does not surprise me and should not surprise you because we have been through this before—they contain some absolutely shocking factual errors.

This is another one of those package deals dreamed up by that group of faceless wonders who used to meet in the Congressional Hotel before they closed that. Now I do not know where they meet. I was told it is some motel, but I do not know—or care, for that matter.

I do not know where they got these figures. I do not know if they purposely

misstated what the committee did, if it was ignorance, or lack of interest. And, specifically, the table which appears on page 59 of the report indicates that the committee is recommending an appropriation of \$200,495,000 for impacted area aid under Public Law 874 for fiscal year 1973. Now, that is absolutely wrong. The committee recommends an appropriation of \$615,495,000 for Public Law 74, over three times as much as stated in these "additional views." How do you like that? What is the explanation for such a misstatement of fact? It is up to you. You pay your money and take your choice.

The table on page 59 also states—and these are people who have been at this business a long time and are supposed to know what is going on—that the committee recommends \$26,770,000 for the Library Services and Construction Act. That is not so. That is absolutely incorrect. We are recommending \$59,500,000. Why would they do that?

Mr. Chairman, several other tables are incorporated in the additional views. They may also contain errors. We have not bothered to check them, so we do not know how many mistakes there may be in them. I suggest that you use them with great caution.

I trust you will not pay much attention to the minority views—I am sure most of the 10 Members who signed them did not.

This is a good bill, Mr. Chairman, and deserves the support of all Members.

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

Mr. FLOOD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida. First, I hasten to add that there is the man in this Congress who is already the fond parent of much important health legislation, and who, I am sure, will be the prime mover of much more in the future, the gentleman from Florida, to whom I have just now yielded.

Mr. ROGERS. I am very grateful to the gentleman. May I say that I would certainly take my hat off to the gentleman in the health field. I would stand and applaud and congratulate his leadership, that of the gentleman from Illinois, and each member of your subcommittee for assuming the initiative in the health field as you have done in this bill. I think it is magnificent.

Mr. FLOOD. I could not have said that better myself, and that is praise from Caesar.

Mr. ROGERS. May I ask the gentleman just one question?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. This is on—and I have talked to the gentleman about it and I think I understand the position of the committee—the disability program.

Mr. FLOOD. Yes, we did talk about that.

Mr. ROGERS. That does have authorization. I understand it is administered in the vocational rehabilitation program.

Mr. FLOOD. Yes, and about 87 percent of the overall appropriation item of which it is a part is not yet authorized. The particular part to which you refer is, as we both know.

Mr. ROGERS. So my only request of the gentleman and to his committee

would be that if the Senate does put in some funds where there is the authorization now existing for the development disability program, would the gentleman consider that in a conference and see if something could be worked out?

Mr. FLOOD. My friend from Florida knows the position of our committee on this program. We are very much in favor of it, we always have been, and we always will be. If the other body in its tremendous command of wisdom sees fit, we will look at it with a sympathetic eye.

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman is most kind. Again I wish to congratulate the gentleman and his committee for the great work he has performed. The whole Nation is grateful to him.

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

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. In the field of health manpower and the cancer program our committee did extensive work, and I want to compliment the gentleman on the attention that has been given by his committee to that cause, because we believe it is a worthy and deserving one. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the truly bipartisan spirit with which the House Appropriations Committee worked out the appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for fiscal 1973.

I am particularly interested in cancer. If the present incidence of cancer were to continue, some 52 million Americans who are alive today will contract this disease. Translated into very simple terms, this means that in the next 10 years alone 3½ million Americans will die from this vicious disease.

In his 1971 state of the Union message President Nixon said:

Cancer has become one of mankind's deadliest and most elusive enemies. The conquest of cancer is one of the most important efforts of our time.

Backing up his call, the President requested an additional \$100 million for the National Cancer Institute even before the passage in 1971 of the historic National Cancer Act. To indicate the strong bipartisan degree of cooperation between the executive and legislative branches, I can do no better than to quote these words from the report which accompanies the bill before us:

The Congress joined with the President last year in this total commitment to conquer cancer by promptly approving the additional funds requested for cancer research. Very recently the Congress approved an additional \$40 million for cancer research which brought the 1972 appropriation to over \$378 million. The Committee shares the President's view that to eliminate cancer this country must be prepared to provide the resources for a sustained battle over a considerable period of time, and the Committee feels that the country is willing to pay the price. There can be no doubt that the cost of defeating cancer will be great but the expenditure is necessary if we are ever to see the day when Americans no longer live in fear of this dread disease.

For fiscal 1973 the President requests an increase of approximately \$53 million over the amount appropriated for cancer research in fiscal 1972. However,

during its months of hearings and deliberations the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor-HEW heard testimony from many eminent cancer specialists and from the Director of the National Cancer Institute himself, indicating that a modest increase in funds would be needed to carry out the goals envisaged when the Congress overwhelmingly passed the National Cancer Act of 1971. It has, therefore, added \$60 million to the appropriations for the National Cancer Institute. While this falls appreciably short of the authorization for the Institute which our Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment included for the second year of the legislation, it is a commendable step forward and I support it wholeheartedly.

Mr. Chairman, in 14 years of service in this body I have never witnessed more effective coordination between the executive and the legislative branches and between both of our political parties in the hammering out of the difficult and complex cancer legislation of 1971. There were some rough moments and some difficult adjustments to be made with the other body, but it is my belief, and I think it is the belief of every member of the Interstate Commerce Committee, Republican or Democrat, that in that legislation we charted a course leading to the eventual conquest of mankind's oldest scourge.

I, therefore, commend the entire membership of the House Appropriations Committee for reporting out a bill which seeks to implement our goals through the provision of adequate funding in the coming year.

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

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ROY. I want also to congratulate the gentleman on this fine bill and the amount of money appropriated for the Federal health program. I think we have seen over a period of time a critical underfunding of health programs, and I think the steps taken by your committee are definitely an improvement. I expect to see a great deal of improvement come from this proper funding. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, physicians know that chronic diseases seldom are cured suddenly and dramatically. Instead, careful treatment can bring slow but steady improvement until one day when the patient is in pronounced good health.

Perhaps it can be said that most Federal health programs are chronically underfunded. Sudden and dramatic improvement in that condition is greatly desired, but that is not the way things happen. Instead, slow but steady progress can be made year by year through the appropriations process. Today I am happy to observe that that kind of steady improvement is being made, thanks in large measure to the sound treatment prescribed by the Appropriations Subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The health budget presented to the Congress today is indeed much improved over that submitted by the administration early this year. The changes made by the committee, amounting to in-

creases of \$347,785,000 for all programs of the National Institutes of Health and \$263,636,000 for the Health Services and Mental Health Administration, have practically given new life to some programs—notably construction—and have significantly strengthened many others.

I thank the members of the committee for their fine work—for their wise treatment of the patient, if you will. And I look forward to the time, not too far off, when all the Nation's health programs will themselves be in good health.

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

Mr. FLOOD. Now I feel better. Of course I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad that I can make the gentleman feel better.

Mr. FLOOD. You do. I would be disappointed if the gentleman from Iowa did not have some comment or question.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman, did the committee increase impacted school aid by \$29.5 million?

Mr. FLOOD. The budget proposed a reduction below the 1972 appropriation for Public Law 874, and we put that back. We also added funds for construction of school facilities under Public Law 815.

Mr. GROSS. Then it has been increased in this bill over last year?

Mr. FLOOD. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. By about \$30 million?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. And over the budget by \$210 million?

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct. But the gentleman understands that we put it back where it was last year, because the powers that be downtown have a different concept of how this will be administered, as you know. We are using the same formula for the aid as we did before, exactly the same formula.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure the gentleman would recommend that the Members read the hearings, would he not?

Mr. FLOOD. Oh, by all means, yes.

Mr. GROSS. At page 302 of the hearings I find you in agreement with the witness who appeared on the impacted school aid program that the program needed reform.

Mr. FLOOD. It is like any kind of reform. We must keep the patient alive while we perform the operation. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I am not at all sure about that. I am of the opinion that a little euthanasia might be helpful in this case.

Mr. FLOOD. For the first time in a hundred years the gentleman and I disagree. This is the war between the States.

Mr. GROSS. That is the record.

Mr. FLOOD. It is.

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the health expenditures included in the fiscal year 1973 House appropriations bill now before us. I believe that the House committee is to be highly commended for the measures it has taken to alleviate the health needs of this Nation. We are all aware that problems in the costs and de-

livery of health services have reached crisis proportions in the United States. Unfortunately the President and the administration chose to ignore them. The funds requested for research, for health manpower, and for mental health constituted only an insufficient percentage of the total authorizations for these various programs.

The House Appropriations Committee has increased the President's budget by \$611 million. This was necessary to insure progress toward the goal of adequate professional health care for all Americans. The bill contains an increase of \$205 million for health manpower. This is a first step toward meeting the health manpower shortages which I have heard documented before the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of which I am a member. The bill also includes an increase of \$142.8 million above the President's budget for the research institutes of NIH. This amount includes funds to increase significantly the campaign to develop a cure for cancer and to increase research activities regarding heart disease. In addition to these increases, the NIH funds restore the project grants and training levels of other institutes to the fiscal year 1972 level. I commend the Appropriations Committee and the Subcommittee on Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare for its foresight in guaranteeing that the research efforts of NIH will not be cut back.

I must also take this opportunity, however, to state that the administration has shown unparalleled shortsightedness in its proposed budget. To ignore the research needs of the aging, to ignore critical needs such as research on the sudden infant death syndrome and on the development of new technology related to human fertility is to turn one's back on the vital concerns of women and children and the elderly. I cannot understand such an approach to the budget of this Nation. Health care cannot improve without concurrent medical research to improve it. Nor do I believe the American people will allow such flagrant neglect of governmental responsibility for their continuing health problems and critical needs. Therefore, I congratulate Mr. MAHON and Mr. FLOOD on their efforts to see that this Nation's health care continues to improve and to provide our people with the services and research necessary to this goal.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, today we see the culmination of some laborious work that has extended over a period from February 5 to May 9, during which the members of our subcommittee listened day in and day out to a host and array of witnesses in support of this monumental appropriation bill. We took more than 7,200 pages of testimony during that time.

I would like to pay special tribute to the other members of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr.

NATCHER), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH), and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULL)—who will most unfortunately after this session of Congress be leaving us of his own choice—and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASEY) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PATEN) on the Democratic side, and also to the great help and assistance of my colleagues on our side, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE), and our newly acquired member, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. ROBINSON), who has so quickly acclimated himself to our committee. I want to express my thanks or appreciation to all the members for their diligence and attentiveness to our hearings over such a prolonged period of time.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has pointed out, the bill we present this afternoon is some \$912 million over the budget and \$768 million over last year's level of spending for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare.

And, of course, this does not take into account the nearly \$5 billion in budget requests which were not considered, because they lacked authorization.

I must say that I have mixed emotions about bringing this bill to you this afternoon in this form. As one who has tried to be a consistent advocate of Federal fiscal responsibility over the years, my support for the increases we have provided in this legislation is not given lightly or without serious consideration.

But here we are almost a billion dollars over the budget, and the bill has not even been over to that most generous other body yet. I cannot help but wonder what in the world we are going to be faced with in conference, and how much over the budget we will have to be asking you to approve in the conference report.

And, I think we had better keep in mind what kind of budget it is that we are adding to—it is not a small one, unless you consider \$27.3 billion small.

Oh, sure, there were some cuts in it, but much of the money from the cuts was reallocated by the administration to other programs, both old and new, that they considered of higher priority—especially in the health and education areas.

While the budget proposed cuts in impact aid and construction grants, for instance, it proposed increases in narcotic addiction programs, family planning services, in the programs of the National Institutes of Health, especially cancer and heart and lung, in education for the handicapped, and in the education renewal programs.

So, it is an expansive budget in the area of what we might call controllable human resource programs—"controllable" as contrasted with the uncontrollable welfare funds, and "human" resource contrasted with "physical" resource programs such as the brick-and-mortar construction grants.

Basically, what we have done is approve these budget increases, restore the reductions considered of lower priority by the administration, and added sub-

stantial health and education increases of our own.

Frankly, some of the money your committee added was not, because we are sold on the value of the program, but rather because we knew that if we did not increase it prudently in committee, it would be increased irresponsibly here on the floor. Perhaps I should speak for myself and use "I" instead of "we" when I point to impacted area aid as an example.

I have stood here in the Chamber time and time again urging my colleagues to revise this whole fouled-up, inequitable program we call impact aid, but year after year we just keep funding it and adding more to it. Why? It is a program not related to economic need, not related to educational need, and some of the funds—in large amounts—go to the wealthiest school districts in the United States. It is not funded on merit; it is funded because everybody gets a little piece of the action—everybody gets part of the pie. This is a real "Uncle Sugar" program in the classical pork-barrel tradition. No strings, just count the eligible kids and write the check, and then look around for ways to broaden the eligibility requirements.

Oh, there is a need here—a different need—and, I believe, a Federal responsibility. But that has gotten lost in the scramble for Federal funds.

The health facility construction grant money is a little bit different picture. The whole argument here has been over the type of construction assistance which should be offered, and not whether assistance should or should not be given.

I think that some grant assistance is going to be necessary well into the foreseeable future for those health institutions that do not have the structure or generate the resources for repayment of guaranteed or subsidized Federal loans. There are other institutions that can and should use the loan programs, but one problem has been that the interest subsidy and guaranteed loan programs have been very slow in getting off the ground.

I believe that situation may be changed in the future, though, and then the question will be whether Congress is going to provide free grant money to everyone, or will ask those institutions that are capable of repayment to assume a greater part of the health facilities construction burden.

Today, the loan guarantee program for hospital construction is a reality. As of the middle of May, requests for 59 loan guarantees totalling more than \$192 million had been received, and awards to 19 of these applicants—with a loan value of over \$55 million were made. This is the way for the Government to balance its fiscal needs with those of our recipient institutes for facilities.

With respect to the other construction items, the Federal Government has supported the construction of 385 community mental health centers with every expectation that we would reach the point where we could get out of the construction business, with all of our emphasis placed on operations; that is, staffing grants. In fact, in fiscal year 1971, Congress did not appropriate any money for construction, and we thought

we had reached agreement that the construction target had been achieved.

In the case of construction for the health professions, the President's budget was based on the concept that vastly enlarged general Federal assistance to medical schools and other schools of the health professions would make it easier for these schools to use their own resources to finance construction. It has been quite clear for several years that we would never be able to fully finance the cost of health professions construction by relying on direct Federal appropriations. Thus, the administration advocates that the Federal Government provide its assistance primarily in the form of student aid and general support and that the private sector—assisted indirectly by these forms of Federal aid—assume major responsibility for financing construction. Frankly, the \$120 million in this bill will not do very much by way of solving the immediate backlog of individual construction projects and has the potential for doing serious harm in that it will encourage these schools to expect future Federal aid and thus defer actions which they might otherwise take to obtain private sector financing.

So, your committee has added more than \$300 million above the budget for education programs and more than \$600 million over the budget for health programs. And, again, we have the recurring massive increases in what we erroneously call the "uncontrollables"—the welfare items, grants to States for public assistance will be funded at nearly \$1.2 billion above the 1972 level, for a total of \$13.4 billion.

And, this estimate was based on data from last November, so we know we are going to have to have a supplemental later on.

Even with what we have added to this bill—which, incidentally, is the largest of any Federal agency, including Defense—we know that some are saying "It isn't enough, it doesn't meet the need." I would say to those folks that they had better do some basic reassessing, not only of national needs, but also of national resources.

The hard truth is that we can never appropriate enough dollars to meet all the needs of this country, and it would be completely wrong to even consider adopting that as an objective. There just are not enough Federal dollars to do that, unless we are willing to accept far heavier Federal taxes, or go to a deficit spending program that would make our current \$26 billion deficit look like pocket change.

It boils down, then, to a matter of judgment—judgment as to which needs are of the highest priority, which needs are the greatest, and the appropriations process is designed to allow Congress and the administration to exercise this judgment.

Your committee has tried to uphold its part of this process. You have assigned us to review the priorities recommended by the Executive in the budget proposal, to hear the Government and outside witnesses, and to recommend some priorities of our own.

We have done this now, to the best of our judgment and ability, and it is up to

you to accept or reject our proposals. Look at our report. Here is where we believe we can do the most good for the most people with the money we have to spend.

Turn to page 3 and look at the highlights of the report—the items of special interest.

Your committee provided an increase of \$7 million over the budget for psychiatric residency training. We have added \$59 million for alcoholism programs. We included \$20 million for construction of community mental health centers and an additional \$30 million for staffing of the centers. We are recommending doubling the budget for the mental health of children programs and have restored grant funds for hospital construction.

We have added \$2.5 million over the budget for the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act. We are recommending a \$50 million increase for the National Cancer Institute and nearly \$45 million more for the National Heart and Lung Institute. We approved all the requested budget increases for the other NIH Institutes and added some \$38 million on top of that.

We are recommending \$205 million above the budget for health manpower programs, including school construction grants.

Your committee is also recommending an increase of more than \$210 million over the budget for impacted area aid. We have increased education for the handicapped by \$12.5 million and vocational education by \$50 million. We have added nearly \$60 million above the budget for public libraries and nearly \$4 million for bilingual education.

We are recommending \$100 million for nutrition programs for the elderly, the full amount of the budget request for this new program.

And, besides that, we have language in the report providing specific direction in such programs as venereal disease research and control, tuberculosis prevention and eradication, sickle-cell anemia, blood bank inspection, psoriasis, genetics research, sudden infant death syndrome, research on aging, cataract and retinal disease research.

I would like to turn now to a discussion of specific items in the bill, starting with title I, the Department of Labor.

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The bill includes \$37,704,000 from general funds or \$200,000 less than the request but an increase of \$852,000 above 1972. The bill also provides for \$26,989,000 to be used from the unemployment trust funds, this \$1,142,000 increase above 1972 is the same as the budget request. Another \$26,602,000 was requested under authority of the Economic Opportunity Act but that act expired June 30, 1971, so action on that request has been referred until authorization has been extended.

The \$200,000 reduction compensates for an oversight in the budget. This sum represents a transfer of \$200,000 for funding of surplus property activities from this appropriation to HEW.

The appropriation provides for main-

taining activities at the program level of 1972 or slightly reduced. The only program increase is \$730,000 and 33 positions to provide staff support for the Unemployment Insurance Service to implement the provisions of Public Law 91-373, Employment Security Amendments of 1970.

MANPOWER TRAINING SERVICES

The committee agrees with the budget request of \$758,544,000 which is a reduction of \$146,745,000 from 1972. Again the committee has deferred action on funds budgeted under the expired authority of the Economic Opportunity Act, which includes \$875,862,000.

The large decrease results from a \$156,500,000 reduction for the "In-school work support" program which is primarily the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer jobs program. An additional \$56,900,000 request fell under the authority of the expired Economic Opportunity Act and was not considered. Also, the committee expects a supplemental appropriation request in the next session of Congress when the need can be more accurately determined.

The funds are expected to provide for the completion of development of 50 statewide Job Bank systems by the end of this fiscal year, and the development of a national Job Bank linking the state wide systems in 1973.

Emphasis will also be placed in providing jobs for Indians in Montana through cooperation with the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture.

EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE

The bill includes the budget request for this item of \$1,250 million, an increase of \$250 million above 1972.

This appropriation will finance 92,000 new entrants in public service jobs, in addition to the 146,000 participating in the program at the end of fiscal year 1972. The 1973 funds will fund approximately 154,700 man-years of employment, 58,100 more than in 1972.

The Federal cost per man-year averages about \$7,600.

FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS AND ALLOWANCES

This is an uncontrollable appropriation under existing law, for which the committee provided the budget request of \$475 million, \$381.6 million below the 1972 level. As the report points out, it appears that the estimate for 1973 is based on very optimistic assumptions with regard to unemployment rates during next fiscal year.

ADVANCES TO THE EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACCOUNT

The bill contains \$120 million, the amount of the request and \$480 million below last year's funding level.

The reduction in this appropriation, the funds of which are used to meet the Federal Government's fiscal responsibility in connection with the extended unemployment benefits provided by the Employment Security Amendments of 1970, Public Law 91-373 and the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1971, Public Law 92-224, is due to the expiration of Public Law 92-224

and the estimated improvement in the unemployment situation.

FEDERAL GRANTS TO STATES FOR EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

This item is at \$66.7 million, the amount of the request.

This is a new appropriation which will provide the funds needed for employment services not covered under the Employment Security Amendments of 1970, Public Law 91-373. These services include those such as youth entering the labor market for the first time; former Federal employees covered only by Federal unemployment insurance, and agricultural workers.

LIMITATION ON GRANTS TO STATES FOR UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

The bill authorizes the use of \$820,300,000 from the Unemployment Insurance Trust Fund. The decrease of \$11,700,000 from 1972 reflects the balancing of several increases and decreases.

The largest decrease results from the change in law described in connection with Federal Grants to States for Employment Services which relieves this appropriation of \$66,700,000 of expenses. Other decreases include \$20,000,000 due to an estimated reduction in unemployment compensation workload and \$25,500,000 resulting from increased productivity from automatic data processing equipment.

Mandatory increases for such things as salary increase, rent increases and increased penalty mail costs total over \$70 million; program increases total approximately \$30 million. The largest program increase is \$18 million to carry out the President's Executive order which requires those having contracts of \$10,000 or more with the Federal Government to list all job openings with local employment offices, to help secure employment for veterans. An increase of \$6,448,000 is to speed up the handling of unemployment insurance program appeals.

LABOR MANAGEMENT SERVICES ADMINISTRATION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Adjusted for transfers and a reserve for savings of \$1,149,000 in 1972, the bill actually reflects an increase of \$4,205,000 above 1972 on a comparable basis.

Near mandatory costs such as salary increases and penalty mail cost account for \$1,734,000 of the increase. Most of the remaining \$1,675,000 is for compliance activities under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act.

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The amount provided in the bill, \$48,889,000, is \$832,000 below the budget request and \$36,269,000 below 1972. The decrease is accounted for by the transfer of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to a separate appropriation.

On a comparable basis, this bill is \$2,754,000 above the amount available in 1972.

This is all for near mandatory items such as increases in penalty mail costs, increased pay costs, and so forth.

Since a recent law postponed the time that the Department would assume re-

sponsibilities to administer the compensation benefits provided to miners under title IV, part C of the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, the committee expects to receive a supplemental request in the near future.

The committee is also emphasizing that the \$27,280,000 budgeted for "Improving and protecting wages" is not to be diverted from its essential purpose, the enforcement of the minimum wage and overtime requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Primary and strong emphasis should be placed on investigation of possible violators and all reasonable complaints should be followed up.

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION FEDERAL WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BENEFITS

The bill supports the budget request which is \$30,008,000 below the 1972 budget. However, due to an increase in anticipated reimbursements from Federal agencies, there will actually be \$201,100,000 available in 1973, an increase of \$13,957,000 above the total estimated to be obligated in 1972.

Included in the bill is \$7,457,000 for disability compensation, \$2,500,000 for increased medical costs, and \$4 million for death benefits.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The \$69,207,000 included in the bill is \$33,323,000 above the comparable appropriation for 1972 which fell under the heading "Salaries and Expenses, Employment Standards Administration."

The appropriation provides for carrying out and enforcing the provisions of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970. The act extends Federal protection to nearly 60 million workers in more than 4 million places of employment.

Currently, I should point out that the Labor Department now has 498 "Field Compliance Personnel" in OSHA and of that No. 389 are classified as "inspectors." With the money that we have in this bill, it is my understanding that the Department is planning to add 150 additional inspectors, and I am not altogether sure how many additional people will actually be involved as so-called Field Compliance Personnel, but it will be a considerable number, for overall, funds in this bill were predicated on a justification of 1,133 employees for the fiscal year 1973 as compared with 983 for fiscal year 1972. However, there are a host of unfilled slots as of the last time I checked.

On page 10 of our report we make mention that our "committee has received many complaints of overly zealous enforcement officers and other complaints of great difficulty in getting assistance from the Department in interpretation of the standards and regulations in order to determine whether or not a particular work place is in compliance or what would be required to get it in compliance." I am going to be placing in the RECORD at a later point copies of several communications I have received from good constituents back home representing small business, medium-sized business and industry and a very large corporation. All of these communi-

cations set forth very succinctly just what problems they have encountered in complying with the law.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The \$1,200,000 below the budget request included in the bill is \$7,484,000 above the 1972 appropriation.

\$3,650,000 of the increase is for revision of the Consumer Price Index. This brings the total 1973 cost of this project to \$9,760,000. Note that the total cost of this project is now estimated to be \$35 million instead of the original estimate of \$11 million.

The remaining increase, \$3,674,000, is spread across nine activities.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The \$24,156,000 included in the bill is \$1,250,000 below the budget request. The bill also includes authority to transfer \$797,000 from the Unemployment Trust Fund.

The amount appropriated will provide for all near-mandatory costs such as salary increases and still provide \$2,002,000 for program increases.

SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM

The committee appropriated \$100,000 to be used for labor attache conferences. The committee did not believe that other activities warranted funding.

Under title II of this bill, we have appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Your committee has tried to fund every worthwhile project here, while keeping the overall budget picture in perspective.

Beginning with the Health Services and Mental Health Administration appropriation, the bill includes \$743,823,000, for Mental Health, an increase of \$130 million above the request and \$130,810,000 above the amount appropriated for 1972.

MENTAL HEALTH

For mental health research your committee provided \$148,533,000, \$3 million over the budget and \$8.9 million over the fiscal year 1972 level.

The budget requested an increase of \$4 million for grants. This would go for expanded efforts in drug abuse, child mental health, alcoholism, minority mental health problems, and crime and delinquency. Hospital improvement grants would remain funded at the 1972 level of \$6.9 million.

The committee agreed to the 1973 request for an additional \$4 million for grants, and added another \$3 million for research in alcoholism. The budget recommended a \$500,000 increase here for alcoholism research over 1972—\$8,043,000 for fiscal 1973 as against \$7,543,000 in 1972. The subcommittee's action would provide \$11,043,000 for 1973.

Manpower development training grants and fellowships would receive \$127,971,000, some \$15 million over the budget and \$88,000 over the fiscal year 1972 level.

The budget recommended a decrease of \$15 million. This consisted of a decrease of \$7 million for the training of psychiatrists and a decrease of \$8 million for undergraduate training in psy-

chiatry of medical students and nursing students.

The 1972 budget proposed a similar cut in the psychiatric residency training program last year, but this was restored by the committee.

The committee this year has restored the \$7 million, and is also putting back \$4 million of the cut in undergraduate training. In addition, the committee recommends an increase of \$4 million over the budget for personnel training for the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. The 1972 budget contained \$4 million for this purpose and recommends the same amount for 1973. The committee's action would make a total of \$8 million available.

The budget recommended no funds for construction grants for community health centers again this year, on the basis that the Hill-Burton program is available for this purpose.

Of the \$15 million provided in 1972, \$5.2 million was obligated and \$9.8 million will be carried over into fiscal 1973.

With this \$9.8 million, the Department expected to provide support for approximately 24 additional centers.

For fiscal 1972, the \$5.2 million available for obligation is expected to help establish 24 new centers, bringing the total number of centers receiving construction support to 385.

The committee bill provides an additional \$20 million for construction grants.

The budget request for Community Mental Health Center staffing was \$135,100,000, the same as the fiscal year 1972 level. This would provide continuation support for 479 staffing grants and funds for 22 new awards. Your committee has added \$30 million to this amount to support all approved but unfunded staffing applications.

During the hearings, Dr. Brown testified that—

At the end of fiscal year 1972, we will have 529 centers funded of which 389 are expected to be operational. When fully operated, the 529 centers funded by June 30, 1972, will provide services to approximately 68 million people.

He went on to say that there were 300 centers operational as of June 30, 1971.

At the end of fiscal 1972, he added, there "will be 36 with construction only and 187 with construction and staffing—grants. That makes 223 out of the total."

The committee concurs with the \$15 million increase in the budget for drug addiction activities, with the understanding that additional funding requests will be forthcoming for narcotic addiction and drug abuse programs, pursuant to Public Law 92-255, the new drug abuse legislation. The bill contains \$91,298,000 compared with \$76,298,000 for 1972.

During the hearings, Dr. Brown testified that "only 3 or 4 years ago" the number of heroin addicts was estimated at about 60,000, and this figure may have been underestimated by half. Now, he said:

I would have to say that the figure is closer to 400,000. That is a big jump from 60,000.

With the funds under this appropriation, Dr. Brown said, "We will have 159

community programs funded at the end of this year," and 192 funded treatment programs by the close of fiscal 1973. Dr. Bunney testified that in 1971 there were 45 rehabilitation and treatment program centers in this country, and of these, 23 were operational. In 1972, he said, we have funded 83 and of those, 76 are operational. The projected number for 1973 is 192 funded and 163 operational by the end of the fiscal year.

In 1971, \$21,252 was obligated in the community assistance activity for drug abuse programs. The President submitted a budget amendment of \$67 million for drug abuse programs in 1972.

The 1973 request of \$15 million would go for staffing grants, special projects, service projects, training and education projects. Special emphasis would be given to programs serving metropolitan areas with a high incidence of drug addiction.

The budget request for grants to States for alcoholism programs was the same as last year's level—\$30 million. A \$10 million increase was requested for project grants to provide funds for alcoholism programs formerly run by the Office of Economic Opportunity which have been transferred to the National Institute on Alcoholism.

Dr. Brown testified that no program increase was requested for fiscal 1973 because "During fiscal year 1972 the alcohol program is experiencing tremendous growth and expansion. Thus, fiscal 1973 will be a period of consolidation and evaluation of our activities to date and planning for the most appropriate future direction."

The committee, however, provided an additional \$30 million for grants to States and \$20 million for project grants, bringing this item to a total of \$130,193,000.

The fiscal 1972 budget, as submitted, contained no request for State and community assistance in the area of mental health services to children, and the program received its initial funding of \$10 million from the committee last year. It provides partial support of professional and technical staff in community mental health centers providing initial or expanded mental health services to children. Last year, with an emphasis on prevention and early treatment, 28 awards were made, and it was expected that, with the \$10 million requested this year, four new awards could be made in 1973, with continuation of the 28.

The committee report notes that during the past decade, the number of children aged 10 to 14 in State mental hospitals has doubled, and the caseload of the community centers has shown a marked increase in children with problems ranging from school maladjustments to drug addiction and alcoholism. So, a doubling of the budget for this item is recommended, bringing the fiscal 1973 funding level to \$20 million.

The committee concurred with the budget request of \$14,022,000 for rehabilitation of drug abusers.

This program provides contract funds for the community "aftercare" of addicts upon their release from inpatient treatment at the Clinical Research Cen-

ter at Lexington, Ky., as well as the salary and related support for the staff who administer the institute's overall drug abuse program.

Under this narcotic addict rehabilitation program, individuals addicted to narcotic drugs may volunteer for civil commitment for treatment, or those addicted individuals charged with violating certain Federal criminal laws may apply for civil commitment in lieu of prosecution.

The staff supported under this activity also administer the marihuana research contract program and the community narcotic addiction treatment and rehabilitation grant program, both funded under another activity.

SAINT ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

The bill includes \$30,664,000 for Saint Elizabeths Hospital. This is the amount of the budget request, and an increase of \$4,445,000 over last year's level.

Including reimbursements as well as appropriated funds, and taking into account comparative transfers, it is estimated that \$52,653,000 will be available in 1972, and \$58,307,000 will be available in 1973—an increase of \$5,654,000.

Most of this increase is for built-in expenses, such as new salaries, wage grade adjustments, and the cost of holidays and pay increases.

HEALTH SERVICES PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

The committee bill includes \$64,501,000 for health services research and development, the amount of the budget request and \$2,391,000 over the 1972 level.

This item provides support for the National Center for Health Services Research and Development, the agency responsible for the appraisal and evaluation of the effectiveness of health services operations and for developing a research and development program that is geared to improving health care nationally.

Of the \$2.4 million budget increase for the center, approximately \$1.9 million will go for grants and contracts to support an expanded research and development effort in the development of a co-operative Federal-State-local health services data system, to provide more reliable national statistical data on health needs in this country.

Among its other activities, the center is supporting the first automated hospital patient care management system in the United States. The center's budget is supporting research, development, and evaluation of health maintenance organizations, with respect to such factors as enrolled populations, benefit structures, utilization patterns, monitoring of services, and legal and market factors.

For comprehensive health planning, the bill includes \$41,686,000, the amount of the request and \$15,751,000 over the 1972 level.

This program includes both formula and project grants for assisting States in the development of mechanisms and training of personnel to facilitate health planning—identification of health needs and resources at State and local levels.

The bulk of the budget increase—\$9 million—would go into project grants, to establish approximately 100 new area-

wide agencies and 20 new State assisted local councils, as well as to increase the Federal share of individual agency budgets. Some 172 agencies and eight State-assisted local councils are expected to be in operation in fiscal 1973.

About \$2.3 million of the budget increase would go to formula grants to States, to allow State agencies to increase professional staffs by some 25 percent.

The appropriation for regional medical programs would be increased nearly \$20 million over the budget request to a level of \$150 million, compared with the 1972 level of \$99,464,000. A carryover of \$44,500,000 from fiscal 1971 provided a total obligational level of \$143,964,000 in fiscal 1972.

Regional medical programs have been organized as functional consortiums of health care providers, each with special and specific resources which can be made responsive to health needs. The merger of providers has produced systematic approaches to the major diseases of the heart as well as cancer and kidney disease.

In 1972, the affiliated health providers with the aid of the regional medical program mechanism, are promoting and demonstrating at the local levels, new techniques and innovative delivery patterns that lead to improved accessibility, efficiency and effectiveness of health care.

Efforts at both regional and national levels are being directed to encourage providers of health care to make care available and accessible to areas where there is a distinct scarcity of resources, particularly in the rural and inner-city areas.

In 1972, a construction grant has been made for a regional cancer center in Seattle, Wash.

In 1973, funds will be provided for programs to enable existing health manpower to provide more and better care and training and more effective utilization of new kinds of health manpower. New funds will be used to plan and develop area health education centers, which will be major sources of manpower for health maintenance organizations, experimental health service delivery systems, and other comprehensive health care systems.

Activities aimed at improving the accessibility, efficiency, and quality of health care will provide opportunities to increase the rate of implementation of systems, innovations and new technology. Rural health care systems will be developed that are compatible with needs of rural areas; development of emergency health care systems and development of integrated regional systems which will prevent duplications of specialized resources. The provider-initiated activities leading to a greater sharing of health facilities, manpower, and other resources will provide the opportunity to show how scarce resources can be linked together efficiently.

Again this year the committee has restored construction grant funds for medical facilities which were not included in the budget request. These funds total \$112.2 million, including \$41.4 mil-

lion for hospitals and public health centers, \$20.8 million for long-term care facilities, and \$50 million for modernization grants.

I have already briefly touched on the problems associated with this item, and would also refer my colleagues to the language on this in our committee report.

HEALTH SERVICES DELIVERY

The committee includes \$249,209,000 for comprehensive health services, the amount of the request and \$19,139,000 over the fiscal 1972 funding level. This includes grants to States, project grants, and migrant health grants.

A budget increase of \$12,287,000 for health service project grants would provide support for additional neighborhood health centers previously funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity and the conversion of several family health centers from planning to operational status.

In 1972, 55 comprehensive health centers, including nine from OEO, provided primary care and ambulatory services to an estimated 850,000 persons. It is estimated that the new family health centers programs established in 1972 will have 20 centers in the planning stage and 10 operational centers serving about 100,000 persons. The \$3 million of this increase slated for family health centers would allow 10 projects initiated in 1972 to become operational, and would fund three new centers.

Of the \$5,800,000 budget increase for the migrant health programs, \$2,800,000 is for a "built-in" increase in continuation costs for the migrant health projects, and \$3 million is an actual program increase for upgrading existing projects.

The department estimated some 460,000 patient visits in 1972, an increase of 101,000 over 1971. During the hearings this year, Dr. Van Hoek testified that—

It is anticipated that the total number of migrant patient visits in 1973 will exceed 600,000, an increase of 148,000 over the 1972 visits.

Maternal and child health services programs would be increased by \$13,890,000 over last year's level.

A budget increase of \$4,156,000 for grants to States will help meet the rising costs of locating, diagnosing, treating, and providing followup care for crippled children. Approximately 500,000 children will receive physicians' services under the crippled children's program in fiscal 1973.

A \$9,322,000 increase for project grants will increase the level of services anticipated in the maternity and infant care and children and youth projects, and to expand services in the dental care program.

Of this \$9-plus million, \$3.8 million will support expansion of the 56 existing maternity and infant care projects and extend services to an additional 12,000 mothers and infants, for a total of 205,000 in 1973.

Another \$5.4 million of that \$9-plus million increase will assure comprehensive health services to an estimated 547,000 children in the children and youth projects, compared with 504,000 expected to be served in 1972.

Family planning services received a substantial increase last year. In 1971,

the funding level stood at \$39.3 million, and it was increased to \$90,287,000 in 1972, an increase of \$51 million. In fiscal 1973, funding would be increased another \$48,802,000 to a level of \$139,089,000, the amount of the budget request.

This year, Secretary Richardson testified that:

The number of women served through the programs of the National Center (for Family Planning Services) and other programs which the Center coordinates will reach 3.4 million in 1973.

Dr. Van Hoek testified that—

During 1972, \$87.9 million for family planning project grants for services will support about 325 projects whose total capacity for services will be about 1.5 million people, more than doubling the service capacity funded through 1971. During 1972, 75 OEO projects were transferred to the National Center. . . . The 1973 budget request . . . will expand existing projects and establish approximately 25 new ones. About 75 established projects presently funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity, will be transferred in 1973, and approximately 2.2 million women will be served by all projects funded through 1973, as compared to 1.5 million in 1972. (The overall target is in excess of 5 million.)

Dr. Van Hoek also said that—

Approximately \$27 million of the (actual program increase of) \$42 million will be for the expansion of existing projects; \$10 million will be for the transfer of the 75 OEO projects and at least \$5 million will be used for the 25 new projects.

The appropriation for the National Health Service Corps would be \$8,998,000, the same as the budget request. This will provide the Corps with \$1,109,000 more than was available in fiscal 1972.

A Presidential budget amendment asked \$10 million for this program for fiscal 1972, an increase of \$7 million over 1971. The House allowed this, but the Senate added an additional \$5 million, which was split in conference.

During our committee hearings, Dr. DuVal testified on this program as follows:

Provision of health care personnel to underserved areas through the National Health Service Corps is progressing. To date, 19 communities in 13 States have been approved for placement of 71 professionals made up of 30 physicians, 11 dentists, 21 nurses and nine allied health professionals. Twenty five of them in 9 communities are now on board, and the remainder, now in various stages of placements will be aboard by the end of June.

He said that—

The second round of assignments will begin in July of '72 in which approximately 100 communities will be selected and about 500 health professionals will be assigned.

Dr. DuVal also said that—

Corps assignees provide direct, primary health care, and bill for services at the customary rate.

Dr. Van Hoek said that—

They expect to obtain reimbursements of \$6.4 million in fiscal year '73 which would make a program level of \$14.8 million when added to the requested appropriation of \$8.4 million.

For patient care and special health services, the bill includes \$93,952,000, the

amount of the budget request and \$3,617,000 over the fiscal 1972 funding level. This appropriation provides support for the Public Health Service hospitals.

This year, Secretary Richardson testified that—

We have included in the fiscal 1973 budget an amount sufficient to fund the (PHS) hospitals. We are actively pursuing with the communities in which they are situated, possible opportunities for transferring them into community use. We believe that, faced with a choice between spending a vast amount of money—perhaps as much as a half billion dollars—in bringing them into first class condition as acute care hospitals on the one side or making them available to communities for other uses, such as long-term care, we think that the latter choice makes more sense.

The Hospitals are not adequately utilized, by comparison with most civilian hospitals. They tie up quite a lot of highly trained manpower. We think that we can appropriately meet our obligations to the beneficiaries of these hospitals, including the merchant seamen, by entering into various kinds of contractual arrangements with other hospitals in the ports around the country and by arrangements with the Veterans' Administration in cases where they may have unused beds at any given time.

PREVENTIVE HEALTH SERVICES

In the area of preventive health services, the appropriation for disease control would be increased \$5,606,000 over the 1972 funding level. The committee provided \$95,337,000 for fiscal 1973, the amount of the budget request.

The Department reports that by the end of 1972, over 30 million children will have received the rubella vaccine through these public programs. Hospital stays due to tuberculosis have been dramatically shortened as a result of research into methods of treatment and prevention of this disease.

An increase of \$1,910,128 will provide expanded investigations and control of infectious diseases, particularly hepatitis, hospital infections, malaria and other parasitic and mosquito-borne diseases such as VEE and dengue, salmonellosis and intensification of the surveillance of national disease problems. An increase of \$2,500,000 in project grants for venereal disease control and \$500,000 for other immunizations including Rh hemolytic disease of the newborn is made possible due to an almost 50-percent reduction in the cost of rubella vaccine.

I would call my colleagues' attention to the language on page 17 of our committee report concerning venereal disease control. It points out that:

The budget and the bill include an increase of \$2,500,000 in project grants for venereal disease control bringing the total for that purpose up to \$24,800,000. A total of 23,336 cases of primary and secondary syphilis was reported during 1971, a 15.6 percent increase over 1970. A further increase of 6.1 percent occurred during the first half of 1972. Reported cases grossly understate the extent of the problem, since most professionals in this field believe that many more cases are unreported than are reported. The recent report of the National Commission on Venereal Disease estimates that 80,000 cases of infectious syphilis and 2.2 million cases of gonorrhea occurred last

year. Gonorrhea reached the highest level in history during 1971 and continues to be the most frequently reported of all communicable diseases. The Committee was tempted to further increase the amount in this appropriation for VD control, but it is becoming more apparent each year that the methods we have been and still are using are not the answer to this problem. They, at best, represent a holding operation. What is needed is more research to develop such things as vaccine, better prophylactics, and an accurate and simple blood test for gonorrhea (a great many cases, especially in women, go undetected by conventional tests).

Such research can most properly be centered in the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases. The Committee has additional comments regarding this in the part of this report dealing with that Institute.

The objectives of the disease control programs in fiscal 1973 will be to:

Reduce the incidence of measles and rubella through the cooperative national program with State and local health departments, community health organizations, and HSMHA grant support to prevent rubella birth defects and serious complications associated with these diseases. Develop epidemiologic and laboratory information necessary to launch a national control program to reduce the incidence of gonorrhea in collaboration with State and local health departments. Develop, evaluate, and disseminate hospital infection surveillance information to identify hospital-acquired pathogens which can be controlled. Increase epidemiologic services with respect to hospital-acquired pathogens. Expand surveillance of currently important communicable disease areas; one of international scope—cholera, and one associated with drug abuse—hepatitis. Maintain the epidemic reserve with single vaccines for measles and polio and with multiple vaccines for measles and rubella to shore up the reserve for potential epidemics. Strengthen international surveillance to prevent the importation of diseases into the U.S. from foreign countries. Correct and prevent nutritional disease through a national program of surveillance of the extent of the problem, community demonstration of remedial and preventive measures, manpower development, evaluation of the health effects of food programs, and epidemiologic and laboratory nutrition research, particularly as it relates to the prevention of chronic disease. Improve the diagnostic competence of 14,000 clinical and public health laboratories through a national program of methodology research, evaluation of commercial diagnostic reagents and other materials, training, consultation, proficiency testing, clinical toxicology testing, and inter-state laboratory licensure in close collaboration with State health department laboratories to improve the quality of health care delivered, and to assure consumer safety. Develop standards and specifications for those commercial laboratory reagents which are most critical to proper patient management.

The community environmental management program would be funded at \$31,075,000 by the committee bill, \$4,731,000 over last year's level and \$2.5

million above the budget. This \$2.5 million was included by the committee for project grants for the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention program. This is discussed in detail in our committee report.

This appropriation item also supports some 30 rat control projects in 29 cities throughout the United States. The target areas within these 30 projects cover 77 square miles and embrace a population of 4.4 million people. In addition to the 30 presently active projects, five new cities will receive project funds from the fiscal year 1972 appropriation. A sixth project will be funded in New York City's East Harlem area.

During our hearings, we received testimony that:

In the total target area we are serving . . . our surveys have indicated that the rat population cumulatively during the period of these grants has been reduced by about 50 percent. When we started, 16 percent showed active rat signs; and right now the figure is between 7 and 8 percent.

Occupational health grants and direct operations would be increased by some \$3.6 million over the 1972 level.

The increase in research grants will provide for development research in the safety field relating to mechanical safety devices, design of more reliable protective devices, explore the synergistic effects of noise, heat, fatigue, and other determinants relating to accidents, and to stimulate the development of preventive occupational health in industry.

The increase in direct operations funds will provide for further development of criteria for standards in occupational health and safety, initiate a medical data survey to validate occupational disease data, initiate the second round of medical examinations for coal miners, and expand assistance to industry and State and local governments relating to occupational health programs.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

The total funding level for all the National Institutes of Health is increased \$142,785,000 over the budget request and \$246,937,000 over the 1972 appropriation.

DIVISION OF BIOLOGICS STANDARDS

The committee bill provides for \$9,528,000 for this Division, the budget figure. This is an increase of \$234,000 over 1972.

The objectives of the Division are to insure the safety, purity, and potency of biological products shipped for sale in interstate commerce. These objectives are accomplished by first, conducting research related to the development, manufacture, testing, and use of biological products and two, a control activity consisting of licensing manufacturers to produce biological products, inspection of the manufacturers' facilities, testing lots of biological products submitted for release, and establishing written and physical standards.

One area in which this Division does research is on hepatitis. Regulations have now been established that every donation of blood, plasma or serum intended for use in preparing a biological product be tested and found negative for the hepatitis associated antigen. In the

past research in this area has been severely hampered by the fact that no animals could be found that were susceptible to the disease by inoculation, so direct studies concerning the development of the disease were not possible. However, the Division has now found that the chimpanzee can serve as an animal model, and the animal model system set up by the DBS points to the possibility of developing and testing various preventative measures of the disease such as possible vaccines, serums or various other therapeutic measures.

We are presently spending \$5,550,000 on this disease, and how it is broken up among three institutes follows:

HEPATITIS		
	1972 obligations	1973 estimate
Biologics standards.....	\$550,000	\$550,000
National Heart and Lung Institute.....	2,200,000	2,200,000
National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases.....	1,900,000	2,800,000
Total.....	4,650,000	5,550,000

NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

The committee bill provides for \$492,205,000 for this Institute, \$113,411,000 over 1972. This is \$60,000,000 over the budget figure.

The National Cancer Institute conducts, fosters, and assists research and training directed toward preventing, diagnosing, treating, and controlling cancer in man. These objectives are pursued directly within Government laboratory and clinical facilities and through universities, nonprofit research organizations, and commercial concerns funded through grants and contracts and include laboratory, field, and clinical studies.

The cancer research centers program funds sizable integrated research organizations and provides locales for translation of research results into clinical practice and public health as models of the most recently developed methods of cancer treatment and prevention for the entire medical community. This knowledge is to be made available to the profession at large to aid in insuring that all citizens have access to the most advanced methods of clinical treatment, care, and advice.

In viral carcinogenesis the knowledge and technology are ready for sizable expansion and for development leading to prevention. Efforts in this field of cancer research of highest relevance, priority, and need remain: improved means of detection, propagation, and isolation of viruses or viral genetic material from additional cancer patients; more efficient means of producing and purifying viruses or related genetic material on an industrial scale; required technology for producing and testing safe and potent vaccines when feasible; and surveys to determine which individuals and populations are at greatest risk to cancers of suspected viral origin.

Increased research is needed on chemicals as causes of cancer. About 1,000 chemical agents have been shown to produce cancers in animals and about 20 have been shown to produce cancers in

man. With the introduction of about 200,00 new agents each year, testing for their cancer-causing capabilities is needed. The methods for conducting such research have been developed to a point where large efforts may now be pursued.

During the 1960's it became clear that two human cancers were curable by the use of drugs—chemotherapy—alone. These are choriocarcinoma and Burkitt's lymphoma. In addition, there are other tumors previously fatal, that can be cured by X-irradiation or surgery plus chemotherapy. Each year the list of susceptible and potentially curable tumors grows a little longer and now includes about 15 percent of all clinical cancer types.

However, Dr. Baker of the NCI warned us that we can expect steady progress rather than any startling breakthroughs. The major reason is that we are dealing with so many different diseases. Cancer of the brain is quite different from cancer of the stomach. We have made major progress in various areas, and in childhood leukemia, we are well down the road. In breast cancer, we are already capable of curing up to 80 percent where it has not spread. Also, the time frame is rather long in cancer. It takes 2 years to evaluate one new drug even after we have gone through about 3 to 4 years of development up to the point where we are ready to take it into man. In terms of prevention, it is even longer. If we had in hand a vaccine today for childhood leukemia, it would take us a matter of years to pin it down. It is not like pneumonia. With penicillin we knew within 48 hours if penicillin was good. Cancer is not that way. And the fact is clinically we have at least 100 different kinds of cancer.

Scientific progress continues to develop rapidly in the cancer virus area. Over 100 viruses have been implicated as causes of leukemia and other cancers in every major group of animals. In anticipation of this "virus explosion" a \$10 million appropriation by Congress in fiscal year 1965 launched the special virus leukemia program—SVLP—designed to intensify NCI supported research to determine whether viruses cause human leukemia. The SVLP, following the discovery of many new cancer-inducing viruses, evolved by 1968 into the special virus cancer program—SVCP—thus including other types of cancer; by 1972 the budget for this program has reached \$49 million. During the past 7 years, as the Institute developed an effective science-management capability, it has made rapid, substantial progress in understanding the role of viruses in the causation of animal and human cancers.

The pap smear has been used for years to detect cervical cancer, and it has now been found to be useful in detecting other types of cancer, such as lung cancer, bladder cancer, and even in the area of oral cancer.

One of the major developments of NCI was the laminar flow rooms, which I visited in an inspection trip to NIH last fall.

In spite of antibiotics, infection is one of the major problems in the management of patients. It is usually associated

with a severe reduction of white blood cells, which provide the principal defense mechanism against infection. This deficiency of white blood cells occurs either as a consequence of the underlying disease or due to the agents used to treat the disease. In acute leukemia, infection associated with severe reductions in granulocytes has become the single most important cause of death accounting for perhaps 70 percent of the deaths. Thus, myelosuppression after intensive cytotoxic therapy is a major and often limiting factor in the treatment of patients with cancer. A patient under such therapy is at high risk to infection by a large variety of organisms both endogenous and exogenous from his environment.

To protect the patient from organisms in the environment, the National Cancer Institute has been evaluating the use of isolation units. This program began in 1964 when a plastic isolator essentially consisting of a plastic canopy over a bed was utilized. In 1968, a new unit was designed based on the horizontal laminar airflow principle by Litton Industries, Applied Science Division, Minneapolis, under contract to the National Cancer Institute. This concept had of course been utilized in the space program for years in the assembly of space capsules and instruments.

The laminar airflow unit consists of a blower-filter system comprising the end wall with two side walls and ceiling of plastic panels. The filter blower wall contains filters which render the air virtually totally free of all organisms and other particles. The head of the bed is positioned against this wall so that personnel and visitors may enter the unit; and as long as they remain "downstream," no contamination will result.

This unit is readily installed in a few hours by hospital maintenance personnel in hospital rooms built according to Hill-Burton standards. The cost of the unit itself is moderate although the protected environment program is expensive because of the backup support needed, for example, sterile supplies, "sterile" food, additional nursing staff, and so forth.

The National Cancer Institute now has four such units, and there are 10 or 15 of these elsewhere in the United States.

NATIONAL HEART AND LUNG INSTITUTE

The committee bill provides for \$300,000,000 for this Institute, \$44,720,000 over the budget figure. This is an increase of \$67,373,000 over 1972.

Heart disease, stroke, and other cardiovascular diseases are the cause of more than 1 million deaths each year, or 54 percent of all deaths, as compared with cancer, the next common cause, at about 16 percent.

This Institute continues to support a varied research program in investigator-initiated, peer-reviewed research grants to universities and other nonprofit organizations. The regular program includes research in these major disease areas: Arteriosclerosis, cardiac diseases, hypertension, and kidney diseases, pulmonary diseases, thrombosis and hemorrhagic diseases and grant programs of a special nature, which includes artificial organ and transplantation studies. The research objective is a continued—and

accelerated—improvement in the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of diseases of the heart, the lungs, and the vascular system.

This year there have been a number of exciting discoveries coming from the medical application branch of this Institute. A significant step was recently achieved toward the goal of developing a tiny, completely implantable engine to provide power for both artificial heart replacement devices and artificial heart assist devices. The nuclear engine, which uses a radioisotope fuel, offers promise for artificial hearts which could last 10 years or longer. Feasibility of the engine, which has been under development for a number of years, was demonstrated by being implanted in a calf and powering a heart-assist device. Plans call for further animal trials of greater duration.

The National Blood Resources program is actively working with several other programs within DHEW to upgrade the quality and increase the quantity of blood available for transfusion.

While there have been no real "breakthroughs" in the area of hypertension, several advances which would be of considerable clinical importance have been made. These include new combinations of diuretic and blood pressure lowering drugs. Together these drugs effectively reduce troublesome side effects of individual drugs. A new, more powerful drug (clonidine) has been introduced experimentally in this country and still has to be fully tested, but it appears to have real promise.

A number of new research techniques have been developed such as computer methods for enhancing and improving X-ray images of vessels. A new operation has been designed to help prevent heart attacks or recurrences. Segments of veins are taken from the patient's legs and connected from the aorta to the obstructed coronary arteries. The improvement in blood flow to the heart muscle is immediate, and the short-term effects of such surgery have been dramatic.

Recent studies suggest that a heritable deficiency of a blood enzyme may predispose affected individuals to the development of chronic obstructive lung diseases, such as emphysema. A number of studies concerned with determining the prevalence of this trait in the general population and its association with chronic lung disease are already underway at the NHLI. Some of the tests being conducted by a grantee of the Institute suggest that if this disease is detected at a very early stage, the disease process is reversible.

In his February health message to Congress, President Nixon identified sickle cell anemia as a high-priority disease target and called for a \$5 million increase in Federal expenditures during the current fiscal year. The National Heart and Lung Institute was assigned responsibility for coordinating the joint efforts of Government agencies. The grand total for fiscal year 1973 in the committee bill is \$15 million and will be allocated in the following manner:

First. Comprehensive research and community service sickle cell centers—\$4.5 million in 1972 and 1973—to be administered by the NIH. There will be a

limited number. Each will include research, screening, education and counseling, clinical applications, and training of professional and allied health professions personnel. The aim is to bridge the gap between fundamental research and clinical application, and promptly translate the results into demonstrations of community service. Second. Screening and education clinics—\$1.8 million in 1972 and \$6.55 million in 1973—to be administered by HSMHA. These clinics will provide education of the public, professionals, and allied health professions personnel, screening, definitive diagnosis for all found to be positive, and counseling. The clinics must be able to refer patients for appropriate and adequate followup care. (3) Research—\$3.7 million in 1972 and 1973, of which \$2.7 million is in the NHLI appropriation and \$1 million is in other NIH Institutes' appropriations—to be administered by NIH. Support will be provided for both target-oriented research related to clinical manifestations and treatment of crisis, and fundamental research initiated by the individual investigator. Fourth. Information—\$0.25 million in 1973. An information center will be established under the direction of the program coordinator, which will serve as a central clearinghouse for all types of sickle-cell disease information.

This disease, as is pretty generally known by now, is a genetically transmitted disease, which affects members of the black race primarily. It is estimated that approximately 1 in 500 black infants is born with this life-threatening disease. Such individuals undergo painful episodes called sickle cell crises.

The disease is due to a genetically determined defect in hemoglobin, the respiratory pigment in red blood cells which enables them to carry oxygen throughout the body. Under conditions of diminished oxygen supply or physical or emotional stress, the abnormal hemoglobin molecules become attached to one another in such a way as to distort the normally doughnut-shaped red cells into a distinctive crescent or sickle shape.

The inability of these sickled cells to pass freely through smaller blood vessels creates a "log jam" effect, blocking the flow of blood to surrounding tissues, thus causing the extremely painful sickle cell crisis.

Because sickle cell disease is genetically determined, there is no way known at the present time to cure the disease in affected individuals. Current methods of treatment are aimed primarily at alleviating the pain. However, new forms of treatment may make possible reversal of the sickling process, thereby shortening or even preventing the sickle cell crises and the resultant tissue damage. These must undergo further development and evaluation before their potential can be realized.

It is estimated that there are 2 million carriers of the trait of sickle cell anemia. These carriers are in no way debilitated. However, if two carriers marry and have children, each child has a 1-in-4 chance of having sickle cell anemia.

So, the major thrust of the program at this point is in the screening area. An

article appearing in the Washington Post on June 1 stated that Dr. Mortimer S. Greenberg of Tufts University has developed a new simple and accurate screening test which can be carried out on a mass basis at a cost of approximately 3 to 4 cents each.

More than 100 different types of abnormal hemoglobin have been identified and of these, sickle cell anemia is the best understood. A few are known to cause anemia. One of these is Cooley's anemia, which is also a genetically determined anemia which occurs primarily in peoples of Mediterranean origin. Again, the carriers of the trait are in no way debilitated, but if two carriers marry, their children have a high percentage of carrying the disease. The true incidence is not known and obviously varies in different parts of the country, depending on the percent of the population of Mediterranean origin. The best available estimates are that about 20,000 individuals in this country carry the trait. The National Institutes of Health currently supports 12 research projects with major emphasis on Cooley's anemia to the extent of approximately \$631,000. In addition, the various institutes support 11 projects in which the work is related to Cooley's anemia or it is a major component. The total for this latter group is approximately \$669,000.

The rate of doing heart transplants has slowed considerably over previous years. To date 187 of these transplants have been performed, with 29 still surviving.

In the area of arteriosclerosis, we now know that control of high blood pressure actually prevents stroke. It reduces the death rate from congestive heart failure which is different from death from heart attack.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL RESEARCH

The committee bill provides for \$46,991,000 for this Institute, which is \$2,576,000 over the budget. This is \$3,603,000 over the 1972 figures.

The National Institute of Dental Research conducts and supports basic laboratory investigations, clinical and applied research, and epidemiological and field studies, directed toward the ultimate eradication of a broad array of oral-facial disorders.

Dental diseases are largely irreversible, for the body lacks the inherent power to repair most of the damage they inflict. Thus, prevention is of special importance to dentistry.

A universal public health problem, dental caries, has been identified as a special initiative program. Through intramural, contract and grant-supported research, intensified efforts are being made to reduce its incidence.

Other major programs are directed toward the problems of periodontal disease, oral-facial malformations, particularly malocclusion and cleft lip/palate; and oral ulcerations. Recently, the dental institute has also begun to focus more attention on pain control, a neglected area of central concern to dentistry.

In the area of caries, or tooth decay, where, as a consequence of substantive budgetary support, the Institute is now

directing special efforts on a truly national scale. This special initiative program was funded by \$9,155,000 the current year and \$9,364,000 is being requested for fiscal year 1973. Through the enlistment of various scientific resources—in industry, universities, and private research organizations—a number of promising leads are being pursued and significant progress is foreseen. For example, the incrimination of a certain strain of streptococcus in human caries has produced a cascade of further developments, which are helping to clarify the complex picture of caries causation.

In terms of magnitude, periodontal—gum—disease, which affects an estimated 75 million Americans, ranks as a major public health problem. The major directions of research effort are highly diversified, including studies of the role of enzymes in the destruction of periodontal tissue, observations of bone metabolism, and projects to explore important immunological aspects. Presumably as our understanding of the complicated biology and chemistry of the inflammatory process in periodontal disease advances, the development of new preventive measures against the most common form of the disease looms as a distinct possibility in the future.

One of the most significant research accomplishments of the year in dental materials was the development of a new amalgam filling material which is stronger and less corrosive than amalgams used to date.

Again this year, it was emphasized that fluoridated water goes a long way in the prevention of tooth decay. There is a 40- to 60-percent reduction in tooth decay in areas with fluoridated water.

Under grant support a new sealant treatment has been developed, which is a plastic coating of the teeth, and over a period of 2 years of observation this treatment has demonstrated almost a 100-percent reduction in decay. If the observations are borne out, within the next 2 years this will be ready for public use.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARTHRITIS, METABOLISM AND DIGESTIVE DISEASES

The committee bill provides for \$167,316,000 for this Institute, which is \$8,227,000 over the budget. This is an increase of \$13,979,000 over 1972.

This Institute bears responsibility for a broad array of chronic disabling diseases—a wider, more diversified range of illnesses than covered by any of the other Institutes of the NIH. Research activities, in addition to studies of the various arthritic diseases, include the study of a broad spectrum of heredity-linked metabolic disease such as diabetes and cystic fibrosis; gastroenterology, hematology, endocrine disorders, and mineral metabolism. Underlying these clinical studies is extensive fundamental research in biochemistry, pathology, histochemistry, chemistry, physical, chemical and molecular biology, nutrition, pharmacology, and toxicology.

Arthritis and rheumatism, terms that refer respectively to inflammation and destruction of joints and disease affecting tissues surrounding the joints, head the list of chronic diseases in the United

States today in terms of social and economic importance.

Rheumatoid arthritis, the most crippling form of arthritis, continues to intrigue medical scientists. There is still no clear understanding of why one person develops the disease and not another, how the disease destroys normal tissue and what causes it to progress.

A major thrust of the research of this Institute revolves around the possibility that rheumatoid arthritis may be the result of an autoimmune reaction in which the body overreacts to proteins originating within the body's own tissues. Such immune processes may be triggered by changes brought about by an infectious agent. In view of this real possibility, diseases in animals resembling human rheumatoid arthritis and caused by a known infectious process are of deep interest. It is estimated there are about 100 disorders which are classed under the heading of arthritis and rheumatism.

This year many nations are commemorating the 50th anniversary of the discovery of insulin. Since this finding, regarded as one of the great landmarks in the history of medicine, an estimated total of 100 million people have relied upon insulin to lead healthier and longer lives. However, diabetes remains a serious and complicated disorder, ranking eighth on the list of diseases causing death in this country.

The Institute is exploring ways to suppress the development of complications of the disease which include enhanced arteriosclerosis and consequent coronary heart disease, nerve damage, kidney failure, and blindness, and to find better therapeutic measures.

In this latter regard, the Institute is involved in a 10-year study on the effects of the oral antidiabetic drugs, tolbutamide. This continuing study, conducted by 12 leading medical centers with research grant support, this Institute now has shown that another well-known antidiabetic drug, phenformin, like tolbutamide, is apparently no more effective than diet or diet and insulin in prolonging the life of patients with mild, adult-onset diabetes. Phenformin was also associated with a higher death rate from heart disease than was found in the other treatment groups just as tolbutamide has been shown previously.

Although, as Dr. Whedon, Director of this Institute commented, these results cannot be regarded as definitive proof of adverse effects, such findings raise questions concerning the long-term benefits of tolbutamide and phenformin therapy, and even concerning the importance of strict regulation of blood glucose levels, heretofore considered an important therapeutic goal in providing longevity for patients with adult-onset diabetes.

The artificial kidney program, a collaborative research and development program of this Institute, seeks to develop simpler, more efficient, and less costly artificial kidneys and improved methods of treatment for patients with permanent loss of kidney function. For the first time as a result of a new process developed by the Institute, we have become independent of large tanks and

plumbing in dialysis and can now foresee development of suitcase-sized artificial kidneys which are portable.

During the past year approximately 1,000 kidney transplants took place in this country. A successful transplant of this kind can restore a patient to a period of renal sufficiency that can last for many years. However, as in heart transplants, the body will eventually reject the foreign kidney and research is continuing on drugs that suppress the body's immunologic mechanisms and on improved "matching" of donor organs and suitable recipients.

Dermatologic disorders include psoriasis, a disfiguring disease which afflicts between 2 and 8 million Americans, and causes great mental anguish to its victims and their families. The cause of psoriasis is unknown, and the disease is marked by rapid proliferation and scaling of epidermal cells. This Institute, in an attempt to accelerate the pace of psoriasis research, has organized two workshops during the last year, bringing together hundreds of scientists and physicians from different fields who pooled their present knowledge and planned for future research directions.

The Institute is in the planning stages for the establishment of a broad screening program directed toward finding one or more drugs that could be used topically to clear and control with reasonable safety the disfiguring psoriatic lesions. In addition, the Institute will intensify its support of fundamental studies on the chemistry and function of skin tissue in health and disease. Only more complete knowledge of the basic causes of psoriasis will help elucidate rational ways of controlling this condition.

This Institute, as well as the Center mentioned under "Research resources," is doing considerable research in the area of cystic fibrosis, and is budgeting \$3,060,000 for fiscal year 1973. Additional grants, worth about \$3 million, which are relevant in varying degrees to fundamental studies of cystic fibrosis are supported by other Institutes at NIH.

Although we still don't know what cause CF, other than it is genetically transmitted, we are making some progress in the area. An example of how CF patients can be helped medically during the first 5 years of life, with marked lessening of morbidity and mortality both during this period and throughout childhood and adolescence, is proved in a paper by an NIH grantee who reported on the course of the disease in 130 patients. The children were under 3 months of age when first diagnosed. They were observed over a 20-year period, 1949-69, for a total of 912 patient years. Whereas the prognosis in the past was nearly hopeless, the vigorous therapy instituted for these young patients after an early diagnosis has greatly improved the outlook for their health and comfort. In contrast to very high mortality rates reported previously, it is estimated that 77 percent of the group studied will survive to age 20. Furthermore, 14 of the children are said to be in excellent health, while 71 either have mild disease or are in good health.

This Institute supports 28 individual

research grants related to sickle cell anemia, totaling \$750,000 annually. About half of these are fundamental which characterize sickle cell anemia and other, related abnormal types of hemoglobin. These investigations attempt to establish the fundamental cause or causes of the disease and to elucidate why the abnormal blood pigment molecules of sickle cell anemia react in their unique fashion, rearranging themselves along a longitudinal axis and distorting and elongating—sickling—the red blood cells in which they are located. The other studies relate to the genetics of the disease and to ways and means of reversing the abnormal sickling reaction.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF NEUROLOGICAL DISEASES AND STROKE

The committee bill provides \$130,672,000 for this Institute, an increase of \$12,795,000 over the budget, and \$13,941,000 over 1972.

This Institute is concerned with a variety of diseases which afflict the brain and sense organs. Disorders such as cerebral palsy, epilepsy, multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy, parkinsonism, and deafness result in long-term disability while cerebrovascular disease—stroke—is the third largest cause of death in this country. The Institute's responsibility is to learn more about the brain, the nervous system, and the communication mechanism in order to prevent disease or treat it effectively, where it already exists. More than 20 million Americans suffer from disabling neurological disorders and another 20 million have hearing, speech, and language impediments.

Spinal cord injury causes serious paralysis in 100,000 persons in the Nation. Each year there are 5,000 to 10,000 new spinal cord injuries. These occur largely in young people injured in sports, auto accidents and in the military.

With funds provided this past year, the Institute has awarded 18-month feasibility grants to six institutions to organize acute spinal cord injury clinical research centers, where teams of neurologists, neurosurgeons, and related scientific personnel will work cooperatively. In these grants, emphasis also is being given to the development and evaluation of emergency room diagnostic techniques and to medical surgical treatment.

Strokes rank third among leading causes of death in this country, taking over 200,000 lives a year. At the present time there are also between 1 and 2 million persons disabled by strokes.

The Institute has mounted a strong program in cerebrovascular disease, including sponsorship of 17 clinical research centers, some 60 research projects and two national cooperative drug trials of clinical therapy.

Since 70 to 80 percent of deaths due to brain hemorrhage occurs within the first 10 days, development is underway on a number of experimental acute care units for stroke patients. There is no uniform opinion at this time on which neurological changes are the most important to monitor in this acute phase. More information is needed on whether transient changes in intracranial pressure have serious effects on the stroke patient. If so, perhaps pressure should be moni-

tored automatically and continuously so that measures can be instituted to counteract rapid fluctuations. The use of implanted radio-frequency sensors to monitor pressure appears to be a possibility.

A task force has been organized to draw up the plans for the development of these acute care research units and the acute stroke monitoring devices which would be developed and tested in them.

The collaborative perinatal research project has been a prospective, multidisciplinary, long-term endeavor carried out in 14 medical institutions across the country, coordinated by the Perinatal Research Branch of NINDS. This Study has made a major contribution to the increased understanding of the genetic and environmental factors affecting the central nervous system in its early development. The study has also provided substantial information on the relation of accident, infections, and birth weight factors in the perinatal period to mental retardation, cerebral palsy, and other neurological and sensory disorders.

From 1959 through 1967, some 58,000 pregnancies were observed and now the children of these pregnancies are being followed until they are 8 years of age. The funds made available last year will enable this institute to proceed with the 7-year follow-up examination of these children.

Valuable data resulting from this study is now being reported on a regular basis. For example, it had been common practice in the United States until quite recently to urge pregnant women to keep strict limits on their weight gain during pregnancy. The study indicated that this is unwise and the practice has been stopped by many obstetricians and physicians.

Scientists in the collaborative perinatal research project have also found evidence that a lack of critical nutrients—especially protein—in the mother's prenatal diet may result in lowered intelligence in her child. Further investigations of factors which suggest this relationship are continuing through the analyses of preserved blood samples taken from the women who have participated in the project since its inception. New studies in human and primate populations are extending the study of nutrition in pregnancy.

The Collaborative Perinatal Research Project has had important ancillary effects also. It has resulted in improved hospital records and better medical care in obstetrics and newborn pediatrics; fostered much related research by providing a patient population and a group of skilled senior researchers whose interests were focused on perinatal problems; led to better training of housestaff and medical students in obstetrics, neonatal pediatrics, and neurology; encouraged interdisciplinary exchange of information, ideas, and respect; and encouraged research in other countries and exchange of ideas with foreign research groups.

The greatest value of the project, perhaps, is that it gives national impetus to the common hope that the neurological disease of childhood, especially CP, may one day be prevented.

The first comprehensive report from the Collaborative Perinatal Research Project is now in press. The report describes the prospective study, displays the distribution of the characteristics and conditions of the pregnancies investigated, and shows the relationships between these characteristics and the pregnancy outcomes (stillbirth, neonatal death, birth weight, and the presence of neurologic abnormalities at 1 year).

Statisticians and staff scientists at NINDS, assisted by collaborating institutions, are now deeply involved in an analysis of the information already available from the study. By the end of fiscal year 1975, the remaining children in the project will have completed the battery of tests.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ALLERGY AND
INFECTIOUS DISEASES

The committee bill provides for \$113,414,000 for this institute, which is \$765,000 over the budget. This is \$4,296,500 over the 1972 figure.

This institute conducts and supports broadly based research on the causes, characteristics, prevention, control, and treatment of diseases believed to be caused by infectious agents including bacteria, fungi, viruses, and parasites—or by abnormalities of the body's immune mechanisms such as allergies.

As new knowledge is gained through medical research, existing ideas on the causes of major diseases are often brought into question. When this happens, investigators find they must return to the basic sciences of biochemistry, microbiology, immunology, and pharmacology to seek new answers. For example, some of the leading cripples and killers of our time may be linked to viruses or to the body's defense mechanisms. When the mysteries of multiple sclerosis, diabetes, rheumatic diseases, and some forms of human cancer are unraveled, the causes might well prove to be microbial infections or abnormal immune mechanisms.

Seven allergic disease centers have been in operation since last summer. With funds provided by Congress, plans are being made to establish additional centers this year, including one unit at the intramural program at Bethesda. At present, these outpatient-oriented centers appear to be the best mechanism for shortening the time lag between laboratory findings and clinical practice.

Prostaglandins continue to generate considerable interest. These hormone-like chemicals occur naturally throughout the body and have powerful effects on smooth muscles, such as those in the lung, which are being studied in the treatment of asthma.

This Institute has played a catalytic role in organ transplantation since the early 1960's. More than 6,000 human kidneys have now been transplanted, and more than 4,000 individuals are alive today with kidneys from another person. Suppression of the body's normal immune response helps to preserve transplanted organs. The Institute has supported studies on immunosuppressive agents, including a biological substance called ALS. Clinical trials of this sub-

stance to prevent kidney graft rejection should begin this year.

For years, scientists in the Institute's Laboratory of Viral Diseases have been studying viruses that produce leukemia in mice. Recently, they developed a technique that might help track down a human leukemia virus.

Taken together, influenza and pneumonia are listed as the fifth leading cause of death in the United States. Each season the influenza virus "drifts" slightly in its antigenic makeup. About every 10 to 12 years, a major antigenic shift occurs. When this happens, existing vaccines become less effective and new ones must be developed. Before the next influenza pandemic occurs, it is hoped new strategies will be developed to solve this problem.

Within the framework of the NIH Hepatitis Task Force, this Institute has primary responsibility to develop vaccines and immune gamma globulin against both infectious and serum hepatitis. Two years ago a protein, Australia antigen, was discovered in the blood of many patients, who had serum hepatitis. Because of this discovery, the Institute has sharply increased its support of hepatitis research. An NIAID special fellow from California and his associates in Chile have reported on a study of nearly 2,000 patients where modified gamma globulin was added to the blood before transfusion, there were no severe cases of Hepatitis B (serum hepatitis).

Gonorrhea is second only to the common cold as the most frequent contagious disease in the United States. An estimated 2 million cases were diagnosed and treated in 1970. And some 290,000 Americans were under treatment for syphilis that year. Unquestionably, the Nation is suffering a venereal disease epidemic, and the explosive increase in the number of VD cases shows no sign of abating. Epidemiologic and clinical aspects of VD have been studied for decades. With the initial, spectacular success of penicillin treatment in the 1940's, and in light of the prevailing concept of disease control at that time, fundamental research virtually stopped. VD is again out of control. In order to have a vaccine for VD, much more knowledge will be required about the organism which causes it. This knowledge is not now available. The Institute has more than doubled the number of grants which they have in this field, and some \$25,000,000 is being spent in other areas of HEW on VD.

We still haven't conquered the common cold, mainly because there are so many different viruses that cause it. There are some 87 different kinds of rhinoviruses which are separate and distinct without much relation to each other. In fact, there are another 25 that we know about which have not been fully identified. These viruses occur sporadically and cause common colds in a very random fashion. A person could have a different virus twice a year for 45 or 50 years and still barely get through all the different strains.

A milestone, however, was reached in 1957 in the understanding of mechanisms of recovery from viral infection, when

two British scientists discovered interferon. This is a protein manufactured by cells in response to a virus attack. This year the Infectious Disease Branch of this Institute sponsored a workshop in interferon and the recommendations hold promise.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF GENERAL MEDICAL
SCIENCES

The committee bill provides for \$183,171,000 for this Institute, which is \$7,211,000 over the budget, and \$9,697,000 over the 1972 figure.

This Institute does most of the basic research for the NIH and its major areas are genetics, fundamental sciences, pharmacology, toxicology, and biomedical engineering.

One of the major advancements in the Institute is the establishment of a library, or repository, of mammalian, particularly human, cell types in culture to make these available for study by scientists and physicians all over the country. This library of cell lines will be made from the cells of individuals who suffer from genetic diseases. Its availability will permit scientists and physicians to study the genetic and biochemical processes going on in these individuals and help them in exploring ways of treating this large group of some 1800 diseases.

This collection of cells will help scientists to determine where genetic abnormalities reside within the 23 pairs of chromosomes contained in the normal human cell. Each infant receives 23 chromosomes from each of his parents, and essentially all of the information needed to make the human body is contained within these chromosomes. Scientists are seeking to map the genetic information contained within each chromosome. They have recently benefited from the development of new techniques for the straining of chromosomes with fluorescent dyes and subsequent study of the chromosomes under ultraviolet light. Using these and other novel staining techniques, it is now possible to identify unequivocally each of the chromosomes as belonging to one of the 23 pairs mentioned above, permitting precise characterization of chromosomal abnormalities as they may occur in cancer or in genetic diseases, such as Down's syndrome, or mongolism. By the process of amniocentesis (withdrawing some of the amniotic fluid surrounding the fetus) it is now possible to determine if Down's syndrome is present and allows for the optional termination of the pregnancy.

As we learn more about the structure of chromosomes and how they function in both normal cells and in cells having gross genetic abnormalities, we may find better ways of controlling hereditary diseases.

Perhaps the most interesting research developments in genetics in the past year have related to the several methods now explored for the transfer of genetic information, in the form of DNA, from one cell to another. The possibility now exists, though probably remote, of introducing into a genetically defective line of mammalian cells the missing genetic information, thereby potentially "curing" a genetic deficiency in an irreversible fashion.

This Institute continues to support research in the effective control and treatment of schistosomiasis, snail fever. Although not prevalent in the United States, it is one of the last great pestilences in the world and it is estimated that at least 200 million people are victims of this infection. That is about 7 percent of the entire world population. The disease abounds in southern Asia, Egypt, and in parts of Latin America and is caused by a worm known as the schistosome, which for part of its life cycle must parasitize a certain species of snail. Irrigation projects in the tropics are often accompanied by a massive epidemic of schistosomiasis and such an epidemic is occurring in Egypt as a result of completion of the Aswan High Dam.

An agent has been discovered by a grantee of this Institute which, if it passes the necessary tests for lack of chronic toxicity in animals, will then be subjected to human testing. If it proves as effective in man as it is in the chimpanzee, a new and far better agent for the treatment of this persistent scourge to mankind will have been discovered.

A significant segment of the research on the structure and function of the cell has been conducted through funds awarded to scientists by this Institute. The potential payoff for medicine is great. For example, 10 years ago, the so-called microtubule was little understood. Then in 1963, electron microscopists developed a new technique which enabled scientists to observe objects that heretofore had rarely been seen. The microtubule is being investigated in many areas, including its use in possible male contraceptives, the process of aging, and since it has an important role in cell division, it is of great interest to those working in cancer research and in cancer chemotherapy.

Approximately \$55.7 million is being spent in this important area of genetics research.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CHILD HEALTH AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

The committee bill provides for \$130,429,000, which is \$3,185,000 over the budget request. It is \$14,002,000 over the 1972 figure.

The National Institute of Child Health and Human Development conducts and supports research and training dealing with human development from conception through old age. The three major programs are population research, child health and aging. These areas and their attendant goals are intimately related and progress in one area represents an advance in all.

Although more women than ever report that they want only two children, many couples fail to plan pregnancies successfully. Clearly, the need for more effective, safe and acceptable contraception is pressing. The institutes' population research program concentrates on contraceptive development including reproductive biology, evaluation of existing contraceptives and research in the behavioral sciences.

Development of a variety of new methods of contraception is essential if the needs and preferences of the entire population are to be met. This scientific ac-

complishment depends on the application of knowledge derived from many years of fundamental research. The design and testing of reversible sterilization techniques for men have been carried out on laboratory animals in the past year. If the approach proves safe and effective in animals, human trials may begin next year.

For female contraception, the Institute is supporting work on the synthesis and testing of new drugs which have promise for eventual use. It is expected that within a year it will be known if prostaglandins will have a significant application to fertility regulation.

Evaluation of the medical effects of contraceptives presently in use has concentrated on oral contraceptives because of their widespread use. Some of the recent findings indicate that in oral contraceptive users there may be a greater risk of stroke; the incidence of breast cancer is not increased; the course of a precursor of cervical cancer is unaffected; blood pressure is modestly elevated; and depression does not seem related to use of these drugs. Next year these leads will be pursued. Research will also be continued on intrauterine devices.

Continued research in the behavioral sciences will increase our understanding of factors affecting changes in population growth. For instance, in 1971 the birth rate dropped unexpectedly to the low levels reached in the 1930's. Whether we are dealing with the beginning of a trend or merely a fluctuation will be carefully studied.

In child health programs, research is stressed that promotes infant survival, the optimal development of children and youth, and the prevention and amelioration of mental retardation.

Over 20 million Americans, representing the immediate families of our Nation's 6 million mentally retarded persons, are directly affected by the problem of mental retardation. On November 16, 1971, President Nixon pledged his support to two major national goals: To reduce by half the occurrence of mental retardation in the United States before the end of the century; and to enable one-third of the more than 200,000 retarded persons in public institutions to return to useful lives in the community. This Institute is helping to achieve these goals. For example, it is known that several types of mental subnormality are associated with chromosomal abnormalities. An institute-supported investigator has recently devised a simple, quick, and accurate method to identify each human chromosome. This is particularly significant at this time when increased demands are being made for genetic counseling.

It has been estimated that between 7,500 and 10,000 children die each year in the United States from the sudden infant death syndrome, also known as crib death. Although the specific cause of sudden death is unknown, viruses frequently are present in affected infants. Selected epidemiologic studies as well as investigations concerned with the physiology of sleep are planned with the intention of increasing our still limited

knowledge of this complex medical problem. The \$3 million is budgeted for this area in 1973.

The population of elderly persons in the United States is increasing steadily and if birth rates continue to fall, the fraction of the population over 65, now one-tenth, will continue to grow. Few areas of scientific activity offer so much promise for mankind as does research on aging. The benefits will appear not necessarily in adding decades to the lifespan, but rather in improving the quality of life.

In a number of aspects, aging in women differs from that of men, and although women generally live 7 to 8 years longer than men, this is unexplained. An event unique to female aging is the menopause and before this occurs, women appear relatively protected from age-related degenerative diseases compared to men. Increased concentration on female aging research will be initiated next year to establish a scientific base on this problem.

There are presently 12 mental retardation research centers, funded at a level of \$32 million, of which this Institute contributes about \$14.2 million.

Presently this Institute is spending \$3.8 million on research on genetically transmitted diseases. We were informed in the hearings that around 60 of these diseases are now detectable using amniocentesis, which, of course, gives the parents the option of terminating the pregnancy if they desire.

NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE

The committee bill provides \$38,562,000 for this Institute, an increase of \$1,178,000 over the budget request, and \$1,429,500 over 1972.

The National Eye Institute was created in 1968 to improve visual health through the conduct and support of research and research training on disease problems and injuries to the eye and visual system. Institute programs are implemented through grants and contracts with individuals and research organizations working on problems of visual health, and through laboratory, clinical, and epidemiological research conducted by Institute personnel.

In its first years of operation this Institute has supported a variety of ongoing vision research projects. Also they have been developing expert scientific and administrative resources in preparation for launching a major attack on blindness. Having now overcome most of the obstacles inherent in the creation of a new research organization, the National Eye Institute is ready to inaugurate a coordinated and comprehensive targeted research program against a leading and devastating cause of blindness: glaucoma.

Glaucoma cannot now be prevented and in most cases not cured. It is a major cause of blindness, accounting for over 10 percent of the newly blind. The Institute will be spending approximately \$5 million on glaucoma research in fiscal year 1973.

The Institute, in addition to its legislated mission to improve the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of blinding eye diseases, is also supporting research on

special problems of the blind and visually handicapped. Institute funds helped make possible the development of the Optacon, a device which enables the blind to read the same printed material any sighted person would use.

This ingenious instrument presents a tactile facsimile image of printed characters which are scanned by an optical probe. Thus, instead of braille impressions, the user of the Optacon senses the outline of a regular letter conveyed through the raising and lowering of an array of tiny rods which fits onto a single finger. The entire system weighs only 8 pounds, can be easily transported, and is relatively inexpensive to produce.

A more complex vision substitution device uses the images captured by a television camera to activate a series of stimulators arranged on a grid and positioned over the skin of the abdomen. A sightless person, with training and practice, learns to translate these impulses automatically into crude spatial images within his brain. The Institute has supported development of this system.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES

The committee bill provides \$30,956,000 for this Institute, which is \$1,943,000 above the budget request and \$4,520,000 over 1972.

The National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences seeks to increase our understanding of environmental agents which can adversely affect man's health either immediately or over a period of time. The results of the Institute's research are promptly made available to agencies having responsibility for environmental monitoring, standard setting, and control. This Institute is seeking to determine the magnitude and significance of the hazard to man's health resulting from long-term exposures to low-level concentrations of chemical, physical, and biological agents in the environment. Underlying mechanisms of adverse response are examined in order to determine the principles and generalizations which can provide criteria which can serve as a basis for the establishment of standards by those agencies charged with the regulatory responsibility in this area.

The direct beneficiaries of the basic knowledge developed by this Institute are the categorical programs in environmental control, including those of the Environmental Protection Agency—air pollution, radiological health, environmental sanitation, solid waste management—as well as those in the Public Health Service, including the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health, and the Food and Drug Administration. Close liaison is maintained with these activities to insure the inclusion of their requirements in the development and implementation of the Institute's research program.

Scientists in this Institute are working on such urgent and diverse problems as the toxicity of polychlorinated biphenyls—PCB's; methyl mercury poisoning; the toxicologic problems of detergents; the displacement of persistent pesticides such as DDT; asbestosis; and the poten-

tial health effects of microwaves and noise.

PCB's are highly heat resistant liquids which have been used in industrial applications for over 40 years, in everything from industrial fluids for hydraulic, gas-turbine, and vacuum pumps to the paper used in form 1040, the income tax form. It's like DDT in that it will persist virtually unchanged for as long as decades. This substance was found responsible for contamination of rice cooking oil in Japan and resulted in liver damage. Recent episodes of accidental contamination of poultry and eggs from the loss of PCB heat transfer fluids and in milk from paints containing PCB's for silo treatment have highlighted the need for additional studies.

Another area under investigation is the phthalic acid esters, which are used in such materials as food wraps, bags, and blood bags. Over a billion pounds of phthalates are produced annually. They are solids or liquids, but they tend to vaporize and go into the atmosphere. An interesting point which turned up in our hearings was that many of us have noticed a film on the inside of the windshield of our cars which is very hard to wipe off. This is most likely due to phthalates vaporizing from the plastic upholstery and depositing on the inside of the windshield.

This Institute has not been in existence very long, but it has become the focus of information exchange that has had an immediate impact on the regulatory agencies in this country and abroad. Its ability to be able to assemble very rapidly the best scientific information on a critical subject has been something of an immediate payoff from the Institute's activities. Some of the experiments take a rather long time, but increasingly, when a major problem comes up, one of the first things that happens is that this Institute is asked to make a scientific assessment of the best information around the world, which they do very rapidly. It is almost a daily occurrence that such efforts have an impact on someone's decisions concerning either regulation or the wisdom of some specific action as far as environment is concerned.

RESEARCH RESOURCES AND GENERAL RESEARCH SUPPORT GRANTS

The committee provides \$75,073,000 for this division which is \$64,000 over the budget and \$92,000 over 1972.

The purpose of this division is, first, to provide basic resources to the biomedical research institutions of the Nation in support of the categorical research activities of NIH; second, to assist such institutions in maintaining their individuality and autonomy; and third, to encourage the conduct of innovative biomedical research by providing crucially required resources.

To accomplish this, DRR has mounted programs in four areas: First, the general clinical research centers program, which supports discrete clinical units, usually in university or university affiliated hospitals, utilized in the conduct of multicategorical clinical research; second, the biotechnology resources program, which supports the development

and operation of large and complex technological resources such as computer system, mass spectrometry, and nuclear magnetic resonance systems; and third, the animal resource program, which provides support for the development and improvement of various animal models.

The research activities and accomplishments in DRR span the entire spectrum of biomedical science. For example, the armadillo has now been found as a model for Hansen's disease—leprosy. This research has been stalemated for years due to a lack of a suitable animal model.

A program at the Primate Research Center for the University of Washington is concerned with research on one of the most tragic diseases of early infancy, the sudden infant death syndrome.

Fifty-seven percent of the National Institutes of Health supportive research project grants require the use of animals. Continued experimentation with various animal models is necessary to establish some of the basic fundamental criteria of biological processes so we can apply this knowledge to human processes.

In the area of biotechnology resources, the computer resources located at the Latter-day Saints Hospital in Salt Lake City has become the unrivaled leader in developing comprehensive computer tools for both clinical research and patient care.

In the General Clinical Research Center at the Mayo Clinic, it was found that a newly discovered acid CDS—a bile acid—would dissolve gallstones, thereby alleviating the patients' suffering and relieving them from having to go through surgical removal of the gallbladder.

One of the new initiatives of DRR is the development of the minority schools biomedical support program, which was initiated during fiscal year 1972. Awards under this program will be made to competing minority institutions and will range from approximately \$30,000 to \$500,000 per year for a possible 5-year support period depending upon the size and quality of the institution's program.

The sources of general research support funds are included in the separate appropriation of the other Institutes and NIMH. They are then transferred to the general research support appropriation and administered by the Division of Research Resources. The amounts obtained from the other Institutes follow:

Based on the amount shown in the President's budget for 1973, \$54,624,000, the breakdown of funds transferred from each of the Institutes include the National Cancer Institute, \$5,924,000; National Heart and Lung Institute, \$8,149,000; National Institute of Dental Research, \$1,018,000; National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases, \$8,124,000; National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke, \$5,439,000; National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, \$5,040,000; National Institute of General Medical Sciences, \$6,975,000; National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, \$3,896,000; National Eye Institute, \$1,551,000; National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, \$481,000; and the National In-

stitute of Mental Health, \$8,027,000; for a total of \$54,624,000.

A prevalent and important hereditary disease in children and infants, cystic fibrosis, is being investigated at the University of Colorado center. In cystic fibrosis, an unusually vicious mucous destroys the lungs and also prevents absorption of fats and digestion of food. The major organs affected are the pancreas, testes, liver, gut, and lungs. The child has a constant feeling of suffocating and weakness and is prone to respiratory infections. Cystic fibrosis costs an enormous amount of time, money, and suffering. Many of the afflicted children never reach adulthood, but throughout their short lifespan, they require extensive and costly medical care.

Using a biochemical approach, it was determined that viscosity of the mucous secretions could be returned to normal by a variety of compounds. The next step was the selection of a nontoxic material used safely in clinical medicine. Arginine, an amino acid, was selected; it fulfilled these safety requirements as well as the biomedical requirements for treatment. Arginine was administered to a group of cystic fibrosis patients under close supervision by the medical and nursing staff.

The results of arginine treatment of cystic fibrosis have been most encouraging. The respiratory and digestive processes of many of these children improved significantly. In patients whose main problem was pulmonary, there was marked improvement in the power of the lungs. The children looked and felt better and had a greater tolerance for exercise. Those with digestive malfunctions similarly improved; they gained weight since their bodies were more capable of absorbing fats. The abdominal pain which accompanies this disease was also relieved.

These favorable results extend beyond the patient to include his family; arginine provides an inexpensive way of treating the complications of cystic fibrosis patients, thus lessening the financial burden. Moreover, the child's relief from pain and irritability helps establish better family relationships. It should be emphasized that arginine is not a proven, permanent cure for cystic fibrosis, but it relieves the immediate physical and psychological strain of the afflicted children and their parents.

In the area of biotechnology resources, the Jet Propulsion Laboratory's sophisticated computer-based techniques for enhancing and analyzing images have been applied successfully to a wide variety of medical problems. This, of course, is one of those "space spin-offs" we have heard so much about—using space age technology to enable scientists to obtain better knowledge of the workings of the human body, benefiting all mankind.

JOHN E. FOGARTY INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR ADVANCED STUDY IN THE HEALTH SCIENCES

The committee bill provides \$4,666,000 for this item, \$121,000 over the budget figure. This is an increase of \$359,000 over 1972.

This center is designed to facilitate and expand the continuing effort of the

National Institutes of Health and the U.S. Government to broaden the knowledge base of the biomedical sciences. The center serves as a focal point for the international activities of the NIH and is responsible for the administration of a number of international programs, such as international fellowships, Fogarty scholars-in-residence, conference and seminars, International Visitors Center, special foreign currency and foreign students exchange.

Also, last year the U.S. contribution to the support of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory became a responsibility of the Fogarty International Center and this year they have also assumed the programming responsibility for training of foreign health professionals sponsored by the World Health Organization, a function previously administered by the Bureau of Health Manpower Education.

A short time ago, obviously as a result of our rapprochement with the People's Republic of China, a meeting was held to review medicine in that country. This was attended by people outside the Government as well as representatives from the Institutes and other Federal agencies.

With the development of new techniques, especially in the area of genetics, the moral and ethical ramifications of those techniques must be studied. In October of 1971 the center held a conference on human genetics, entitled "Ethical Issues in Genetic Counseling and the Use of Genetic Knowledge" and was attended by 100 persons.

It brought representatives from the fields of law, religion, and ethics together with basic scientists, physicians, and genetic counselors involved in the diagnosis of human genetic diseases. The prime concern of the conference was the ethical and social issues which have arisen as a result of recent advances in our scientific knowledge of human genetics. These advances have enabled us to detect persons (carriers) who can transmit genetic diseases to their children and to determine, using the technique of amniocentesis, the presence or absence of disease in the fetus. The ethical questions which arise from this knowledge include: Should we detect carriers, and, if so, how should they be counseled about marriage and childbearing; how severe must a genetic disease be in order to warrant an abortion; who should decide whether a defective fetus should be aborted; what are the legal rights of the fetus and the parents.

These and other questions have particularly confronted those scientists who have developed and are applying the new methods in diagnosis of human genetic diseases. Since these are ethical and social questions, no rigid answers can be provided, but the conference provided the opportunity for a unique dialog between the leading scientists in this field and the ethicists, theologians, and lawyers who are also concerned about the application to society of the new genetic knowledge.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

The committee bill provides \$28,568,000 for this division, which is \$4,441,000 over 1972.

The National Library of Medicine, the

world's most important resource for biomedical documents, facilitates the application of biomedical information to the treatment and prevention of disease by acquiring, organizing, and disseminating informational materials to health professions. The NLM actively explores ways in which technological advances in the communications field can be applied to organizing that knowledge and making it available where and when it is needed. It is making its computerized bibliographic data base available to users in biomedicine throughout the country through the use of on-line computer terminals, linked by a commercial land wire network.

The library is currently using an old NASA satellite to make the expertise of local hospitals available for the health care of remote Alaskan villagers with no professional health personnel. I inspected this procedure when I visited the library last fall, and it is most ingenious. On at least two occasions it provided information which proved to be lifesaving. It has served to bring medical assistance to persons who previously could not be reached by telephone or radio communications. It has helped physicians determine when patients need to be evacuated to district or regional hospitals for emergency care. On the other hand, it has cut down on unnecessary bush plane evacuation when the patient could be managed by a health aide or local nurse after satellite consultation with a physician.

Health manpower programs would be funded at a level of \$738,628,000 for fiscal 1973, an increase of \$205 million over the budget request and \$64,957,000 over the 1972 funding level. Rather than go through this appropriation item by item, I would refer my colleagues to the section of the committee report beginning on page 41, in which each of the committee increases is discussed individually.

Turning now to the Office of Education, as has been pointed out the committee bill is \$301,455,000 above the budget request and \$54,147,000 above the 1972 level. Nearly \$1.5 billion in higher education programs lacked authorization when our committee considered the bill and, thus, has not been included.

Mr. Chairman, since we will continue debate on this bill tomorrow, at which time amendments will be offered to the education portion. I will defer further comment until that time. There are additional sections of the bill—Social and Rehabilitation Service, Social Security Administration, and the special institutions—which I want to discuss as well and these, too, I will defer until tomorrow's debate.

In closing, let me return briefly to the Department of Labor and, at this point, I would like to place in the RECORD, the several communications I discussed earlier in regard to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

F. MEYER & BRO. CO.,
Peoria, Ill., May 30, 1972.

Representative ROBERT MICHEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: I am writing to present my views on OSHA which are shared by most business men affected by the Act.

Most business men are in agreement with the spirit of this Act since the health and safety of our employees directly affects the morale and productivity of the work force. Then too a bad safety record directly penalizes us with high workmen's compensation rates and lost time expense. The Act has been beneficial in forcing us to take a hard look at working and safety conditions in our plants and to improve them where possible.

What I object to is the fact that the Act has taken the optimum or maximum standards as set forth by the various trade and professional groups and then demands that business meet these optimum standards and fines us when we do not or cannot meet them.

If the citizens of this country demanded the same high degree of accountability from our legislators and bureaucrats that the government increasingly demands of business many of them would soon be unemployed.

We all know that standards must be set and laws passed to guide us in running our businesses and our lives so that this results in the most good for the greatest number of people. What we are really asking is that common sense be used in administering the laws and requiring compliance with the standards. Businesses vary in nature as much as people and what is required of one should not necessarily be required of another and some standards should be seen as a goal that can only be reached by a few.

You well know that an increasingly large number of citizens view the operations of the federal government with disenchantment, dislike and sometimes outright disgust. An uncompromising and punitive enforcement of OSHA can only reinforce this attitude especially when the standards required do not really benefit either health or safety.

We have not yet been inspected but certainly expect to appeal what we regard as arbitrary, capricious and unreasonable citations.

We also know that our mutual friend, Ed Stoetzel, says the inspectors get "Brownie Points" for each citation made. One of our directors, a CPA, was quite incensed when his client was fined because a fire extinguisher was found standing on the floor. Surely a warning notice would have been sufficient. We hang most of our extinguishers with the tops six feet from the floor instead of the specified five feet. We wonder if we will be fined and forced to lower them where they can easily be dislodged by our high trucks.

Millions of dollars are being spent by business to get into compliance with OSHA. Where this results in better working and safety conditions it is moneys well spent. Where it is spent to meet some arbitrary standards with no regard to conditions in the business involved and no assurance that safety and health will benefit then it only detracts from the employers ability to pay higher wages and put this money into more productive equipment.

We know that there have been complaints about the administration and the requirements that are much stricter than necessary. We want to also enter our plea for a common sense approach.

Yours truly,

GEORGE MEYER,
President.

McDOUGAL-HARTMANN CO.,
Peoria, Ill., April 17, 1972.

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: Following up on our recent telephone conversation, I want to discuss further "The Occupational Safety and Health Act." This Act should have been written to cover industry apart from construction, because there is so much in the Act that cannot be applied to construction. This leads

to much confusion and unnecessary expense. It simply is not practical.

For instance, it states in this Act that all rubber-tired equipment must have fenders, regardless of where they are used. How can you use a motor patrol on a rough excavation job? It just won't work. But what is even worse, Congress has given Labor another club with which to clobber the Construction Industry. When is Congress going to wake up and give our industry an opportunity to meet Labor on even grounds?

According to this instrument, Labor has the authority to say whether or not a job is safe. We have already heard from business agents that they can break any contractor by claiming jobs are unsafe. If a job is thus declared "not safe" at 2:00 P.M., for example, all work stops as the result. It is my understanding that ex-business agents are to be used as "inspectors" to determine whether or not a job is safe.

In the face of all the irregularities in the Unions that you read about in the newspapers, Congress continues to give them more authority over industry. This can only lead to trouble for any employer. Things are so one-sided now when it comes to Labor, that it is almost impossible to operate a business.

This Act will increase our costs at least 30% with a chance that it will be much more, depending on the type of inspection. Where is all this money coming from?

It is my opinion that many contractors will go out of business in the very near future, especially the smaller ones; the very ones Government is trying to keep in business.

Sincerely yours,

H. W. HARTMANN,
President.

PEORIA, ILL., March 27, 1972.

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

We understand the House will hold a hearing on the Occupational Safety and Health Act. The following comments are offered for whatever use you may wish to make of them.

In general, Caterpillar Tractor Co. has found the Occupational Safety and Health Act to be administered effectively and efficiently. Inspectors have been capable, professional and efficient, and objective in applying OSHA regulations to plant situations.

The principal deficiency of OSHA is that it emphasizes conditions. The unsafe acts of people continue to be the principal causes of occupational accidents. Achieving conditions established under the law shows good faith in providing a safe workplace, but safety performance continues to depend largely on cultivating sound employee attitudes toward safety.

We believe OSHA could be improved in the following ways:

1. There is a need to reduce the period required to obtain an interpretation of regulations. Sometimes this requires as much as two months.

2. Provision should be made for inspectors to visit plants on a consultative basis. Presently, if a company requests an inspector to come in he will inspect the plant, issue citations and levy fines for any violations found. The interests of safety would be better served if inspectors could visit plants to give their professional opinions on conditions affecting safety, and establish a time frame for correcting those they believe are deficient. This approach would be particularly helpful to small companies that most need competent advice but hesitate to invite the stigma of citations and fines. Additionally, the practice of imposing fines for minor violations tends to interfere with the professional and consultative role of inspectors.

3. As yet, we have no experience in seeking variances, but we believe past performance

should be made a substantial consideration in granting them. For example, guard rails are 36 inches high in most of our plants. The OSHA regulations require them to be 42 inches high. We have no history of accidents that occurred because guard rails were no more than 36 inches in height. On this basis, it would seem that the substantial cost of raising guard rails will not improve safety and is not justified.

4. Permanent regulations, to replace the present interim regulations, are to be promulgated by April, 1973. Industry needs to know as soon as possible if there will be substantial changes so it will have time to study them and put them into effect.

R. R. HOFFMAN,
Manager, Safety.

LETTER FROM AL FULLER, OWNER, PEORIA HEIGHTS LUMBER CO., MAY 4, 1972

I am writing to you a few facts that concern me. I hope you will study H.R. 12068 and act with good judgment as you have in the past.

Approximately 20 years ago there were 26 lumber yards in the Greater Peoria Area, now only 4 remain of that 26. Two changed hands and three new cash and carries have started. In Peoria, Carver's and Siegel-Hunt's; Bartonville, Claus Lauterbach—H.R. changed hands. In Peoria Heights, We are left. (How long I don't know). In Aurora, Illinois there were 10 now only 3, possibly going to 2. Its like this all over the state according to the Director of Illinois Lumber and Building Material Dealers Association, Ed Sembell. Ask Sonny Meckemer why he went out.

I know there are many reasons why these yards went out of business, but government regulations, union pressures forced many to retire early and live on their investments, rather than fight the pressures of government costs and controls and union pressures.

I pride myself in being unselfish that profit is not the only motivating factor why I have stayed in business this long. I am a servant to the public. I try to make it easy for the home owner to pick up supplies for repairs and still come out even or a little ahead.

After a severe windstorm in the Peoria Area, we get many calls to fix the roof shingles. Many of these calls come from people who we have done work for or been referred by customers because they know we are honest and will not overcharge. Many times we have sent a carpenter out repairing a few shingles and the charge would be \$10.00 to \$15.00. We did this because the \$50.00 deductible insurance left the owner with the expense. We made a little or no profit and the customer was happy. A large percentage of my customers are retirees or people on fixed income and they appreciated the economy.

Now comes OHSA.

First, I must have specified ladders so I bought one 28'. (Used to be the owner would have one or a neighbor). Now on a roof call with a couple of shingles blown off, out goes the 28' ladder. This requires a big truck or the pick-up with suitable racks. A union driver must drive the truck (rate: \$4.62 hr.) a helper, yardman or laborer must go along (rate: \$4.52 hr.). The carpenter in the meantime drives his car to the job (\$8.00) which includes 51½ cents per hr. to pension fund. Because I directed the carpenter to the job, I am now liable if he has an accident and his insurance coverage is not enough—additional expense to me. OHSA says the ladder must be secured to the building, cannot be placed in a driveway unless there is a barricade around the ladder. So the helper goes along to hold the ladder. Union driver or teamster can't do this because of the union rules. Now the carpenter takes the 3 or 4 shingles, cost 45 cents, up the ladder and completes the work in 15-

20 minutes. He must have a life line or build a scaffold. All three men must wear safety shoes and helmets, more cost.

So that a 15 minute job now becomes 30-45 minutes, be silly to have the truck come back and go out again. So 2 men wait. When the job is finished they bring back the ladder or if we are lucky they may have another job and could proceed on to it and reduce costs. Meantime a truck has been tied up. So that \$10-\$15 job has now gone up to \$40-\$50. Who pays, the home owner. The only increase in cost except OSHA standards has been maybe 5 cents for the shingles and a 75 cents hr. raise for the carpenter in the last year. I know some contractors say they won't go out for less than \$80.00.

That is bad to comply with such regulations, but the worst is the fear of an inspector. Do you realize a violation on a job I just described could run between \$50.00 and \$500.00. The record keeping of OSHA requirements and a possible \$10,000 fine. I know these things were intended to larger employers and I know there are hazards that should be corrected. I'm not saying OSHA is not good, but latitude in correcting a situation should be considered. The seminars I have attended indicate the whims of these safety directors can fine you whatever they feel like and go according to the book.

In 26 years of operation, I have carried workmen's compensation with just two accidents, over 270,000 man hours in that time. One fellow jumped off the truck and a ring on his little finger caught the top stake—had to be amputated. Another, a ladder slipped and the employee said he hurt his back. After his settlement, which he agreed years later was in his favor, he continued to work and has for 10 years for other people.

The fear of penalties and my inability in my case (6-8 employees) to send someone to school to learn all of these rules, to have a safety director, first aid director. Why should I have worked and done without to build what I have got today be subject to someone who knows only the book and is out to show his power?

I say again all small businessmen I have talked to fear the penalties and fines, I don't think Hitler SS Troops were any more feared. I like others say to hell with it, its not fun being in business anymore. You can't take pride in your work when you know costs are prohibitive due to government regulations. We are intelligent men and my employees are intelligent, they don't work on something unsafe and good judgment has always prevailed on our jobs. Our record attests to that.

I'm sure OSHA is needed in many, many areas but it seems to me it should be helping businessmen with their problems not penalizing them without a chance to correct errors. I know some employers would take advantage of things, but these are a minority. 98% don't want any unsafe conditions for their employees.

Sorry this got so long, hope you can find time to read it.

A very appreciative friend.

AL FULLER.

These letters are very typical, I am sure, of many letters which Members of Congress have received from these harassed businessmen, particularly small businessmen, back home. That is why we held this figure to the budget and have written strong language in the report with the hope that some of these people will take a cue from the complaints we are getting every day.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has given us an example of how prices to the con-

sumer are forced up, costs and prices. Am I correct in understanding that there is money in this bill to send bureaucrats around the country to tell the consumer how much he should get out of his consumer dollar?

Mr. MICHEL. Yes, through the Office of Consumer Affairs, and Extension Service in the Department of Agriculture come to mind. Their funding will come up in another appropriation bill.

Mr. GROSS. Did not the committee give this outfit funds?

Mr. MICHEL. Is the gentleman talking about money for occupational safety and health in this bill?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. MICHEL. Yes. We have met the budget request.

Mr. GROSS. As with the increase in impacted school aid, where the committee was told that the program needs reform.

Mr. MICHEL. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. They not only got every dollar that they asked for but they got \$30 million more than last year. Is there not some way that the Appropriations Committee can rap some people over the knuckles by cutting their funds and thereby forcing reforms that all admit should be made? The chairman of the subcommittee apparently does not think so, but it seems to me that this committee, by using the purse strings, can do something.

Mr. MICHEL. If I might quickly respond as to whether we can rap them over the knuckles, the gentleman may recall a few years ago we attempted to do that in our subcommittee, and then the membership of this House racked up our subcommittee unmercifully with a \$1 billion increase in our bill, and we took the cue from that, saying, "Look, we are not going to let that happen to us again." I think the subcommittee feels that if there is going to be real pressure to alter our bill, we ought to do the best we can to meet the most pressing demands by acting prudently and wisely rather than yield to irresponsible action on this floor.

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

Mr. MICHEL. Yes, happily.

Mr. GROSS. There is no succor, no help for the taxpayers of this country if the subcommittee and the Appropriations Committee are going to roll over and play dead. Why not let the responsibility rest with the House of Representatives? You are assuming more than your share of the responsibility by bringing these bills to the floor.

Mr. MICHEL. Let me say to my dear friend that when his attention was being diverted away a few minutes ago, I said that there are 385 Members of this House of the total membership of 435 who get a piece of that action, and when we had the authorizing bill up here, that was the time to make the change, and the simple question of mathematics vis-a-vis Members for and Members against dictates to us that such a motion as proposed by the gentleman would go down the drain.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOGAN. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding. I have a great deal of respect and admiration for the gentleman in the well, but I was one of those who participated in the knuckle rapping to which the gentleman referred, and I might submit that since 385 congressional districts are recipients of impacted aid, we might consider this as a no-strings-attached revenue-sharing for education. I submit that for the gentleman's consideration.

I ask the gentleman, is he aware that the Maryland State Senate adopted a resolution on the subject of Impacted Aid for schools?

Mr. MICHEL. No; I never heard of that nor has anyone else having to do with this decision. It may be of interest that ever since President Kennedy and President Johnson sent up their budget requests on these items, it has been at about the level that was proposed by this administration. Every administration that I can remember, going back for the last decade, has proposed that we do away with it and get it back to its original intent and purpose, and that was to provide for payments in lieu of taxes for military bases or Federal installations where there is real Federal impact.

Mr. HOGAN. Would it be safe in assuming that the Maryland Senate resolution to which I referred had no result in the subcommittee's deliberations?

Mr. MICHEL. That is correct. Absolutely none.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased that the Appropriations Committee included in this bill \$641,405,000, an increase of \$210,495,000 over the budget request and \$29,525,000 over the comparable 1972 appropriation. I am also pleased that the amount provided in the bill for assistance for maintenance and operations under Public Law 874 is \$615,495,000, an increase of \$200,495,000 over the budget request, and \$22,915,000 more than the 1972 appropriation.

This is the amount estimated to be necessary to provide each school district the same percentage of its entitlement for 1973 as was provided by the 1972 appropriation; namely, 73 percent for "B" children, those whose parents either live or work on Federal property; 90 percent for "A" children, those whose parents both live and work on Federal property, and 100 percent for "A" children in heavily impacted school districts, where "A" children constitute more than 25 percent of total enrollment.

I commend the committee for rejecting language proposed in the budget which would have provided Public Law 874 payments only on behalf of dependents of uniformed services personnel, and would have eliminated payments on behalf of dependents of civilian employees of the Federal Government.

The bill also provides \$25,910,000 for assistance for school construction in federally affected areas under Public Law 815, an increase of \$10,000,000 over the budget request and \$6,610,000 over the 1972 appropriation.

When the administration first proposed to reduce the Public Law 874 part

of impact aid nearly \$177.5 million below its fiscal 1972 level of funding, I felt that it was neither in the national interest to cut back on this important program nor would it represent justice to the schoolchildren and taxpayers in my district.

During the committee hearings on this measure as I have done in past years, I testified in support of the impact aid program and urged the committee to restore these vital funds. As do 384 other of our colleagues in the House, I represent a congressional district whose schools rely heavily on Public Law 874 funds to compensate for lost tax revenue due to the Federal presence in our area. And without such Public Law 874 funding, the schools in my district would find it impossible to balance their budgets and maintain high caliber educational systems.

Every year since I have been in Congress I have fought before the committee and in this Chamber against reductions in impact aid payments because of the importance of those Federal contributions in helping to provide quality education for public school students across the Nation. As I mentioned earlier in my colloquy with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) I participated in the "knuckle rapping" he referred to. I had hoped that the administration would recognize Congress confidence in, and overwhelming support of, the impact aid program over the past 22 years, and would forgo the traditional yearly attempt to substantially reduce the program. If we are to have quality education in our public schools, impact aid funding must be continued at least at its current level. To do otherwise would mean fiscal chaos for local school systems which have already budgeted for next year based on expectations of a continuation of current Federal contributions.

Impact aid funds are not simply handouts from the Federal Government. Not only are they payments for the education of children of Federal personnel who work or live on tax-free Federal installations, but they are also payments in lieu of taxes which would be generated by the land occupied by Federal installations.

This year, the administration proposed to cut more than \$17 million from the Federal Government's contribution to Maryland for fiscal 1973. Such a cutback would have meant 65-percent reduction in funds for Prince Georges and Charles Counties in my congressional district. But this year is not the first year that the White House has tried to drastically cut these special funds paid to school districts which serve areas with Federal installations. Every President since Harry Truman has tried to trim back impact aid funds.

In 1969, my first year in Congress, the administration tried to cut back the impact aid funds. I and the majority of the Members of the House opposed the cutback, and full funding was restored.

At that time I voiced my opposition to the reduction to Mr. Nixon, saying:

Mr. President, I share your concern about the fiscal crisis facing our country, and I recognize the need for reducing Federal ex-

penditures and establishing priorities in domestic spending. It seems to me, however, that education should be the last program to be sacrificed. The minds of our people are our greatest natural resource, and if Americans are to cope with the complexities of the society in which they live, they must be afforded every possible educational advantage. Certainly, we should not place our school systems in jeopardy by the suddenness of a drastic reduction in funds.

In 1970, the administration again tried to cut impact aid and again the great majority of us in the House opposed it and funding was restored.

Last year, the White House proposed to reduce impact aid to \$430 million nationally and I again opposed that move.

I found this year's attempt to cut over \$177.5 million in impact aid funds particularly disturbing in light of the President's statement on busing, his commitment to provide quality education for all, and his call to Congress to fund programs aimed at insuring that goal.

There are currently thousands of school districts that rely on Public Law 874, section 3(b) payments to compensate for lost tax revenue due to the presence of Federal property. According to the National Education Association, estimate of school statistics, 1971-72, expenditures for public elementary and secondary education nationally have increased 154 percent in the last 10 years. Many local school districts in recent years have been extremely hard pressed to raise the necessary revenue to meet these rising costs of education. And for many of these school districts, impact aid, section 3(b) funds have meant the difference between a balanced budget and acute financial crisis.

In Prince Georges County, where property taxes average about \$4 per \$100 of assessed value and are already among the highest in the Nation, the loss of impact aid funds would necessitate a property tax increase of approximately 21 cents per \$100 of assessed value.

In Prince Georges County alone, the Federal Government owns and occupies 24,283 acres, or roughly 7.9 percent of the county's total acreage, most of which is extremely valuable because of its location in the Washington metropolitan area.

There is no way to calculate how much tax revenue that land would generate if it were in private hands, but one thing is clear; based on the administration's proposed impact aid contribution of \$3.8 million for fiscal 1973, the Federal Government would have paid less than \$160 per acre for use of some of the choicest land in the United States.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I simply wish to point out that the impact aid program has been working successfully for 22 years, in no small measure because it gives such great flexibility to school systems by allowing the funds to be employed to meet general operating expenses throughout the system instead of tying them to specific programs. It is, in effect, a kind of no-strings attached revenue sharing. About 56 percent of the Nation's schoolchildren are in school systems which receive Federal impact aid funds.

For 22 years, despite the efforts of every President from Harry S Truman

on, Congress and its authorizing committees have recognized the wisdom and value of the impact aid program, and we must resist the gutting of this program now. I urge my colleagues to support the impact aid funds in the legislation before us and hope that our colleagues in the other body will retain the funds.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Chairman, several weeks ago, in remarks to this distinguished body, I pointed to the need for increased funding of the research programs of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. This Institute faces the very formidable task of seeking scientific knowledge in the fields of human reproduction, including the causes and consequences of population growth, in the problems of child development, including mental retardation and the sudden infant death syndrome, and in adult development and the human aging process. I believe the proposed fiscal year 1973 budget for these research programs to be vastly insufficient given the magnitude of the task. The proposed budget would have not only precluded the financing of new investigation in all NICHD research areas but would have diminished present research efforts. The funding of competing research grants, training grants, and fellowships would have been affected by severe cutbacks. The requested budget increase of a mere less than 8 percent would barely hold the line against inflation in ongoing research. The level of funds requested would serve as a further discouragement to talented researchers who might otherwise enter these fields.

Therefore I believe it both heartening and significant that the House Appropriations Committee has given recognition to the urgent need for additional fiscal year 1973 funds for NICHD. Its recommendation to increase the budget by just over \$3 million restores funds for competing research grants, training grants, and fellowships to their fiscal year 1972 level of funding. I wish to commend and express my appreciation to Mr. Flood and members of his committee for responding to the need for vigorous action in health research. As the committee has pointed out, advances in biomedical research require at the very least a maintenance of effort. The large and complex undertakings of NICHD require systematic and continued attention, given its responsibility for protecting the health of every American.

I am particularly grateful to the committee for pointing out the critical and still unmet need for improved and acceptable fertility control technology. As chairman of the Republican Task Force on Population Growth, I have a deep concern that the Federal population research program not be given short shrift in our striving to improve human health and well being. As the President's Commission on Population Growth and the American Future has stated, methods of fertility regulation remain limited because our knowledge of basic reproductive biology is inadequate. I personally

believe that the Congress must encourage the growth of the population research program if our national health goals are to be realized. This knowledge is essential not just for regulating fertility, but also for improving the outcome of pregnancy. The social science program in population will enable us to ascertain the consequences of continued population growth and to more adequately structure programs to meet the needs of America's population.

The committee is also to be applauded for its recognition of the need for continued and expanded research in prematurity, the primary cause of infant mortality and morbidity, and its expression of concern for research into the sudden infant death syndrome, and the prevention and amelioration of mental retardation. It has furthermore encouraged the growth of research on the aging process and has recommended vigorous efforts in this field.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, did the committee give the NLRB and its trial examiners everything they wanted, despite the fact that they testified in the hearing that they dispose, on the average only one case a month?

Mr. MICHEL. Yes, we did. I might say to the gentleman that over the course of the years I have gone round and round with the chairman and several members of the Board. We had a problem a number of years ago when there was a big backlog of cases. We addressed ourselves to that problem and gave them additional people to cut into the backlog. We think they have cleared it up, and we do not want to see them fall into that situation again.

Mr. GROSS. The hearing record shows that in the past they disposed of as many as 40 cases each per year. Now it is down to 12 or 13 cases per year on the average, and the chairman of the subcommittee calls that "a very unimpressive record" in the hearings, but still they get everything they asked for.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman on the floor at this time, as I did previously, and the chairman and other members of the subcommittee.

I hope the subcommittee will see fit to make inquiries of the Office of Management and Budget. As the gentleman will recall, this Congress passed legislation, really requested by the President on a special action of his, for a drug abuse program. The President signed that bill March 21 of this year. Yet it is my understanding that all this time the committee has sat in on these hearings, and the Office of Budget and Management did not get up the budget request to carry out that program the President, himself, has given the highest priority to.

Certainly it is one of the major national problems we face. I wonder if the gentleman could comment on that and

see if we can get some action on it. It is certainly needed, but I know the gentleman's committee did not have the request before it.

Mr. MICHEL. Yes, and some of us, as individual Members have been in touch with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, who is now the new Secretary of the Treasury, and with Mr. Weinberger taking over from Mr. Shultz. The same observations have been made to him, and I hope, if by no other way than by this colloquy, the agitation will be such as to move them off dead center.

Mr. ROGERS. I thank the gentleman. I hope the gentleman's committee will, and certainly our committee will ask for some action, because this must be handled immediately, or we will get completely behind, even more behind in the action on drug abuse.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. HATHAWAY).

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

At the appropriate time, I shall offer an amendment to the bill which is above the budget by \$364 million.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Forty Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 202]

Abernethy	Evins, Tenn.	Mailliard
Abourezk	Findley	Melcher
Abzug	Fish	Miller, Calif.
Addabbo	Flowers	Minish
Alexander	Ford	Mosher
Anderson, Tenn.	Gerald R. Gallagher	Nichols
Archer	Giallino	Perkins
Ashbrook	Gray	Pryor, Ark.
Ashley	Griffiths	Rangel
Barrett	Hagan	Reid
Bell	Halpern	Rooney, N.Y.
Betts	Hébert	Rosenthal
Bingham	Horton	Rostenkowski
Blanton	Hosmer	Sandman
Brademas	Jarman	Serbanes
Broomfield	Karsh	Scheuer
Byrne, Pa.	Kastenmeier	Shlepley
Carey, N.Y.	Keating	Springer
Celler	Kee	Stanton.
Chisholm	Keith	J. William
Clark	King	Steiger, Ariz.
Clay	Kuykendall	Steiger, Wis.
Diggs	Kyros	Stevens
Dingell	Leggett	Stratton
Dowdy	Long, La.	Talcott
Downing	McClary	Thompson, N.J.
Dwyer	McCloskey	Tieman
Edmondson	McDonald,	Vander Jagt
Edwards, Calif.	Mich.	Wiggins
Ellberg	McEwen	Wilson.
Eshleman	McMillan	Charles H. Zablocki

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOLFIELD, 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. 15417, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 341 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the

absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. At the time the point of no quorum was made the Chair had recognized the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) for 20 minutes.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

REVENUE SHARING: THE WAYS AND MEANS APPROPRIATION AND AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the fires of patriotism were glowing brightly in the House of Representatives today during the Flag Day ceremonies, and I doubt if there were any present in the House or in the gallery at that time who did not feel a tingle down their spines as we said together in unison the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag and as we stood and sung the Star-Spangled Banner.

THE LABOR-HEW BILL BEFORE US

It is because we love our country and want to act in her best interest that we meet here today to consider what is in effect a \$96 billion appropriation bill. The bill before us, counting the trust funds administered by the agencies covered herein, relates to \$96 billion of budget authority.

The year I was elected to the Congress the total expenditures of the Federal Government for all purposes were about \$6 billion, but the pending bill alone involves some \$96 billion.

We need to pause and give thought to the great, profound, dangerous issues confronting the Nation.

The gentleman from Maine, prior to my rising to speak, took steps to announce that he was going to propose an amendment to increase the pending bill by about \$360 million above the present level. And the bill is already \$900 million, plus, above the budget requests.

It is not wise for us to consider this measure or any spending measure separately and out of context with the entire budget program of the Government. So I want to try to place in proper perspective the whole spending picture of our Government.

I suspect that if the revenue-sharing bill comes up on the floor next week—and it may—and it may not—the vote which we cast may probably be the most significant and important vote that any Member will cast during his period of service here in the House of Representatives. So it is important that we consider this bill in the context of the revenue-sharing measure which in effect is an appropriation measure and which may or may not be approved by the House.

REVENUE SHARING: AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS COME—AND GONE

As was said in an editorial in one of our great newspapers yesterday, revenue sharing is an idea whose time has come—and gone.

Revenue sharing, I believe, was conceived by Walter Heller, a well known economist, in the early 1960's, when it appeared that the Federal tax structure was such that it would be generating vast sums of money for which we had no spending purpose insofar as the Federal Government was concerned. It was

thought that a large, overwhelming surplus would be confronting us. There was worry about a fiscal drag.

Think of it. Was that not a grand and glorious moment, when we could ponder such a delightful problem? It vanished so quickly.

Yes, this was the atmosphere in which the idea of revenue sharing was conceived and brought to the forefront. But what brushed it aside? It was the programs of the Great Society, which rapidly accelerated, and the war in Vietnam. And so the vast potential surplus which some wanted to share with the States and local communities vanished. Instead of that, we have a desperately serious budget deficit situation.

THE CLIMBING FEDERAL DEBT

Yes, the average deficit in Federal funds to run the Government during the 1960's was about \$10 billion a year. But in the 4-fiscal-year period concluding with the end of fiscal year 1973, we will be running a Federal funds deficit averaging about \$28 billion per year, nearly three times as much per year as in the 1960's.

As a result of this borrowing to pay our bills, the debt will go up more than \$110 billion during this 4-year period—representing about one-fourth of the total monumental national debt which has accumulated over the entire history of our Nation.

Here are the Federal funds deficit figures for the 4 fiscal years 1970 through 1973: \$13 billion, \$30 billion, \$32 billion, \$38 billion—climbing, climbing, climbing. And people talk about tax reductions and revenue sharing.

GROWTH IN FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES AND LOCALITIES

In view of our growing deficits, we are already doing more for the States and local communities than we probably are able to do—more than we can afford to do because of the terrible fiscal plight of the Federal Government at this time.

Then, when you start a program of revenue sharing at what will be called a low level of only \$30 billion for 5 years, that is chicken feed. That is a mere pittance of what it will become once it is begun.

With reference to the grants to the States and local communities in 1960, what did we spend? We spent \$7 billion.

For the fiscal year which ends this month—fiscal 1972—how much are we spending in grants to the States and local communities? Not \$7 billion—but \$37 billion.

That is how rapidly these grant-in-aid programs climb. But revenue sharing will climb a lot more precipitously than that if it ever starts down the pike. I have no doubt of that, because of the broad based lobby groups it involves and helps to organize. I dare say that no one would undertake to dispute that fact.

CATEGORICAL GRANTS VERSUS REVENUE SHARING

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, would the distinguished gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. MAHON. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, there certainly is no one in this

House who commands more respect, I am sure, on matters of fiscal policy than the distinguished gentleman from Texas. There is no man who through the years that I have been here has displayed more knowledge and more deep feeling and more sincerity on this very important question of somehow regaining control of the fiscal situation in our country than the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

But it seems to me that the argument made by the distinguished gentleman in describing, and very accurately so, the vast expansion that has taken place in the categorical aid programs—

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. From \$7 billion to \$37 billion in just 10 years is not an argument against revenue sharing but, rather, it is a very good argument in favor of making a new departure, of trying somehow to stanch this flow, this hemorrhage, that is going on insofar as the Federal Treasury is concerned, and instead of relying on this kind of aid tell the States and local communities that here we are going to give you this opportunity by giving you this very limited amount of money, giving you an opportunity what frankly must be regarded an innovative and experimental program over 5 years to see if you cannot do a better job with this than we have done over the last decade with the \$37 billion in the categorical programs. I think the gentleman has stated a good argument in favor of a new approach.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his contributions, but here is a point that seems to refute the suggestion of my good friend.

If revenue sharing was being proposed to the Congress as a substitute for the \$37 billion in categorical grants—if the administration had requested \$5 billion less per year in categorical grants—then there might be some substance to the argument of my friend. But it is proposed that we pile this \$30 billion program at the rate of more than \$5 billion a year on top of the \$37 billion which we have made available in categorical grants for the fiscal year 1972.

A TIGER BY THE TAIL

Anyone knows that if we start this program of revenue sharing on the basis of what will be called an inadequate level of only \$5 billion a year, it will grow very rapidly. When we start down that road it will indeed be at a gallop.

As I said once before in this House, if you grasp this tiger by the tail, you will find it difficult to turn him loose.

Never in this century would you ever turn that tiger loose, and everyone here knows it.

ASSISTANCE TO STATES AND LOCALITIES

Yes, we have done a great deal for the States and the local communities. They are in difficulty, but most of them are not in as much fiscal difficulty as the Federal Government. Some of them are in as much or more difficulty than the Federal Government, I agree. And it is a matter of great concern to all of us. But what have we done for them?

In Federal assistance to State and local communities, we went in the period 1960 to 1972 from \$7 billion to \$37 billion.

In 1960, of total nondefense Federal spending, 16 percent went to the States and local communities. But of total nondefense Federal spending in 1972—not 16 percent, but 26 percent is going to aid States and local communities. That is an additional 10 percent of the nondefense Federal dollar. It is about a 60-percent increase in Federal assistance to States and localities during that period.

You ask what we have done? We are concerned and have helped.

In 1960, we provided State and local communities with 11 percent of their revenues. But in 1972, we provided them with 21 percent of their revenues for their expenditures, and yet some of the mayors—some of whom have not done such a brilliant job—come in here in the shadow of this Capitol and get the roll and check on Members of Congress and apply pressure for more, and more, and more.

But let us not be swept off our feet. Let us be strong. Let us be wise. Let us look beyond the ends of our noses at the future. It does not take a very wise man to see what is in prospect.

A VOTE FOR REVENUE SHARING IS A VOTE FOR A TAX INCREASE

I mark my words when I say a vote for revenue sharing is a vote for a tax increase. Of course, it is. Can there be anyone who thinks to the contrary?

If you add on to the \$37 billion we are already providing for grants to States and localities in 1972 another \$5 billion in 1973 for revenue sharing, expenditures will go up \$5 billion more in the fiscal year 1973.

Spending will go up that much more precipitously. And that will only be the beginning.

Where will the revenues come from?

A vote for revenue sharing I say—and mark my words—will be a vote for a tax increase. You can tell your mayors and your folks back home that this would be a vote for a tax increase in 1973. Keep that squarely in mind.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE REVENUE SHARING VOTE

There are a lot of distasteful problems here. Perhaps the most important vote that we will ever cast in our service here relates to this matter of revenue sharing. Revenue sharing is wrong in principle. This bill recommends a program that separates two inseparables—political responsibility for taxing and responsibility for spending.

Do Members want to bear the agony of raising taxes next year to support spending by States and local officeholders? Think about it.

Maybe as a temporary expediency revenue sharing might sound good. But in the long pull, I think those who become committed to this will find themselves in a box.

What will the States and the local communities do with this Christmas tree handout? Will they spend it as wisely since they do not raise these revenues as they would otherwise?

Of course, they do have their problems but revenue sharing is not the answer. If you cannot save the States and local communities with grants of \$37 billion,

how can you save them with this additional grant?

A MILE WIDE AND AN INCH DEEP

The revenue-sharing money will be spread so thin. How many local communities are there in the United States? There are 38,000. You are going to try to spread these funds out to these 38,000 governmental units in this country. Where will you find yourself? You will find yourself with a stream a mile wide and an inch deep and you will not solve the problems that confront the country and confront the States and the cities. It will not dent them. But it will more or less signal the takeover by the Federal Government. Everybody knows that if we appropriate Federal money, eventually there is going to be a Federal takeover. You know that. And why shouldn't the Federal Government eventually take over if the Federal Government is providing the funds?

The illustrious late Senator Dirksen of Illinois once remarked that the day might come in this country when only Rand McNally would be interested in State lines. And I would add county lines and city lines. If that day is coming, I guarantee it will be hastened by the approval of revenue sharing.

Some Members say, "I am having difficulty with my people on revenue sharing—with my mayors—not the people."

Well, let us fortify ourselves with the facts and discuss these facts with our friends at home.

They will be on our team generally speaking in my judgment if they explore the problem fully.

THE REVENUE-SHARING LOBBY

If revenue sharing becomes the law of the land, Members of Congress could well become puppets on a string. We would be dancing to the tune played by the 38,000 governmental jurisdictions throughout the United States.

The lobby now is nothing by comparison to what it would be. It is peanuts compared to what it will be after we establish the vested interests that will grow out of these funds. Is that not clear to Members?

We are helping States and local communities now far beyond what our revenues provide.

Some of our friends are here now lobbying. But, my, after the sweet taste of this painless \$30 billion, what could they do? And how helpless might we be then unless we are quite strong in resisting the pressures for more and more now? The passage of the revenue-sharing bill will organize and galvanize the most powerful lobby group that this country has ever known.

I was reading one of the newspapers this morning. Finally, over on a further page, I read, "Revenue-sharers say they have the votes." They had checked us off on their list. The article said, they have the votes. But that check will be nothing compared to what will happen in 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976, and 1977 up to the year 2000, and so on. Yes, they say they have the votes. They have checked us off.

I called the Library of Congress today and said "Give me a little data about Stonewall Jackson."

They said, "Well, on July 21, 1861, the unpleasantness growing out of the war between the States, the first battle of Bull Run was fought and it was quite an engagement." The forces from the South were doing quite well. Brigadier General Bee saw Stonewall Jackson and here is a quotation of his statement:

Brigadier General Bee shouted, "There is Jackson standing like a stone wall."

My friends of the House, when the time comes to cast our votes, will we stand like a stone wall and repel the blandishments and the expediency arguments of others? Perhaps the case is in doubt. I do not know what may happen. But a good fight in a righteous cause is well worth making.

Regardless of one's views on revenue sharing—and I support the degree of revenue sharing in which we are now engaged by way of special grants, sharing \$37 billion to help States and local communities. We actually have been sharing more than we have had to share.

THE RULE ON THE REVENUE-SHARING BILL

The question arises as to an open rule on this Ways and Means Committee appropriation bill.

As chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I do not recall that I have ever asked for a closed rule on a general appropriation bill. I would not have the temerity to do so. I would not do that to the House. We are not children. We are adults. All of us are at least 25 years of age.

But what has been requested under the rule by which we are to consider revenue sharing—a straight forward appropriation bill? Thank heavens it passed the committee by only one vote. It has been requested in this rule that you, elected by the people, each representing about 470,000 people, will not be able to offer one amendment to this appropriation bill. Is that not ridiculous? Of course it is.

Well, is it an appropriation or a revenue bill? Examine it. It does not raise one nickel in revenue. The language in the bill reads:

There is hereby appropriated out of any amounts in the general fund of the Treasury—

That is standard language used in this bill, appropriating so much money. That is the customary language which is used in appropriation bills. And it provides the money on a yearly basis up to 5 years, giving Congress no opportunity to exercise its responsibility to account for the prudent expenditure of these funds by means of the time honored annual review process.

Yes, it is an unvarnished appropriation bill. I know there is some hazard in providing an open rule on a tax bill, and I am not advocating an open rule on the tax code part of the bill. But I am saying that we should not agree to a closed rule on this appropriation part any more than we do on any other general appropriation bill.

Certainly we should not have a closed rule on an appropriation bill extending for 5 years. How absurd can we be? How absurd?

I would suppose if we are going to have this program that we should advance

fund it for 1 year so the State and local governments can know from year to year what they are getting. That amendment would, no doubt, be offered if we consider the bill under an open rule. Some say, "Oh, if you open it up, you will have this amendment, or you will have that one." Are we not able as men and women to do our duty with respect to this matter? We are prepared to do just that with the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill now before us. And goodness knows we expect amendments to be offered, regardless of the efforts of the Members of the committee to produce a bill acceptable to the House.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina.

REVENUE SHARING—AN AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, is it not true the bill not only appropriates the money, but it authorizes it?

Mr. MAHON. It absolutely perverts the legislative committee system of the Congress. Of course, it does. The bill proposes to spend a great deal of money for a 5-year program for activities now subject to authorization by the legislative committees. On May 22, I wrote to all Members citing examples of how the bill impinges upon several committees.

Yes, the committees are just trampled upon like stepchildren. Shall we permit it? My committee does not want me to permit it. I have talked to my committee.

NO GROUNDSWELL FOR REVENUE SHARING

Some people think there is a great public groundswell of support for this bill. No.

I understand the Governor of New York was in Washington in support of it. I have great respect for the Governor—we have been friends for many years—but the groundswell from the people is not there.

Shall we be frightened? Shall Members of the House of Representatives be frightened by a group of mayors and Governors? Shall we panic into doing something we will everlastingly regret, and that will tend to basically alter our federal form of government? Shall we do it? Not with my vote.

NO CLOSED RULE

So we do not want to have a closed rule. Let us let the House work its will.

Did not your people think enough of you when they asked you to serve in the Congress to assume that you could vote intelligently? Of course they did.

Never in the history of the Congress have we ever been faced with an appropriation bill like this. Certainly the House must be permitted to work its own will on anything as important as this issue.

I am very much concerned that the House do the right thing. I am not worried about the people who do their homework. They know what is really involved in this issue. I am concerned about those who have listened only to a few mayors and not to the people, because the people know in revenue sharing what is going to happen. They know how it is going to gobble money, and they are not naive.

They know that more money must mean increased taxes.

The mayors are under heavy pressure, and we cannot blame them for welcoming money for which they did not have to raise taxes, but we do not need to take them off the hook.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is my observation we are not going to increase taxes in this Congress. The administration is vigorously opposed to it. We are obviously not going to increase taxes.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman means this year?

EXPENDITURE CEILING

Mr. CORMAN. In this Congress. And I would think not in the next Congress in the first half of next year, but, be that as it may, we are undoubtedly going to have an expenditure ceiling. I do not think the Ways and Means Committee is going to bring in an increase in the debt ceiling unless our committee imposes an expenditure ceiling. We are spending a total of \$7 billion on revenue sharing. There are only a limited number of places to cut that \$7 billion out of. Am I correct?

Mr. MAHON. I would say to the gentleman that 71 percent of the budget outlays are relatively uncontrollable under present law in the fiscal year 1973, according to the budget that came to us in January.

Mr. CORMAN. And we have appropriations requests in the neighborhood of \$270 billion, and there is a proposed \$250 billion expenditure ceiling. I wonder if the gentleman might indicate to us what programs might possibly be cut if we are saying that we will have the \$7 billion in revenue sharing, because certainly we have to impose limits.

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Texas 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Of course, the administration, I assume, would choose to spend the revenue sharing money in fiscal year 1973 if Congress provides it.

Mr. CORMAN. Oh, yes, sir.

Mr. MAHON. I do not know what it might come out of, or whether the administration would seek to offset in other items, and I do not propose to vote for revenue sharing and then try to explain that.

But there is another thing that bothers me a little, I might say to my friend, the gentleman from California. Why would the Ways and Means Committee be proposing an expenditure ceiling at this time? This is the committee which has brought out this revenue-sharing bill that raises no revenues, but propels us on to greater spending. How could the same Committee on Ways and Means in good conscience and with a straight face come in with an expenditure ceiling proposal? Will somebody explain that?

Mr. CORMAN. It may be easier for the seven members of the minority to explain that.

Mr. MAHON. That may well be so.

NO GROUNDSWELL FROM THE PEOPLE

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. The gentleman made the statement that he sees no political groundswell for revenue sharing and I want to offer concrete evidence to support his statement. I just finished a primary in which my opponent made support of revenue sharing the only issue of the campaign. I want to say that this issue was not worth 10 votes. There was absolutely no support for that position.

If the Members think the voters want revenue sharing and are inclined to vote for it because it is politically expedient to do so, they are very much mistaken. On the basis of my recent political experience I agree entirely with Mr. MAHON that the voters do not want revenue sharing.

I agree entirely with the chairman.

Mr. MAHON. I am sure that the experience of the gentleman from Maryland could be matched many times. That is one of the reasons why we should act objectively now.

But the pressures of the lobby, if this program gets going and accelerates, will be tremendous, as the gentleman well knows.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, who, I assume, would not favor an expenditure ceiling, because he is adding by his vote on the Ways and Means Committee appropriation bill another \$30 billion of spending over the next 5 years.

Mr. CONABLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding so graciously.

I am a little surprised that the distinguished chairman has expended so much time and so much earnestness in discussing a bill on which we are expecting 8 hours of debate next week.

I wonder if the gentleman would care to relate his remarks to the bill now before the House. Does the gentleman intend to stand like a stone wall with respect to extensions beyond the budget of this particular type of categorical aid program, which he acknowledges has been a siren song for our communities, destroying their discretionary money? The total is \$94 billion that has been expended in this way, and obviously it has been a failure as a type of aid program.

Would the gentleman care to relate his remarks to this bill now before the House?

Mr. MAHON. I would be glad to. I made reference to the bill before us earlier. I would not say that all the aid we provided in these programs, at the current rate of \$37 billion a year, has been a waste. I believe some tremendously important, far-reaching things, helping people in the communities all over the Nation, have taken place. Many good things have come of these programs.

I am sure the gentleman from New York has voted for these programs. I have voted for many of them myself. The gentleman from Illinois, the rank-

ing minority member of the subcommittee, knows something of the good that has been done through these programs. We have volumes of testimony to attest to that.

How do we relate to proposals to increase the bill over the budget? It is already \$912 million over the budget. That is not totally with my blessing, but, after all, I am only one of 55 members of the committee.

One of the members is proposing to offer an amendment to provide \$360 million additional over the budget.

I shall stand, like Stonewall Jackson, Thomas Jonathan Jackson, at Bull Run, and oppose these amendments. That is my feeling, and I hope the House will not agree to these amendments.

We have done pretty well on our appropriation bills this year. We are over the budget in the bill before us today, but we have been under the budget in other bills we have already brought to the House and we will be under the budget in bills yet to be presented to the House.

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

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

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the Ways and Means Chairman; pardon me, I misspoke. I yield to my friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. COLMER. Since the gentleman has a full minute, I should like to take half of that to say that if I were the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and could have exerted some influence there, the revenue-sharing bill would not be here to be discussed. And that is no reflection upon the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

What I really wanted to ask my friend was this: With the deficits he has explained and considering the fact that Mr. MILLS, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, has asked my committee for a hearing next week as to raising the debt ceiling and the fact that he indicated again he was going to ask us in October to raise it still further, how can we talk about deficit—I am sorry; that is what I call it—they call it revenue sharing.

We do not have any revenue to share, as the gentleman pointed out. What are we going to have to do? We are going to have to borrow this money, pay interest on it, and give it to the States under the guise of revenue sharing.

That really does not seem to make sense to this common man.

Finally, I wanted to say to my friend that I agree with what he said about this rule. It should not be a closed rule.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) so that the topic of this discussion can all be in its proper place.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I strolled into the Chamber a few minutes ago, and I have been listening for the last 15 or 20 minutes with great interest to the remarks

of the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

I had expected to make my defense of the revenue-sharing bill under the closed rule on next Wednesday when we are scheduled to take up this legislation. But I certainly do not object to the discussion going on at this time. It is surely going to be one of the most important and one of the most landmark pieces of legislation to come before this or any other Congress. However, I could not help but think of the meeting of the Committee on Rules which took place this morning as I listened to the gentleman from Texas deny the suggestion that we seek in fiscal year 1973 to share \$5.3 billion in Federal revenue.

I sat upstairs in this Capitol Building in the Rules Committee and voted against a rule which was asked for by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency today that in one single bill would commit this Federal Government to another \$5 billion in categorical programs under the Community Facilities Administration of HUD, most of it to be spent in the next 12 months. He said two-thirds of it was going to be spent in the next 12 months of the \$5 billion to be authorized.

If the gentleman from Texas really wants to do something about halting the situation he talked about, the categorical aid programs, which have mushroomed from \$7 billion to \$37 billion, I would suggest again that the only way he is going to do it is by adopting a revenue-sharing program so that we will have an answer to the people like the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) who come before us repeatedly and say we simply must have yet another categorical aid program to help local communities with their water and sewer needs.

There is plenty of opportunity to formulate that kind of plan in the revenue-sharing bill to help our communities, to make funds available under the environmental protection program to take care of the water and sewer facilities.

But we have one more categorical aid program that has already been launched for \$5 billion as a result of the action that was taken just this morning by the Rules Committee.

On the question of the rule—and certainly I do not lightly differ with my honorable friend and distinguished chairman (Mr. COLMER) but I just happen to have in front of me a chart that indicates that there have been 16 closed rules granted in the 91st Congress. To date six closed rules have been granted in this Congress. They covered such varied matters as the sugar bill, House Joint Resolution 1005, continuing appropriation for fiscal 1972, the interest equalization tax extension bill, the Federal employees salary increases, the Social Security Act Amendments of 1970, and I could go on and on.

These are not just revenue measures. There is a long and very respectable precedent for what the Rules Committee did in granting a closed rule on the bill on which the Ways and Means Committee has labored for literally 10 months

in working out a very complicated formula for the allocation of these funds.

Let me suggest that I am very glad that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) made his speech today, because there has been a rumor going around the Capitol to the effect that the only thing that offends the Appropriations Committee is that we granted a rule that waives points of order, and that this deprives them of the right that they would otherwise have of making points of order against that provision of the bill to appropriate as well as to authorize funds. But, I think the gentleman from Texas has made it abundantly clear in his usual honest and forthright manner that he is going to make every effort to kill the bill. He is very fundamentally against revenue sharing, period. But if there has been granted the kind of rule that would allow him to raise a point of order it would carve the very heart out of the revenue sharing proposal, because once you submit it to the appropriations process, what is the committee going to do in exercising its jurisdiction?

It will seek to establish the standards and criteria by which those funds shall be expended by State and local governments.

The Appropriations Committee would not be able to properly exercise its jurisdiction if it did not follow this procedure. But this is the very thing we want to get away from—namely, to merely create another categorical aid program.

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

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

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. It does seem to me grossly indefensible to have an appropriation bill of \$30 billion—

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Now, let me state to the gentleman that this is not a \$30 billion appropriation bill for the first year. Let us make it clear that we are talking about \$5.3 billion for the first fiscal year, which is virtually the amount of a single categorical program that we had before us in the Rules Committee this morning.

Does not the gentleman from Texas think that if local officials are intelligently going to plan for the most judicious use of these funds, they have got to have the assurance that we are not going to be withholding funds from them in some future year. They have to know whether or not they will be available.

Mr. MAHON. I would say, the Congress could assure them for 1 year in advance, and still retain the principle of annual review.

But I was not so much complaining that the Committee on Appropriations could not offer any amendment. I was complaining that no Member of the House could offer an amendment except the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. On a spending bill of such far reaching importance I regard that as an affront to the House of Representatives.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I would say to the gentleman, we have been af-

fronted—all of the Members of this House have been affronted about 31 times in this Congress and the two preceding Congresses because that is the exact number of closed rules that there have been over that period of time.

I suppose there ought to be some limit to the indignity that we heap on Members of this body, but 31 times in the 90th, 91st, and 92d Congresses, closed rules have been granted.

Mr. MAHON. I am only talking of the appropriation bills and insofar as I am aware not one in the history of this Congress has been before us under a closed rule.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. We had some continuing resolutions. I have here a continuing resolution on the Department of Transportation that came out of the Committee on Appropriations on the 31st of December 1970, under a closed rule.

I have another continuing appropriation—this time in 1972, which came out of the Committee on Appropriations on the 13th of December 1971, under a closed rule.

Mr. MAHON. And the original appropriation bills to which they pertain were all subject to amendment. The continuing resolutions to which reference is made were made necessary by very special circumstances in the closing hours of the session, where a conference impasse had been reached on the regular bills—the SST issue on the transportation appropriation bill in December of 1970 and the controversy on the foreign aid appropriation bill in December of 1971.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, all I want to talk about is \$1 billion.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) for health, education, and welfare.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, somebody in this Congress once said that when a ship is set adrift in a storm tossed sea, the mariner avails himself of the compass and tries to get his ship back on course.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is an excellent idea if we talk about health, education, and welfare.

Mr. Chairman, I want to heartily commend the great Chairman DAN FLOOD and the members of both parties who serve on the Labor-HEW Appropriations Subcommittee for reporting to the floor today a bill which goes a considerable distance toward restoring many of the cutbacks in the health field recommended by President Nixon in his January budget.

In my remarks of May 10 on the floor of this body, I pointed out that although President Nixon as far back as 1969 had referred to a "crisis in health care," his recommended budget, if accepted, would have resulted in severe cutbacks in health manpower training, nurse training, mental health, alcoholism, hospital construction programs, and many other areas too numerous to list at this point. Outside of a commendable increase in the budget for the National Cancer Institute and a bare cost of living increase in the National Heart and Lung

Institute, it would have resulted in cutbacks in research and training programs for the eight other Institutes which comprise the National Institutes of Health, the acknowledged leader of research in the entire world.

Mr. Chairman, increased appropriations for medical research and health care are vital. They not only save precious lives, but they also save money. For instance, I received recently a report from the Massachusetts Health Department documenting the point that the Department's measles eradication program had saved the State approximately \$7 million over the past 6 years. In addition, the program reduced the number of reported cases by 98 percent, from 19,500 in 1965, to 276 in 1971. This reduction is truly miraculous and greatly important to the health of the people of my State.

I have also learned from the Massachusetts Department of Mental Health that the development of community mental health centers throughout my State has reduced the population in our formerly overcrowded State hospitals by more than 50 percent; and in the last decade alone, it has saved the State of Massachusetts close to \$1 billion.

Mr. Chairman, I have been following the daily press predictions that these modest increases in the health budget voted by the House Appropriations Committee may be subject to a presidential veto. Just the other day, I read such a warning in the June 9, 1972, issue of that well-known liberal publication, the Wall Street Journal. Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand this kind of rationalization. This is the one bill which in its entirety affects the health, the education and the welfare of every American family. If any appropriations bill is to be described as a people's bill, this bill is it.

Even with the modest increases voted by the committee, only a little more than \$4 billion will be devoted in fiscal year 1973 for programs aimed at changing and improving the conditions of the Nation's health as a whole. The committee increase over the administration's request is only \$611 million.

To that small band of carping critics who are crying veto already, I suggest a look at the fiscal year 1973 Pentagon budget request. In its initial presentation, the Department of Defense requested \$81.8 billion, an increase of \$4.7 billion over fiscal year 1972, but that is not the end of the story. Last week Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, who during his service in the House was a strong advocate of more moneys for health programs under both Republican and Democratic administrations, informed committees of the House and Senate that our recent escalation in Southeast Asia would probably require a budget amendment adding a minimum of \$5 billion to the fiscal year 1973 request of his Department.

He told the congressional committees that the escalation since March of this year was costing an extra \$16 million a day. By comparison, the practical eradication of live measles in Massachusetts over a 6-year period cost \$1.3 million.

Mr. Chairman, I support the committee report, though it falls short of

some of the recommendations in the health area that I made on the floor of the House on May 10. I support it because these moneys will save hundreds of thousands of lives; I support it because these moneys may one day lead to a cure for such age-old scourges of mankind as heart disease and cancer, which together claim the lives of 1,400,000 Americans each and every year.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that our President will come down on the side of human life and human productivity when he is presented with the usual memorandum from the Office of Management and Budget to veto the bill because it is above his original request.

I submit, not as a partisan Democrat, but as a Congressman representing all the men, women, and children of my district, that such a veto will not be tolerated. It will not be tolerated because the American people value good health above any other segment in their lives.

I respectfully request that the President of the United States listen to the voice of the people.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the appropriations bill the House is considering today and tomorrow accounts for more than one-third of all Federal spending for the next fiscal year. This bill calls for the expenditure of \$94 billion. All of this money will be spent for human resources, and it is \$16 billion more than the fiscal 1973 budget requests for our Nation's defense.

The major portion of the Labor-HEW funds—\$68 billion—will come from trust fund accounts, such as social security, railroad retirement and unemployment compensation. We should remember, however, that these funds come from taxpayers just as surely as general revenue funds.

Before I comment on a few of the highlights of our hearings on this bill, I would like to call attention to the valuable service to this House and to the country over the past 5 months by our dedicated chairman and ranking minority member and my other colleagues on the subcommittee.

Consider for a moment the hundreds of complex and worthwhile programs which are administered by these two departments and the related agencies. The official justification books for these budget requests were spread over several thousand pages. Hundreds of witnesses presented testimony which, together with questions, added up to 7,200 pages of hearings. Many other interested persons and groups contacted subcommittee members separately in behalf of specific funding items.

I will not belabor the point, but we all owe a debt of gratitude to our patient chairman, DAN FLOON, and ranking Republican, BOB MICHEL, and all connected with this hard-working subcommittee.

In reporting out this bill, our subcommittee has made significant changes in the budget requests which were presented by the administration. In large part, these changes reflect the interests and recommendations of many of our constituents who have taken the time to

let us know how they want their tax dollars spent.

The bill includes sizable increases for health programs. Among these are the cancer, heart and lung disease research efforts of the National Institutes of Health, hospital construction and modernization, health manpower training, and drug and alcohol abuse programs. In making these recommendations, our subcommittee is consciously initiating a new and more vigorous phase in Federal support for medical research and health delivery systems.

In part, the \$600 million increase for health programs in this bill over the budget requests is in recognition that there is a built-in inflationary factor now in health research costs of 8 percent per year. So the overall 14-percent increase for health programs which we are recommending is actually a 6-percent increase when inflation is considered.

We are recommending \$492 million for the National Cancer Institute. This is \$60 million over the budget request, and, together with the \$40 million fiscal 1972 supplemental funds recently approved, the additional amount available for spending in the new fiscal year will be \$532 million—this is the same amount as the legal authorization level for fiscal 1973.

In providing this extra \$100 million for cancer research, the subcommittee is responding to a reply by the Director of the Cancer Institute when I asked him if the full authorization level could be effectively used. Dr. Baker testified that the added funds could indeed be used effectively, and he listed, for the record, the uses to which the money would be put.

Thus, cancer research efforts are now funded at more than twice the level of 1 year ago. These additional funds are producing results. Our subcommittee was informed of notable progress in the treatment of several types of cancer, such as childhood leukemia and Burkitt's lymphoma. We hope that the funds in this bill will lead to progress in other forms of this disease.

We are recommending a 30-percent increase over fiscal 1972 for the National Heart and Lung Institute. Heart disease is still our Nation's leading killer, and it disables many thousands of Americans. Emphysema is the fastest rising cause of death in the United States today, and it ranks only behind heart disease as a disabling disease. It is just as important to step up our research efforts on these diseases as on cancer.

While much of basic health research is highly technical and difficult for the layman to understand, sometimes this research produces ironically simple results. Research conducted by the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke has shown a new use for an old standby—aspirin. Very small quantities of aspirin have been shown to greatly reduce blood platelet aggregation, and thus lead to the prevention of recurring strokes.

There are many similarly encouraging reports of progress and promise throughout the 7,200 pages of our hearings. There are also instances of statisti-

cal information which might be helpful to my colleagues in corresponding with their own constituents concerning overall Federal efforts in areas of current interest. I would like to take the rest of my time in pointing out some of these reports.

The Members will find useful and concise information listing all Federal drug abuse programs for fiscal years 1969 through 1973 on page 130 of part 1 of the hearings. Similar tables showing Federal efforts in aging programs for the last three fiscal years appear two pages later in the same volume. The various Federal agencies' programs to assist returning Vietnam veterans to find jobs are listed on page 41 of part 6 of the hearings.

During these hearings and others, we have been getting the impression that everyone is jumping on the environment bandwagon. In response to my inquiry, the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences provided a breakdown of 61 different Federal agencies and offices now dealing in one way or another in this field. This is on pages 908 through 913 of part 4.

In view of our chronic shortage of health manpower, we are recommending an increase of \$205 million over the budget request for health manpower programs. We were informed during the hearings that partially as a result of the new capitation grants, the first enrollments in the health professional schools will increase this year by about 2,800 students. This is real progress, but these new students must have some place to go. That is why we have included an additional \$100 million for the construction of health educational facilities and \$20 million for nursing education facilities.

In providing funds for the U.S. Office of Education's programs, we have increased the assistance for schools in federally affected areas by more than \$200 million—or 50 percent above the budget request.

If we had allowed the cutback in this impacted area aid program to go unchallenged, many school districts now qualifying under the law would have some very serious problems. In my own home county, we have one school district which would have to double its property taxes, and they already pay a higher rate than the property taxes in the Washington, D.C., area.

Incidentally, a question was asked earlier as to whether or not a Maryland resolution, which was passed by the Maryland Legislature, had anything to do with our increase in the impact aid program. I would say categorically no. I was not aware of the passage of any such resolution here in Maryland. No Maryland resolution was discussed.

If we had approved this cut, Kansas would suffer a loss of \$2,745,000 below the fiscal 1972 allocation. In the area that I represent, Public Law 874 accounts for 35 percent of all Federal elementary and secondary educational assistance to local school districts. In terms of the children involved, 90 percent are in the "B" category, aid for whom would have been eliminated. Reform is still needed in this program because of geographi-

cal inequities, but that reform should not come in an appropriations bill. That is the job of the authorizing committees.

Other testimony regarding this administration's plans in the field of education were more encouraging. U.S. Commissioner of Education Marland, who is doing a fine job, is pushing hard for the education renewal concept, for higher emphasis on career education, and for the establishment of a system of education extension agents.

Concerning education renewal, the commissioner told us that he intends to have a single set of regulations, guidelines, and applications which would be available to school systems wishing to update and reform their operations. Each application would be reviewed as a comprehensive whole, and each renewal site would deal with a single project officer. This should reduce considerably the amount of bureaucratic redtape that applicants now have to face.

Our subcommittee has expressed its support in the past for making our entire educational system more responsive to the real employment needs of the pupils and the manpower needs of our economy. The commissioner told of considerable progress toward setting up workable models of this concept.

For your interest, there is a brief description of the concept of this "career education" on page 110 of part 2 of our hearings. This also includes an outline of the procedures by which a local school district might convert its ongoing educational program into the career education mode.

Dr. Marland told us that the long-term objective of the proposed education extension agent program is to develop a local-State-Federal network to help local educators take prompt advantage of new education research findings. Like the popular and successful agricultural extension agents, these education agents would be hired by the local systems, and their primary job will be to meet the real and immediate needs of local schools.

Our subcommittee was encouraged by these developments. But we still have a long way to go in the administration of our ongoing education programs. We were told that even now only about 25 percent of the Office of Education's programs have been subject to formal evaluation. We are spending many billions of dollars, and we have no real way to find out if we are accomplishing the objectives of these programs.

This is a serious problem when you consider the rapid growth in these education programs. Since I joined this subcommittee, the Office of Education appropriations have gone from \$583 million to the total proposed fiscal 1973 budget of \$6.4 billion. The number of their programs has increased from 43 to 109 during the same time period, and their personnel has more than doubled. Congress appropriated funds for increased evaluation of these education programs in fiscal 1970, and we will expect more progress in this important task in the near future.

Turning to the Department of Labor, we have recommended funding at the full authorization level of \$1.25 billion

of the Emergency Employment program. This will provide Public Service jobs for 155,000 persons in fiscal 1973 who would otherwise be unemployed.

This public service employment program has been a great help in my congressional district in lowering our high unemployment rate, which had been brought on largely by changing national priorities. For the most part, this emergency program has been administered very well at both the local and Federal levels. During the hearings, Secretary Hodgson credited Congress with giving them a program which, in his words:

Didn't require you to carry water on all shoulders at one time.

I hope we will remember this instance in which a pressing national need can be addressed successfully and promptly without wrapping up the corrective program in all sorts of red tape.

Time does not permit my going more in depth into these hearings, but I do recommend them to you for a fuller understanding of our subcommittee's actions on this bill.

We have not pleased everyone with our recommendations in this bill—not even ourselves on every item. There is probably no way in a "human resources" funding bill that we can ever please everyone. But we have included substantial increases for those items which the testimony told us were most pressing and in which the experts indicated that the best chances for meaningful progress existed.

The bill represents the cooperative judgment of the members of our subcommittee after these 4 months of intensive hearings. I urge your support of these recommendations.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH), a member of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, there has been an increasing interest in the delivery of health services in this country. As a member of the subcommittee which recommends appropriations for health activities and who has had an opportunity to hear experts both in and out of Government for several years testify before our 10-member subcommittee regarding the priorities in the health field, I came to the conclusion several years ago that the only way we would solve the health services shortages in the reasonably near future is to revise the health delivery system itself.

As a practical matter, there is no possibility that we will graduate enough physicians and specialists so that they can adequately fulfill all the jurisdiction they now have under the medical practice laws and rules of the various States. On the other hand, nurses are fully capable of being legally delegated the responsibility of delivering more health services and with a relatively small amount of additional training could in many cases take over substantial additional amounts of responsibility. It is with this in mind that I very violently disagree with the administration's low-budget estimate for the support of nursing and strongly promoted increases in

the appropriations for institutional support and construction as well as student assistance and other areas where nurses are involved.

The budget request submitted by the administration for nursing support totals \$122,934,000 and we on the committee are recommending and asking the House to approve an increase up to the sum of \$163,434,000. I realize that this is an increase of over \$40 million and almost 35 percent in this one field while we did not recommend increases nearly approaching this sum in other programs. However, I firmly believe that this substantially higher appropriation in the case of nursing support is fully justified in terms of the results that can be expected and the need for more immediate, rather than merely long range, relief from the shortage of health care.

Not all the remedies for this health delivery problem can come through appropriations and I do not claim that it can. For several years, I have been pressing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the White House to call a conference of people directly involved in the delivery of health services to promote changes in State laws that are needed and which could give immediate relief in this area. I made a report on this to the House on February 17 of last year. A copy of it is as follows:

SMITH HEALTH SERVICE PLAN

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, today I have written a letter to President Nixon as follows:

FEBRUARY 17, 1971.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee which recommends appropriations for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, I have for several years had the opportunity to question and to hear the greatest medical experts available and it has become abundantly clear to many of us on the Committee that the health care problems in this country are not only getting worse but also that they will not be overcome in the foreseeable future unless there is substantial change in the method of delivering health services in this country. It has become obvious that under the state laws that now exist and the medical practice acts, as well as the various kinds of limitations on training physicians, there is no possibility that everyone who needs medical services in this country can be provided those services by a specialist physician and that a Family Nurse Practitioner or others must render preventive health services if they are to be available for most people.

For several years we have financed demonstration programs which have shown that far better medical care can be made available through greater use of allied professional and medical personnel and that as a result, not only the quantity of care but also the quality of care can increase by proper use of such personnel.

As you know, the problems of licensure and certification involve the laws and medical practice regulations of all of the 50 states. In almost every case these state laws and regulations permit educational obsolescence, provide barriers to change educational requirements as needed, restrict the delegation by a physician of tasks that others could perform, restrict the use of new equipment, prevent some qualified physician from delivering a lot more in the way of health services and make it almost impossible to have

a national program for educating allied, professional and paramedical health personnel so that the supply of such personnel can be shifted to where the demand occurs. However, a national system of licensure and certification must be developed with the cooperation and support of the various groups involved in the delivery of health care and be acceptable to the consuming public. I also believe the attitudes of most members of the medical professions have now changed greatly and they would welcome some national leadership in this area.

The need for doing something concerning our national health problem has become so great that various groups are now proposing many programs, most of which would not solve the basic problem cited above. The people of this country are so eager for a solution that they are willing to try almost any kind of a program and I fear that unless the central problem is solved, some expensive non-solution will be adopted and the American people 10 years from now will find that they are no better off than they were in 1971.

It is for all the above reasons that I strongly urge you to immediately call a national emergency meeting on health care composed of representatives from various health occupations, professions, organizations, health care institutions such as hospitals, and adequate representation by the public and the government and that this commission be directed to recommend definite courses of action to overcome these problems.

I believe the group among other things should report on the following:

- (1) recommend whether, and if so, how model projects should be established demonstrating how more high quality medical care can be made available by reorganizing the methods of delivering health services, the use of nurse practitioners, health technicians and other allied health personnel;
- (2) identify and define the specialties which could extend the ability to deliver medical services;
- (3) define the responsibilities of personnel in each of the specialties;
- (4) determine the courses needed or the method of providing uniform minimum requirements for the courses needed for each of the specialties and to recommend the titles of degrees to be granted for the various specialties;
- (5) establish education equivalency measures and job performance tests;
- (6) develop ways of assuring that health personnel may continue their education with the educational program so organized that credit would be given for courses taken and work accomplished toward advanced degrees;
- (7) determine the most desirable method licensing individuals and institutions for the delivery of medical care;
- (8) determine how state licensing procedures can best be coordinated with a national testing examination for allied health personnel;
- (9) determine the feasibility and the enactment of national standards for licensing personnel; and
- (10) determine whether greater public representation on an existing state license board is desirable and, if so, how this can best be obtained.

Since inadequate health care results in suffering and inability to fully enjoy life, any delay which can be avoided is intolerable. I believe it has now become abundantly clear that the only way that this national problem can be dealt with is at the Presidential level, and that the stakes involved are so great that an emergency continuous meeting under the highest national leadership is needed at this time. You could press for a solution and agreed course of action in much the same way your mediators press for solutions to a nationwide labor dispute or other matters of great importance. I re-

spectively and sincerely urge you to take this course of action.

Sincerely,

NEAL SMITH,
Member of Congress.

As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee which handles health appropriations, I have for several years advocated as strongly as I could the need for greater use of allied professional and paramedical personnel and reforming our system of delivering health services.

SHORTAGES OF PHYSICIANS

Everyone agrees that we have a great shortage of physicians and manpower available to deliver adequate health care. It should be obvious that under the State laws which now exist and the medical practice acts, as well as the limitations on training physicians, there is no possibility of everyone who needs medical services securing the services of a physician to provide not only remedial health services but also preventive health care. In the United States we only have 151 physicians for each 10,000 of the population and they are distributed in such a way so that many millions of people are for all practical purposes without adequate preventive health care. One hundred and nine whole counties in the United States have no physician whatever and 153 only have one.

Rural areas and low-income areas are suffering from medical care deprivation but also middle-income people who do not object to paying the cost of a call at the doctor's office must take at least one-half day off from work to do so and after considering this inconvenience and loss of income from such loss of time, they, as a practical matter, do not secure preventive medical care.

Thus, the limited time of the specialists is tied up even more because they must give highest priority to time-consuming remedial care. It is clear by now that there is no possibility within the foreseeable future of educating enough physician specialists to fill the demand for all kinds of professional health services. Therefore, we must turn to the use of allied professional personnel and paramedical personnel so that the physician's time can be utilized more efficiently and his ability to deliver preventive care extended very considerably.

SERVICES NURSE PRACTITIONERS COULD RENDER

For several years Government-financed demonstration programs our committee has supported have shown that clinics, even in rural areas several miles from a doctor's principal office or in a ghetto area, can be manned by an assistant to the physician who has been taught to discern the abnormal and treat it with or without telephone consultation with the physician's main office, to handle routine examinations and treatments, and to screen the patients who should come back on a particular day when an M.D. will be present, or to send the patient immediately with a priority where warranted to the physician's main office.

These clinics under a family nurse practitioner with the telephone consultation of a physician available can provide well child and well baby care including making observations and checking for abnormalities. They can note growth and development of the child and routine evaluation of adults and other children, all of which can be studied in the office of the physician, where he can detect anything indicating a need for personal observation. Such nurse practitioners can provide immunizations and counseling concerning the feeding of children and methods of maintaining regular health.

They can screen patients and initiate therapy in some instances. They can cooperate with the public health agencies where an epidemic is underway or a mass immunization program needed. They can track down those who react positively to tuberculosis

tests and even provide house calls for the invalid and chronically ill patients who could be treated either by the nurse practitioners on the spot or with the help of a telephone call to and instructions from the physician when necessary. They would be capable of making observations relating to pregnancy, diabetes, congestive problems, and make interim reports on the condition of patients who are under continuing and direct care of physicians. They could call on these patients more often than the physician would have time to; and, therefore, when a patient needed immediate hospitalization or care of a physician they could determine this and provide that care on a priority basis.

In the local clinic, the family nurse practitioner could culture organisms from a sore throat, conduct prenatal examinations, examine, clean and disinfect punctures, give first aid and they could through a special telephone hookup, initiate an electrocardiograph examination for the physician's office or health care institution which may be many miles away and otherwise unavailable to the patient. Through this modified delivery system, the overworked physician could tremendously expand his availability to deliver health care to the family and go a long way toward remedying the serious present imbalance between supply and demand which simply cannot be remedied by just any amount of money alone.

INCREASE OF QUALITY OF CARE

With this substantial change in our method of delivering health services in this country, the same number of doctors could deliver far more medical care and have their time used more effectively so that those who need them the most can receive better quality medical care.

STATE LICENSES

Currently each State licenses the health professions within that State and in almost every case they permit educational obsolescence and provide barriers to changing the educational requirements as needed as well as permitting the delegation by the physician of a task that someone else could perform. Traditionally licensing of physicians, nurses and health personnel has been the function of each of the 50 States and these laws or medical practice regulations have, in most cases resulted in a rigid definition of the scope of practice and prevented health functions from being assumed by personnel below the level of a physician which, with new equipment and the availability of new types of personnel, could have been performed by someone other than a physician. While it is imperative that physicians in all States be permitted to delegate more tasks to allied health personnel, it is also necessary to have both public and professional acceptance of the use of such personnel and that there be some kind of uniformity of the standards for each of the health occupations so that quality of health services can be preserved or enhanced while increasing the quantity available. While preventing some qualified physicians from delivering a lot more in the way of health services, they also do not adequately solve the problem of the unethical or incompetent practitioner.

BOARD REPORT

I believe the group, among other things, should report on the following:

First. Recommend whether, and, if so, how model projects should be established demonstrating how more high quality medical care can be made available by reorganizing the methods of delivering health services, the use of nurse practitioners, health technicians, and other allied health personnel;

Second. Identify and define the specialties which could extend the ability to deliver medical services;

Third. Define the responsibilities of personnel in each of the specialties;

Fourth. Determine the courses needed or the method of providing uniform minimum requirements for the courses needed for each of the specialties and to recommend the titles of degrees to be granted for the various specialties;

Fifth. Establish educational equivalency measures and job performance tests;

Sixth. Develop ways of assuring that health personnel may continue their education with the educational program so organized that credit would be given for courses taken and work accomplished toward advanced degrees;

Seventh. Determine the most desirable method of licensing individuals and institutions for the delivery of medical care;

Eighth. Determine how State licensing procedure can best be coordinated with a national testing examination for allied health personnel;

Ninth. Determine the feasibility and the enactment of national standards for licensing personnel; and

Tenth. Determine whether greater public representation on an existing State license board is desirable and, if so, how this can best be obtained.

OTHER PROPOSALS

I have noticed many people groping for and proposing various courses of action in the hope of relieving this critical situation. However, none of them seem to go right to the heart of the problem. Too many would try to solve this merely with money—when money alone simply cannot solve the problem. Paying each of the limited number of physicians now in the health profession twice as much money will not increase the quantity of services, but rather, there must be a change in the methods of delivering services.

For several years and especially the past several months, I have looked everywhere for a program that will offer some hope of overcoming the principal problems connected with changing State medical practice acts, developing educational programs for allied health personnel, and providing a method whereby the licensing problems can be overcome in the least possible time. I have finally decided that the only way this can be done is by the President calling an emergency meeting and pressing continuous negotiations for a solution in much the same way that our mediators press for solutions to a labor dispute or other matters of great national importance. Unless this is done, various groups will continue to propose nonsolutions or wait for someone else to do something. The President has ample authority to call such a meeting and I strongly urge that he do so.

Although some encouragement was given in previous years to get the White House to take affirmative action in changing restrictions on delegation of authority to nurses and improving health care, it had not been done; and I reviewed the request this year when the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Elliot Richardson was before our subcommittee. A copy of that colloquy between Secretary Richardson and myself is as follows and can be found in the hearing record in volume I at pages 136-147:

HEARING RECORD

RURAL HEALTH CARE

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Secretary, everyone I guess is interested in health care and the lack thereof. A year ago I asked you some questions about this and I think you did do a number of things designed to help, but I am particularly interested in the lack of preventive health care and the fact that the

administration's proposal and the proposal in the Senate and the AMA proposal, all three in my estimation are inadequate for rural areas in that they do not provide for a way to have clinics in these rural areas staffed with some kind of personnel that could be delegated authority from a physician and could carry out such things as well-baby clinics and house calls for the old folks to execute doctor's orders and help with health service problems such as immunization.

There is practically no plan for this in any of these programs. On the other hand it seems a lot of it could be accomplished without any new programs, just by some kind of a different arrangement on licensure and by the State themselves changing their laws and regulations regarding delegation of authority by the doctor so that he could delegate the authority to a nurse practitioner or allied health personnel who are not actually in his presence but perhaps have a direct telephone line and other electronic communication devices which are available today.

What is the situation, what progress has been made toward getting something like this done?

Secretary RICHARDSON. Let me say first, Mr. Smith, that we share the concern you have with what needs to be done to improve the accessibility of health care services. We do not regard any of the financing bills before the Congress as the primary means of seeking to accomplish this, although we do believe that it is important that any legislation that is eventually enacted to help people pay medical payments be designed in a way that is consistent with seeking to make health care more accessible and to reduce its costs.

Mr. SMITH. In other words, the new bill should permit payments to a nurse practitioner who is not in the presence of a doctor but working under him?

Secretary RICHARDSON. Exactly. Beyond that I would say that we are one way or another, through legislation, through funding of pilot and demonstration projects, or through encouragement and exhortation, pursuing all of the means that we think make sense in bringing us closer to the general objectives you outline.

INITIATIVES IN HEALTH CARE DELIVERY

If I might just review in a summary kind of way what is in the works. With respect to the use of subprofessional personnel who can serve in remote areas, tied in by electronic means—including closed circuit television in appropriate cases—to a medical center or to a doctor's office, we are pursuing the goal of model legislation in the field of licensure in order to assure that such people can be used up to the limit of their capabilities.

Mr. SMITH. Have you presented a draft bill on that?

Secretary RICHARDSON. No. We haven't felt this could or should be a matter that the Federal Government should legislate on. We have been working on the assumption that the most the traffic would bear would be Federal leadership in seeking State legislation. So our focus has been on the development of model legislation that the States could put into effect.

Mr. SMITH. Have you submitted model legislation to the States?

Secretary RICHARDSON. I don't think we have got quite that far yet. It is a highly complex problem and it is a very controversial one within the health profession.

Mr. SMITH. In some States their State law permits it.

Secretary RICHARDSON. It is variable. In the States that do permit it we have been encouraging various kinds of projects that do utilize subprofessional personnel such as midwives, psychiatric nurses, and so on. The medex program is one of the most successful of these projects. That, as you probably remember, involves the utilization of military medical personnel who after a slight additional

period of training are made available in communities around the country usually in rural areas as physician's assistants. In 1971 the total number of medex graduates was 14 and this will rise to 415 in 1972 and is estimated to be about 420 in 1973.

I could develop this further. We have a project, a particularly exciting one in Missouri, where the doctor is tied in to outlaying satellite service centers through closed circuit television and can help to provide diagnosis and guidance in this way. We think there is a lot of room for this. We think there is a lot of room for the development of means of transporting patients, in cases where this is necessary, from a remote area to a center.

AREA HEALTH EDUCATION CENTERS

Which leads me to another heading, which is the development of area health education centers. This is a concept originally proposed by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Such a center consists essentially of a sort of small-scale medical teaching center in an area too sparsely populated to support a medical school, but which can nevertheless serve as a place for the provision of postgraduate training, internship, residency, and so on; and, as a place for the continuing education of the doctors in that area—a place to which they can come and where courses can be held. They would ordinarily be, and we think should be, tied in with a medical school so that they are kind of an outpost of the medical school.

Mr. SMITH. These don't contribute much to the problem I am talking about in the rural areas and those urban areas where physician's offices are few.

Secretary RICHARDSON. They can, we think, because the experience generally has been that an area has a fairly good chance of retaining in practice someone who has had his internship or residency in the area. We think this will do more to upgrade the attractiveness of practice in rural areas and the quality of practice in those areas than almost any other single measure.

Mr. SMITH. That is true, but rural towns and medically deprived urban areas which I am talking about, the problem there is that the man works, perhaps he makes \$40 a day, and if he is going to go to the hospital for preventive health care, a puncture on his hand, he has to lose a half a day's work. It isn't a matter of paying \$10 to the doctor for an office call, but in addition, a half day's work is lost. So he doesn't go. He won't go to the health center either.

Secretary RICHARDSON. I don't mean to suggest the area health center is a substitute for having qualified personnel like the medex in a community who can do and often do better.

There was a good article on the medex program in one of the newspapers over the weekend in which a doctor was quoted as saying he relied on his medex to do all casting of fractures. He said that his medex assistant can do this better than he can. This is true of a lot of procedures that doctors have traditionally done themselves.

Mr. SMITH. X-ray technicians have been doing it for years even though the law usually does not permit it.

Secretary RICHARDSON. If you look at the pattern in the field with the physician's assistants in the most remote, sparsely populated areas tied in electronically to the physician with whom he is associated, the physician in turn having access to an area health education center which can help keep him updated on progress in his field and give him the sense of association with other doctors who are doing significant work, the area health education center would have a significant impact. It could, in addition, sponsor research in health problems particularly relevant to the community served.

At any rate these are two things that are underway.

LOAN FORGIVENESS FOR DOCTORS

A third is incorporated in the health manpower legislation recently passed by the Congress, signed and funded by this committee in the first supplemental appropriations for this legislation. It provides means of making practice in areas which a medical personnel shortage more attractive by very generous loan forgiveness provisions for doctors who had their education funded by loans.

Mr. SMITH. Already the Sears Foundation gave up 60 or about one-third of these in their experiment. This approach won't work at all to get doctors in small towns. When I say small towns I mean towns of 3,000 or 2,000 people. They tried it for 4 or 5 years and gave up.

Secretary RICHARDSON. I have heard about their experience in this.

On the other hand it seems worthwhile at least to try. What I said in the beginning, and I would repeat at this point, is that there is at some stage of implementation, everything that seems to make any sense that would help deal with this problem.

NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE CORPS

A fourth heading is the National Health Service Corps, also established by recently enacted legislation. We have selected 18 communities provisionally and expect to have about 62 field assignees at work by the first of March and 240 by the middle of July, and about 575 by the end of June of 1973. This is one way of making personnel available, but it is fair to say it depends on the ability to recruit them in the first instance into the Public Health Service which depends in turn at the present time very largely on the obligation of military service by doctors. At any rate it is another facet of the effort that is being made.

We are open, in effect, to the incorporation of other approaches wherever they are brought to our attention and seem to make sense.

PROPOSED WHITE HOUSE MEETING ON REVISION OF STATE LAWS FOR ALLIED HEALTH PERSONNEL

Mr. SMITH. I proposed something last year which I want to bring to your attention again, and I wish you would consider it again. It is that the President call some of these people together, the medical association people, hospital people, nurses and allied health representatives, and other people that are interested in health care, and develop a plan for immediate implementation to get States to change their laws and regulations so that doctors can delegate some of their authority to nurse practitioners or allied health personnel to work in some of these towns and medically deprived urban areas. I am fearful we are going to pass some bill in Congress which doubles or triples or quadruples the amount of money that goes into an inadequate system and that it will not help cure preventive health care problems in these rural and medically deprived areas. The only hope of solving this problem in the near future is to either have a national licensure or else, preferably of course, get the States to change the rules relative to delegation of jurisdiction, which they could do next week if they want to.

Secretary RICHARDSON. I will ask to have inserted in the record at this point a summary of the meetings and discussions that have gone on in this. I will pursue further your suggestion of a nationally convened meeting on the subject.

HEALTH MAINTENANCE ORGANIZATIONS

Secretary RICHARDSON. Your point prompts me to cite one other development that is of key importance. That is the health maintenance organization legislation now pending before Interstate and Foreign Commerce in Mr. Roger's committee.

In that legislation as you know we are concerned with encouraging the develop-

ment of comprehensive prepayment plans under which services are paid for on a capitation basis. It is important both from the point of view of prevention, insofar as the health maintenance organization has a direct incentive to keep people well, and from the standpoint of cost savings. It can be important also in developing a more rational network of service including service in remote areas and the health maintenance organization may well be in many areas the best organizational matrix in which to provide the kind of structure and pattern we were talking about earlier.

In any event, the point I wanted to make is that in this legislation we have a provision to the effect that where a health maintenance organization enters into a contract with the Federal Government for the provision of service under our health financing legislation, that if in carrying out its functions under the contract it employs a physician's assistant or subprofessional not otherwise licensed in that State, under the contract clause of the Constitution that person would nevertheless be regarded as qualified, if the responsible physician in the HMO deemed him to be capable of performing the service delegated to him. The physician would remain responsible.

Mr. SMITH. But the service would still be performed in the HMO center, wouldn't it?

Secretary RICHARDSON. A HMO isn't necessarily a facility. A HMO is a financing system. He would have to be employed by the HMO. If the HMO consisted, for example, of a central building and out-patient ambulatory diagnostic facilities in, let's say, Billings, Mont., it might have outpatient clinics in a number of smaller communities which were staffed by physician's assistants. It might have a contract with a community hospital to assure that it would have acute care beds available to its subscribers. It wouldn't have to own the hospital in order to have that arrangement. And if it then in addition had a contract with the United States under which it undertook on a capitation basis to provide the comprehensive care to a person whose care was subsidized under Medicaid or under our proposed family health insurance plan, then this contractual clause would apply and it could use physician's assistants for the provision of this care notwithstanding barriers of State law.

HMO OPERATION IN RURAL AREAS

Mr. SMITH. To use your example, everybody I have talked to about HMO's seem to visualize the HMO in Billings as being the answer for that whole part of the State. We are still talking about transportation. They tried that 10 years ago and that didn't provide preventive health care at all for rural areas.

To use your example, what they would need then is in Melstone which is 60 miles east, to have a clinic there occupied by a nurse practitioner or somebody with a telephone line to the physicians in Billings.

Secretary RICHARDSON. Exactly.

Mr. SMITH. She could make house calls on the elderly folks there and operate a well baby clinic and recognize the abnormal in the local citizenry when they came to the office and also know if they needed to go to Billings immediately or see the doctor the next time he comes to the clinic in Melstone.

Secretary RICHARDSON. Exactly.

OBSTACLE OF STATE LAW

Mr. SMITH. But everybody I have talked to visualized the HMO to be the answer without going into additional steps and without Montana changing their law so that the allied personnel could perform this service in Melstone. At the present time, she would have to be operating in the same office as the doctor.

Secretary RICHARDSON. Our general counsel was consulted originally about whether or not he thought the provision I am talking

about in our bill would in effect supersede State law in that kind of a situation where the Federal Government did have a contract with the HMO. He thinks it would, and to that extent at least there would be the opportunity to make fairly substantial impact, depending on the rate at which HMO's come into business and depending on the amount—we don't think we need a great deal of money under the HMO legislation, however, because what is essentially required are startup costs.

We have under consideration opportunities and ways and means of forward funding of HMO services where these are federally subsidized. It has never made any sense to me, for example, if we know we are going to provide medicare funds to reimburse services to the elderly people in a given community, if we know there are a certain proportion of poor people going to become entitled to medicare service reimbursed up to 50 percent by the Federal Government, there is no reason whatever, it seems to me, that we should not make funds available in advance based on some conservative estimate of level of services to be provided. If we do this, then the HMO can, in effect, begin to develop services with an assured source of financing from the beginning.

And under our contract with an HMO, under which it would be obligated to provide services to our beneficiaries—they might be Indians as well as the elderly or the poor—it could employ, under that contract, nursing assistants or nurse midwives or physician's assistants who could be the person in a small remote village tied in electronically with the responsible doctor. Then in those circumstances it wouldn't matter what the State law restrictions were. This I think is as important as any step we do now have in the works.

Mr. SMITH. The legislation we passed last year for scholarships for doctors and so forth and the various bills that have come up have been presented as if they are the answer to the medical problem in the United States. There is practically no possibility of us getting a new doctor out of medical school to go to Melstone, Mont.

I don't care how many doctors are graduated, they are not going to move to such places as Melstone, Mont., or to towns of a thousand population. They want to go where other doctors are and practice a specialty now. So we have to recognize the need for these satellite clinics.

UNDERUTILIZATION OF CAPABLE PERSONNEL

The other thing about it is that we talk about these returning veterans and training them, but when the States won't permit them to use their training to the extent that they are really capable of using it, what incentive is there for them to go to these schools and get this training. We first need to have the delegation of authority legalized so that they can get a job that is meaningful to them. We have nurses by the hundreds who are not practicing their profession because they don't want to go down to the county hospital or to an HMO for that matter to merely change bed pans or perform menial labor.

They would come right out of retirement tomorrow if they could operate a clinic somewhere under a doctor. I find to my surprise—and the change has been great in the last 2 or 3 years—I think fully 40 percent of the doctors also want to do this.

Secretary RICHARDSON. I think this is true.

We have run tests with Federal funds in dental care, too, which show how enormously increased the productivity of dentists can be made by use of assistance; and, the dental profession is very supportive of this.

This is something that you may want to go into further with Dr. Duval and Dr. Wilson of the Health Services Mental Health Administration. Both of them are very inter-

ested, very sympathetic, and very supportive. I think it is fair to say we all agree completely with what you have said. We have tried to avoid overselling any single component of the approach to this, the various components I have tried to outline. And certainly you are absolutely right that the State law restrictions are a serious obstacle to the rational development of services.

I will, as offered earlier, provide for you and for the record a summary of what have been our efforts along these lines, and what is still coming up so that you can look this over and see whether you think we are doing enough, and if not, tell us what more you think we should be doing.

EMPHASIS ON LARGER CITIES

Mr. SMITH. This is one of those things that doesn't cost money, and I think it is more important than anything we are talking about that would cost huge sums of money. I am also concerned that people are looking only at the important problems of the bigger cities, the places where the HMO would be located and so forth.

Secretary RICHARDSON. This problem, of course, that you are mentioning exists within the bigger cities as well as in remote areas.

Mr. SMITH. That is true.

Secretary RICHARDSON. There are serious shortages of medical personnel in the poorest areas of our cities just as there are in rural areas. The problems are somewhat different but the need for the use of para-professionals and subprofessionals tied in with doctors in essentially the way we have been talking about is not different in principle.

Mr. SMITH. I agree that is true. In fact doctor's offices are usually located primarily in just one part of a city in most of the cities.

Secretary RICHARDSON. Yes.

NEED FOR A WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE

Mr. SMITH. The President calls the parties in when there is a strike and he can get them into a room and say, "You stay there until you settle this strike," and he usually gets results. He uses the prestige of his office to get people to get together. In the same way, I think he should also use the prestige of the office to get these health people together and say, "Now you come up with a plan under which authority can be properly delegated and you can go back to your States and accomplish this objective." This is not something that has to wait until some Federal law is passed. It is something they can do next month.

Secretary RICHARDSON. I think this is a good idea.

Mr. SMITH. I think we could have an improvement in preventive health care almost overnight with this kind of approach.

That is all I have. Thank you, sir.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Conte.

In an attempt to get action in still another area which will directly involve this same aspect of the health delivery system, I appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee last year to make sure that any new legislation permit payment for the services involved. That testimony, which is pertinent to this discussion, is as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. NEAL SMITH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF IOWA, ON NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate having this opportunity to express my views on what should be done to improve the medical care delivery system in this country, with particular emphasis upon the rural areas, towns, and smaller cities.

One-third of our Nation's citizens live in what are described as rural areas, the total population of which exceeds that of 100 of

the largest cities in the United States. These people have a total population which exceeds that of all but eight of the countries of the world.

Of the 25 million Americans listed as poor, some 14 million live in rural communities. But whether one is poor or middle class employed and working, one of the primary difficulties they face today is that there is not a sufficient system of preventive medical care for these people living in the rural areas and smaller cities. There are not enough physicians to provide this kind of care; and indeed in most of the towns and cities, there is no physician, including thousands of towns and cities where there was at one time a full-time physician for that community only. Not only have the physicians left these areas without adequate attention for preventive medical care, but also no one has replaced them that could provide this kind of service.

The American Medical Association provides statistics showing that there is only one doctor for each 2,145 residents in rural areas. In the most densely populated areas, there is one doctor for only 442 residents. There are 132 counties in the United States without a single physician, and this situation is becoming worse.

I think that a recent Wall Street Journal article clearly points out the difficulty of retaining the physician in the small community. An excerpt from the article is as follows:

"As discouraging as the enfeeblement of the old rural-health-care system is the fate of one major effort to preserve it. Last year, the Sears-Roebuck Foundation reluctantly killed a 14-year-old program to help rural towns attract doctors; by establishing well-equipped medical centers. By 1970, 52 of 162 such centers were closed and empty."

BEATING THE DRAFT

"The premise on which the program was found—that a good facility will recruit and retain a physician—was no longer valid," a foundation spokesman explains. "There are fewer and fewer doctors who are willing to staff these clinics. It's an injustice to a community to encourage them to build these clinics when the likelihood of getting a physician is remote."

"Doctors reject a rural practice for diverse reasons. Because medical training has become increasingly sophisticated, many of them wind up as specialists; their specialized expertise is in greater demand in larger cities than in thinly populated areas. In the country, the round-the-clock demands on a doctor, and 'professional isolation' from his peers, seem uninviting. And disadvantages of small-town living, such as schooling that sometimes is inferior and limited cultural activities, deter doctors."

I am saddened but not surprised by the fact that the Sears-Roebuck Foundation has reluctantly killed a 14-year-old program to help rural communities attract physicians by establishing well-equipped medical centers. I never did think that would work. Doctors cannot be enticed into locating where they do not prefer to live and practice. Forgiveness of debt for education and furnishing facilities will not even shift the shortage from one area to another.

One of the major problems in rural areas is that these people who work for a living both on farms and in factories must go many miles to a larger city to a doctor's office for just minor medical problems. A puncture of the hand, the need for a tetanus shot, the need for an antibiotic to curb a minor infection, immunization against an epidemic, all of these things require not only traveling several miles to the doctor's office but taking off a day from their work in order to wait for the doctor and receive the minor medical attention. The cost of the doctor's fee is small compared to the loss of time, and together, the cost is so great that they avoid preventive

medicine and take the chance on becoming very ill. If they become very ill they can go to a hospital and get good care and so the doctor's time then is spent taking care of people that should have never been ill enough to have to go to a hospital to start with.

I am convinced that doctors in these county seat cities must operate clinics in the smaller towns and have them staffed with a nurse practitioner or doctor's assistant. These nurses and paramedical personnel with a direct telephone line and other modern communication methods could have the necessary supervision and yet perform services that simply are, as a practical matter, not existent in these rural towns and smaller cities of America. We are not going to have enough doctors so that people needing a tetanus shot can have it taken care of by a doctor who has spent years becoming an expert on the entire body or a specialist on the heart or some other part of the body. We are not now talking about whether we should lower the quality of medical service. What we are talking about is whether these people have any preventive medical service at all. At the present time, as a practical matter, they have no quality because they have no service.

I want to urge this committee to make provisions in any legislation reported by the committee to allow payments to nurses and paramedical personnel who operate clinics or are available in these rural towns and small cities even though they are not under the direct supervision at all times by a doctor on the premises. They should be permitted to be paid for making house calls on elderly citizens, operating well-baby clinics and performing those kinds of services. They could recognize whether a patient needs immediate attention by the doctor and sift through the patient load, so that if a doctor does come to the clinic 1 day per week, his time can be used to see those who need to be seen the most. Many doctors have told me that they believe this kind of assistance is the only way we can solve these problems, and they would like an opportunity to use this kind of assistance. Although many physicians would use this approach, rules do not permit it at the present time. I think they are going to be changed very soon, and if the Federal legislation permits payment under these circumstances, it will encourage the change of the laws so that people who now have no preventive medical care available can receive it.

There is now also serious concern in the medical community relative to malpractice law suits. Doctors simply cannot perform all of the services that are demanded of them, and there is constant pressure to delegate some of the services in their offices and to not have enough time to spend on those who need the services the most. If the pressure of the circumstances causes them to make an error in judgment, or if they delegate some authority which the State law or medical practice regulations do not authorize, they are subject to malpractice suits.

Encouraging States to make it legal to delegate this authority under certain guidelines should make a substantial contribution to reducing the malpractice suit problems. Some would like to go to the extreme and prohibit malpractice suits. This would compel those who suffer life disability to forgo any possibility of being paid by an insurance company for this disaster and ultimately result in not spending the risk that this will happen when one goes to a doctor's office. On the other hand, we all recognize that some law suits should not have been filed and request damages clear out of proportion to the loss incurred. Sometimes these suits are sustained on the basis of illegal delegation of authority or failure to provide the full quality of services purchased. Making it legal to delegate certain authority should help relieve the abuses in the malpractice law suit situation.

I serve on the Appropriations Subcommittee which recommends appropriations for the Department of HEW including the National Institutes of Health and other health-related agencies. We have heard testimony from experts throughout the field of health care who all agree that the situation is serious. I have asked deans of medical schools and others how fast they could increase the supply of doctors. There are many problems involved in doubling or tripling the number of doctors, and I am convinced that this situation cannot be solved quickly enough merely by increasing doctors. It is not practical to think that it can be. What is required is to permit physicians to delegate some of the medical services to others. We do have a lot of nurses in this country who, with a very short supplemental training course, could operate clinics in direct communication with a physician's office and as a family nurse practitioner render tremendous services which are badly needed and not being furnished today. Since the problems of licensure and certification have historically involved the laws or medical practice regulations of each of the 50 States, it will not be easy or fast to change these requirements so that some of these services can be delegated.

I recognize that any Federal law in this area would not be the primary responsibility of this committee. However, in writing a Federal health law it would provide the payment of a large share of the services involved. This committee and the law that is recommended can have a tremendous impact and offer great encouragement toward securing these changes. It not only would be socially desirable and contribute to increasing the medical care services available in this country, but it also could reduce greatly the outlays in money required to provide medical services. The cost of preventive medicine is small compared to the cost of remedial services. Hospital costs have leaped 204 percent in the last 10 years and the competition for these services would be much less if preventive medicine had been practiced to a greater extent.

I visited refugee camps in the Middle East where we have been paying about one-half of the cost of medical and other services for refugees who have almost complete preventive medical services and as a result almost no one needs to go to the hospital. Although they have complete medical service, the cost is only about \$10 per year per refugee. I talked to the doctors who head the services and they say they will put the medical care for these refugees against medical care available for average citizens in any country and that the whole secret is that through the medium of the refugee camp dispensaries, they can practice preventive medicine. If anyone becomes seriously ill, they send them to very well-equipped hospitals in central cities, but the rest of the medical care problems are taken care of within a few blocks of where the people live at a dispensary or clinic.

There are a lot of people on social security in this country who have not had a house call from a doctor in years and are not able to get to a clinic in some central city. For practical purposes, they do not have what anyone could call adequate medical service even though they will be able to go to a hospital in the event of a serious illness if they reach it in time.

I would like to see the establishment of some model clinic projects with nurses and technicians in close communication with the doctor. Although you will primarily be dealing with authorizing payments for services, in view of the fact that legislation you propose will effect total payments required, I believe you could in some way become involved in encouraging or establishing these model clinic projects.

There are still some people, including some Members of the House, who believe we can

solve this problem in the rural areas of the United States by forgiving part of the indebtedness a doctor requires in securing his education or in some way bribing a doctor to go to the smaller town. A community of about 800 near where I live, Monroe, Iowa, made an all-out effort to secure a doctor. The people of the town built a clinic for a doctor but he only stayed a few months and the clinic is no longer being used. There are many reasons why doctors will not live in these communities when a group practice situation or a specialist position is available in the larger city. In some instances it is plainly a matter of living where they want to live or their family would prefer to live. At the income they can earn, forgiving the repayment of a few thousand dollars is of no significance compared to living and working where they prefer. I think it is time to quit looking for easy gimmicks and time to quit thinking that money alone will solve this problem. We need to look for ways to reform and encourage reformation of the delivery system. This committee can make its contribution by permitting payments for these preventive medical services.

I thank the committee for its time and apologize for such a lengthy statement. However, I think it is one of the most important questions in the country today and that your action with regard to the matters that I have covered could very well reduce the cost of medical care under this bill by billions of dollars over a period of years.

Mr. BURKE. Are there any questions? I hear none. Thank you very much, Mr. Smith.

To give a further indication of the problems involved in trying to secure results in Washington, I also want to bring to your attention a colloquy with Dr. Merlin K. Duval, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs when he appeared before our subcommittee. That colloquy is as follows:

LEGAL PROBLEMS IN UTILIZATION OF ALLIED HEALTH PERSONNEL

Mr. SMITH. You talked about the underserved areas. It seems to me as a practical matter, and I talked to the Secretary about this when he was here, the only way we will more adequately serve these underserved areas is to get clinics out there and have a doctor delegate to a nurse practitioner or someone the authority to do certain things in his stead. They can have direct communication with him, recognize the abnormal, set up appointments for him, and on certain days he can come out there. What is being done to get the State laws and the State regulations changed to permit this kind of delegation of authority?

Dr. DuVAL. There are a number of the 50 States which already have introduced changes in their appropriate medical practice laws to make it possible for persons to serve as extenders of physicians. These changes are taking different forms. In some States it is taking the form that the practitioner is being relieved of liability. In others it is actually authorizing practitioners to serve as an extension of a physician. In California the practitioner serves as an extension of the physician but relieved of liability for 2- or 3-year periods until we have determined what kind of training program it will take to educate and train these people and set appropriate educational standards.

The issue that you correctly put your finger on is that in trying to get an outreach from a clinic or from an individual physician you do have a combination of a number of factors at work. One is the fact that that individual cannot be paid directly for his services. Second, he cannot be a free-standing practitioner under the eyes of the law as yet. Third, we have very little evidence so far that he is going to be acceptable to the public. The public very often

wants a physician and not someone who has not had a physician's training.

Mr. SMITH. Some of them have wanted medical service for 10 years and not been able to get it. They would take something less than a specialist for many health services.

Dr. DuVAL. We are counting on that as one of the breakthroughs.

Mr. SMITH. Some people in towns in Iowa have not had a house call from a physician since the thirties. If there were a nurse practitioner in town, I am sure they would allow her to see them. I cannot imagine that would be a serious problem.

Dr. DuVAL. We hope it is not.

Mr. SMITH. My point is that it seems to me that here is something where the prestige of the White House can be used. The President can call in some of these people and figure out some approach so that they could all go back to their States and get the States to change their medical practice acts. In many cases it is just a matter of the State health authority having a meeting and doing this. It would help on the malpractice problem. One of the reasons doctors are caught on malpractice suits is because they are crowded for time and let some of the allied personnel or a nurse do something which under the law they are not supposed to delegate. In the event something goes wrong, it was an unauthorized delegation of authority. If there were a legal delegation of authority it relieves them of that kind of liability.

Dr. DuVAL. How would the patient petition if they thought there were malpractice involved?

Mr. SMITH. They would have to show, as they do now, that the person who gave them the medical service made an error of judgment, that they should have known better. If the service were by a nurse and it was a legally delegated service, it would be different because a nurse does not have the same level of responsibility as a physician. Under existing rules, there is liability based on the nurse performing a service when the doctor was the only one who legally could have done it. She was working for him, so he is liable. If it were an authorized delegation of authority, that risk would be reduced.

It seems to me this is basic and something should be done now.

Dr. DuVAL. This year, under the Health Manpower Education initiative awards section of the Health Manpower Act we will be starting up new programs to educate and train young people who have an interest in careers of the type you are describing. The training will take place in smaller communities on the assumption that the person who comes from that community and is trained there will stay and practice there.

Mr. SMITH. But why would one of them want to take that training when the law in most cases does not permit them to use it?

Dr. DuVAL. The law is very responsive. When those persons are in place the law will become responsive. We didn't have a physicians' assistants law 3 years ago, but they have it now.

Mr. SMITH. It seems to me we need to change the law to make it legal first, so they will train for a legal job.

Dr. DuVAL. I acknowledge the chicken-and-egg problem.

Mr. FLOOD. Congressman Addabbo asked me to hand this letter and memorandum to you.

It seems like getting results where we are involved with the movement or changes of substantial segments in our society, which are well financed, is very difficult and especially where such groups are both alert and well financed. Getting changes in our health delivery system in the manner I believe is absolutely im-

perative, if we are going to get sufficient results, will not occur overnight. I have been working on this matter for several years and as long as I am privileged to do so, I am going to constantly press for practical solutions to this health delivery problem rather than merely talk. I think some progress is being made and I do see from time to time additional evidence of this idea being adopted.

A recent newspaper article indicating, to some extent, the problem and the movement in this area illustrates what I mean and it is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Good health is the greatest need for all mankind. Without good health nothing else is really important. A great concern is sweeping the nation to improve the health delivery system so that all may have adequate care.

Congress has got into the act with great gusto as more than a dozen health-payment plans have been advanced. The most extensive health care plan has been advocated by Sen. Edward Kennedy and its concept may well provide him with the most appealing issue to sweep him into the White House. Basically Kennedy's "cradle to grave" treatment plan would establish a government operated national health insurance program completely paid by the taxpayer so that all people would be covered.

The Nixon administration has countered the Kennedy proposal with its own plan to provide health insurance coverage for all workers and their families which meet federal minimum standards. Nixon says his plan would cost a mere \$7 billion and warns that Kennedy's plan would bankrupt the nation to the tune of \$77 billion.

Everyone is in the act with a plan—the American Medical Association, the private health insurance companies, Sen. Russell Long with his catastrophic health insurance scheme, plus many other political leaders and organizations.

However, all the plans tackle only the financing and fail to meet the basic need of improving the nation's current health delivery dilemma today.

If the nation provides the finances, the end result may be the Pandora's box will be opened and a plethora of patients will descend into the overcrowded doctors' offices and hospitals. The danger could be that instead of improving the medical delivery system it would be critically wounded.

However, Rep. Neal Smith (D-Iowa), who has carefully observed the medical dilemma as a chairman of a key appropriations subcommittee, has come up with an idea to help solve the current problem. Basically Smith believes that a series of clinics should be opened throughout the nation where preventive medicine could be practiced. He believes that if doctors are unavailable then medically-capable nurses or paramedic personnel could help ease the health crunch. In private many physicians believe that Smith's idea has serious merit.

Congressman Smith last February in a floor speech called for President Nixon to bring together the best people in medicine and related fields to tackle the current health crisis. He talked with doctors, hospital personnel and other medical leaders about meeting the problem now with a crash program of clinics. The President asked HEW Secretary Elliot Richardson to take a hard look at the Smith concept. Although silence at first prevailed, Richardson evidently thought the plan had merit because in August he approved a HEW report recommending changes in licensing of a health personnel so that the manpower shortage would be eased.

Congressman Smith clearly demonstrates that something should be done now when he points out that throughout rural America

doctors are scarce and in many cases nonexistent.

"In the U.S. we only have 151 physicians for each 10,000 of the population and they are distributed in such a way so that many millions of people are for all practical purposes without adequate preventive health care," Smith explains. "One hundred and nine counties in the nation have no physician and 153 only have one."

Congressman Smith points out a perfect example in his own Iowa congressional district where the small community of Monroe struggled and saved so they could build a health clinic. Although the clinic was finally built, it had to close down because of the lack of a doctor.

Rep. Smith points out that all states must change their current licensing laws so that preventive medicine could be practiced without doctors on the premises but in close communication with well-trained nurses and paramedical personnel. Some people raise their eyebrows and say that doctors must be on hand. However, most physicians would welcome this plan to relieve them of simple medical functions which could be performed as well through close communications with the doctor. Maybe, an early diagnosis could prevent misery in the future. In many cases a well-trained technician or nurse could spot the trouble and send the patient to the doctor.

The nation can ill afford to wait for Congress to work out a financial scheme and the many years it takes to train badly needed doctors. The states would be wise to take a hard look at the Smith plan and to start licensing changes.

Mr. Chairman, as this bill is under consideration, I ask my colleagues in this Congress to approve this admittedly very substantial increase over the budget request for the support of the nursing profession. I do so without any apologies whatever to other segments to the health industry, some of which we increased, but in much smaller amounts, and I do so because I think it is imperative that we concentrate a far greater share of our health dollars in this area where we can hope in the near future to get some effective relief from the shortage of health delivery services.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE).

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this occasion is becoming a sadder one each year. Once again, I find myself face to face with a Department of Labor, HEW, and related agencies appropriation bill which runs out of concern, which runs out of compassion by the time it gets to the appropriations for social and rehabilitation services—specifically child welfare grants. For 4 years now, the amount of money spent by the Federal Government for improving the lot of the children who are doomed to be wards of the State through no fault of their own has remained as a constant, miserly level of \$46 million. The national search for ways in which to aid local, community, and State governments; the great national debate over revenue sharing seems to have passed this opportunity by. Every year, it seems, I find myself standing in this well urging that the House amend the committee bill and increase this \$46 million level to the authorized sum of \$110 million. Over the years I have referred to it as the John E.

Fogarty amendment. I have told my colleagues that it would be one of the most fitting tributes to the memory of our great departed friend from Rhode Island. I have received promises year after year from various officials at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that come next year the administration will make an all-out effort to raise this level. Yet, each year I find myself back here disappointed after learning that promises have not been kept. This year is no exception. Once again you are treated to the sorry spectacle that in spite of inflation, in spite of the need of these children, \$46 million is all the Federal Government can expend on their behalf.

I know the situation would be otherwise if we were discussing the needs of a group with muscle, a group that was vocal. What we have before us today, however, is a small group but nonetheless deserving, a neglected group but nonetheless a scandal for being so. We are talking about the children about whom no one cares. The quality of what care there is varies so much across the Nation.

It seems to me we ignore these children's fate at our own future peril. These are the children in the end that no one will adopt. I hate to use the word, but in every sense, they seem to be the leftovers of this Nation in our society. Their treatment at the hands of the Federal Government can only appear to confirm this.

This year, I am changing my strategy. Instead of taking the time of the Members of this House in an all-out effort to overturn the committee provision and raise it to the authorized level where it belongs only to fail as those without a care come out of the woodwork to defeat my proposal—this year I am going to change my strategy and see if I cannot persuade my colleagues in the Senate to add this feature to their bill and hope that in conference, men of goodwill will find it in their power to measure up to our responsibilities and appropriate the full amount authorized. This in no way is indicative of any diminished concern on my part for the children involved or respect for the memory of John Fogarty, merely a decision on how best to accomplish my objectives in the light of past experience. To those from whom I would have expected support today if I had offered an amendment, I want to thank you and remind you that your support will still be valuable in seeing this thing through to completion.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, the Labor-HEW Appropriations Subcommittee has jurisdiction over literally hundreds of Government programs affecting the most important concerns of human life. Each year, the subcommittee is hard pressed to accommodate the very real challenges faced by the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare with the stark limitations inherent in the Federal budget.

Not all can be satisfied with each of the budgetary decisions that was made in this year's bill. But none can deny the diffi-

cult task that each year confronts the subcommittee members. The distinguished gentlemen from Pennsylvania and Illinois, Mr. FLOOD and Mr. MICHEL, as well as my other colleagues on the subcommittee, are to be commended for their hard work and dedication. It was a privilege to serve with them, and I look forward to many more years of continued association on the subcommittee.

I will not repeat the very fine presentations that have already been made regarding the committee bill, but I do have some relatively brief comments that I wish to offer.

It was my hope that additional funds could have been allotted to certain programs covered in the bill, but I believe it important to stress that the committee's recommendations do represent an additional \$912 million above the administration's budget requests and an additional \$768.4 million above last year's appropriation. And these recommendations will undoubtedly be increased by the time final congressional action is completed on the bill.

For the Office of Education, the committee recommends substantial increases in the areas of impact aid, vocational education, education of the handicapped, bilingual education and library services, and construction. These increases are crucial if the Federal Government is to meet its commitment of preparing today's youth adequately to meet the imposing social, economic, and political problems of the next two decades.

There were several areas, however, in which I was disappointed that the committee could not have done more.

Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act authorizes \$605 million for innovation in education. During the past 6 years, hundreds of projects in every subject area of the elementary and secondary curriculum have explored creative new approaches to the solution of identified educational needs. The funds are granted to local school districts for locally controlled programs which meet local educational needs.

With the increased national emphasis on guidance and counseling and the need for rehabilitation training of counselors to cope with increasing numbers of complex personal and social problems confronting our youth and adults, it was my hope that the committee could have increased the administration request of \$126.2 million.

A strong case was made before the subcommittee for additional title V funds to strengthen State departments of education to enable them to meet the burdens imposed on them as the result of the authorization of nearly \$3 billion for education programs under other titles of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Yet the committee simply endorsed the administration request of \$33 million.

The specific learning disabilities, innovation and development, and teacher education programs under education for the handicapped are likewise deserving of increased Federal support.

The committee did make substantial increases in the basic grant program for vocational education, yet there is a need for further Federal efforts in several of

the other vocational education programs dependent upon Federal funds.

There were also many important programs for which the necessary authorizations were lacking. These include virtually all the higher education programs, the Follow Through program, the equipment and minor remodeling program, and the undergraduate instructional equipment program.

I intend to do everything I can, as a member of the Labor-HEW Subcommittee, to secure adequate funding for all the education programs I have discussed.

The committee made important increases in several health programs in which I am extremely interested. Last February the administration called dramatic attention to the fact that alcoholism is one of the most serious diseases affecting our country. There are presently at least 9 million alcoholics costing our economy an astounding \$15 billion a year. Even more tragic than this is the reality that heavy drinkers contribute to more than half the deaths annually on our Nation's highways.

In the face of these grim statistics, the administration actually recommended a sum for the Alcoholism Institute which was below the amount appropriated last year. I am particularly pleased that we added \$59 million to the budget for a coordinated attack on the problems associated with the most abused drug in the United States.

The budget recommendations were likewise woefully inadequate in the mental health area. As I pointed out on the floor of the House last month, the administration requested no new funds for the construction of community mental health centers in fiscal 1973. If we endorsed this recommendation, we would in effect be signing the death warrant for this program. Fortunately, we rejected this course of action and provided \$20 million for construction grants.

The same perilous situation exists regarding the staffing of community mental health centers. Higher matching Federal percentages are now required for centers in poverty areas. Nor are we anywhere near the announced goal in the 1963 legislation of 1,600 to 2,000 new community mental health centers by 1980. Despite this, the administration requested the exact same sum as the Congress appropriated last year. In contrast, we provided an increase of \$30 million to spur us along to the 1980 goal.

I am also gratified that the committee allocated an additional \$10 million for the mental health of children and restored psychiatric residency training grants to last year's level.

As has been explained earlier, the committee made substantial additions to the budget requests for health manpower. I would take special note of the fact that we added a total of \$45.5 million for our hard-pressed nursing schools and their students. Had we endorsed the administration recommendations, the level of capitation and financial distress assistance would have been inexcusably low for fiscal 1973.

There is one other item that is worthy of mention and that is the \$100 million that we included to provide low-

cost, nutritionally sound meals for the elderly.

Numerous studies, conducted over the past several years, have shown that limited employment opportunities, fixed income, lack of mobility, isolation, and a sense of rejection have all too often prevented the elderly from getting the proper nutrition they need. This has resulted in physical and mental deterioration becoming a way of life for too large a proportion of our senior citizens. The money provided in this bill should go a long way in reversing this trend.

In closing, let me say once again that it is an honor to work on this subcommittee. The funds we have recommended are crucial to our goal of improving the quality of American life. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Thank you.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania, DAN FLOOD, and the ranking minority member, BOB MICHEL, who did an outstanding job in bringing this monumental piece of legislation before the House. Let me say that this has to be one of the greatest HEW bills ever brought to the floor of the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I know of the gentleman's interest in the question of lead poisoning, which I have discussed often with him and other members of the subcommittee. It is a devastating disease, yet wholly preventable. As the author of the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, I have been pressing for adequate funding.

But I am concerned that the bill only has some \$12 million to combat lead poisoning, although I recognize and applaud the fact that it is an increase of \$2½ million over what the administration requested.

Mr. CONTE. Yes, it is about \$2½ million above what the administration requested.

Let me also say here, if I may, not only this year but last year, it was the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) who not only put pressure on me, but I am sure he put pressure on the chairman of the committee and the minority members and all the members of the committee to fund adequately this particular project to eliminate lead poisoning. It was his leadership that really spurred the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from New York for his great crusade in this field.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE) for a question.

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

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that the bill before us today would have included an additional \$6.25 million for the migrant health program.

We have over 1 million migrant workers in the United States. We have 21 migrant health projects in Texas and

two of the projects are in my district in Austin and also in San Marcos.

But they have never been able to handle fully the needs of migrant workers. There are 280,000 migrant workers in my State who need help. This group needs more help than any other group of workers.

It is the announced plan of the Public Health Service to phase out the hospitalization program. I think it would be an unfortunate development if that took place.

I wonder what the plans of the committee might be for giving full funding to this?

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman knows that "full funding" is a bad word, as far as we are concerned. But I know what you mean.

The gentleman knows that I personally, and I think I can speak for the subcommittee, am very much in favor of this program.

We have always funded it.

In my own district, as I told the gentleman, we had a meeting of Catholic groups and Protestant groups and ecumenical groups last year to do exactly this. The poverty people are helping us do it. That is the thinking of the subcommittee.

The other body I know has also indicated some interest in this program, and I think the gentleman may have that in mind.

Mr. PICKLE. I understand the other body has worked on the possibility of a proposed provision including these additional funds in its version of the bill.

Mr. FLOOD. May I say this—probably I should not tell you—but the other body is going to mark up this bill tomorrow and it is only 20 minutes after 5, and you can take that into account.

Mr. PICKLE. I will say to the gentleman, I did not know that they were working on that. Now I know and I thank the gentleman for being sympathetic to the program.

Mr. Chairman, I feel there is a need to increase the health delivery appropriation by \$6.25 million. The purpose of this increase is to increase the fund for the Migrant Health Act from \$23.75 million to the authorized level of \$30 million.

I suggest this increase, Mr. Chairman, because I believe the health needs of over 1 million migrant farmworkers have been neglected for too long, or have been underfunded.

Texas has the largest number of migrant health projects in the Nation with 21, two of which are located in my district in Austin and San Marcos. However, these projects have not as yet been able to fully meet the needs of the estimated 280,000 migrant workers who call Texas home.

I am deeply concerned about the plans of the Public Health Service to phase out its program of hospitalization coverage for migrants because the funds available are inadequate.

In light of the plight of the migrant worker this action would be a sad step indeed.

Generally, the man and his family who follow the crops rarely receive adequate health care. He is seldom eligible

for local programs and when he is, his work usually takes him to isolated areas that do not have adequate facilities or programs. According to the U.S. Public Health Service at least two-thirds of all migrants are totally unaware of any of the handful of special programs designed for them.

Most importantly, the migrant's working and living conditions make him highly vulnerable to a wide range of diseases. His life expectancy is 20 years shorter than the average citizen's. His infant and maternal mortality rate is 125 percent higher than the national average while his death rate from influenza and pneumonia is 200 percent higher than the national rate. He or his family are 17 times more likely to suffer from tuberculosis and 35 times more likely to have worms. If he survives infancy and does not die 20 years before his time of pneumonia or tuberculosis, then he has a better chance than the average citizen of suffering from high blood pressure, diabetes, anemia, rickets, or a dozen other major diseases.

If provision is not made for adequate funding of the Public Health Service's hospitalization program for migrants under this act, then the proposed policy will seriously reduce the amount of health service available to those who most severely need more help—not less help.

Because most welfare programs do not cover these families, a single serious illness requiring hospitalization can wipe out their life savings. Furthermore, the elimination of Federal assistance will place the financial burden of these services on local communities which often already are facing severe financial problems.

At present the per capita health expenditures per migrant is less than \$9 compared with a national average of \$250 per person.

Mr. Chairman, I think we can afford to appropriate these additional funds. I believe the time has come to end the migrant's status as a forgotten and ignored man and to start trying to make some adequate provision for his health care needs.

Mr. FLOOD. I understand your views.

Mr. PICKLE. I thank the gentleman.

I hope if the additional funds are added during the conference, we might be able to reach the point near full funding—whatever it might be.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge passage of H.R. 15417, appropriating funds for fiscal year 1973 for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. I want to particularly offer my commendations to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee responsible for fashioning this bill, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD). I can sincerely attest to his dedication and to his determination to bring to the floor a bill which is a direct assault on the pressing health and education needs of this Nation.

The bill before us appropriates more

than \$28 billion for health, education, manpower training, employment, and other vital programs. This constitutes an increase of \$768,481,500 over the funding for fiscal year 1972. This is an increase which is absolutely essential, because the appropriations for the health, education, and employment needs of this country constitute the very guts of our struggle to turn around the priorities of this Nation.

There are a whole list of specific items in H.R. 15417 which, given the time, I would want to discuss thoroughly. Very briefly, I want to mention in passing just a few of these.

An increase of \$7 million over the administration request is provided for psychiatric residency training, restoring this program to its 1972 level.

The administration budget proposed no increase in the mental health for children program. H.R. 15417 provides a \$10 million increase.

The administration requested no funds for construction of community mental health centers. The bill provides \$20 million.

Three hundred million dollars is provided for the National Heart and Lung Institute—an increase of more than \$44 million over the administration's request, and more than \$67 million over the appropriation for fiscal year 1972.

The bill before us provides more than \$490 million for the National Cancer Institute. In this case, the increase over the administration request is \$60 million.

H.R. 15417 provides \$112,200,000 for construction grants and modernization for hospitals and public health centers and long-term care facilities. No funds were requested by the administration for this.

A more than \$200,000,000 increase over the administration request has been provided for programs authorized by the Comprehensive Health Manpower and Nurse Training Acts of 1971. This includes \$20 million for construction grants for nursing schools and \$100 million for construction grants for schools of medicine, dentistry, and other health professions. Again, and I note this pointedly, the administration requested no funds for construction grants.

The appropriations bill before us also adds \$59 million for activities related to the prevention and control of alcoholism.

An increase of \$30 million over the administration budget request is provided for the staffing of community mental health centers.

The refusal by the Appropriations Committee subcommittee to be limited by the administration's limited sense of the priorities of this Nation is commendable, and must be supported, so that we can continue to turn this country around to meeting our pressing domestic needs. However, I would be remiss if I did not state clearly that while we have begun, we still have very far to go. I support the bill before us, but I urgently support even greater funding for all the crucial programs it encompasses.

In addition to the many programs involved which I have attempted to lend my voice in support of, there is one to

which I do want to direct particular attention. This is the Federal assault on childhood lead poisoning—an assault fashioned by passage of the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, Public Law 91-695. As the original sponsor of this legislation, which was signed into law in January of 1971, I have, I believe, developed some special knowledge of the enormity of childhood lead poisoning's effects and of the number of innocent children it victimizes.

Sometimes childhood lead poisoning is called the "silent epidemic"; sometimes it is referred to as "ghetto malaria." But no matter what it is called, the tragic fact remains that childhood lead poisoning continues needlessly to plague the children of America. Each year thousands of young children are afflicted by this dread disease. The exact number of youngsters poisoned is unknown, for there are still far too few programs to screen children for lead poisoning. Even so, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has estimated that each year some 400,000 children are subjected to lead-based paint poisonings.

As a result, some 16,000 youngsters require treatment. An additional 3,200 suffer moderate to severe brain damage. And 800 are so severely afflicted that they require institutionalization for the remainder of their lives.

And for another 200 children there is no future at all—not even the bare existence of permanent institutionalization—for they will die as a result of this crippling of young children. Two hundred children a year.

In the words of HEW's Bureau of Community Environmental Management, what this adds up to is a "disease more prevalent than polio before the advent of the Salk vaccine."

Tragically, childhood lead poisoning is a totally manmade and totally preventable disease. It is not some rare malady waiting for a miracle cure. It exists only because we let it exist.

Three years ago I introduced legislation to begin a Federal program to come to grips with thiscrippler and killer of young children. Subsequently, Senator KENNEDY introduced companion legislation in the Senate. Finally, after 2 years of intensive effort, and with the special aid of our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT), the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act was signed into law on January 13, 1971. In enacting this law, President Nixon committed this Nation to a massive assault to eradicate the blight of childhood lead poisoning. That commitment remains unfulfilled.

Much of the reason for this is as simple as it is intolerable: the victims of lead poisoning are the poor and the black youngsters of our inner cities, destined to live in slum housing, without enough to eat, and without adequate medical care. They are America's forgotten children, her invisible children. And the attitude of this administration toward these youngsters has been one of cruel and callous disregard. This unconscionable neglect can only be measured in the unnecessary suffering of thousands of young children.

This Government has been allowed to close its eyes to the plight of these children for far too long. It is imperative that the Congress sustain a comprehensive and meaningful program which will safeguard their health from this dread disease.

In good part, the reason that lead poisoning continues to be a national peril is that neither the Congress nor the administration has been willing to provide sufficient funding to meet the menace of lead-based paint poisoning. Despite the fact that the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act authorized \$30 million for fiscal years 1971 and 1972, the Nixon administration refused to request any money to fund this act for fiscal 1971, and only after great pressure from me and other concerned individuals did it belatedly submit an amended budget request for \$2 million for fiscal year 1972. The Congress—with great credit due to the distinguished chairman (Mr. FLOON) and members of the subcommittee which has fashioned the bill before us today—recognized the total insufficiency of this request. But still, only \$7.5 million was provided in appropriations for fiscal year 1972. That was inadequate to meet the need.

For fiscal year 1973, the fiscal year which is the subject of the appropriations bill before us today, the administration requested \$9.5 million. Fortunately, the Subcommittee on the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations of the House Appropriations Committee has raised that amount by \$2.5 million, providing \$12 million in H.R. 15417.

While I commend the subcommittee for not being constrained by the administration's totally inadequate budget request, I do not believe that \$12 million is anywhere near sufficient. For fiscal year 1972, which ends on June 30 of this year, the regional health directors of HEW had received, as of May 5, 1972, 61 grant applications from communities totalling about \$15.8 million. This means that grant requests—with 2 months of the fiscal year still left—exceeded by more than 100 percent the available funds. And certainly the amount of requests would have been much greater but for the discouragement potential applicants received upon finding how little moneys were available, and how dilatory the administration was being in releasing funds. In fact, the first grant was not even made until May 8 of this year.

All factors indicate that the grant requests for fiscal year 1973 will far, far exceed the \$12 million provided in H.R. 15417.

The most compelling testimony to the need for far greater funds was registered, perhaps, by the administration itself. At page 428 of the Appropriations Subcommittee's hearings, part 3, an administration statement acknowledges that—

An expenditure of \$25 million would support a program for approximately 60 percent of the children at risk.

Thus, even an appropriation twice that provided in H.R. 15417 would still leave 40 percent of the children, who risk lead poisoning, unscreened and untreated.

And at page 473 of the same volume,

another administration statement acknowledges that, given the administration's request of \$9.5 million, which is only \$2.5 million less than that provided in the bill before us, only "40 percent of the estimated high risk population will be under surveillance as a result of the screening programs."

The figures are clear. We are simply consigning children to total lack of screening for lead poisoning, and care, if they in fact have this dread disease.

I realize that there are innumerable pressures for increased funds, and I realize that the Appropriations Subcommittee's raising of funding for the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act by more than 25 percent over the administration request demonstrates a very real recognition of the seriousness of this disease. Given the competing demands confronting it, I believe the subcommittee acted admirably. I urge the Senate, however, to greatly increase the funding for the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, and I urge the eventual conferees on the fiscal year 1973 appropriations bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to accept this increased figure.

The children must have that money. I would continue by pointing out that we are now working to increase the authorizations for the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, so that we can expand the assault on childhood lead poisoning.

On the first day of this session of the 92d Congress, I introduced legislation (H.R. 12466) to extend and expand the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act. And I am pleased to note that subsequently Senator KENNEDY introduced the companion legislation (S. 3080).

It is my firm belief that the passage of this legislation is an integral part of the program which we must launch to eradicate the blight of lead-based paint poisoning from the face of this country.

Sixty-five Members of Congress have joined in sponsoring this bill. They are:

LIST OF COSPONSORS

William F. Ryan (N.Y.).
Bella S. Abzug (N.Y.).
Herman Badillo (N.Y.).
William A. Barrett (Pa.).
Mario Biaggi (N.Y.).
Jonathan Bingham (N.Y.).
Edward Boland (Mass.).
John Brademas (Ind.).
Frank Brasco (N.Y.).
James Burke (Mass.).
Phillip Burton (Calif.).
Hugh Carey (N.Y.).
Shirley Chisholm (N.Y.).
William Clay (Mo.).
James Cleveland (N.H.).
George Collins (Ill.).
Silvio Conte (Mass.).
John Conyers (Mich.).
James C. Corman (Calif.).
George Danielson (Calif.).
Ronald B. Dellums (Calif.).
John Dent (Pa.).
Charles Diggs (Mich.).
John Dow (N.Y.).
Robert Drinan (Mass.).
Don Edwards (Calif.).
Joshua Ellberg (Pa.).
Walter E. Fauntroy (D.C.).
Donald Fraser (Minn.).
Ella Grasso (Conn.).
Seymour Halpern (N.Y.).
Michael Harrington (Mass.).

William Hathaway (Me.).
Augustus Hawkins (Calif.).
Ken Hechler (W. Va.).
Henry Helstoski (N.J.).
Louise Day Hicks (Mass.).
Frank Horton (N.Y.).
Andy Jacobs (Ind.).
Edward I. Koch (N.Y.).
Romano Mazzoli (Ky.).
Abner Mikva (Ill.).
Parren Mitchell (Md.).
F. Bradford Morse (Mass.).
Claude Pepper (Fla.).
Otis Pike (N.Y.).
Bertram Podell (N.Y.).
Melvin Price (Ill.).
Charles B. Rangel (N.Y.).
Thomas Rees (Calif.).
Ogden Reid (N.Y.).
Henry Reuss (Wis.).
Peter W. Rodino Jr. (N.J.).
Benjamin Rosenthal (N.Y.).
Dan Rostenkowski (Ill.).
Fernand St Germain (R.I.).
Paul Sarbanes (Md.).
James Scheuer (N.Y.).
John Seiberling (Ohio).
Louis Stokes (Ohio).
James Symington (Mo.).
Robert Tlernan (R.I.).
Lester Wolff (N.Y.).
Sidney Yates (Ill.).

I believe that both the bipartisan nature and widely differing geographic representation of this list of cosponsors indicates the growing awareness throughout this Nation that childhood lead poisoning must be eliminated, and that the Federal Government must lead the way in that effort.

Our legislation provides that for fiscal year 1973 and for each succeeding fiscal year, there is authorized to be appropriated \$20 million for grants to units of general local government to assist in developing and carrying out local detection and treatment programs for victims of childhood lead poisoning; \$25 million for grants to develop and carry out programs to identify high-risk areas, and then to develop and carry out lead-based paint elimination programs; and \$5 million for the Department of Housing and Urban Development to carry out a demonstration and research program to determine the nature and extent of the problem and the methods by which lead-based paint can most effectively be removed.

Any amounts authorized for 1 fiscal year but not appropriated may be appropriated for the succeeding fiscal year.

That every penny of these funds is urgently needed is clear. But what is more striking is that, if we fail to spend the necessary funds to combat this menace, we will have to expend far more patching up the sins committed against our children by allowing them to fall victims to this horrid disease.

Each year, for example, 800 young children are so severely afflicted by this crawler that they require institutionalization and care for the remainder of their lives. It has been estimated that such care costs \$250,000 per child for a lifetime of institutionalization. What better proof that, even in cold economic terms, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

Our pending legislation would also change the definition of lead-based paint from paint containing more than 1 percent lead by weight—calculated as lead

metal—in the total nonvolatile content of liquid paints or in the dried surface coating to 0.06 percent lead by weight.

The matter of a "safe" level of lead in paint has been of deep concern to me for quite some time. On August 9, 1971, five child health advocates joined me in filing a formal petition with the Food and Drug Administration requesting that agency to ban paint with more than minute traces—0.06 percent—of lead from household uses under the authority of the Federal Substances Act.

Joining me in submitting this petition were Prof. Joseph A. Page, associate professor, Georgetown University Law Center; Anthony L. Young; Mary Win O'Brien; Journalist Jack Newfield; and Dr. Edmund O. Rothschild, Memorial Hospital for Cancer and Allied Diseases, New York City.

On November 2, 1971, the FDA published our petition in the Federal Register in order to allow interested parties to make their comments known. At the same time, however, the FDA published another proposal—one which it had itself initiated—which would merely require that paints with a lead content in excess of 0.5 percent bear a warning label.

The overwhelming preponderance of medical and scientific evidence and opinion submitted to the FDA in regard to these proposals support my petition to ban paint with a lead content in excess of 0.06 percent from household uses. Included among the wide range of individuals and organizations endorsing my proposal are the Environmental Protection Agency; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Bureau of Community Environmental Management; Jane Lin-Fu, Pediatric Consultant, Maternal and Child Health Services, HEW; the American Academy of Pediatrics; the American Public Health Association; the State of New York; the New York City Department of Consumer Affairs; and a great number of State and local health departments across this country.

Typical of the comments submitted to the FDA are those from the Environmental Protection Agency, which in its memorandum to the FDA of January 28, 1972, pointed out that—

(EPA) studies . . . indicate that lead paint, in excess of 0.05% could constitute a danger to the health of children with pica. Our conclusion is similar to that of the American Academy of Pediatrics, which strongly recommended that lead paint in excess of 0.06% should not be permitted.

On August 2, 1971, I requested the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development to undertake a full investigation as to the lead content of all paint manufactured in or imported into the United States. That study, being conducted through the National Bureau of Standards is now underway.

On February 16, 1972, Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology, HUD Harold B. Finger, provided me with the results of the preliminary survey undertaken in the Washington, D.C., area.

This preliminary study demonstrated two things. First, that there are some paints on the shelves which are in viola-

tion of the self-imposed industry standard of 1 percent lead content for household uses. And second, the vast majority of paint—72 of 97 samples analyzed—currently have a lead content less than 0.1 percent. What is most striking about this is that the paint industry has endorsed the FDA proposal to lower the definitional level to 0.5 percent, while adamantly opposing anything more stringent. Yet only three of 97 samples had a lead content in excess of 0.1 percent and less than 0.5 percent. From this preliminary data it would appear that the great preponderance of paint currently being manufactured is no more than 0.04 percent in excess of the definitional limit which our legislation proposes.

If we are to eliminate lead-based paint poisoning, we must eliminate lead from paint. It is my firm belief that the health of our Nation's children is of far more import than the slight inconvenience to paint manufacturers who will be obliged to insure quality control in the manufacture of their product.

On March 11, the FDA family acceded, and has adopted our petition. Adoption as law of this position by passage of H.R. 12466 will protect against future retraction.

The Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act specifies that only "units of general local government in any State" are eligible for grants under titles I and II. Unfortunately, because of the administrative set-up in two States—Rhode Island and Delaware—this precludes them from receiving Federal assistance under the act.

In an effort to coordinate health services, the State of Rhode Island abolished all local health departments and offices and placed all health matters under the jurisdiction of the State Department of Health in 1966. Likewise, health programs in the State of Delaware are operated on a statewide basis.

In order to permit these States to obtain much-needed Federal funding to combat the hazards of childhood lead poisoning, my pending legislation—H.R. 12466—authorizes grants to be made to State agencies in any case where units of general local government within a State are prevented by State law from receiving such grants or from expending such grants in accordance with their intended purpose.

I believe that it is essential that Federal funds to combat lead-based paint poisoning be easily channeled to the community level where they are most needed. Therefore H.R. 12466 broadens the definition of those eligible to receive grants to include comprehensive health services programs within the meaning of section 222(a)(4) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Finally, H.R. 12466 broadens the provisions relating to grants for detection and treatment of childhood lead poisoning to allow the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to State agencies for the purpose of establishing centralized laboratory facilities for analyzing environmental and biological lead specimens obtained from local lead-based paint poisoning prevention programs. The amount of any such grant

cannot exceed 75 percent of the cost of such a facility—a matching requirement identical to that under the other sections of title I of the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act.

It should be stressed that while lead poisoning is a health problem, it also is a housing problem. The main cause of this terriblecrippler and killer of young children is lead-tainted paint fallen from the dilapidated walls and ceilings of tenement housing. If we are to eradicate this disease, we must eliminate its cause, for it does little good to screen and treat young children for lead poisoning and then send them back to the same conditions which caused the disease in the beginning.

Unfortunately, the elimination of lead-based paint has not been a task which has been thoroughly undertaken by States and local governments. I believe that the Federal Government can play a two-fold role in changing this situation. First, it is essential that the Congress provide adequate funding for grants under title II for the eradication of the lead-based paint in these dwellings. But second, it now appears necessary that the Federal Government use whatever means necessary to force the improvement of this housing.

Therefore, I have introduced H.R. 12943 which provides that Federal assistance to a State or local government or agency for rehabilitation or renovation of housing and for enforcement of local or State housing codes under the urban renewal program, the public housing program, the model cities program, or under any other program involving the provision by State or local governments of housing or related facilities, shall be made available only on condition that the recipient submit and carry out an effective plan for the elimination of lead-based paint poisoning.

Childhood lead poisoning is a national peril, bringing death and affliction to thousands of young children each year. Its continuance is a strain on our national conscience, for there is absolutely no reason for this disease to be allowed to continue.

We have the ability to eradicate the menace of lead-based paint poisoning from the face of America. There is no question about that. What must be questioned, however, is our will to do so. For this Government has a history of sitting on its hands when it comes to safeguarding the health of our poor citizens.

As I said when I testified on April 20 before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on the bill before us today:

We have an obligation to assure that all children in this Nation—all children—have the opportunity to grow up in health and decent living conditions. Either we meet that obligation or we fail. It will not fade away by our ignoring it.

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

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from New York for his statement which he just made and also for the very eloquent testimony that he gave our subcommittee in specific detail.

I must say that the subcommittee was very impressed with his remarks for the addition of \$2½ million which will go principally for the screening and treatment activities in the lead poisoning problem.

I just wanted to make that comment at this particular juncture because I think it is very much deserved, and but for his testimony and his persistent efforts I do not think we would have done what we did. I appreciate that and commend the gentleman for it.

Mr. FLOOD. I would like to say in addition to that, I would like to add my words.

Because of the experience with this problem in recent years with reference to lead-base poisoning, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) brought this up year after year especially for the last 3 years before the committee and is largely responsible for the making of these grants and the beginning of that program.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. DENHOLM).

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I would first commend the members of the committee for bringing a very complicated and comprehensive bill here this afternoon.

I would direct your attention to page 48 of the committee report under "School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas," particularly where it reads:

The bill also provides \$25,910,000 for assistance for school construction in Federally affected areas under P.L. 815, an increase of \$10,000,000 over the budget request and \$6,610,000 over the 1972 appropriation.

It is the Committee's intent that the funds provided for 1973 be used to support high priority projects to meet urgent needs for school facilities for Indian children and for children living on military installations, particularly in cases where the schools are located on Federal lands, but are operated by local authorities.

My question is, Mr. Chairman, in a case where the schools are not located on Federal lands but are adjacent to, and the districts include Federal lands, and there are a number of schoolchildren attending the off-Federal-located institutions, is it the intent of the committee that the funds under Public Law 815 be used for construction to provide facilities for all children who attend that institution?

Mr. FLOOD. I think it is language that, without torture, should be so construed, and I will say for what it is worth that I believe that would be the opinion of the committee.

Mr. DENHOLM. Very well. I commend the committee for including that this year and funding it.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

URGENCY OF ARTIFICIAL HEART DEVELOPMENT

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, without comment or judgment on sectional or total overages or cuts, or national resource capability I would like to give a professional comment and report.

It has long been known that more than one-half of our U.S. citizens die of causes related to heart malfunction, disability,

or disease. Many of these lives may well be lost for lack of prompt medical attention, and lack of ready transport to modernized, new intensive-care units; but assuredly many others are lost simply because their hearts are tired, wornout, and beyond repair. At least 20 to 30,000 of these unfortunate people die each year because a "replacement heart" is not available.

Long before I came to the Congress, I made the statement as a physician-surgeon, that someday in the future the cure of heart disease as one of man's greatest scourges would be surgical or mechanical; and hopefully that the treatment of malignancy—cancer—would be by hormone, serum, or injection. I have previously stated in the RECORD, that the solution to the cardiac replacement problem must rest with a suitable artificial heart; just as we now use pacemakers, properly implanted in the chest and heart wall to regulate rhythm and uniform contraction of the unique heart muscle itself. Even if heart transplants were 100 percent successful, there would still not be enough donor hearts available to meet current needs, at all times and places. Even if we would allow use of a still beating heart, from an otherwise legally determined "dead person," it would be a difficult technical feat, that is time consuming with too few surgeons to supply the demand.

It now appears that the technology is available to make a suitable artificial heart in accordance with the line of research, developed under grants from the National Heart and Lung Institute of the U.S. Department of HEW, Public Health Service, National Institute of Health, as contracted to Atlantic Richfield Co., atomic nuclear division. There undoubtedly are others working on the same or similar projects. Suffice it to say, that every effort, as demonstrated by these booklets and brochures, available for perusal by the Members during these committee hearings—should now be made to accelerate the development effort expended on artificial heart research. The incentive is obvious, in that for every day we save, about 100 lives can be saved. We can well leave it to posterity to decide whom would turn off the artificially implanted heart, all other body mechanisms being equal.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORMAN) for the purpose of asking a question.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, earlier I addressed a question to Chairman MAHON with reference to the impact of an expenditure ceiling. As I understand, this bill exceeds the budget request by a substantial amount.

Mr. FLOOD. \$912 million, close to \$1 billion.

Mr. CORMAN. Tomorrow, as I understand it, we may be considering some additions in the field of education.

Mr. FLOOD. Amendments will be proposed.

Mr. CORMAN. If either, in connection with the debt ceiling extension, or by action of the Appropriations Committee the House imposes an expenditure ceiling at the amount recommended by the

President, which is his budget request, and if we go over on this bill by \$1 billion, it means he must either cut this bill back or cut some other expenditure by \$1 billion.

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct.

Mr. CORMAN. And this is just one of several appropriation bills, many of which have had limits over the budget request.

Mr. FLOOD. Some have.

Mr. CORMAN. Have any had less than the budget requests?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. CORMAN. Which?

Mr. FLOOD. Some have. I do not recall. There will be some, but most, of course, will be above the budget level. This will be the biggest one. I might add that we have reason to believe that the Department of Defense will ask for an additional, maybe, \$3 billion or \$4 billion or \$5 billion.

Mr. CORMAN. That was our preliminary information when we considered the debt ceiling request, that it would be \$3 to \$5 billion more than anticipated.

I understand there has been a bumper corn crop which has increased by nearly \$3 billion the subsidy in the corn program. Maybe that is too far afield for the gentleman.

Mr. FLOOD. I have difficulty telling one type of corn from another, yes.

Mr. CORMAN. My question is, if we should adopt revenue sharing plus an expenditure ceiling, then we must anticipate some substantial cuts in the expenditures we propose. I am wondering what areas the President would have in which he could make those cuts. Obviously he must pay some bills.

Mr. FLOOD. That is a rhetorical question the gentleman will have to answer himself.

Mr. CORMAN. Just one other point on that. I understand there is going to be a substantial increase, at least the Senate Finance Committee has proposed it, in social security benefits.

Mr. FLOOD. I have so heard.

Mr. CORMAN. That, too, falls within the expenditure ceilings.

Mr. FLOOD. I have so heard.

Mr. CORMAN. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

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

Mr. FLOOD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

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

I was interested in that bumper corn crop the gentleman from California was talking about.

Mr. FLOOD. If I were from Iowa, I would be, as well.

Mr. GROSS. If anyone would have told me a few months ago there was going to be a bumper corn crop, I would say there must be a crystal ball, the like of which I have not known.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman from California has such an instrument.

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

Mr. FLOOD. Of course, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORMAN. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa, I know almost nothing about corn, either distilled or in its natural state.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I thought.

Mr. CORMAN. But I would like to point out to the gentleman that when the Committee on Ways and Means was informed by the Treasury that there have been budget increases that were unanticipated, the Department of Agriculture had come up from \$8 billion to \$11 billion, \$3 billion of which was not anticipated. I asked why. I was told it was because a couple of years ago there was a corn blight, and they anticipated a lower yield, and they planted too much corn, and then there was no corn blight the next year, and they had to buy almost \$3 billion more worth of corn than they had planned. I cite the Treasury Department rather than the Department of Agriculture as my source.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman ought to understand that simply because seed is put into the ground, it does not mean there will be a crop.

Mr. CORMAN. But I understand they got a big crop and they could not sell it to anybody else. So naturally, they sold it to the taxpayers.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman is saying we are going to have a bumper crop, I say to the gentleman he does not know, and no one knows.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, it is just a little bit too much corn.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, the fiscal 1973 appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare presents the House, in general, with satisfactory funding levels for most programs and agencies within its purview.

However, with regard to elementary and secondary education, adult education, vocational education, and library assistance, the legislation falls short of providing adequate funding to meet even the costs of inflation. Therefore, I shall support the quality education amendment which seeks to add \$364 million to the bill and I shall have more to say on this subject when that amendment is considered by the House.

Another area in which I have been vitally interested and to which I will devote my remarks is cancer research. I am extremely gratified that the committee saw fit to overrule the administration by providing \$60 million more than the budget request for the National Cancer Institute.

The legislation before us today would appropriate \$492 million for the National Cancer Institute during fiscal 1973, an increase of \$114 million over last year's budget. In addition, most of the \$40 million included in the recently enacted second supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal 1972 will be available for expenditure next year thus bringing the cancer appropriations up to virtually the full authorization.

As a prime sponsor last year of the Conquest of Cancer Act which eventually led to the cancer attack bill signed by the President in December, I must commend the committee for a job well done. The committee has provided a funding

level for the cancer attack program which will insure that the commitment made in last year's authorizing legislation is fulfilled.

Mr. Chairman, the Senate now should act to provide a similar level of funding for cancer research so that we may proceed promptly with the difficult task of finding the cause and the cure for this dread disease.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Chairman, once again the Appropriations Committee has responded to the health needs of the Nation by providing generous support for the various health programs authorized under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I heartily support the health provisions of H.R. 15417, the Labor-HEW appropriations bill, and commend the chairman of the Labor-HEW Subcommittee, the distinguished gentlemen from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood) and his colleagues on the Committee for their outstanding work.

A major component of improved health care for the people of this Nation is adequately funded, advanced health research and improved health care facilities and programs. The health budget submitted by the administration failed to meet these needs. Throughout the entire health budget, the administration request totaled only \$3.7 billion for programs to improve the Nation's health. The net increase for research in diseases other than cancer and heart disease was less than 3 percent—an increase which did not even cover the cost of inflation. This is false economy which could deprive every major program of the funds necessary to improve the health and health care services of this Nation.

Fortunately, the Appropriations Committee's decision that to economize on the Nation's health benefits no one is reflected in the health budget which it has presented. In a number of specific areas, the Committee has provided substantial and welcome increases in appropriations for vital programs.

For instance, although an estimated 10 percent of the population suffers from some type of mental illness requiring treatment, the budget requested only \$613.8 million in this area. This represented an increase over the fiscal year 1972 appropriations of a mere \$800,000. The committee included \$130 million in additional funds for certain vital mental health programs.

Under the administration budget, the community mental health center program (CMHC)—the major contribution of the past decade to mental health care—would no longer provide essential expansion. The budget included no increase for CMHC staffing grants and no request for construction grants. Realizing the importance of this program to local mental health care, the committee provided \$30 million for staffing and \$20 million for construction grants.

Alcoholism affects 9 million Americans, accounts for half of our traffic fatalities and costs an estimated \$15 billion a year to the economy. To counterattack what has been called the Nation's No. 1 drug problem, the budget called for funds that would maintain a program at the

1972 level. The committee on the other hand, decided that a true national commitment required additional funds and, therefore, provided \$59 million more. Of this figure, \$30 million will double the figure allocated to formula grants for statewide treatment and rehabilitation programs and another \$20 million will increase individual project grants to over \$70 million.

The crying needs of our children in the mental health field are of special concern to me. While the number of adult patients in State mental hospitals has declined in the past 16 years, the number of admissions of children has drastically risen. The most devastating and merciless effect of inadequate Federal mental health funding has fallen, tragically, on these children. At a time when this administration claims that mental health services for children enjoy high priority consideration, it is baffling—indeed, appalling—that only \$10 million for developing children's services at community mental health centers was requested this year. The additional \$10 million approved by the committee will provide a better start for the development of proper care for these children.

In other health areas the committee has reaffirmed the commitment of the Congress to important programs.

Although the need for new and improved health facilities increases each day, funds for the Hill-Burton and other construction and modernization programs were virtually eliminated from the administration request. The bill before us, on the other hand, includes \$112 million for hospital construction under this program.

During the 92d Congress, the Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act and the Nurse Training Act of 1971 established new programs to meet the ever increasing need for skillfully trained medical personnel. Yet there was no request for the funds which would effectively implement these programs—actually the amount requested was \$140 million less than last year. Noting that adequate health care demands trained personnel, the committee increased the administration's request by \$205 million and stipulated that \$120 million shall be used for the construction of facilities.

This Congress also passed legislation to embark on a crusade to conquer cancer, a disease that strikes one in every four Americans. The Congress, reflecting the determination of our people to apply the necessary resources required to meet this commitment to conquer cancer, authorized \$532 million for this year. The budget request was only for \$432 million. However, with the \$40 million contained in the recent supplemental appropriations and the \$60 million added by the Appropriations Committee to this bill, the committee has reaffirmed this national resolution which has as its goal the discovery of a cure for cancer.

Heart and lung diseases take a frightening toll of victims each year. Heart disease alone accounts for 38.6 percent of the deaths annually. Emphysema and chronic bronchitis have increased at alarming rates. To combat the various diseases which affect the heart and lung,

the committee has suggested \$300 million—\$44.7 million above the administration's request. \$14 million will be used for research and treatment of sickle cell anemia. As the first sponsor of legislation introduced in this Congress to establish a national program to seek an effective cure for sickle cell, I am pleased to see that this commitment has been translated into desperately needed research funds. It is my hope as well that the war on Cooley's Anemia will be recognized in supplemental budgeting as authorizing programs are developed.

Other areas have also received funds needed to continue research at least at last year's level. Some areas of research are little known to many of us, but they deserve our support.

The National Institute of Child Health and Human Development will receive \$130.4 million this year—\$3.2 million above the budget request and \$14 million above last year's appropriations. I was heartened to read that the committee is very much concerned about the lack of research being conducted into sudden infant death syndrome—SIDS. The syndrome is the major cause of death of infants between 1 month and 1 year of age. Yet, the occurrence of SIDS or "crib death" cannot be predicted nor is a cure available. In a statement submitted to the Labor-HEW Subcommittee on May 2, I urged that \$10 million be specifically earmarked for research on SIDS. On June 7, the Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 206 by a vote of 72 to 0. This resolution, identical to one which I introduced on March 27, stipulated that research on SIDS should be given one of the highest priorities within the Institute of Child Health. The increase in appropriations for the Institute and the committee's statement that research on the syndrome should be vigorously pursued increases the possibility that discovering the cause of and cure for SIDS will soon become reality.

Last year, the Congress provided \$350 million in additional funds for these health programs. This year the Appropriations Committee again reviewed our health priorities and reported a bill with over \$600 million more for health programs than had been suggested in the budget.

Mr. Chairman, as a nation of wealth and technology, we should use our resources to benefit all the people of our Nation. Unless the Federal commitment in this field is increased, the health and health care situation in this country will deteriorate further. Not to take this affirmative action would be a crime against ourselves and our children.

I believe that the proposal before us takes this positive action. The committee bill funds programs desperately needed to provide better health, health care and facilities for the citizens of this great country.

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Chairman, I support the House Appropriations Committee's increase of \$912 million to the appropriations budget for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I am particularly pleased to see that HEW's health forces will receive \$4.7 billion, instead of the \$4.1 billion in the

President's proposal. Even this, however, is not enough. If there is an area of national concern in which we should be concentrating our efforts, it is in the area of health care. There are not enough doctors; not enough hospitals—and most of the hospitals are understaffed and ill-equipped; and there are too many people in this country who are without easy access to any hospital or any medical doctor.

As chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus' Subcommittee on Health, I have been involved in several conferences on health which have brought together consumers and medical experts, both of whom have testified to the inadequacy of health care in this country. I am convinced that health care must be one of our national priorities.

If this increase is approved there will be more money in the area of mental health, cancer, heart disease and alcoholism. And there will be more money for our medical schools.

I am also happy to see that we are headed in the right direction in the area of education. The \$3.6 billion approved by the committee, is \$302 million above the budget request and \$54 million above the fiscal year 1972 funding level. However, as is so in the health area, this still is not enough to meet our educational needs. I support the Hathaway amendment which will add \$364 million to various education programs in the committee bill and I support Representative BADILLO's amendment to add \$15 million for bilingual education.

I urge my colleagues here to also support the committee's bill and the two amendments to this bill which I have mentioned.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak in support of the quality education amendment to the HEW-Labor appropriations bill. The Appropriations Committee recommended increases in the Office of Education appropriations in the form of basic grants for vocational education, education of the handicapped, bilingual education, and the library services and construction areas. This is commendable, but the recommendations do not go far enough in some areas, and are lacking in others.

The Appropriations Committee has increased the administration's budget request by about \$300 million for fiscal year 1973. However, according to Office of Education data, my State and school districts will still receive at least \$118,000 less than they did in fiscal year 1972. This is represented by a \$38,000 cut in programs for educationally disadvantaged children and a loss of \$80,000 for vocational education.

I have long been a staunch supporter of increasing educational opportunities for all people. In the past few years, great advances have been made, especially in the areas of vocational education and education of the handicapped. But, these advances cost money. We cannot afford to go back on the investments of time and money that we have already made in the educational system of our country. We must do whatever is necessary to maintain the level of education which has been attained, as well as to

advance it in the future. To reach these goals, full funding up to the level requested by the Office of Education, is vitally necessary.

I have found that needed additions, over and above the subcommittee additions to the administration's request, total nearly \$364 million. Along with the subcommittee's additions of \$301 million, this would represent a total addition of over \$665 to the original budget. I feel that this is a reasonable request and that the Office of Education should be funded up to the level of these recommendations.

Of the \$364 million in needed additions to the committee report, \$257.5 million would be allotted to the areas of elementary and secondary education. The bulk of that sum—\$212.5 million—would be spent on programs for the education of disadvantaged children. We cannot turn our back on individuals who, because of their special situations, may require more intense and specialized and, therefore, more expensive, types of education.

Under the proposed amendment another \$27.6 million would be granted to vocational education programs. This is a relatively new and rapidly expanding area of education which provides a different type of opportunity than the traditional institutions of higher learning. It is important that we continue to expand in this area.

The additions which I am supporting are necessary in order to continue to improve and expand our educational system. Any cutback or insufficiency of increase could be fatal to programs already in existence, and prevent the development of needed new programs. There is not a doubt in my mind that the quality education amendment should have the firm support of every Member who recognizes the importance of education to our society.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the Committee on Appropriations has recommended an increase of \$611 million in the health budget to help meet the health needs of our Nation.

It is particularly gratifying that the committee has proposed restoration of Hill-Burton funds to last year's level of \$197 million and health manpower funds of \$120 million for hospital construction.

In Minneapolis, restoration of Hill-Burton funds will provide additional aid to enable Hennepin County to proceed with the planned construction of a new Hennepin County General Hospital. It is the only hospital that provides extensive emergency services for the area's 960,000 people. Twenty-five percent of all physicians in the State of Minnesota received part of their education at Hennepin County General Hospital. Its facilities now do not meet the licensing standards of the State. The facilities are old and obsolete and do not comply with modern fire prevention codes. The State has continued the hospital's license only on the basis that new facilities will be completed by 1975.

Reinstatement of health manpower funds will allow the University of Minnesota to carry out its plans for expansion of needed medical school classes

and other health facilities at a time when there is a dire need for more health manpower.

I urge passage of H.R. 15417.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to apologize to the subcommittee chairman for the two errors noted by him and appearing in the table on page 59 of the report.

The fiscal year 1973 subcommittee recommendation for impacted aid, Public Law 874, should read \$615.495 million. The fiscal year 1973 subcommittee recommendation for library services and construction should read \$59.50 million. Both errors came about as a result of a failure to add the budget recommendation in each case to the subcommittee additions to those recommendations.

At the appropriate time I shall introduce an amendment. This amendment, if adopted, would add \$363,833,000 to amounts contained in the bill for eight broad programs.

TITLE I, ESEA

The largest of these is for title I, ESEA, the major activity of the Office of Education which provides compensatory education for disadvantaged children attending schools having a high concentration of youngsters who because of their background of poverty, migrant status of parents, or physical handicap, have need of remedial programs to permit them to compete scholastically with children from more fortunate backgrounds.

There are over 8 million young people in this category in our country who come from families where the income is \$2,500 per year or less. The program in the bill would provide about \$203 per eligible child above what is annually expended for each child in the school he attends. The average per pupil expenditure now runs nationally about \$858 per child. More money is needed per pupil than that provided. Administration studies indicate that at least \$300 per child ought to be provided for truly lasting results. There are some 12 million children in families receiving an annual income of \$4,000 or less. So that as far as need is concerned, additions to this program have ample justification.

However, I make my main plea on an additional basis which I think can be helpful to the House.

The funds under title I, ESEA, flow to States and to school districts within the State by virtue of a complicated formula, using census data of family income, numbers of children whose support flow from the aid to dependent children welfare program, children who are wards of the State as dependent, or delinquent children or who are in State operated institutions for handicapped children.

The actual amount each State receives each year is calculated by the Office of Education using these factors. Because of the changes which take place in the data collected, we find for fiscal year 1973—as set forth in the hearing record, part 2, page 167—that if the same funding level is provided as was provided in fiscal year 1972, under the terms of the statutes, 25 States will receive less than they received in fiscal year 1972. For example, Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, and Mississippi would each

receive over \$3 million less than in fiscal year 1972.

By providing the additional \$212.5 million, however, according to tables prepared by the Office of Education, every State but New Mexico would have at least as much as it got in fiscal year 1972 and the deficiency in New Mexico would be only \$269,157 instead of a \$1.4-million deficiency.

TITLE II, ESEA

Title II, ESEA, which provides library materials to schools, both public and parochial, most needing them in the States, is funded in the committee bill at last year's level of \$90 million. The amendment proposes to raise this by \$10 million, to \$100 million for fiscal year 1973.

Again the argument for the proposal is sustained by two principal lines of thought. First as to merit, the committee bill would buy about one-third of one book per child for a book costing about \$3.25. Many schools, 34,000 of them in the country, do not have any school library facilities or materials. The need is undeniable. But the second line of appeal is similar to the point argued earlier for title I, because of the formula factors some 25 States will receive less in fiscal year 1973 than they received in fiscal year 1972. The budget documents in the hearing record on page 290 show this clearly. The additional \$10 million provided by my amendment would alleviate that problem in good part.

TITLE III, ESEA

The supplementary services and centers of program of title III, ESEA, is designed to find better ways of reaching children and improving the education provided them. Projects are reviewed by a broadly representative State council in each State and funded for a 3-year period generally. Projects must involve the non-public sections in this planning although the proposals come only from public school systems.

In the committee bill, the sums provided have not changed in over 3 years, they have been held constant despite inflation costs of about 10 percent per year in that time. So, on that merit factor alone, an increase is justified; but in addition, as in the case of titles I and II, ESEA, we find the fact situation as shown in the budget documents hearings record, part 2, on pages 290 and 653, some 26 States and the District of Columbia will receive less in fiscal year 1973 than they received in fiscal year 1972. The \$25 million of the amendment add-on will serve to correct in part that situation.

TITLE V, ESEA—STRENGTHENING STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Title V, ESEA, consists of these parts: Part A, regular State grants to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the State education agency for which the fiscal year 1972 funding in the committee bill is continued in fiscal year 1973 at the same level; part B, which has not been funded; and part C, comprehensive planning for State and local agencies which received for the first time this year, an initial funding of \$10 million in its administration proposals.

Yet because of educational renewal de-

terminations, funds previously available to State agencies under section 402 and under the Educational Professions Development Act, part B-2 provisions, funds aggregating more than \$11 million, are no longer available to State departments. For this reason, the \$10 million increase of the amendment for part A is, I believe, very well justified if we are to carry out the intent of the statute.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT PROGRAMS

Despite the \$50 million added by the subcommittee to the basic State grants of part B of the Vocational Education Act, it remains true that it would take \$249 million more than last year to hold each of the programs in each of the States at the same funding level in fiscal year 1973 that was received for fiscal year 1972. That is more money, I believe, than the House would be willing to provide.

What I have done, therefore, is to take four programs which focus on disadvantaged young people and we bring them up, under the formulas of the enabling act to the point where no State would receive less in fiscal year 1973 than in fiscal year 1972 at a cost of \$27,633,000. A chart on pages 1230-31 of volume 7 of the committee hearings, shows the deficiency that would occur unless the amendment is adopted.

The amendment provides the following amounts for each of the selected programs:

Special needs of disadvantaged students	\$9,898,000
Consumer and homemaking	12,697,000
Work study	4,524,000
State advisory councils	514,000
Total	27,633,000

The provision of these amounts for these programs would have the result of making sure that each State in fiscal year 1973 will receive as much as it received in fiscal year 1972 under the operation of the formula grants.

THE ADULT EDUCATION ACT

In this portion of the bill, we find that the subcommittee provided but \$51,300,000, the same as last year's original allocation before a supplemental which raised the amount to \$63 million. Some \$90 million is needed if we are to service the changes in the act that expanded it from the eighth grade to the high school level. My amendment adding \$23,700,000 to the program would permit a beginning on the high school activities and would also cure in part the same problem that we have met before of some 26 States receiving less in fiscal year 1973 than they received in fiscal year 1972.

LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT

While the subcommittee is to be commended for having increased the budget estimates for these items by \$26,770,000 over the administration proposals, thus bringing the funding nationally to some \$800,000 over the fiscal year 1972 figures, still more money is needed for the same reasons as before.

The \$14 million for services proposed in my amendment recognizes that book costs are up 39 percent since 1969. The average adult library book has a \$13-plus cost attached to it. Many communities

do not have this service at all. Library materials are the basic tools at all educational levels including the adult education areas.

There is great popular support for building libraries. Some 200 communities have matching money ready and waiting for Federal funds to arrive. My amendment would raise the amount available for this purpose to \$15 million.

But the best and most economical use of materials is enhanced if funding is provided for more inter-library cooperation projects and programs than would be made available under the committee bill. Hence I propose adding \$4.8 million for this purpose. All in all, for all these areas of the act, the amendment would provide \$25,000,000 additional funds above last year's level.

PUBLIC LAW 874

Finally, the amendment includes a \$30-million increase for Public Law 874 over the committee bill. It is in this area that I know many Members can speak with far greater authority than I can. It is an in-lieu of tax payment and is very important to more than a majority of the congressional districts in this country. The \$20 million increase I seek would raise the entitlement of "B" children from the 73-percent level of the committee bill and it would provide for a \$10-million start on funding the so-called category "C" program based on a case count of public housing children. The money, however, would be used—as is true of all Public Law 874 money—for the operation and maintenance costs of the recipient district. They and they alone, the local school boards, would determine the purposes for which the money is to be spent.

The \$10 million of my amendment for part C would start the mechanism in the Office of Education. It would enable the collection of accurate statistics on where those children are and in what numbers, and it would begin to fulfill an obligation that we undertook when we approved the changes in the act.

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

Mr. FLOOD. 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. HOLIFIELD, 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. 15417) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on the bill H.R. 15417, considered today.

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

There was no objection.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO CON-
SIDER APPROPRIATION BILLS
NEXT WEEK

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, in our effort to expedite the work of the House, I had planned to ask unanimous consent to make it in order to bring up in the House on Tuesday next, for general debate only on that day, either the bill providing appropriations for Public Works or the bill providing appropriations for Treasury-Postal Service-General Government. If we take up one or both of those bills—we could not take up more than one—the next order of business, when the Appropriations Committee was recognized thereafter, would be to consider the bill under the 5-minute rule.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire to make that request?

Mr. MAHON. I desire to make that request, realizing that on the 2 days following—Wednesday and Thursday—the House is scheduled to consider the revenue sharing bill. We could undertake to complete consideration of the appropriation bill after the revenue sharing bill is disposed of.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, first I reserve the right to object because I do not believe any living human being could understand that unanimous consent request.

Mr. MAHON. I must concede that the gentleman has a valid point.

Mr. HALL. I would be glad to yield for a further explanation, but I would certainly recommend that the gentleman withhold.

Mr. MAHON. I would ask unanimous consent that we could have general debate on either the Public Works appropriation bill or the Treasury-Postal Service appropriation bill on Tuesday next.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would have to know at what time the papers might be filed, and the bill might be printed and available to the Members; and that has not been stipulated as of this time.

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

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. The two bills are scheduled to be reported on Monday afternoon next.

Mr. HALL. Which I presume, Mr. Speaker, means that the committee has not yet completed its work and the report has not been filed.

Mr. MAHON. The full committee has not. The bills have been agreed upon in the subcommittees, and they will be before the full committee on Monday next.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, pointing out that this violates the rules of the House, but full well realizing the need to expedite the business of the House and the leadership problems as to getting away for a political convention, and so forth, I do not intend to object after the fact, when the bill is filed, in spite of the repeated remarks by the gentleman who spoke so eloquently in the well about invading the rights of individual Mem-

bers; but, as of now, I would certainly have to object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

THE 750TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
HUNGARIAN CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has just completed a most successful conference with Soviet officials and Polish leaders. There is evidence that a new understanding between the United States and the countries of East Europe has been reached during these visits and the Presidents earlier trip to Rumania. In the long run the success of our changing relationship with these nations should be measured by its effect in bringing about a loosening of internal control within these Eastern nations and new freedom for their peoples. Often the Western world forgets the rich heritage of freedom and independence which has been part of Eastern Europe's history for hundreds of years.

It is important during this period of changing relationships to recognize Eastern Europe's contribution to man's continuing struggle for freedom. This year is the 750th anniversary of the "Bulla Aurea," or the Golden Bull, which is the Hungarian parallel of the English Magna Carta. It is an early and fundamental expression of individual freedom and civil dignity which are still central concerns for the people of Hungary and for all freedom loving citizens of the world.

In 1222, the Hungarian Diet placed its official golden stamp upon the document, which protected the rights of all citizens against the greed of the King and the barons. The Golden Bull was originally created by free men uniting in opposition to the King and the oligarchy and it has continued to symbolize the spirit of Hungary throughout its long history of struggle. The provisions of the Golden Bull insured that feudal barons could no longer suppress their people and individual could no longer be forced into unwilling servitude or payment. The freedom of landowners was guaranteed in very specific terms. The final clause of the Bull promised that citizens had a right to resist the King if the King were to violate the provisions of the document. This "ius resistendi" clause, the right to resist injustice, has been a cherished ideal of the Hungarian people for seven and a half centuries, an ideal which has survived through June 1956 Hungarian Revolution and to the present day. I hope that my colleagues will have an opportunity to visit the excellent Library of Congress exhibit commemorating the Golden Bull which will be shown until the end of the month.

The basic idea of the Golden Bull is one which made a large step forward toward modern government, for the Bull is a constitutional limitation of power which preserves a balance between economic and political forces. Losing two world wars and suppressed beneath two successive totalitarian dictatorships,

Hungary has kept alive the spirit of the Golden Bull and continues the struggle toward freedom in the face of challenges.

Hungary's long tradition of individual freedom should not be overlooked by the western world. As relations between the United States and the Communist world grow more amicable, the issue of the personal freedom of all peoples living in Communist countries should be considered in future discussions of human rights. If the rapprochement between our country and Communist nations is to have real meaning, there should be progress toward improving the rights and freedoms of those living under Communist rule.

Dr. Andrew Frey, a distinguished Hungarian journalist before he was forced to flee his native land, has written a definitive study of the significance of the Golden Bull in the April issue of the Hungarian Freedom Fighter's Federation newsletter, the text of which follows:

THE GOLDEN BULL OF HUNGARY

The 750th anniversary of the Hungarian Magna Charta recalls the past of a thousand-year-old state. And reminds us that the nature of some social and political conflicts remains more or less the same through centuries.

This cornerstone of the Hungarian constitution, named the Bulla Aurea (Golden Bull), was issued in 1222, seven years after the Magna Charta of England was granted in June 1215. While in England this charter of liberties strengthened the barons against the King, in Hungary, it served all landowners, in today's terms the middle and the lower middle classes.

Since it was a peculiarity of Hungarian history that incomparably more people were nobles than in any other European country and that they often remained noble even when impoverished, the Golden Bull gave constitutional protection to a much larger part of the population than other similar letters of rights elsewhere in medieval Europe, including England, the "cradle of parliamentarism", or Switzerland, the "flower-garden of individual liberties".

The fact that in Hungary the human rights of that period were extended over the mass of the lesser nobility, authorizing them to put up armed resistance individually or collectively against violation of their rights, limited not only the King's power. It made it easier for the middle classes to defy also the magnates, the "petty monarchs" of the realm.

The national Diet began to emerge before the end of the 13th century and was a precursor of our modern Parliaments. It was an assembly of locally chosen delegates of all landowners and was destined to protect the lesser nobility (which then consisted of all who owned land) as well as the Church more against the aristocracy than against the King. This was one of the main reasons why feudalism could not become firmly established in Hungary.

The Golden Bull, the trailblazer of the national Diet, was such an important step towards modern democratic institutions that some of its stipulations are worth remembering even now, 750 years after the event.

It attacked the very roots of feudalism by decreeing that the title and estates of the lords—lieutenant of counties were not hereditary. It provided for the degradation of any lord-lieutenant who abused his office; and promised safeguards to all nobles—i.e., to a significant portion of the nation—against arbitrary arrest.

Soon after, in 1231, the Golden Bull was placed under the guardianship of the Archbishop of Esztergom, the Primate of Hun-

gary. He was authorized to excommunicate the King for violation of the charter's articles.

This is why the Golden Bull, this 13th century bulwark of what today we call human rights, has been regarded as the foundation of Hungarian constitutional liberties.

"If the Bull expressed them in legal terms, their political content became known as the Doctrine of the Holy Crown, the crown of the first Hungarian king, Saint Stephen, who was anointed in 1000 A.D. The constitutional Doctrine of the Holy Crown is based on the same principles as the Golden Bull: all political power, even royal prerogatives, were subject to, and derived from, the Crown that symbolized the union of, and independence between, King and nation; the Crown was considered the fountainhead of all rights, of the King's privileges as well as of the rights of all his subjects."

While according to the concept of that age the ruler's power was based on the Grace of God, in Hungary the effectiveness of royal power depended on the assent of the entire nobility. This tenet was defined by the great codifier of Hungary, Stephen Werboczy, who also played a memorable part in European history when he accompanied Charles V of the Holy Roman Empire to Worms where the famous confrontation with Luther took place.

The basic idea of these principles—those of the Holy Crown dating from 1000, and those of the Golden Bull of 1222—is the same: a constitutional limitation of power, a limitation that served to keep a balance between economic and political forces.

A doctrine that could help us to heal some of the problems of our modern societies.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that today I share in the observation of the commemoration of the 750th anniversary of the Golden Bull of Hungary—The Hungarian Magna Carta. The Golden Bull is one of the earliest assertions of the type of human rights which the Founding Father's deemed so inherent to freedom and democracy in America.

Serving as the cornerstone of the Hungarian Constitution, the Golden Bull gave broad constitutional protection to the population of Hungary. Today we pay tribute to the architects of the Golden Bull and to all of the people of Hungary. However, our praise today is not limited solely to the promulgation of the Golden Bull in 1222. The principles embodied in the Golden Bull are principles which are very much alive and enforced in our own Nation today.

The Golden Bull provides clear authorization for the protection of the rights of the lower classes of Hungary. Our own "Golden Bull," the Bill of Rights, guarantees similar safeguards for the protection of all Americans.

The Golden Bull provides for severe degradation of any lord-lieutenant who abuses his office. Our own laws similarly protect the American people from abuse of powers and authority by our elected leaders and representatives.

It imposes safeguards against arbitrary arrest. Our own Constitution protects American citizens from similar treatment.

The Golden Bull embodies the same constitutional limitations which the Founding Fathers incorporated into our own system of government.

In today's world of protest and dissent, we sometimes lose track of the

great safeguards the American system contains to protect the rights of her people. These freedoms—which each of us consider inherent to a democratic society—has threads which can be traced to the Golden Bull. Today is a day of celebration and rejoicing to be shared not only by all Hungarians, Mr. Speaker, but by all of the peoples of the world who cherish individual freedom in a democratic society.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my colleagues today in commemoration of the 750th anniversary of the "Bulla Aurea," the Golden Bull, known as the Hungarian Magna Carta. The quest for freedom marked by insistence for human rights has been a mark of Hungary as a nation since its inception.

The Golden Bull, enacted in 1222—7 years after the Magna Carta was granted in 1215, is one of Hungary's monumental contributions to man's continuous struggle for freedom. It became another step toward our modern democratic institutions, and free men everywhere shall be forever indebted to the vision and courage of those men who drafted, enacted, and enforced the Golden Bull.

So great was its influence that feudalism did not thrive in Hungary as it did in other areas of Europe. The tenets contained in the Golden Bull served to protect not only the aristocracy from the King but also to protect the poor and the middle classes from the aristocracy. In short, the document became a constitutional limitation of power—a limitation to keep a balance between economic and political forces.

Unheard of in its day was the provision contained in the Golden Bull which extended to prelates, barons, and nobles the "ius resistendi," the right to resist the King should he violate the charter. This right has continued to burn brightly in the hearts of Hungarians from that time to the present as evidenced by the inspiring resistance of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters in 1956.

The freedom we know today is taken far too lightly. We enjoy it only because it was born in the minds of enlightened men centuries ago, because it was won through personal sacrifice by valiant men on the fields of battle, because it was continually defended at enormous costs when necessary, and because it has been jealously guarded in legislative bodies such as our own.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, any glimmer of freedom from whatever its source and every particular act of freedom wherever committed is part and parcel of our rich heritage.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, here in the United States we are too often inclined to take our freedoms for granted, forgetting that men and women through the ages have fought and died to obtain these freedoms and bequeath them to others.

The rights that free people enjoy did not come to them overnight, but inch by inch as stubborn rulers of bygone days grudgingly yielded concessions. Neither were these rights immediately granted to all; they were extended to one group at a

time. Even here in America, where our Founding Fathers recognized that fundamental human rights come, not from government, but from Almighty God, some groups enjoyed more rights than others in the early days of the Republic and their extension to everyone has been a continuous process.

We ought, from time to time, to turn back the pages of history and read about earlier efforts to secure freedoms and rights from powerful rulers who were reluctant to grant them. An auspicious occasion for such a backward glance presents itself in this year of 1972, the 750th anniversary of the enactment in 1222 of the Golden Bull by the Parliament of Hungary. This document has been called the Magna Carta of Hungary, the Great Charter of England having antedated it by a mere 7 years.

Under the terms of the Golden Bull, which was forced upon King Andrew II, Hungary's lesser nobility and clergy were exempted from taxation, permitted to dispose of their lands as they saw fit, protected from arbitrary imprisonment and confiscation, and guaranteed an annual assembly where they could petition for a redress of their grievances. The nobles also received the right to refuse to perform military service in foreign countries.

Through the centuries that followed the promulgation of the Gold Bull, the people of Hungary have been dominated at various times by the Hapsburgs of Austria, the National Socialists of Germany, and the Communists of Russia. By comparison with the Nazi and Communist tyrannies that followed, the Hapsburgs were paternal and benevolent rulers who occasionally made some concessions to their Hungarian subjects.

Let us suggest to the Soviet Union, which according to its apologists here in the United States, is mellowing, that it ease the difficult lot of the Magyars by extending to them the liberties that are enjoyed by free peoples in other lands—freedom of worship, freedom of speech and press, and free elections, to name only some of the more important ones.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no better way to commemorate the 750th anniversary of the Golden Bull, the Great Charter of Hungary.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to pay homage today to a great people and to a great document, a landmark for freedom in the history of mankind.

The Bulla Aurea of the Hungarian nation represents some of the noblest aspirations of the human mind, guaranteeing personal freedom, closing the gap between the upper and middle classes, and forbidding oppression and exploitation of the poor. It is one of the pillars of the Hungarian Constitution, a constitution we all hope and pray in our lifetime will be reinstated so that Hungary can resume its rightful place among the free nations of the world.

For those of you who have not yet seen the very fine exhibit commemorating the Hungarian Golden Bull at the Library of Congress, I recommend that you do so before it closes June 30.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to insert a copy of the April, 1972,

newsletter, "The Fight for Freedom," published by the Hungarian Freedom Fighters' Federation, U.S.A., an excellent dissertation on the history of the Bulla Aurea and its relevance today.

THE GOLDEN BULL OF HUNGARY

(By Dr. Andrew Frey)

The 750th anniversary of the Hungarian Magna Carta recalls the past of a thousand-year-old state. And reminds us that the nature of some social and political conflicts remains more or less the same through centuries.

This cornerstone of the Hungarian constitution, named the Bulla Aurea (Golden Bull), was issued in 1222, seven years after the Magna Carta of England was granted in June 1215. While in England this charter of liberties strengthened the barons against the King; in Hungary, it served all landowners, in today's terms the middle and the lower middle classes.

Since it was a peculiarity of Hungarian history that incomparably more people were nobles than in any other European country and that they often remained noble even when impoverished, the Golden Bull gave constitutional protection to a much larger part of the population than other similar letters of rights elsewhere in medieval Europe, including England, the "cradle of parliamentarism," or Switzerland, the "flower-garden of individual liberties."

The fact that in Hungary the human rights of that period were extended over the mass of the lesser nobility, authorizing them to put up armed resistance individually or collectively against violation of their rights, limited not only the King's power. It made it easier for the middle classes to defy also the magnates, the "petty monarchs" of the realm.

The national Diet began to emerge before the end of the 13th century and was a precursor of our modern Parliaments. It was an assembly of locally chosen delegates of all landowners and was destined to protect the lesser nobility (which then consisted of all who owned land) as well as the Church more against the aristocracy than against the King. This was one of the main reasons why feudalism could not become firmly established in Hungary.

The Golden Bull, the trailblazer of the national Diet, was such an important step towards modern democratic institutions that some of its stipulations are worth remembering even now, 750 years after the event.

It attacked the very roots of feudalism by decreeing that the title and estates of the lords-lieutenant of counties were not hereditary. It provided for the degradation of any lord-lieutenant who abused his office; and promised safeguards to all nobles—i.e., to a significant portion of the nation—against arbitrary arrest.

Soon after, in 1231, the Golden Bull was placed under the guardianship of the Archbishop of Esztergom, the Primate of Hungary. He was authorized to excommunicate the King for violation of the charter's articles.

This is why the Golden Bull, this 13th century bulwark of what today we call human rights, has been regarded as the foundation of Hungarian constitutional liberties.

If the Bull expressed them in legal terms, their political content became known as the Doctrine of the Holy Crown, the crown of the first Hungarian king, Saint Stephen, who was anointed in 1000 A.D. The constitutional Doctrine of the Holy Crown is based on the same principles as the Golden Bull: all political power, even royal prerogatives, were subject to, and derived from, the Crown that symbolized the union of, and independence between, King and nation; the Crown was considered the fountainhead of all rights,

of the King's privileges as well as of the rights of all his subjects.

While according to the concept of that age the ruler's power was based on the Grace of God, in Hungary the effectiveness of royal power depended on the assent of the entire nobility. This tenet was defined by the great codifier of Hungary, Stephen Verboeczy, who also played a memorable part in European history when he accompanied Charles V of the Holy Roman Empire to Worms where the famous confrontation with Luther took place.

The basic idea of these principles—those of the Holy Crown dating from 1000, and those of the Golden Bull of 1222—is the same: a constitutional limitation of power, a limitation that served to keep a balance between economic and political forces.

A doctrine that could help us to heal some of the problems of our modern societies.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the 750th anniversary of the Hungarian Constitution.

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

There was no objection.

SEARS CONGRESSIONAL INTERNSHIP PROGRAM FOR JOURNALISM STUDENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROONEY) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for the first 3 months of 1972, I was fortunate to have a young intern from the University of Indiana work in my office under the auspices of the Sears congressional internship program for journalism students. The intern, Margaret Finucane, proved to be a valuable asset to my staff. She was industrious and energetic. From her first day on the job, she performed like a veteran staff member. Because of my experience, I discussed this program with several of my distinguished colleagues who also received interns through this program. Their reactions were as favorable as mine.

I feel I should take this opportunity to bring this rather unique intern program to the attention of those who may not be as familiar with it as those of us who have participated.

The Sears program was conceived by Mr. John L. Wheeler who, until his recent retirement, served as the company's vice president for governmental affairs. Mr. Wheeler, the son of the distinguished former Senator from Montana, Burton K. Wheeler, was greatly influenced by his own experiences in his father's office, and felt that this type of opportunity should be made available to as many young people as possible.

The intern program was inaugurated in 1970 and, to the best of my knowledge, is the only such program designed specifically to provide journalism under-

graduates with firsthand experience in the legislative process.

During their stay in Washington, the interns serve as full-time staff members, most often working in press-related activities—writing press releases and speeches, handling constituent mail, or doing research. The actual assignment of duties is left entirely to the office to which the intern is assigned.

Coordinated with the 3 months of office work is a course in "Understanding and Reporting Legislative Affairs," taught by Samuel J. Archibald, director of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee and academic adviser to the program. The course consists of 12 3-hour sessions. Students are given reading and writing assignments, are visited by guest lecturers from all phases of the media and participate in group discussions. Between the full work days in the offices and two evening classes a week, these students are making maximum use of their time in Washington.

Students participate in the internship program at no cost to them nor to the offices in which they serve. Sears pays each intern a stipend of \$1,300 plus a travel allotment based on the distance from his campus to the Capitol.

Upon their arrival in Washington, the students are given an orientation program. In addition to the details of the program itself, they are given a brief seminar as to the functioning of a congressional office. The orientation enables the intern to report to his or her assignment with some basic knowledge of the workings of Congress.

The entire program is monitored by a congressional advisory committee. Each year, eight Members of Congress—who have had interns—are invited to participate. The committee reviews the winning applications, assists in the process of matching interns with congressional offices, and advises on matters of policy. It is with great pleasure that I serve on this committee for the 1973 program. The other distinguished Members of Congress on this committee are: Senators BAYH and HATFIELD, and Representatives TIM LEE CARTER, JOSHUA EILBERG, MICHAEL HARRINGTON, PETER PEYSER, and TOM RAILSBACK.

In my experience in Washington, I have not seen an intern program that was more effective from the standpoint of a congressional office, but more importantly, I have not seen a program from which the individual intern could gain so much experience and education. I would highly recommend the Sears program to any of my colleagues.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROONEY) for taking this special order to give us an opportunity to comment on the Sears congressional internship program for journalism students.

As a Member who already has had a Sears intern in my office, and as one who had the privilege of serving on the congressional advisory committee for this year's program, I am quite familiar with, and impressed by, this internship program.

The Sears program is one of the newest on Capitol Hill, having started only

in 1970. But already it has established itself as one of the best.

The benefits of the program have been felt by the outstanding students selected to participate so far, and by the Members of Congress who have had the good fortune to have these students in their offices.

But I believe an even greater benefit will accrue in the years ahead to the entire country. It will come in the form of better, more informed reporting of the Nation's business as it is conducted by the Congress.

The outstanding young journalism students taking part in this program are gaining an invaluable amount of knowledge and experience in the legislative process. I firmly believe nothing can match service in a congressional office for obtaining such a background.

Because the vast majority of people cannot participate in such a program, it is vital to an informed public that the people who will be reporting and commenting on the Federal Government in the future have this kind of experience.

Thus the real winners from this program are not only the Congressmen who participate and the students who become interns. The public itself stands to benefit greatly.

The company which sponsors this programs and all those who are actively engaged in the endeavor are to be congratulated for recognizing the importance of journalism in our national life, and for taking such dramatic steps to insure that the quality of that journalism remains high in the future.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my good friend to praise one of the most outstanding student internship programs in the Nation, the Sears congressional internship program for journalism students.

I have had the pleasure of serving on the Sears program's selection committee as well as having a Sears intern serve in my office.

Mr. Speaker, I have also been privileged to speak before the seminars of Sears students and can report that there has been no more attentive and responsive group of students in the Capitol.

Credit for the outstanding success of this program must be shared by the students themselves and the fine staff in the Sears office in Washington.

The curriculum designed by the Sears staff and Sam Archibald of the Freedom of Information Center is top rate, demanding, and of great personal assistance to the interns and to the offices where they work full time.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to commend my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROONEY) for providing me with an opportunity to comment on the Sears program.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, education is a combination of training and experience. The Sears congressional internship program provides a unique opportunity for outstanding journalism students from all regions of America to study first-hand the legislative process and enrich their college studies of communication and political science with practical experience.

Since 1970, 60 students have been placed in the offices of Members of the House and Senate, where they have been able to observe the workings of a congressional office, while assisting staff members with various projects.

These students, who have shown an interest in pursuing careers in political reporting, have been permitted to return to their studies with an increased understanding of the problems and responsibilities of the legislator, and have seen the interaction of the lawmakers with their constituents and their colleagues. Their internships have helped them prepare to report and analyze events, as future leaders of the communications media.

This spring, Theresa C. Pitts, a senior at the University of Oklahoma, was a Sears intern in my office. I was impressed by the quality of her research, and her knowledge of current affairs. Assisting my staff with special projects, I feel Theresa gained new insights into the role of the Congressman.

May I join with my colleagues in saluting the achievements of former Sears congressional interns as they begin their professional lives as reporters and researchers. I am sure we will be seeing and hearing more of these talented young people in the future. I also recognize the contribution of Sears, Roebuck, & Co., for supporting this program. In 1973, enrollment will increase by 50 percent, an expansion which indicates the success of the Sears congressional internship program for journalism students.

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in this special order to recognize the significant contributions made by the Sears congressional internship program to those congressional offices which have participated in the program. Those of us in our office who worked this year with Tom Adkinson of the University of Tennessee know at first hand what a fine program Sears has developed. These young men and women represent some of the finest talent in our colleges. They are imaginative and hard working. In sponsoring their experiences in Washington, Sears has helped contribute not only to the short-range goal of making a congressional office perform more effectively and responsively but to the long-range goal of making our democratic institutions stronger. When Tom Adkinson left our office, he wrote of his experience for Editor and Publisher magazine in the following article:

SEARS U. ESTABLISHES CAMPUS IN CAPITOL FOR J-STUDENTS

(By Thomas L. Adkinson)

A new "university" has just finished its third year of giving a few aspiring journalists some experience that may be a welcome surprise to their future employers. Without reservation, it can be said that this "university" is unique.

As in other universities, students strive diligently to get in; but that is about where any similarity ends.

Only journalism students attend this special university. Everyone in it seeks a job in the media. Most will try to be specialists.

The student-teacher ratio is more like a teacher-student ratio because the teachers outnumber the students. The physical plant is immense, composed of many well-known

buildings stretched across two states and a patch of federally-owned land.

What is this amazing university? It is Sears U., otherwise known as the Sears Congressional Intern Program, the only program of its kind for undergraduate journalism majors.

Who are these students and teachers? The students are 20 journalism majors from 18 accredited J-schools selected through nationwide competition. The teachers include an associate professor of journalism from the University of Missouri, a sampling from the Washington press corps, and a host of congressmen, senators, administrative assistants, legislative assistants and other aides.

And what is this physical plant. Obviously, the halls of Congress, associated office buildings, and residences strewn across the District of Columbia, Virginia and Maryland.

MORE THAN JUST INTERNS

"The word 'intern' is practically a dirty word around Capitol Hill because there are so many useless interns," this year's Sears interns were told in an early winter pep talk. "The term denigrates you. But you are more than the average, run-of-the-mill interns." Therefore, Sears interns often say, "I'm on the congressman's staff," rather than "I'm just an intern in the congressman's office."

The pep talk speaker was Samuel J. Archibald, executive director of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee and an assistant professor of journalism from the University of Missouri. He was the interns' mentor in a seminar on "Understanding and Reporting Legislative Affairs."

The I'm-on-the-congressman's staff attitude reflects the professionalism of the entire Sears program. The program was begun in 1970 by Sears, Roebuck in cooperation with the American Council on Education for Journalism.

Providing selected outstanding journalism and communications students with first-hand knowledge of the legislative process is the stated purpose of the program. A sincere interest in pursuing a journalism career is an important criterion on which students are recommended.

"When Sears began the intern program, we weren't sure what type of students we wanted. We wanted people who could benefit from the experience for the moment; but more than that, we wanted people who could put their experience to good use later," said James Ritch, Sears information director in Washington.

CANVASSED EACH SPRING

"Journalism students have proven a good choice. They have been knowledgeable, well-trained, and assets to their offices. We hope the office work, coupled with the legislative affairs reporting seminar, will benefit them in their careers," he added.

It is true that the Sears students are not the average interns. They are sought out by the congressional offices. All offices are canvassed each spring to determine their interest, and always the demand exceeds the supply of interns. This year 167 offices vied for the services of 20 interns. In the first year of the program, 60 offices requested interns and 117 did last year.

"We have tried to get a Sears intern for three years and were unsuccessful until this Winter," said Tom Lambeth, administrative assistant to Rep. Richardson Preyer, Democrat of North Carolina.

Offices that have not had Sears interns are most likely to be accepted. Pairing interns with offices is supervised by the Congressional Advisory Committee. Members are legislators who previously have had Sears interns.

"The offices are getting a free hand, so we want to make sure they utilize the interns meaningfully," said Archibald. "We try to screen out the offices that are looking for 'go-fors'—someone they ask to 'go for this'

or 'go for that.' After an intern is in an office, he is on the staff and we want and have no say on what he does."

Offices and interns are matched on party preference of the intern, common fields of interest, geographic background of the intern, and interest areas and experiences of the intern that could benefit the office.

WASHINGTON PRESS CORPS SPEAKERS

The seminar on legislative reporting was in addition to working full-time for 10 or 11 weeks for the congressmen. The course included a series of speakers from the Washington press corps, writing assignments, and readings on Congress, lobbying, electioneering, backgrounders and other subjects.

"Government isn't as simple as most columns and features make it out to be. There are plenty of angles and pressures that, if known and understood, make for better stories," said Archibald.

"There has never been a good study of reporting legislatures, and there is a vast lack of research in this area," he said. Hence, the sessions with the Washington reporters.

The seminar is another factor that makes this intern program unique. No other intern program incorporates an academic course into the experience. The course permitted most interns to receive academic credit which they otherwise might not have gotten.

Providing entertainment and enlightenment on class nights were Mike Green from the McClatchy Newspapers in California; Frank Eleazer, head of the UPI bureau in the House; Peggy Simpson, an AP regional reporter; Bill Small, vice-president of CBS News; James McCartney, national security affairs reporter for the Knight Newspapers; and Les Whitten, from Jack Anderson's "Washington Merry-Go-Round."

Perhaps the beauty of the seminar speaker program was that each speaker had a different perspective on Washington reporting. Each had a different job and, therefore, different ideas on the Washington scene.

THE REGIONAL CORRESPONDENT

Mike Green explained his concept of Washington reporting for a group of distant papers. In his case, distant meant California. His principal statement was that even though he works for a relatively few papers, there is more than enough to report for his region from Washington.

Peggy Simpson later gave her ideas on being a regional correspondent. She covers Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and Oklahoma for AP.

"Wire regional reporters are not the backbone of the Washington scene, as many editors think," she said. "We do much more than report every breath of a region's Congressmen. We work on national stories but do have to drop everything for a regional request."

"It rarely develops that we have the time we want to work on a story. AP regional reporters previously had been grounded in Washington, but now they can travel for stories, although not everyone takes advantage of the freedom."

James McCartney from Knight Newspapers bureau explained his group's theory of Washington coverage. Knight has broken away from the geographic beats such as the House, the Senate, the White House and the Pentagon.

Instead, reporters have subject-area beats and pursue stories anywhere they crop up in the Washington bureaucracy. This, McCartney said, frees reporters from dependency on a very few sources and gives them more latitude.

His insights on the Washington information situation proved very enlightening and perhaps most useful to the interns. He theorized that "because the government is so diffuse, a certain amount of information has to be given out to make the system work."

"It is so large that you can see where inconsistencies arise—when people are lying. That's where you start. You can do this at city hall, too, because they also know how to lie," he said. "Lying has become an established national institution."

McCartney also filled in the interns on what he termed two verities in Washington. First, whenever a bomb is dropped, it is in the name of peace. Second, whenever the government wants to lie, it does it in the name of the national interest, he said.

McCartney hit one note that practically all speakers mentioned. This was that "Congress and the press have somewhat similar roles: both should be adversaries of the executive branch, but Congress is not performing."

"That is why we brought you here," he told the interns, "to break open the unnecessary secrecy of the government."

"Young fogeys" is what Bill Small, vice-president of CBS News, called 19 of the 20 interns. Only one of the group indicated he was aiming at a broadcasting career.

Although promoting the importance of broadcasting, Small was concerned about the public's dependence on television news.

"It is disturbing that so many Americans get all their news from TV because they will remain ignorant. Television news is the front page and a few features. For depth, reading newspapers is absolutely essential," he said.

Small said broadcast coverage of Congress will not bring matters out in the open. "It doesn't matter whether cameras are present for congressional action because most of the work is done behind closed doors," he said.

What broadcast news can do for Congress is to enhance its prestige, he said. "In recent years, the Senate has had more television exposure than the House and has gained more public prestige, particularly concerning the Vietnam issue."

UPI's Frank Eleazer struck on the watchdog role of the press. "When congressmen have been caught in any wrong-doing, it has been more by the press than the Justice Department. No one really is watching Congress except the press," he said.

Les Whitten, who works for Jack Anderson, was the seminar's final speaker and he gave an almost evangelistic talk on investigative reporting. He called it the "only thing year in and year out that can serve a reporter who has a conscience. You can see direct results," he said.

"Investigative reporting is going after the big boys, the ones that are dangerous to go after because they are so powerful. It is a life in the gutter that requires a lot of zeal, and I would like to see some of it rub off."

"Politicians are easy marks," he said, "but the hard shots are banks, insurance companies, motor companies, pharmaceutical companies, utilities, etc. However, the record-keeping facilities of the country work in favor of the investigative reporter."

INTERNS COVERED STORIES

For the college scene, he said "college newspapers are atrocious in their ignorance of their power. After college, it will be much more difficult for reporters to get things published."

"In fact, it is often easier to expose a crook than to get the story into your newspaper. Half of the investigative reporting is fighting your own paper. Sometimes you have to shame city editors into publishing one of your reports."

Covering stories was an integral part of the seminar. Each intern wrote a localized story on the proposed federal budget, covered a series of hearings in a House Judiciary subcommittee on school busing amendments, and amendments, and prepared a series of stories on a week of hearings on Freedom of Information legislation.

On their own, several interns wrote news stories and features for their college or

hometown newspapers. "Having a Washington dateline on a story by a local writer really sets the story off," said John Borger, who filed stories back to Michigan State University.

It sounds as if the seminar could have occupied all of an intern's time, but, in perspective, it took only a small portion of the Winter.

What did take up most of the time was regular office work. They were "on the staff" and they paid (in hours) for the privilege to say so.

Some worked directly with press secretaries. Others practically became press secretaries. Those who did do press work had to familiarize themselves with the district or state newspapers, prepare press releases, write radio spots, get to know the correspondents covering their offices, maintain clipping files, and sometimes arrange full-scale press conferences.

Whether or not the interns worked with their congressman's press relations, they all could observe how their offices were covered and how news was disseminated from their offices.

Practically all utilized their writing skills. Interns drafted speeches, summarized committee proceedings, and answered constituent mail.

LEARNED ABOUT THE WILDERNESS

Oregon's wilderness areas became the chief concern of Linda Herman from Indiana University, who worked for Sen. Mark Hatfield. She answered constituent letters about wilderness areas and had a considerable amount of learning to do since, as she put it, "There are precious few wilderness areas in Indiana."

On a mundane note, almost everyone got to learn or exhibit some secretarial skill. One male intern quipped, "I will be eternally grateful to my office if I ever decide to become a professional secretary."

The experience is over for the 1972 interns, but the learning process has just begun. The former interns now have the background to make a big difference when they take the road to becoming legislative or congressional reporters.

One former intern who has some time left at the University of Montana will return to her student government beat. She admitted it would be quite a letdown from Congress, but the insights she gained in Washington will be somewhat applicable, even to student government.

Next year, the program expands to 30 interns. So editors, be on the lookout. Qualified prospects to fill your governmental reporting slots are on the way.

Thomas L. Adkinson, a senior in journalism at the University of Tennessee, has participated in the Sears program. Last summer he was a Newspaper Fund intern on the copy desk of the Columbus (O.) Citizen-Journal.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlemen from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROONEY) for obtaining this special order to comment on the Sears congressional internship program.

It was my pleasure to have Mr. James E. Smith, a journalism student from Iowa State University in my office this spring. I have had numerous interns on my staff for short periods of time in the past and I can never be sure who benefits the most, the interns or myself.

I was glad to have Mr. Smith in the office for our mutual learning experience and hope it will benefit him in his pursuit of a journalism career. In return, it added to our understanding of the process

necessary to creation of a perceptive journalist.

The founders of the Sears Congressional Internship program are to be congratulated for the concept and performance of this new internship program. I believe it is a national service to acquaint prospective practitioners of journalism with all the participants in the public exchange of ideas necessary to a healthy society.

In this day and age of people urging "involvement," I can think of no better way for young people to get involved in the processes of Government. Similarly, I think young people preparing themselves to become professional observers and interpreters of the American governmental processes should be exposed to the inner workings of the process on which they will pass news judgments.

It is a fine program and one that I think will ultimately benefit the citizens of our Nation through better informed reporting of public events.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in commending the Sears Congressional Internship program for journalism students as a most worthwhile effort. I have always supported the many congressional intern programs because of the mutual benefits derived from having intelligent young people working with Members of Congress and their congressional staffs. The program, sponsored by Sears, Roebuck & Co., in cooperation with the American Council on Education for Journalism, stands out as one of the most effective of the many intern programs with which I have been associated.

Perhaps the key to the success of this program has been the thoughtful efforts of such individuals as Phil Knox, John Wheeler, Jim Ritch, Sam Archibald and Larry Horist in putting together a complete plan by which both the interim and the congressional office get the most from the experience. The intern selection process, the orientation of those selected, and the Washington experience itself are designed to make the intern feel and function as part of the staff. The effort, from my experience and based on what my colleagues have told me, has had remarkable success. As one Member half jokingly remarked, "I almost resented having to let the young man go; he's become that valuable to my office."

Since the program began in 1970, 60 internships have been awarded. In 1973 the program will expand so that 30 internships can be awarded. The program is open to full-time undergraduate students majoring in journalism or communications who will be juniors or seniors during the period of internship. The individuals selected are characterized by high academic performance, interest in political reporting, and an ability to write articles, news releases, speeches and newsletters.

The goal of the program is to provide selected outstanding students with firsthand knowledge of the legislative process. One criterion upon which students are recommended for the program is sincere interest in pursuing journalism as a career. As the reporters and commentators of tomorrow, the intern will

hopefully leave with the kind of understanding of legislative problems and processes that will make them better journalists.

The internship consists of an appointment to the staff of a Member of Congress and enrollment in an academic course, "Understanding and Reporting Legislative Affairs." The interns work as a full-time staff person in the congressional office for 8 weeks and have a chance to translate their studies in journalism and political science into concrete experiences.

The Sears intern most recently on my staff was given major responsibility for researching and writing a number of speeches and news columns to be used in my district. His previous training and ability made him most competent in his assignments, and he quickly became a vital part of my staff. In addition, his fresh, young approach to issues often proved stimulating and helpful.

The intern frequently consulted with myself and members of my staff and soon became familiar with the wide range of legislative and governmental affairs of interest and concern to the residents of my district. During his stay, he considerably refined and expanded his understanding of what it means to be a Federal representative. His experiences with us also seemed to increase his interest in becoming actively involved in political affairs.

As always, I was sorry when the internship came to an end and our intern had to return to school. However, I am very happy to know that the program will be expanded next year and that Members of Congress will have more opportunities to work with the fine young men and women selected as interns for the Sears Congressional Internship program for journalism students.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROONEY) for taking this time to comment on the Sears Congressional Internship program for journalism students.

I was fortunate to have an intern on my staff during the 1971 program and I will happily vouch for the quality of students who participate in the program.

Miss Suzanne Dean, a graduate of the University of Utah, finished graduate school at Columbia University after completing her internship on my staff and she will begin work on the staff of the Washington Post this summer. Miss Dean was a valuable addition to my staff during her internship and I am confident she will have a bright future in her journalism career.

Something I learned from Miss Dean, and I am sure my colleagues learned from their interns, is that young reporters are very concerned with fair and accurate reporting and that many of them are disturbed by the numerous criticisms of the news media.

I think their distress is justifiable. As they prepare to enter the field of professional journalism, they can see before them a news media which is rapidly losing much of its credibility, and hence much of its value to a free society.

Hopefully, their own dedication and hard work during their college years and

the experience which they gain during their internship will be not only of benefit to them in their careers, but to the news media itself.

If the news media is to effectively play its important role as "watchdog of government," it must enjoy the trust of its readers and viewers. And in order to win that trust, it must be honest, objective and perhaps most of all, aware of the responsibility which the public has given it.

Fortunately, the participants in the Sears congressional internship program for journalism students appear to have these qualities. I wish to commend the program, but particularly the students who have been selected to participate in it.

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE McCLOSKEY WITH REFERENCE TO PRISONERS OF WAR AND THE ESCALATION OF BOMBING IN NORTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) and some of his colleagues on the Republican side, engaged in an attack on their Republican colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. McCloskey) for some remarks he had made on a television show concerning possible risks to American prisoners of war in North Vietnam resulting from the administration's escalation of the bombing of North Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California (Mr. McCloskey) was not present and, therefore, not able to respond, and apparently no one was here to speak in his behalf.

I certainly cannot speak for Mr. McCloskey and I do not know what he intended by his remarks on the television program. I did not see the television program but only read what was recorded in the press.

However, it seemed to me that the remarks being made against him on the floor yesterday were so one sided that it would be appropriate that someone attempt to bring a little perspective into that discussion.

Accordingly, I asked the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) if he would yield, which he did. However, before I had completed my remarks, the gentleman from New York announced that he would yield no further time to me. Of course, under the rules, he was within his rights to do this.

Since I was prevented from doing so yesterday, I would like to complete my remarks now.

I would simply add, that when you consider the situation arising from the escalated bombing of North Vietnam, it is obvious that this escalated bombing greatly increases the risk that American bombs will eventually strike American prisoners of war in North Vietnam. This risk exists no matter how careful our Air Force is to avoid bombing residential areas and no matter how careful the North Vietnamese are in complying, as

they should, with the mandates of the Geneva Convention to minimize the risks to prisoners of war.

These bombings by B-52's, on the average, lay a path of destruction one-half mile wide and 3 miles long. So, inevitably not only civilian lives, but lives of other people in the vicinity are risked. It is like lightning. You never know where it is going to strike, but over a period of time, you know that a certain number of people are going to be struck. There is always a chance it will strike one of your own people. So it is with the bombing of North Vietnam.

We can only hope that tragedy will not occur. But if it does, it would mock reality to try to pin the blame on the gentleman from California (Mr. McCloskey) because he may have chosen some extreme examples in an effort to point out some of the risks involved to our prisoners of war in the administration's policy of escalated bombing.

Certainly, if there is any single American who bears responsibility for increasing those risks to our prisoners of war, it is the man who made the decision to escalate the bombing, and that is President Nixon himself.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. ABBITT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members recall that some few days ago the Honorable THOMAS N. DOWNING announced to this body that the Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia had appointed one of our colleagues to the Supreme Court of Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, I am highly pleased that the Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia has appointed Hon. RICHARD H. POFF to fill this vacancy on the Supreme Court of Virginia that was created by the resignation of Mr. Justice Gordon.

DICK POFF, as he is affectionately known by all of his colleagues and by his friends and associates back home, is one of the outstanding Members of this House. He has been such ever since he entered on his duties here.

I have known him intimately and I have been associated with him intimately. He is one of the finest men I have had the privilege of being associated with here in this great body. He is loved and respected by all of his colleagues.

He has rendered outstanding service to the people of his district and to the people of Virginia and to the people of the Nation. He is a man of great integrity, high intelligence and he will bring to the court a dignity, modesty, knowledge, and a judicial temperament. He will render a great service to the people of our Commonwealth. He will be a great justice in the tradition of the members of the present court and of those who have gone before.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, in

my opinion, DICK POFF has one of the best legal minds in the Congress. His work on the Committee on the Judiciary has been outstanding and has given him adequate training and preparation so that he will serve with honor and distinction as a justice of the Supreme Court of Virginia.

DICK POFF has the ability and training and judicial temperament and integrity and sense of fairness to make an outstanding justice.

I wish him Godspeed on this all-important assignment.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to my associate, the honorable Member from the 10th Congressional District of Virginia who has served so long and so faithfully in this great body.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the departure of my colleague DICK POFF to the highest court in the State of Virginia is a great gain for justice there and elsewhere in the Nation, but it is a loss of major proportion to the Congress of the United States.

His wisdom, his integrity, and his sense of fair play and justice has long been known to those of us who sought his advice and counsel throughout his distinguished career in Congress. His potential to serve in the highest councils of justice has long been recognized by the finest legal minds and legal organizations in this Nation. It has been recognized by more than one President of the United States.

Now he has chosen to serve justice in his native State of Virginia. He will serve it well, Mr. Speaker, as he has served his colleagues, his country and his constituents.

I will miss him as a friend and a counselor. This Congress will miss him on both sides of the aisle. But we shall, I am sure, miss him with pride as he adds his knowledge and integrity in the cause of justice and to the heritage where it was cradled along with the creation of this republic.

I wish him Godspeed.

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

Mr. ABBITT. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from the Third Congressional District of Virginia.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate my colleague and to associate myself with his remarks and the remarks of my other colleagues.

I have known DICK POFF for over 25 years and I have come to know him as a man of impeccable integrity, of intelligence and of reason. I know too that he possesses that rare combination of keen perspective and judgment and ability to enunciate his views concisely and with force and with clarity. These and his other capabilities I firmly believe eminently qualify him to serve as a justice on the high court of the State of Virginia.

Although I am sad that he will be leaving this body to which he has contributed so much, my sadness is tempered by the fact that we will continue to have his services on the supreme court of appeals of the State of Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday last the Richmond Times Dispatch carried an editorial about DICK POFF, endorsing and supporting this appointment which I believe in part reflects the high esteem in which he is held by the people of his State.

Mr. Speaker, I include this editorial at this point as a part of my remarks.

POFF TO THE COURT

As a member of the Virginia Supreme Court, Richard H. Poff can be expected to continue making significant contributions to his state just as he has during the past two decades while representing this state in the U.S. Congress.

The 48-year-old Republican congressman from Virginia's Sixth District has been chosen by Gov. Linwood Holton to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Justice Thomas C. Gordon Jr. of Richmond, who is returning to the private practice of law. The interim appointment is subject to confirmation by the General Assembly early next year.

Although he has never sat on the bench, Poff was so highly regarded by President Nixon as a potential member of the judiciary that his nomination to the U.S. Supreme Court seemed certain last fall. His ultimate confirmation by the Senate seemed assured, but it was also obvious that some liberals would oppose confirmation because of dissatisfaction with Poff's conservative voting record in the House. So Poff asked that his name not be submitted, saying that he wanted to spare the country, the court and his own family the unpleasantness resulting from the fight that his nomination might precipitate.

Following World War II service as a bomber pilot, the study of law at the University of Virginia, and five years of law practice, Poff was elected to the House in 1952. His constituents have returned him to Washington every two years, but last year he announced he would not seek reelection in 1972.

Before he took his seat in Congress, Poff told a reporter: "I'm dedicated to the principles of states' rights and I will work well as I can against the drift toward a big, paternalistic federal government." He has waged that fight consistently.

It is reassuring to know that the new state Supreme Court appointee has long been a strong advocate of vigorous law enforcement. He has worked for effective legislation to permit properly controlled wiretapping in the investigation of crimes, and his GOP colleagues recognized his leadership in the general area of law enforcement by naming him to head the Republican Task Force on Crime in 1967.

In 1966 Poff was one of four members of Congress praised by the American Bar Association for their efforts in obtaining congressional approval of the Twenty-fifth Amendment, providing the line of succession in the event of the death or disability of the president. He also has earned the respect of the legal profession through his work as a long-time member of the House Judiciary Committee.

It is interesting to note in the files a newspaper story of May 23, 1954, which began: "Rep. Richard H. Poff today set himself squarely against sending U.S. troops to Indochina . . ." When this country did become deeply involved in Vietnam, however, Poff supported the successive administrations on the war issue, though in 1964 he was urging that the nation either adopt a win policy or get out of Vietnam.

From the liberals' standpoint, Poff was especially vulnerable for having signed the anti-integration Southern Manifesto in 1956. Years later, Poff said that he was wrong in having signed it, that it was based on the doctrine of interposition which he knew at the time was invalid but he signed "in the

political imperatives of the moment." This kind of candor is commendable.

Obviously, the duties of a judge are different from those of a legislator. Nevertheless, looking at what Richard Poff worked for and at what he accomplished during his nearly 20 years in Congress, one comes to the conclusion that he is the type of fair-minded man of sound basic principles who should serve with credit on the state's top judicial body.

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from the Fifth District of Virginia.

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we had all assumed that in 7 months, with the adjournment of the 92d Congress, this body would lose one of its most distinguished Members in the person of the Honorable RICHARD H. POFF.

Unfortunately for those of us here today, the departure is closer at hand, as he has been appointed to the Supreme Court of Virginia, effective in August.

Some chosen for this singular position are unknown beyond the confines of their profession or their home territory. This is not the case in the present instance.

Ten times the people of his district have recorded the high esteem in which they hold this gentleman. Their regard is shared by his colleagues in the Congress, for he is universally respected on both sides of the aisle in this House as a man who is knowledgeable and fair-minded.

It is gratifying to learn that Representative Poff has been named to Virginia's Supreme Court. Our State's judiciary has gained a man not only well versed in the law, but a constitutional scholar with few peers.

For a score of years, RICHARD POFF has represented in an outstanding manner the people of the Sixth District, of the Commonwealth, and of the Nation. Citizens of the Commonwealth are indeed fortunate that they will continue to benefit from this man's service to his fellow man.

Mr. ABBITT. I thank my colleague.

I am happy at this time to yield to my distinguished colleague from the Eighth Congressional District (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlemen yielding and want to commend him for taking a special order to pay tribute to our distinguished colleague, Dick Poff.

We all agree that the Governor has made an excellent choice in naming Dick as an associate justice of the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia. There are many Virginians who could fill this post but I know of none more highly thought of, and with such a large number of friends, than our colleague who has received this appointment. In my opinion, he will serve with distinction on our State's highest court and I am hopeful that the interim appointment made by the Governor will result in an appointment for the full term by the Virginia General Assembly.

As the membership of the House knows, Dick received serious consideration by the President for appointment to the Supreme Court of the United States but asked that his name be removed from

consideration for personal and family reasons, when it appeared that there would be a long drawn-out battle for confirmation. There is every reason to believe that had this action not been taken, the President would have appointed our distinguished colleague to the High Court and Dick would have been confirmed by the Senate. Nevertheless, I am sure we all respect the decision he made.

All of us have heard Congressman Poff discuss legislation coming from the Committee on the Judiciary and I believe all Members of this House are impressed with his legal knowledge with special reference to the Constitution. He has served with distinction on the House Committee on the Judiciary and he has the respect of the members of that Committee who may be of a different party affiliation and a different political philosophy. I could review our colleagues biography and pay tribute to him on many personal achievements, but would only add that by training, experience, knowledge and temperament, he has the requirements to serve on our highest court in Virginia and to be a credit to that court.

Thank you again for yielding and for permitting me to join with my colleagues in commending the Governor on this appointment and urging that members of our General Assembly give favorable consideration to Dick Poff for the full term on the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia.

Mr. ABBITT. I thank the gentleman.

I am happy to yield to my colleague from the 7th Congressional District (Mr. ROBINSON).

Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am not a lawyer, so I shall not dwell on the legal attainments of my distinguished colleague. As a layman, however, and being somewhat wary of the language of the legal profession, I can state that I have had great confidence in the exposition of a point of constitutional law by Dick Poff, because I could understand it, and because the conclusion at which he arrived almost invariably impressed me as one solidly based in commonsense.

Although I was privileged to count him as a friend before coming to the Congress, the true value of that friendship was made abundantly evident on my arrival in the House. His wise and generous counsel enabled me to avoid many of the pitfalls which beset the freshman Member, and the fact that he vouched for me was instrumental, I know, in the acceptance and assistance which I received from many other senior Members.

Our colleague has been a model of the effective, yet unobtrusive, legislator. He has retained his intellectual curiosity and has drawn on his continuing studies in weighing the potential impact of each legislative decision, in committee and on the floor. His judgments have been calm, and, once they have been arrived at, he has not been moved from them by public clamor or political expediency.

His views, however, have not been intransigent, and he has been ready to acknowledge, on occasion, that new circumstances and new insights, have given him reason to modify a position previously taken.

Through the years, by conscientious attention to his public duties, Dick Poff gained in stature in the House, but it remained evident that his first concern was not personal advancement, but the best interests of the people who had sent him here to represent them—the citizens of the 6th Congressional District of Virginia. His congressional office was organized to serve them—to represent them—to represent them not only in legislative matters but also in the wide variety of problems involving agencies or agents of the huge Federal establishment with which private citizens become involved.

I am not certain as to all the ingredients of what is called judicial temperament, but, if they combine to produce an unwavering commitment to interpret the law and administer justice in an evenhanded manner, with both firmness and compassion, I am confident that our colleague will not be found deficient in any of them.

Speaking still as a layman, I will state that I have had, and continue to hold, the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia in great respect—a higher order of respect, I might add, than I have found myself able to accord the Federal judiciary on occasion.

When Justice Poff takes his place on that bench in Richmond, my confidence in it will be further enhanced, because I know he will be prepared not to make law, but to interpret the statutes of Virginia after measuring them against the directives and injunctions of the constitution of Virginia and the Constitution of the United States.

I share the regret being expressed here today at his impending departure from the House, but it is softened by the knowledge that judicial thought will be enriched.

Mr. ABBITT. I thank the gentleman.

I am happy to yield at this time to my dear friend and colleague from the Second Congressional District (Mr. WHITEHURST).

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I am honored and pleased to join my colleagues this afternoon in paying tribute to my good friend and colleague RICHARD POFF. While I am sorry to see Dick Poff leave the House, I believe that his appointment to the Supreme Court of the Commonwealth of Virginia will not only cap an illustrious career of public service but will bring to the high court of our State a degree of wisdom and legal talent that is matchless.

Before I came to the Congress in 1969, I knew of the splendid reputation of this man. Men in both parties told me that he had the best legal mind in the House of Representatives. After I became a Member of Congress, I saw this reputation confirmed over and over. Dick Poff has been a wise counsel to many Members of this House. His integrity and seriousness of purpose are an inspiration to me and I am going to miss his steadying influence. I would also like to commend Governor Holton this afternoon for selecting Congressman Poff for this significant judicial post. We in Virginia have always placed a high premium on judicial skill. It is in the heritage of George Mason and Thomas Jefferson, the only two Americans whose faces we see among the law

givers above the doors of the gallery. It is fitting, therefore, that RICHARD POFF should go forth from this Chamber and serve on the high bench in Virginia for he will serve with distinction and in the spirit of those great Virginians who look down upon us. Mr. Speaker, I say again that I am honored to be able to participate in this tribute to my good friend and colleague.

Mr. ABBITT. I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WHITEHURST).

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WAMPLER) who is representing the Ninth District of Virginia.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, I feel a special pride in my friend, Dick Poff, as he receives the well-deserved accolades of his colleagues. It is a pride born of the ascertainment that hard work is rewarded, that honesty and integrity are valued, that intellect coupled with tolerance, is justified.

Dick and I came to Washington together as freshmen Members of the 83d Congress in 1953. During that first session he was more than a colleague from my home State—he was friend, adviser, counsel, and confidant to me, as well as a model legislator. He remains so to this day.

When he made his decision a few months ago not to seek reelection this year, I felt a deep personal regret. But the greater loss will be felt by the House of Representatives and the Judiciary Committee where his contribution is invaluable. That he is attuned to the needs of his constituency is evidenced by the election returns over the past 19 years. By virtue of reapportionment, I have inherited two of his counties, and the city of Radford, where he practiced law before coming to Congress. It will be difficult to reach the level of his performance in this behalf.

But now, a singular honor has come to him which both recognizes his past achievements and seeks his continued service. Gov. Linwood Holton has indicated that RICHARD H. POFF will be named justice of the Supreme Court of Appeals of the Commonwealth of Virginia. This is our State's highest judicial tribunal.

And an exemplary justice he will be. He is thoroughly versed in constitutional law, dedicated to the ideal of law with justice, tempered with compassion and human understanding. He can be depended upon to administer this high office with dignity, with honor, and without prejudice. The Governor has chosen well, and the citizens of our beloved Virginia will be the chief beneficiaries of his wisdom.

I am delighted to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the pride of the Virginia delegation, a distinguished Member of Congress, a respected lawyer, a cogent force on the Judiciary Committee, an altogether able man, and a good friend—RICHARD H. POFF.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WAMPLER).

I would like to say at this point I am so pleased that all nine Members of the Virginia delegation have joined together to commend the Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia for this great ap-

pointment. I believe I can commend him on this appointment. He has appointed in my opinion one of the outstanding men, second to none, to fill the vacancy on that court.

We are personal friends of Mr. Poff, but we are not commending him because of our friendship. Five of the nine Members from Virginia that have spoken here today are attorneys. We know of Mr. Poff's integrity, and we know his ability. We have confidence in him, and we believe he will serve with honor, with fairness, and reflect great good upon the judicial members of Virginia. He will serve in the great tradition of the former members and present members of the Supreme Court of Virginia. I just want to say to our people back home that we are proud to commend Congressman Poff to the Legislature of Virginia.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to a non-Virginian to make a few remarks?

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, of course, I am only a freshman Congressman, and I cannot even say that on many legislative issues that I have been on the same side as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Poff) but having had the experience of serving in this term on the Judiciary Committee with Mr. Poff, I would like to associate myself with the remarks just made by various gentlemen from Virginia about the qualities of mind and character evidenced by Mr. Poff.

It does not take long association to recognize the highest qualities. Mr. Poff gives every indication, to those who know him, that he will be a judge in the mold of that other great Virginian, Chief Justice John Marshall. I am sure that if he is on the bench long enough he will make a record of similar distinction.

Mr. Poff is a man who, whatever his political persuasion, approaches problems with a detached, a judicial point of view. He is a man with an unusually keen and disciplined legal mind, a clear thinker and speaker. But more than that, he is a man of fairness who tries to look objectively at a problem instead of bringing it within preconceived notions and outworn values. A man with these qualities has the capacity to grow with the times yet retain the valid essences of our great traditions.

I hope that, if the Supreme Court of Virginia can afford to suffer, in his departure, the loss that this House is soon going to suffer, there will come a time when Mr. Poff will be elevated to that yet higher post from which he withdrew his name for nomination a few months ago.

There are some people, happily, on the bench as in our legislatures, who consistently rise above the particular passions of the moment and take the long view and the enlightened view. We need more of them in high places. I believe Mr. Poff is that kind of person. I want to add my commendation to the Governor of Virginia for showing the wisdom of appointing RICHARD POFF to the supreme court of his State.

Mr. ABBITT. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I want to be associated

with those sentiments expressed. I am sure I speak for all the other eight members of the delegation. They desire to be associated with those remarks.

I appreciate the opportunity of being here and of presenting this matter to the House.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I came to this great Chamber almost 14 years ago. During the intervening years, I have risen on numbers of occasions with the other Members to pay proper respect to the significant accomplishments of a distinguished colleague. I appreciate this opportunity to salute yet another colleague whom we hold in the highest esteem.

Our colleague, the Honorable RICHARD H. POFF, will leave us soon. We had begun to grow accustomed to the idea of his no longer serving in the House of Representatives since his announcement earlier that he would retire at the end of this Congress. It was not easy for us to accept the idea that Dick Poff has chosen to leave us, because many of us—those of us from Virginia in particular—have come to rely heavily not only on his leadership, which is of the highest quality, but on his friendship which knows no bounds.

Now we have learned that our colleague's departure from this House which he loves so well, will be sooner than expected. Several weeks ago, the Honorable Linwood Holton, Governor of Virginia, announced at the Capitol in Richmond that he planned to appoint RICHARD H. POFF to the Virginia Supreme Court.

Governor Holton said that he had selected him, "because he has stood at the highest levels of leadership nationally, has demonstrated legal ability during almost 20 years on the House Judiciary Committee, and has provided unique representation with amazing accomplishments."

His colleagues here in the Virginia delegation feel that our Governor could have chosen no more wisely. To us, Dick has always been the one who espoused the Constitution as a sacred trust. His legal scholarship has been exemplary; his principles of justice exact. To us, he was the model candidate for high judicial appointment.

We therefore were not surprised at his response as he stood beside the Governor when the announcement was made yesterday. He said:

I feel a mixture of joy, gratitude and humility. The Virginia Supreme Court ranks highest of all of the high courts of the States. Its decisions are acclaimed for their scholarship and craftsmanship throughout the legal profession and the academic community. His excellency, the Governor, has done me an honor which I shall strive mightily to earn.

And in particular, I was impressed with the three pledges which our colleague made.

First, he pledged "to the distinguished chief justice and the senior associate justices" that as a freshman member of the court, he will be a dutiful apprentice.

And then my admiration for him swelled to the very highest when he said:

As a member of the judicial branch of Virginia's government, I pledge to the General Assembly that I will never invade or usurp the function of the legislative branch.

Would only that other justices on other high courts make the same resolve.

And finally, he said:

As one sitting in judgment upon the property rights and personal rights of others, I pledge to the people of Virginia that I will seek only to serve the cause of justice for all people.

Governor Holton announced that he plans to make the formal appointment so that our good friend will be able to join his new colleagues on the bench in time for their term which begins late in August.

We will miss our daily association with him—an association which began in my case when we were classmates in the law school at the University of Virginia. We will see him go, however, without the customary feeling of sadness which we hold for many departing Members, but with a measure of admiration, because of his answer to this new call and with unbounded joy for the realization that a man so superbly schooled in this great legislative body will take to the judicial branch the lessons he so diligently learned here about "government of the people, by the people, for the people."

And, Mr. Speaker, when we welcome his successor, we will do so in the knowledge that he may walk in the shoes of RICHARD H. POFF, but never will he match his stride.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague Congressman WILLIAM M. COLMER, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, was unable to be present today but he asked me to extend to DICK POFF the sincerest congratulations and best wishes.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the day that RICHARD H. POFF leaves the House of Representatives, it will be a loss to this body. Congressman POFF is one of the most able and brilliant Members ever to serve in the Congress, and I personally am privileged that I have had this opportunity.

The great State of Virginia is fortunate in having him accept appointment as a justice of its supreme court. I am reminded of conversations with numerous friends on the House floor when we felt that he would make this Nation an outstanding Associate Justice of its Supreme Court.

Congressman POFF has been elected to 10 consecutive terms in the House of Representatives. It is fair to say that the respect that I hold for him is not that he has served for so long, but that he has served so well.

This year will see a number of distinguished Members of this body move on to other pursuits. Their counsel, guidance, and dedication will be missed.

But none will be more missed than our distinguished colleague from Virginia.

I wish him well in this new and exciting challenge.

The people of Virginia will be well served with RICHARD POFF as a member of their supreme court.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to sit with DICK POFF for 8 years and work closely with him on major legislation. I know of no lawyer with a keener judicial mind.

With his knowledgeability and stability, he will make an outstanding justice on the supreme court of the Commonwealth of Virginia. I am confident that he will continue to serve the people of Virginia with the same dedication that he served them in the House.

His leadership in the President's programs for judicial reform and law enforcement has been inspired. I know that he will become even more nationally recognized as one of our Nation's most able appellate jurists.

I know that each of you shares my mixed feelings of sincere congratulations and keen sense of loss of DICK POFF's devoted service to the House.

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the appointment of our colleague from Virginia, RICHARD POFF, as associate justice of the Virginia Supreme Court adds lustre and prestige to the entire institution of the judiciary.

While I had favored DICK POFF's appointment to the U.S. Supreme Court—and joined in making such a recommendation to the President—I consider that his decision to withdraw his name from consideration was one which he considered valid notwithstanding the loss to the Nation which his action caused.

Mr. Speaker, the appointment which will now result in his service on the Virginia Supreme Court should enable the judicial branch of our Government to benefit from his broad experience and his special legal talents.

Mr. Speaker, having served on the Judiciary Committee with DICK POFF during the past 8 years, and having been intimately involved with him on various major pieces of legislation in committee, and in active debates on the floor of this Chamber, I can attest, firsthand, to his scholarly analysis of legislation and his eloquent presentations during committee sessions and in floor debate.

Mr. Speaker, there are clear differences of opinion with regard to virtually all legal and legislative matters—and there are as great a variety of political philosophies as there are individuals in this Nation—but no one could ever question the fidelity and sincerity with which DICK POFF expressed his legal position and his political views. I am confident that the quality of legislation has been improved and that the reputation and prestige of this body has been enhanced by his faithful and constructive service as a Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate DICK POFF on his appointment and wish him well in his career as a member of the Virginia Supreme Court. The loss to the House Judiciary Committee and to the House of Representatives is substantial, the gain to the Nation's judiciary is immeasurable.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks on the subject of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

PROTECTIVE LEGISLATION FOR POLICE, SHERIFFS, AND PROSECUTORS

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, just recently, a situation was brought to my attention which I am sure you will agree is most unfortunate—a lawsuit was brought against one of my constituents who is a police officer which launched him and his family into near poverty, even though he was proved innocent of the charges brought against him for actions taken during his line of duty. The family is still \$4,000 in debt due to the legal fees incurred, and they have lost their home after having to mortgage it during these trying times. And we can only imagine the tremendous amount of pressures and sufferings the officer and his family had to endure—and are still enduring. This is an incredible situation, and a very sad one.

A short time ago, my colleague, Mr. ICHORD, brought to the attention of this House facts which indicate that the case I posed is not an isolated one by any means. He documented that the number of "frivolous" suits being brought against law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and others in the field of law have increased significantly. The excuses for bringing these suits are endless. It may be that it is a ploy to delay prosecution, to create publicity, to gain sympathy, or even to "get back" at those who were only performing a duty on behalf of the citizenry at large.

Since these suits must be defended with the lawman's own resources, it can but have ill effects on their performance for fear that they will be brought to trial themselves.

It is for this reason that I am introducing a bill today aimed at helping lawmen sued for damages in Federal courts. Essentially, this measure would require plaintiffs to file a bond with the court conditioned upon the payment of reasonable investigative and legal costs if the defendant wins the suit. This would insure reimbursement, and would, hopefully, fend off those who do not believe they have a chance of winning their case in court.

This proposal is the only equitable alternative to the present situation, and it is essential that we undertake to help protect the law enforcement officers found innocent of charges.

It is my hope that this measure be seriously considered, along with other protective measures which I have supported ever since I came to Congress, providing reimbursement to the families of officers injured or killed on duty by the defendant, and making it a Federal crime to kill or feloniously assault law enforcement officers. Let us protect our "protectors."

HIGH PROFITS CAUSE OVERRUNS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, contractors demanding profits as high as 20 percent are a major reason for cost overruns totaling \$77 million of the Navy's special new quiet submarine.

Caving in to the unwarranted demands of contractors by the Navy has pushed the price of this new submarine from \$100 million to \$177 million.

General Electric, the only potential builder of the submarines' nuclear engine and Worthington Corp. of Harrison, N.J., which provides special pumps for the subs, were the major offenders in what I believe is a money-grabbing escapade.

The Navy has allowed itself to be put over a barrel and has permitted contractors to extract excessive profits. These contractors took unfair advantage and exploited the Navy for extra profits.

General Electric charged the Government for 13 percent profit for the nuclear plant on the SSN685 submarine which is nearly double the normal amount.

According to Adm. I. C. Kidd in response to questions that I posed before a recent hearing of the House Armed Services Committee, Worthington Corp., the builder of pumps, "insisted on 20 percent profits." The normal profit for this kind of contract is 11 percent.

I have written today to Navy Secretary John Warner urging him to renegotiate these contracts in order to eliminate obviously excessive profits. I believe it is unconscionable for the Navy to provide a 20 percent markup to Worthington for its pumps.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that an independent authority should be established which enforces contract incentives and penalties. While many contracts today contain incentives and penalties for the contractor, they are rarely enforced. The establishment of an independent body through congressional legislation would be a first step in forcing contractors and the services to enforce penalty clauses.

Since the military obviously refuses to discipline contractors then Congress must legislate an end to this kind of ridiculous boondoggle.

HEART ASSOCIATIONS PLAY KEY ROLE IN EFFORTS TO CONTROL HEART DISEASE

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

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, many of us were watching television one evening almost 2 months ago when the evening newscasts reported on a domestic drama involving one of the country's most famous families. The family was that of former President Johnson, and the drama centered on Mr. Johnson's second heart attack, which he suffered while visiting his daughter and her family in Charlottesville, Va.

The experience the Johnson family had in early April is one that is sadly familiar to all Americans. Many have themselves been stricken by some form of heart disease, and there is hardly anyone who does not have a friend, rela-

tive, or neighbor who has been among the victims.

Cardiovascular diseases—those diseases that affect the heart and circulatory system—are the largest single cause of death in our country today. They are also a leading cause of disability. They strike at Americans in all age groups.

The statistics are sobering. Approximately 30 million Americans—close to 15 percent of our population—suffer from some form of cardiovascular disease. Over 1 million people annually die from heart disease; that amounts to 54 percent—or slightly over half—of the total deaths that occur in the United States each year. Fifty-six percent of all Indiana deaths, slightly higher than the national average, are from heart disease.

Among the elderly—those over 65, cardiovascular diseases account for two-thirds of total deaths. But they also take a heavy toll of those in the prime of life; one-third of the Americans who die before reaching 65 are victims of heart disease.

The economic costs of heart disease are staggering. They cost the Nation about \$17.3 billion annually, and they cost the Nation's business about 52 million man-days of production each year.

In this country, we take pride in having brought under control many diseases that once took a heavy toll on our citizens. The threat from diphtheria, polio, tuberculosis, pneumonia, and malaria has been greatly reduced in this century.

Yet the incidence of heart disease is actually much higher today than it was in 1900. And although the death rate from all cardiovascular ailments has declined somewhat in the last few years, it is still increasing for some of the most prevalent forms—notably coronary disease and strokes.

This rising toll cannot be fully explained by increasing life expectancy. It is true that Americans are living longer and that heart attacks occur more frequently among the elderly. But the coronary death rate is also climbing for persons in the younger age bracket—especially men. Since 1950 it has gone up 14 percent for men aged 25 to 44, and 4 percent for those between 45 and 65. President Johnson suffered his first heart attack when he was 47. 8 years before he entered the White House.

What this means is that heart attacks and strokes are taking an ever greater toll of men in the most productive years of their lives. One estimate is that heart disease is responsible for \$6.9 billion in lost wages each year. There is no way of assessing the hidden costs due to losses in management skills, production know-how, and personnel training.

The picture is not entirely gloomy, however. We have had some significant advances toward bringing heart disease under control. A wide variety of technologies join forces to make more precise and effective the diagnosis and treatment of cardiovascular disorders. Cardiac catheterization, radioisotope scanning, computers, sophisticated X-ray techniques, ultrasound and exercise tolerance tests are all employed.

Treatment, too, has improved with anticoagulant drugs, diuretics to remove

fluid from the tissues, digitalis to regulate the action of the heart muscle, diet control, and antibiotics.

SURGERY

Impressive progress has been made in surgical techniques. The development of heart-lung machines and perfection of open-heart surgery have enabled doctors to correct many of the congenital heart defects that once condemned their victims to invalidism and early death. None can better appreciate this accomplishment than the parents of the more than 25,000 babies born each year with defective hearts.

New heart valves, transplanted leg veins used to bypass a diseased area of a coronary artery, "booster" pumps are all relatively new and dramatic advances in surgical techniques.

EMERGENCY FACILITIES

Another area in which there has been great progress is in the provision of emergency facilities to treat heart attack victims. Fast action means the difference between life and death in many cases of heart attack. The solution is to begin treating the patient and monitoring his heart condition as soon as possible after an attack occurs and to maintain this surveillance continuously.

President Johnson's case provides a good illustration of what can be done. A mobile coronary care unit was sent for him after he suffered his attack. This meant that doctors could begin treating him even before he reached the University of Virginia hospital. Once at the hospital, he continued under constant observation at the intensive care facility there. And when he flew to his Texas home 2 weeks later, equipment to provide the same type of care was aboard the plane on which he was traveling.

Only a decade ago few hospitals had the type of emergency facilities that helped President Johnson. Now more than one-half of our 7,000 hospitals have coronary care units at the hospital, and more and more have mobile units as well. These units feature highly trained personnel, around the clock monitoring devices, the latest techniques in the use of drugs, electrical methods of restarting and repacing the heart. This is a major reason that the death rate among hospitalized heart attack victims has dropped 30 percent in recent years.

REHABILITATION

Restoring the victim to productive living is another important advance in the treatment of cardiovascular disease, patient, family, therapist, physician all cooperate to restore health.

These are noteworthy accomplishments, but much remains to be done if we are to be successful in curbing heart disease. Further progress will require that we give attention to three tasks: prevention, research, and education.

PREVENTION

Prevention is important because it offers by far the best prospect of lowering the overall toll from heart disease. Treating persons after they suffer heart attacks and strokes can save many lives, but a really significant drop in the death rate will only be possible if we can reduce the number of heart attack victims.

The tragic fact is that half of the

persons who suffer coronary attacks die within minutes or seconds and never have an opportunity to receive medical assistance. Fifty percent of those who die suddenly are not aware they have heart disease until the fatal attack occurs. Even those who survive an initial attack may be disabled for extended periods or perhaps for the rest of their lives.

Our major objective, therefore, should be to learn more about the causes of heart disease so that we can undertake effective prevention programs.

RESEARCH

This is why research is so important. Why, for example, is the mortality rate for men under the age of 55 about twice as great in the United States, as it is in the Scandinavian countries? Medical investigators have learned a great deal about heart disease in recent years, but they acknowledge that there are still many gaps in their knowledge. They know that arteriosclerosis, or hardening of the arteries, which gradually restricts the flow of blood to the heart and the brain, is the proximate cause of most heart attacks and strokes; yet, they still do not fully understand the process by which arteriosclerosis takes place.

Statistical analysis has shown that there is a high correlation between heart disease and what have come to be known as the three high-risk factors: cigarette smoking, cholesterol in the blood, and high blood pressure. This evidence suggests that these three factors may be among the principal villains in the heart disease drama. Extensive experimentation will be needed to test this hypothesis.

Heart experts also want to find out whether there is any relation between the tensions of modern urban living and the incidence of heart attack. They would like to know why coronary disease afflicts many more men than women under age 65. The answers to these questions might lead to a significant breakthrough in preventing heart disease.

EDUCATION

Research must go hand in hand with education. We still need to do more to alert the American public to the danger from heart disease and to spread information about ways of combating it. People need to be familiar with the symptoms of heart disease, so that they can seek proper treatment before it is too late. Too often those who suffer heart attacks postpone seeking medical assistance; the average delay, according to one study is 3 hours. As research yields the information we need to mount an effective prevention program, educational activities to disseminate this information to members of the medical profession and to the public will become even more important.

CONGRESS

Congress has recognized the need for action to combat heart disease. Legislation has been proposed in both the House and the Senate to expand the activities of the National Heart and Lung Institute, which has been engaged in research into all aspects of heart disease since 1949.

The legislation in the House, which I have joined in sponsoring, provides for:

First. Development of a comprehensive plan to combat heart disease. The plan will be prepared by the National Heart and Lung Institute, and will set forth a specific, long-term strategy, identifying research priorities and requirements for new facilities, funding and staffing.

Second. Increased funding. Under the House bill annual authorizations for the National Heart and Lung Institute will be doubled next year and will continue to increase thereafter, rising from \$370 million in fiscal year 1973 to \$490 million in 1975.

Third. New research facilities. Fifteen new centers to be established by the National Heart and Lung Institute will work on diagnosis and prevention, as well as treatment, of heart disease.

Fourth. An expanded educational program, to be conducted by the National Heart and Lung Institute. It will give special attention to disseminating information about prevention of heart disease, particularly with regard to diet, exercise, weight control, stress, hypertension, and cigarette smoking.

Fifth. Better administration, to be achieved by giving the National Heart and Lung Institute greater authority to coordinate the activities of the Federal Government relating to heart disease.

Sixth. Closer cooperation between the National Institute, the medical profession, and the concerned public. The vehicle for this will be a restructured National Heart and Lung Advisory Council, in which Federal officials, medical experts, and public representatives will participate.

The prospects are good that we will see enactment of this legislation before the end of this year. In the House, floor action on the proposals which I am supporting should take place in a few weeks. In the Senate, a similar bill, which incorporates all of the principal features of the legislation pending in the House, has already been passed.

The proposals now being considered in Congress will give a strong impetus to the campaign against heart disease, but success will not be possible without the active involvement of concerned citizens throughout the country.

HEART ASSOCIATIONS

That is why it is essential to have the continued support of heart associations. These organizations bring together people who want to do something about heart disease in communities in all parts of the United States. They provide a valuable link between the medical profession and the general public. They have helped build the foundation of popular support that has made it possible to win Congressional approval of expanded Federal heart programs.

Volunteers are the most important resource of every heart association. Thanks to the support of public-spirited persons who are willing to contribute their time and skills, heart associations have compiled an impressive record of accomplishments.

These associations have helped to inform the people about the symptoms of

heart disease and to alert them to the risks inherent in smoking, improper diet, overweight, and high blood pressure. This has involved the distribution of school health kits, the organization of nutrition and weight control classes, and the provision of speakers and informational materials.

The heart associations have introduced a new preventive technique through their PhonoCardioScan programs, which detect abnormal heart sounds in school-age children.

Another valuable association service is supplying data on the latest developments in heart research to doctors and nurses. Training sessions in mouth-to-mouth resuscitation and closed chest heart massage have prepared firemen, police, school personnel, and other individuals to give emergency assistance to heart attack victims.

Volunteers have made all of these programs possible. Volunteers will be needed to continue and expand them so that your association can contribute to the stepped-up campaign against heart disease that is now commencing.

With the vigorous support of heart association members throughout the United States, I am confident we can look forward to new progress in controlling the ravages of heart disease.

TAXATION WITHOUT JUSTIFICATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. GALIFIANAKIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, in 1772 taxation without representation oppressed the American people. Two hundred years later we have taxation with representation, but without justification. That may be progress, but I doubt it.

I refer specifically to the \$8 billion the Federal Government is estimated to have withheld unnecessarily from millions of American taxpayers. In effect, the Government has confiscated the property of American citizens and plans to hold that property and enjoy the benefits thereof for up to 1 year without paying any compensation.

The excuse, of course, is that this sorry situation is the taxpayer's fault. He or she, we are told, should have had enough sense to overdeclare personal exemptions, to claim more exemptions than he or she really has. I should not be too surprised. This is no more nonsensical than many provisions of our tax code. What is even more absurd is the attempt to blame the victim for the crime.

In reality, bureaucratic miscalculation and ineptitude are responsible for this economic fiasco, and in my opinion the Government should accept responsibility and pay the price for its mistake. The Government failed to adequately alert the American people about the recent increase in the withholding tables, and as a result, many taxpayers are being compelled to make, in effect, interest-free loans to the U.S. Treasury.

Several of my colleagues have suggested that the Government consider offering such taxpayers interest-bearing

bonds instead of no-interest refund checks. In the light of the inflationary pressure likely to be incited by the cashing of millions of huge refund checks, the interest-bearing bond approach appears to be an effective instrument for correcting this gross inequity without substantial damage to the fight against inflation.

Therefore, I urge both the Congress and the administration to expedite its consideration of this subject and make a prompt effort to right this obvious wrong.

POLLUTION RESPECTS NO BOUNDARIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, much of Florida was plagued earlier this month by smog and haze which has been traced, by weather satellite photographs and other means, to smokestack emissions from as far away as Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee.

In some areas of Florida these air pollution conditions caused a significant increase in respiratory ailments and in hospitalizations for these ailments. The situation in Dade County, Fla., became so bad that county officials have threatened Federal court action against these out of State polluters.

I think that this incident is just one more indication that we are going to have to be sure that strict Federal air pollution standards are enforced nationwide if any of us are to live to enjoy the benefits of clean air and clean water in our local communities. It also serves as a warning that we as a community of nations are going to have to do a good deal more than we are now doing if we are to stop the pollution of our planet.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to insert an editorial on the recent "out of State pollution" problem in Florida which appeared in the Tampa Tribune of June 2:

POLLUTION RESPECTS NO BOUNDARY LINES

A complaint from Dade County this week emphasizes that the problem of air pollution is national, not local, and why national standards are so important.

Dade County (as was much of the rest of Florida) was blanketed with haze last week. In the Miami area particularly, there was a notable increase in respiratory attacks and hospitalization of victims.

In a protest to Federal officials and pollution control directors of three states, Peter Baljet, Dade pollution control chief, said weather satellite photographs and other studies had clearly established that smokestack emissions from Ohio, Pennsylvania and Tennessee had ridden air currents southward, and a temperature inversion had trapped the smog over Florida.

Baljet asked the three states and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to act immediately against offenders. He said under the Federal anti-pollution act the county could go into a U.S. court for injunctions against out-of-state polluters, and threatened to do so "if the administrative route fails."

That the Environmental Protection Act has sufficient teeth in it to assure clean air for everyone was made plain Tuesday by the

action of U.S. District Court Judge John H. Pratt in Washington. Judge Pratt, acting in a suit brought by four ecology groups, ruled that the Federal law requires not only that states adopt pollution standards, but that they also prohibit high-quality air from deteriorating even to the level of the standards.

He ordered William D. Ruckelshaus, director of the EPA, not to approve state pollution control standards unless they expressly contained the non-degradation element. The four plaintiffs argued that Congress, in enacting the law, held its purpose was to protect and enhance air quality, and Judge Pratt, agreeing, stated, "On the face, this would appear to permit no significant deterioration of air quality."

Ruckelshaus responded that he doesn't believe he has the authority to require a non-degradation policy in clean-air areas. He asked a review of the decision, and said if Judge Pratt is upheld the courts must define the principle clearly enough for him to write appropriate regulations. He said the court's decision would open up a new area of standards for state anti-pollution plans, including those nine states, Florida among them, whose rules have received final Federal approval.

Judge Pratt's ruling, however, makes special sense in light of Dade County's plight. Even mild pollution at the point of emission, when combined in the upper air currents with that of other areas, can intensify the plague on other localities.

The air we breathe knows no city, county and state boundaries. When a polluter in Pennsylvania can put a Miami in the hospital, the problem obviously is nationwide, not local. It behooves every citizen to demand strict Federal action to control the smoky stacks even a thousand miles away; the cough he prevents may be his own.

THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF EDITH GREEN

(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, those of us who have enjoyed the privilege and honor of serving in the House with Representative EDITH GREEN, know of her dedication to America and of her valuable contributions to sound legislation, particularly in the field of education.

Long known for her distinguished work in that field, she has again been brought deservedly to the attention of the entire country through a recent article in the Christian Science Monitor. It appeared on Monday, June 12, 1972, under the heading "School-Trend Watcher." In this article Mrs. GREEN talks with a reporter about her views on education, the financial difficulty facing our schools, and misuse of schools as a tool for social change. No one is better qualified than Mrs. GREEN to speak on this matter.

I commend the article to my colleagues and I congratulate Mrs. GREEN not only for what she has said but for the outstanding work she has done in this most important field throughout her career.

The article is reprinted below.

CONGRESSWOMAN GREEN—SCHOOL-TREND WATCHER

(By Marion Bell Wilhelm)

When Edith Starrett, the bright-eyed daughter of two dedicated teachers, yearned to become an electrical engineer, she was advised not to try for a "man's career."

Her second choice was law. Again, she was

counseled out of a profession that would relegate a young woman to a "back office."

So Edith Starrett grew up to become a teacher, as was advisable for a woman looking for regular employment in the 1930's. Today she is one of the most powerful spokesmen for American education in the U.S. Congress.

After 18 years on the House Education and Labor Committee, Rep. Edith Starrett Green (D) of Oregon says philosophically: "As it turned out, the career that was chosen for me has been invaluable to my work in Congress, and I suppose it even makes me a little impatient with those of my colleagues who have never taught school."

As the chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Education, Mrs. Green keeps her eye on trends and changes throughout the 50 states and the District of Columbia. She has sponsored major legislation to help rescue the nation's schools from the gathering storms of "a social hurricane."

DECLINE OF CONFIDENCE

All over the United States, she notes, school tax levies and bond issues are being defeated. Property taxes are high and uneven. Too often, she says, those making school policy are untrained in educational and professional skills.

"People seem to be losing confidence in the public schools," she observed in a recent interview. "I fear the day may be coming when we just won't have an educated citizenry. Already, we can see some evidence of this in some of our big cities."

Representative Green's goal is to see the federal government eventually take over 35 percent of all educational costs from kindergarten through college. This would help equalize education for all Americans, she believes, while maintaining the quality of their best schools. She calls the coming changes in the financing of education "revolutionary."

However, the trend toward national financing contains some pitfalls, she cautions.

In a number of states, she points out, suits have been brought by citizens questioning the equality of education in school districts with widely divergent tax revenues. If the local property tax is abandoned for some kind of statewide tax, parents in states such as Mississippi or Alabama might also bring suits claiming inequality with states such as Connecticut. National equalization, though beneficial in some ways, could be disastrous, in Mrs. Green's opinion, "if we settle for mediocrity."

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED

"I introduced a bill last year in which I proposed that the federal government by the year 1976 would contribute 25 percent of the total cost of education in the average district," she says, "and this session I am introducing a bill that would provide one-third of the cost. At present, we are contributing 7 or 8 percent."

"But I am not persuaded that money alone is going to buy quality. Here in the District of Columbia, for example, our schools are decaying before our eyes. And yet they have the highest per capita expenditure for education of any city of similar size in the nation."

Nor does Mrs. Green think that busing is the way to achieve the best education. She says: "I think a careful reading of the evidence shows that a child's education and his ability to be educated depend more upon the environment in which he lives than on the six hours a day in which he is transported to a school outside his neighborhood. I think that the task is much greater than we have assumed. We're going to have to change homes, and we're going to have to change neighborhoods."

TOO BIG A BURDEN

Any attempt to place the major responsibility for social reform on the schools alone is doomed to failure, she asserts.

"It may be that a youngster who is attending a very poor school and is bused has an opportunity for a higher quality of education," she adds, "but I think that, overall, the reverse is accomplished. I had lunch with some school-board members in Los Angeles, for example, a year and a half ago. This last year they had to cut out \$50 million in programs and services for children in the Los Angeles schools because they didn't have enough money.

"Then a state court came along and said, 'You're going to have to desegregate.' The superintendent's office told me last November that for the first year their estimate on the cost of buying buses and hiring bus drivers will be \$42 million."

KISSINGER TESTIFIES IN NIGHT-CLUBS BUT NOT BEFORE CONGRESS

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, Presidential Adviser Henry Kissinger is a law unto himself. While his free-wheeling antics make him a one-man successor to the old rat pack which used to be fashionable at the White House, he apparently holds out a double standard on his briefings. Rarely will he be quoted. He will not testify before congressional committees and yet, according to an article in the May 29, 1972, *International Herald Tribune*, he showed no qualms at "testifying" in a Moscow night club about U.S. defense and negotiation information which should be treated as highly confidential, if not secret. Will he make the same statements before appropriate congressional committees or does he limit his discussions of our Nation's secrets to bars and the jet set crowd?

According to that news report, Mr. Kissinger discussed the balance of American-Soviet nuclear weaponry in the dim Skylight Room of the Intourist Hotel. The account noted:

To American newsmen based in Moscow, it was astonishing to hear the principal strategic adviser to the American President discussing the level of both nations' nuclear arsenals in a Moscow nightclub.

Astonishing to them, possibly, Mr. Speaker, but not astonishing to many Americans who do not trust Mr. Kissinger. One of the reasons that many of us have so little confidence in President Nixon's foreign policy conduct is Mr. Nixon's confidence in Mr. Kissinger and his coterie. There are many reasons for firing Henry Kissinger. This is probably the least of them and yet it is a part of the story of arrogance at the seat of power and national security in Washington.

The entire story is included at this point:

KISSINGER TELLS ALMOST ALL: STORY OF SUCCESS COMES OUT IN MOSCOW NIGHT-CLUB

(By Murrey Marder)

Moscow, May 28.—None who experienced it will quickly forget the climax of an improbable diplomatic presentation that leaped between the Kremlin Palace of the Czars; a well-worn diplomatic bargaining room in Helsinki; the American Embassy here, and ultimately the nightclub of Moscow's Intourist Hotel. No one fully orchestrated this

production, which dramatized the world's first nuclear arms limitation.

In the seductively dim Skylight Room, which happens to be on the hotel's ground floor, between a bandstand and a circular, raised dance floor, against a background of champagne buckets, President Nixon's inexhaustible security adviser, Henry A. Kissinger, gave the American version of what Mr. Nixon described as the "enormously important" strategic arms agreement signed two hours earlier in the Kremlin.

Over the nightclub's public address system, listeners heard what must surely have been some of the most unusual statements uttered out loud in the Soviet Union.

KISSINGER HUMOR

The Kissinger sense of humor, leavening the sobering statistics of nuclear warfare and grueling around-the-clock sessions of intensive bargaining here, was on display in an incongruous setting. Pressed by American newsmen to supply hard details on the balance of American-Soviet nuclear weaponry, Mr. Kissinger was saying: "The Soviet Union has been building missiles at the rate of something like 250 a year. If I get arrested here for espionage, gentlemen, we will know who is to blame."

To American newsmen based in Moscow, it was astonishing to hear the principal strategic adviser to the American President discussing the level of both nations' nuclear arsenals in a Moscow nightclub.

The nightclub revelation was anticipated by no one, including Mr. Kissinger. The road to it was long, tortuous, and constantly subject to the unpredictable interplay of international developments that reached from Moscow and Washington to the mined harbors of North Vietnam.

It was learned here yesterday from Nixon administration sources that one critical breakthrough to an American-Soviet agreement on strategic arms limitation was reached during Mr. Kissinger's initially secret Moscow talks with the Soviet Communist party's general secretary, Leonid I. Brezhnev, April 20-24.

In their meeting, which centered both on Vietnam and the scheduled summit talks, Mr. Kissinger and Mr. Brezhnev reached basic agreement, it is said, on including a limitation on nuclear missile-firing submarines in a first-stage SALT agreement. The accord was considered a breakthrough for the United States, which pushed hard for submarine limitations, although later new problems were to arise over exactly how the complex submarine freeze would be applied.

Simultaneously, the United States and the Soviet Union were sliding toward new tension over the American bomber attacks on the Hanoi and Haiphong region prior to Mr. Kissinger's arrival in Moscow. That slide toward the risk of a great power confrontation sharply accelerated with President Nixon's May 8 decision to order the mining of North Vietnam's harbors to try to cut the Soviet Union's sea supply line to its allies in Hanoi. American-Soviet developments were heading in exactly opposite directions at the same time: toward high prospects of coexistence, and toward confrontation.

The total inside story of the tense days between May 8 and Mr. Nixon's arrival in Moscow May 22 is still buried in secrecy. But as portions of the tale emerge they reveal increasingly that what evidently saved the summit from postponement or collapse over President Nixon's mining order was that by then the two nations were deeply involved in negotiating subjects of superior mutual interest—most especially SALT.

By the time Mr. Nixon arrived here last Monday, it was expected on both sides that a SALT agreement would be reached during his visit because the basic political decisions and most of the technical decisions had been thrashed out during 30 months of negotiating, with meetings alternately in Vienna and

in Helsinki. But last-minute bargaining hangups, it was conceded, might possibly extend beyond the summit. So the pressure was on for both sides.

On Tuesday, Mr. Kissinger said, the President and Mr. Brezhnev spent the afternoon and evening on four unresolved SALT disagreements, resolving all but two of them. One group of remaining problems concerned the terms for interchanging land missiles with submarines, and another obstacle was how to deal with older Soviet submarines.

STALEMATES BROKEN

By noon Friday, the stalemates were broken, and the Russians were anxious to announce the result Friday night to avoid disrupting the summit schedule. Joint instructions were flashed to the U.S. and Soviet negotiators in Helsinki, and the final agreement was literally pieced together by American Ambassador Gerald C. Smith and chief Soviet negotiator Vladimir S. Semyonov on an American plane that brought them to Moscow Friday evening.

But the task of publishing the agreement and explaining it to the world was barely beginning at that point, with a signing ceremony set for 11 p.m. in the Kremlin.

At 10:02 p.m., American newsmen traveling with the President were assembled in the U.S. Embassy for an on-the-record briefing by Ambassador Smith and Mr. Kissinger, both operating under heavy strain.

Mr. Smith called it "the freshest treaty that I have ever talked about." In fact, it was so fresh that no one in the room had a copy to show to newsmen. That produced tumult.

Criticism already was being raised in Congress about the still-unseen treaty, especially charges that it gave lopsided submarine advantages to the Soviet Union. Mr. Smith and Mr. Kissinger firmly denied that, and then—in an unusual sequence—began revealing, in Moscow, intelligence information to sustain the American assurances.

This session, and the one afterward in the Intourist Hotel, produced on-the-record exchanges between American newsmen and officials never before heard in Moscow.

Reporter: "The basic story (about the treaty) is going to go out of this session. I think we have to get figures on submarines and other estimates, otherwise the story will go out in a garbled way . . . Is this figure of 42 Y-class submarines an accurate one that they will be allowed to complete, and we with 41?"

Mr. Smith: "I don't know about this figure of 42 submarines. I have seen all sorts of speculations about Soviet submarines, but it is perfectly clear that under this agreement, if the Soviets want to pay the price of scrapping a substantial number of other important strategic weapons systems, they can build additional submarines."

NOT AS CONSTRAINED

Reporter: "... I think you are evading the point . . ."

Mr. Smith: "I am purposely evading the point because that is an intelligence estimate that I am not in a position to give out . . ."

Mr. Kissinger: "Since I am not quite as constrained or don't feel as constrained as Ambassador Smith, lest we build up a profound atmosphere of mystery about the submarine issue, I will straighten it out as best I can."

"The base number of Soviet submarines is in dispute. It has been in dispute in our intelligence estimate exactly how much it is, though our intelligence estimates are in the range that was suggested."

Question "41 to 43?"

Mr. Kissinger: "I am not going to go beyond what I have said. It is in that general range. The Soviet estimate of their program is slightly more exhaustive. They, of course, have the advantage that they know what it is precisely." (Laughter).

The briefing was interrupted for the 11 p.m. signing ceremony. The frustrated newsmen watched the three official documents being signed on television. They still had no copies of the "landmark" treaty.

Later, over 100 weary, deadline-stricken U.S. reporters were assembled to meet with an equally tired Mr. Kissinger in the only available hall, the Intourist Hotel nightclub.

As he proceeded through 45 minutes of exhausting questioning, Mr. Kissinger, sleepless most of the past furious week of diplomacy, still displayed his whimsical aplomb and command of detail on a subject that has preoccupied him for years before and since he came to the White House.

NO SPRINKLING OF LEVITY

There was no sprinkling of levity to ease tension, however, when Mr. Kissinger was asked if "the United States got stuck with a submarine deal." Replied Mr. Kissinger firmly "that is an absurdity. It is a total absurdity. It was the United States which insisted that the submarines be included. . . . So this is not something that the Soviets forced on us. It is something we urged on the Soviets. . . ."

If this "important first step" in limiting defensive and offensive nuclear missiles succeeds, said Mr. Kissinger, "the future will record that both sides won."

NETWORK ANTI-NIXON BIAS DOCUMENTED

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

Mr. DEVINE, Mr. Speaker, the publication known as First Monday, sponsored by the Republican National Committee, revealed some very interesting facts about the networks, as well as their commentators.

Although First Monday is a politically oriented journal, the revelations in the June 5 issue should have much broader exposure for the benefit of the public; thus I am including the following:

SOVIET SUMMIT LEAVES MEDIA CHICKEN LITTLES WITH EGG ON THEIR FACES

(By John Heywood)

The U.S.-Soviet summit meeting has among other things, left the media Chicken Littles with egg on their faces.

The President had barely faded from the TV screen on May 8 when the network sneerleaders, hand-wringers and hand-shakers went to work.

As a result of the President's just announced initiatives in Vietnam, steps taken to protect American lives and prevent a Communist take-over of South Vietnam, CBS's Eric Sevareid stated flatly: "I would suspect that the summit will not come off." His CBS colleagues Marvin Kalb and Collingwood voiced similar opinions. Collingwood said "... certainly the Moscow summit meeting, from which so much had been expected, is now in jeopardy. . . ." Kalb declared: "One casualty of the President's mining and blockade may well be his upcoming summit to Moscow. Those who began packing and dreaming of caviar in Russia are beginning to unpack and return to some dry cereal."

CHANCELLOR: SUMMIT IN JEOPARDY

NBC's John Chancellor said on May 8: "The summit is in jeopardy today." Saying the USSR "can't sit still for this," NBC White House correspondent Richard Valeriani asked "How can they receive him (the President) now?"

Edmund Stevens of NBC observed: "The President's announcement will be pretty hard for them (the Soviets) to swallow. . . . It practically killed the prospects (of a sum-

mit) . . .". ABC's Ted Koppel said: "I don't see how he (the President) can go."

Characterizing the President's actions as a "threat to the peace of the world," inviting "Soviet retaliation," the *New York Times* editorialized that "a big question mark hangs over projected summit" and "there remains no certainty that it will take place." *Times* columnist Wicker branded the President a "true emperor" and worried about the world turning into an "ash."

Not to be out-done in their denunciation of the President, the *Washington Post* opinionized: "The Moscow summit is in the balance, if it has not yet toppled over." In another editorial wondering about the national interest and the self-respect of the Soviet Union, the *Post* foresaw a possibility that "the China glow," "the Moscow summit," and "the prospects of reaching SALT, trade and European agreements before next January" might all go down the drain. *Post* columnist Joseph Kraft proclaimed the summit "in hazard" and blasted the President for putting up for grabs "the structure of world order, and the lives of thousands of Vietnamese and hundreds of Americans."

The fact of the matter is, as columnist Joseph Alsop put it: "The Soviet response to the mining of Haiphong harbor was about as tough and stiff as a length of sadly overcooked spaghetti." Those who made hysterical predictions conjuring up the wildest sort of apocalypse performed a disservice to their readers and viewers in that their ravings contributed to an irrational dialog on a subject of the utmost sensitivity, a subject which cried out for sensible discussion.

In short, much of the media's post-May 8 commentary on the President, Vietnam and the summit gives reasons to question not the judgment of the President, but rather the perspicacity of those who so badly misjudged him and subsequent events.

CBS NEWS ACCENTUATES NEGATIVE, DISTORTS FACTS IN REPORTING VIETNAM ACTION

During the past several weeks since the North Vietnamese invasion of South Vietnam, the *First Monday* Media Monitor has picked up a few items of interest, items which show that when it comes to astigmatism nothing sees things quite like the CBS eye:

"DEFEAT" NOT A DEFEAT

On the evening of May 6, 1972, CBS Evening News viewers were greeted by anchorman Roger Mudd telling them: "The South Vietnamese suffered two more defeats today trying to push back the Communists in the Central Highlands." One of the "defeats" cited by Mudd was at Firebase 42 where enemy forces reportedly killed or wounded at least 100 South Vietnamese in a three-hour assault.

Meanwhile, on NBC, Don North was reporting from Firebase 42 and his more detailed account showed that the battle wasn't quite the defeat CBS had made it out to be.

Pointing out that the attackers were an estimated company of North Vietnamese sappers ("probably the most feared enemy soldiers in Vietnam"), North reported that the base had been destroyed but "if the enemy mission had been to overrun and hold this firebase, as they have so many others, they failed." North said the base was not overrun due to the fighting of the elite South Vietnamese airborne unit that had "beaten off" the attack by the North Vietnamese.

VOLUNTEER ARMY MISREPRESENTED

In the same May 6 CBS Evening News broadcast, there was a film report from Hue, South Vietnam, showing a volunteer army marching through the streets. As the camera focused on a close-up of a man who looked like a 150-year-old Ho Chi Minh in a helmet, CBS reporter David Henderson (in Hue) intoned ominously:

"Led by a brass band playing patriotic marching tunes, the local militia for the ancient imperial capital of Hue paraded through the streets today to show off their strengths. The ragged army of volunteers will be the first line of defense when the expected enemy attack comes. The militia is made up of men too old or too young to be in the regular army, veterans—some of them disabled, local officials and teachers."

Henderson went on to point out that the parade was through mostly empty streets because most of the people left as "they were not impressed with the militia to protect them. Local armies in this country have a reputation for panicking and running away when attacked."

NOT FIRST DEFENSE LINE

The fact of the matter is that the volunteer army shown on CBS News was not and is not the "first line of defense" of the city of Hue. As an Associated Press story reported: "The government has provided 20,000 weapons for volunteers to defend the city if the army cannot hold off the North Vietnamese." The AP report labeled the local militia "the last-ditch volunteer defenders of Hue." Thus, by presenting this disorganized group of volunteers as the primary defenders of Hue, CBS gave their viewers a much gloomier picture than the facts warranted.

The final items involve CBS reporter Bob Simon and things he said and didn't say.

In an April 29 report from Hue, Simon was reporting on the Communist shelling of Highway One and the thousands of refugees on the road. Commenting at one point on how the people had to learn for themselves that the road was being bombarded, Simon said: "The Communists were not aiming for civilians, at least one can't imagine why they would, there were more important targets on the road. . . ."

COMMUNIST TERROR TACTIC

What one can't imagine is why Simon would wonder why the Communists would shell civilians. They have done so as a terror tactic since the beginning of the Vietnam war.

Just last week in a press conference, Defense Secretary Laird cited facts and figures to show the Communists "complete lack of regard" for civilians: Since the Communists invaded six weeks ago, the South Vietnamese city of An Loc, a two square mile area concentrated with a civilian population, has been hit by 35,000 rounds of enemy artillery. The four days before Quang Tri fell, the Communists were putting into that civilian population area a total of 3,000 rounds a day. The last day before it fell, the city took 4,600 rounds. As Laird put it: "They sprayed artillery into those civilian centers just as if they were using a water hose."

Another Simon report, April 28, ended on a very moving note. As the camera pans slowly showing the bodies of dead and injured men, women and children, South Vietnamese refugees, strewn across a road after their truck had hit a Communist mine, Simon says:

NOTHING LEFT TO SAY?

"By evening government spokesmen are saying another grand victory has been won in Quang Tri province, the situation is once again stabilized. But there will be more fighting and more words. Words spoken by generals, journalists, politicians. But here on Route One, it is difficult to imagine what those words can be. There is nothing left to say about this war. There is just nothing left to say."

Nothing left for Bob Simon to say obviously. But is there really nothing left to say about a truckload of innocent refugees killed and maimed by a Communist mine put there by an enemy who throughout the entire war in Vietnam has deliberately mur-

dered civilians as an instrument of national policy? Is there really nothing left to say about an enemy who after years of aggression continues to try and enslave his fellow countrymen by force and violence? Is there nothing to be said about how 12 of North Vietnam's 13 regular army divisions are now engaged in aggression outside its borders against Laos, Cambodia and South Vietnam? Is there nothing to be said about North Vietnam's violation of the 1954 Geneva Accords and the 1968 understandings which led to a cessation of U.S. bombing? Is there nothing to be said about North Vietnam's truculence and refusal to negotiate in good faith an end to the war?

Of course there is plenty to be said about the war. But the odds are you won't hear it or see it on CBS.

THE ABSURDITY OF SOME FEDERAL PROGRAMS

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

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that I find myself unable to respond to inquiries from my constituents. Some 30 years on Capitol Hill, as an aide to two Senators and as a sitting Member of this honorable body, have given me the experience not to be surprised by any inquiry, to expect almost anything from a citizen and even more and stranger things from Government, and to cope with all of these.

But I confess that two recent letters from constituents have me nonplussed. I am chagrined at my own ignorance of what brought the circumstances about, when and how I, as one Congressman, supported such a proposition, what to do about it, and how to answer the plain-text comments of my constituents.

In the interest of brevity, I want to read the two letters. I have, of course, deleted the names of the writers and other personal references.

—, KANS.,
May 2, 1972.

HON. JOE SKUBITZ,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOE: Curiosity combined with anger (perhaps you have heard from others before now) prompt this letter to you.

—, and his wife —, who live about one and a half blocks east of me in —, and who have lived on welfare all of their life are building a new house and it's nothing small. Of course, it can't be because they have either thirteen or fourteen children.

By the grape vine—they got an FHA loan and are to repay it at forty something dollars a month.

Those of us who work for a living, pay our taxes, contribute to all drives, etc., can't even consider such a thing as a new home—many of us even have to study all circumstances before we can even invest in a car. Yet we have to support such as this and can't help but wonder how such things are done.

We would appreciate any investigation of this situation that can be done since many of us are at a loss to understand it. Possibly in six months it will be a total wreck just like all other places they have been moved into.

So much for this—do hope you and Jess are both well and that I see you sometime soon when you are home.

Sincerely,

—, KANS.

HON. JOE SKUBITZ: As a taxpayer I am wondering how the welfare Dept. can built a \$30,000 home for a family with 12 children and the husband not work one day in his life time except when he need some cash for—

I think I should resign from my job and have the welfare Dept. pay the mortgage, the taxes, and some cash for food & clothing for my living. New clothing is much better than seconds or hand me down.

I do need an explanation of this matter.
Thanks

Obviously, when I read that first letter, I could not believe my eyes. But the writer is an old and trusted friend, a lady who travels each day to an adjacent town to work 10 hours a day to earn her own living. And my second correspondent is a medical technologist, a man who works hard for a modest living to support his family.

Upon making inquiry from Government departments, I find that the FHA will arrange financing for homes for welfare clients and that welfare payments will be augmented to meet the mortgage payments. Frankly, I had thought we were past that day when taxpayers' hard-earned dollars were squandered on \$50-a-day suites at the Waldorf-Astoria and other New York hotels to house families on welfare. And I was naive enough to believe that this could happen only in New York, or Los Angeles, or Chicago, or Cleveland, never in Kansas.

Mr. Speaker, the small town in Kansas where \$30,000 of taxpayer funds are being spent to build a home for a welfare family is populated by people of the most modest means. Many must live on their social security benefits alone. Most live in homes originally built by their grandparents. These are modest dwellings, small, inadequate by modern standards.

These people have a hard time making both ends meet; many find it difficult to pay their annual real estate taxes, buy fuel in winter, buy necessary medicines, and clothe themselves and their families. Many, indeed, are happy with second-hand clothes and hand-me-downs. But they are decent, hard-working people who retain their pride and independence.

Yet it is their taxes that are being used to pay for a home, a new, modern, spick-and-span dwelling that shames every remaining home in the town. Is it any wonder that people cry out at the tax load; is it any wonder that people decry the extravagance of Government; is it any wonder that people oppose welfare as it is presently constituted and administered?

Is it so hard to understand why people are frustrated and angry? Is it still a puzzle why people look for new leadership that promises an end to some of these inequitable and unsupportable programs and policies?

Nor is this surprising welfare policy the end of the story. A few days later, in a "Dear Colleague" letter, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. McCLURE), informed us of the so-called double subsidy program now available under the section 235 housing program of HUD. We learned that Internal Revenue's interpretation of existing law permits a

homeowner to deduct from his Federal income tax the total of his mortgage interest paid the Federal Government.

Of course, we all understand that mortgage interest paid on a privately placed mortgage loan is a deductible item in filing income tax. The logic is that the recipient of the interest must include it as income in his tax return so that the Government properly and appropriately collects a tax on the interest thus earned. But the section 235 loophole, if indeed it is a loophole, denies the Federal Government any return. The mortgage borrower gets an HUD subsidy in the first place to buy his home and then, in effect, charges the Federal Government for the interest on its own mortgage. Why not make it an interest-free mortgage in the first place; why go through this meaningless fiction?

As a certain TV comedian would say, "How sweet it is!" But to me, this is no laughing matter. It is a cruel joke on responsible, taxpaying citizens who must bear this burden. Whose largess is this, indeed?

Not the Members of Congress who advertently or inadvertently voted for such a program—we are not putting up our money for this gift.

Certainly not Mr. Romney's nor his fellow officials at HUD—it is not their private funds that are being used for this subsidy.

No, indeed—it is the sweat and blood of that inchoate mass out there—the average, small-home taxpayers whose moneys are being taken and squandered in this fashion.

I ask that those in this body who have the responsibility for these programs, those who handle welfare legislation and housing legislation; I ask them to look into these matters and do something about them before it is too late.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 12931, RURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT, 1972

MR. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers be given permission to have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 12931, Rural Development Act, 1972.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 92-1129)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12931) to provide for improving the economy and living conditions in rural America, 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 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 this Act may be cited as the "Rural Development Act of 1972"

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSOLIDATED FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1961

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.—Section 301(a) of the Consolidated Farmer-Home Administra-

tion Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) This title may be cited as the 'Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act'."

SEC. 102. RURAL ENTERPRISE LOANS.—Section 304 of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by—

(1) inserting "(a)" before the first sentence and striking out

"(a)" and "(b)" in the first sentence; and

(2) adding at the end of section a new subsection as follows:

"(b) Loans may also be made or insured under this subtitle to residents of rural areas without regard to the requirements of clauses (2) and (3) of section 302 to acquire or establish in rural areas small business enterprises to provide such residents with essential income."

SEC. 103. APPRAISALS.—Section 305 of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "normal" in the first and second sentences and striking out the last sentence.

SEC. 104. ESSENTIAL RURAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES.—Section 306(a)(1) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended (1) by inserting after "corporations not operated for profit," the following: "Indian tribes on Federal and State reservations and other federally recognized Indian tribes,"; and (2) by striking out "and recreational developments" and inserting in lieu thereof "recreational developments, and essential community facilities including necessary related equipment".

SEC. 105. GRANTS FOR WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL SYSTEMS.—Section 306(a)(2) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "\$100,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$300,000,000".

SEC. 106. PLANNING REQUIREMENTS.—The first sentence of section 306(a)(3) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows: "No grant shall be made under paragraph (2) of this subsection in connection with any project unless the Secretary determines that the project (i) will serve a rural area which, if such project is carried out, is not likely to decline in population below that for which the project was designed, (ii) is designed and constructed so that adequate capacity will or can be made available to serve the present population of the area to the extent feasible and to serve the reasonably foreseeable growth needs of the area, and (iii) is necessary for an orderly community development consistent with a comprehensive community water, waste disposal, or other development plan of the rural area and not inconsistent with any planned development provided in any State, multi-jurisdictional, county, or municipal plan approved by competent authority for the area in which the rural community is located, and the Secretary shall require the submission of all applications for financial assistance under this section to the multi-jurisdictional substate areawide general purpose planning and development agency that has been officially designated as a clearinghouse agency under Office of Management and Budget Circular A-95 and to the county or municipal government having jurisdiction over the area in which the proposed project is to be located for review and comment within a designated period of time not to exceed 30 days concerning among other considerations, the effect of the project upon the areawide goals and plans of such agency or government. No loan under this section shall be made that is inconsistent with any multi-jurisdictional planning and development district areawide plan of such agency. The Secretary is authorized to reimburse such agency or government for the cost of making the required review."

SEC. 107. EXTENSION.—In the second sen-

tence of section 306(a)(3) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 strike out "1971" and insert "1973".

SEC. 108. WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL PLANNING GRANTS.—Paragraph (6) of section 306(a) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by—

(1) striking out "\$15,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$30,000,000";

(2) striking out "official"; and

(3) striking out "sewer" and inserting in lieu thereof "waste disposal".

SEC. 100. DEFINITIONS.—Section 306(a)(7) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows:

"(7) As used in this title, the terms 'rural' and 'rural area' shall not include any area in any city or town which has a population in excess of ten thousand inhabitants, except that for purposes of loans and grants for private business enterprises under sections 304(b), 310B, and 312 (b), (c), and (d) the terms 'rural' and 'rural area' may include all territory of a State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, that is not within the outer boundary of any city having a population of fifty thousand or more and its immediately adjacent urbanized and urbanizing areas with a population density of more than one hundred persons per square mile, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture according to the latest decennial census of the United States: *Provided*, That special consideration for such loans and grants shall be given to areas other than cities having a population of more than twenty-five thousand.

SEC. 110. REPEAL OF MAXIMUM SIZE LOAN.—Section 306(a) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by striking out paragraph (5).

SEC. 111. RURAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING GRANTS.—Section 306(a) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(11) The Secretary may make grants, not to exceed \$10,000,000 annually, to public bodies or such other agencies as he may select to prepare comprehensive plans for rural development or such aspects of rural development as he may specify."

SEC. 112. PRIORITY FOR CERTAIN WATER FACILITY AND WASTE DISPOSAL LOANS AND GRANTS.—Section 306(a) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(12) In the making of loans and grants for community waste disposal and water facilities under paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection the Secretary shall accord highest priority to the application of any municipality or other public agency (including an Indian tribe on a Federal or State reservation or other federally recognized Indian tribal group) in a rural community having a population not in excess of five thousand five hundred and which, in the case of water facility loans, has a community water supply system, where the Secretary determines that due to unanticipated diminution or deterioration of its water supply, immediate action is needed, or in the case of waste disposal, has a community waste disposal system, where the Secretary determines that due to unanticipated occurrences the system is not adequate to the needs of the community. The Secretary shall utilize the Soil Conservation Service in rendering technical assistance to applicants under this paragraph to the extent he deems appropriate."

SEC. 113. INTEREST RATES ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT LOANS.—Section 307(a) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the second sentence thereof the following: "; except that loans (other than loans to public bodies or non-profit associations (including Indian tribes

on Federal and State reservations and other federally recognized Indian tribal groups) for community facilities, or loans of a type authorized by section 306(a)(1) prior to its amendment by the Rural Development Act of 1972) made or insured under section 304 (b), 306(a)(1), or 310B shall—

(1) when made other than as guaranteed loans, bear interest at a rate, prescribed by the Secretary, not less than 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 comparable to the average maturities of such loans, adjusted in the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury to provide for a rate comparable to the rates prevailing in the private market for similar loans and considering the Secretary's insurance of the loans, plus an additional charge, prescribed by the Secretary, to cover the Secretary's losses and cost of administration, which charge shall be deposited in the Rural Development Insurance Fund; *Provided*, That the rate so prescribed shall be adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum; and

(2) when made as guaranteed loans, bear interest at such rate as may be agreed upon by the borrower and the lender."

SEC. 114. ESCROW PAYMENTS.—Section 307 (a) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: ", and borrowers under this title shall prepay to the Secretary as escrow agent such taxes and insurance as he may require, on such terms and conditions as he may prescribe".

SEC. 115. AGRICULTURAL CREDIT INSURANCE FUND. AMENDMENT.—(a) Section 309(f) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by—

(1) changing "\$100,000,000" to "\$500,000,000" in paragraph (1);

(2) changing paragraph (2) by—

(A) striking out "the interest" and inserting in lieu thereof "amounts";

(B) changing "prepayments" to "payments" in all three places; and

(C) inserting after "until due" the following: "or until the next agreed annual or semiannual remittance date".

(3) striking out "section 335(a) in connection with insured loans." in paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof "connection with insured loans, including the difference between interest payable by borrowers and interest to which insured lenders or insured holders are entitled under agreements with the Secretary included in contracts of insurance."

(4) inserting in paragraph (5) after "to pay" the following: "for contract services".

(b) Section 309 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections: "(g)(1) The assets and liabilities of, and authorizations applicable to, the Farmers Home Administration direct loan account created by section 338(c) and the Emergency Credit Revolving Fund referred to in section 326 are hereby transferred to the fund, and such account and such revolving fund are hereby abolished. Such assets and their proceeds, including loans made out of the fund pursuant to this section, shall be subject to the provisions of this section, section 308, the last sentence of section 306(a)(1), and the last sentence of section 307.

"(2) From time to time, and at least at the close of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall pay from the fund into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts interest on the value as determined by the Secretary, with the approval of the Comptroller General, of the Government's equity transferred to the fund pursuant to the first sentence of this subsection plus the cumulative amount of appropriations made available after enactment of this provision as capital and for admin-

istration of the programs financed from the fund, less the average undisbursed cash balance in the fund during the year. The rate of such interest shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with remaining periods to maturity comparable to the average maturities of loans made or insured from the fund, adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum. Interest payments may be deferred with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, but any interest payments so deferred shall themselves bear interest. If at any time the Secretary determines that moneys in the fund exceed present and any reasonably prospective future requirements of the fund, such excess may be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury.

"(h) The Secretary may provide financial assistance to borrowers for purposes provided in this title by guaranteeing loans made by any Federal or State chartered bank, savings and loan association, cooperative lending agency, or other legally organized lending agency."

SEC. 116. RURAL DEVELOPMENT INSURANCE FUND.—The Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by inserting the following new section after section 309:

"Sec. 309A. (a) There is hereby created the Rural Development Insurance Fund (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Insurance Fund') which shall be used by the Secretary as a revolving fund for the discharge of the obligations of the Secretary under contracts guaranteeing or insuring rural development loans. For the purpose of this section 'rural development loans' shall be those provided for by sections 304(b), 306(a)(1), 310B, and 312(b), except loans (other than for water systems and waste disposal facilities) of a type authorized by section 306(a)(1) prior to its amendment by the Rural Development Act of 1972.

"(b) The assets and liabilities of the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund referred to in section 309(a) applicable to loans for water systems and waste disposal facilities under section 306(a)(1) are hereby transferred to the Insurance Fund. Such assets (including the proceeds thereof) and liabilities and rural development loans guaranteed or insured pursuant to this title shall be subject to the provisions of this section and section 308.

"(c) Moneys in the Insurance Fund not needed for current operations shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Insurance Fund or invested in direct obligations of the United States or obligations guaranteed by the United States. The Secretary may purchase with money in the Insurance Fund any notes issued by the Secretary to the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of obtaining money for the Insurance Fund.

"(d) The Secretary is authorized to make and issue notes to the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of obtaining funds necessary for discharging obligations under this section and for making loans, advances, and authorized expenditures out of the Insurance Fund. Such notes shall be in such form and denominations and have such maturities and be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes shall bear interest at a rate fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average market yield of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to the average maturities of rural development loans made, guaranteed, or insured under this title. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes of the Secretary issued hereunder, and, for that purpose, the Secretary

of the Treasury 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 such securities may be issued under such Act, as amended, are extended to include the purchase of notes issued by the Secretary hereunder. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States.

"(e) Notes and security acquired by the Secretary in connection with rural development loans made, guaranteed, or insured under this title or transferred by subsection (b) of this section shall become a part of the Insurance Fund. Notes may be held in the Insurance Fund and collected in accordance with their terms or may be sold by the Secretary with or without agreements for insurance thereof at the balance due thereon, or on such other basis as the Secretary may determine from time to time. All net proceeds from such collections, including sales of notes or property, shall be deposited in and become a part of the Insurance Fund.

"(f) The Secretary shall deposit in the Insurance Fund any charges collected for loan services provided by the Secretary as well as charges assessed for losses and costs of administration in connection with making, guaranteeing, or insuring of rural development loans under this title.

"(g) The Secretary may utilize the Insurance Fund—

"(1) to make rural development loans which could be insured under this title whenever he has a reasonable assurance that they can be sold without undue delay, and he may sell and insure such loans;

"(2) to pay amounts to which the holder of insured notes is entitled on loans heretofore or hereafter insured accruing before the date of any payments by the borrower and the date of transmittal of any such payments to the holder. In the discretion of the Secretary, payments other than final payments need not be remitted to the holder until due of until the next agreed annual or semiannual remittance date;

"(3) to pay to the holder of insured notes any defaulted installment, or upon assignment of the note to the Secretary at the Secretary's request, the entire balance due on the loan;

"(4) to purchase notes in accordance with contracts of insurance heretofore or hereafter entered into by the Secretary;

"(5) to make payments in compliance with the Secretary's obligations under contracts of guarantee entered into by him;

"(6) to pay taxes, insurance, prior liens, expenses necessary to make fiscal adjustments in connection with the application and transmittal of collections or necessary to obtain credit reports on applicants or borrowers, expenses for necessary services, including construction inspections, commercial appraisals, loan servicing, consulting business advisory or other commercial and technical services, and other program services, and other expenses and advances authorized in section 335(a) of this title in connection with insured loans. Such items may be paid in connection with guaranteed loans after or in connection with acquisition by the Secretary of such loans or security therefor after default, to an extent determined by the Secretary to be necessary to protect the interest of the Government, or in connection with grants and any other activity authorized in this title;

"(7) to pay the difference between interest payments by borrowers and interest to which holders of insured notes are entitled under contracts of insurance heretofore or hereafter entered into by the Secretary; and

"(8) to pay the Secretary's costs of administration of the rural development loan program, including costs of the Secretary in-

dental to guaranteeing rural development loans under this title.

"(h) When any loan is sold out of the Insurance Fund as an insured loan, the interest or other income thereon paid to an insured holder shall be included in gross income for purposes of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954."

SEC. 117. INSURED WATERSHED AND RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT LOANS.—Subtitle A of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end a new section as follows:

"Sec. 310A. Loans meeting the requirements of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act may be insured, or made to be sold and insured, in accordance with and subject to sections 308 and 309, the last sentence of section 306(a)(1), and the last sentence of section 307 of this title."

SEC. 118. RURAL INDUSTRIALIZATION ASSISTANCE.—(a) Subtitle A of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof, after section 310A as added by this Act, a new section as follows:

"Sec. 310B. (a) The Secretary may also make and insure loans to public, private, or cooperative organizations organized for profit or nonprofit, to Indian tribes on Federal and State reservations or other federally recognized Indian tribal groups, or to individuals for the purpose of improving, developing, or financing business, industry, and employment and improving the economic and environmental climate in rural communities, including pollution abatement and control. Such loans, when originated, held, and serviced by other lenders, may be guaranteed by the Secretary under this section without regard to subsections (a) and (c) of section 333.

"(b) The Secretary may make grants, not to exceed \$50,000,000 annually, to eligible applicants under this section for pollution abatement and control projects in rural areas. No such grant shall exceed 50 per centum of the development cost of such a project.

"(c) The Secretary may also make grants, not to exceed \$50,000,000 annually, to public bodies for measures designed to facilitate development of private business enterprises, including the development, construction, or acquisition of land, buildings, plants, equipment, access streets and roads, parking areas, utility extensions, necessary water supply and waste disposal facilities, refinancing, services and fees.

"(d) The Secretary may participate in joint financing to facilitate development of private business enterprises in rural areas with the Economic Development Administration, the Small Business Administration, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development and other Federal and State agencies and with private and quasi-public financial institutions, through joint loans to applicants eligible under subsection (a) for the purpose of improving, developing, or financing business, industry, and employment and improving the economic and environmental climate in rural areas or through joint grants to applicants eligible under subsection (e) for such purposes, including in the case of loans or grants the development, construction, or acquisition of land, buildings, plants, equipment, access streets and roads, parking areas, utility extensions, necessary water supply and waste disposal facilities, refining, service and fees.

(1) No financial or other assistance shall be extended under any provision of sections 304(b), 310B, and 312(b) that is calculated to or is likely to result in the transfer from one area to another of any employment or business activity provided by operations of the applicant, but this limitation shall not be construed to prohibit assistance for the expansion of an existing business entity

through the establishment of a new branch, affiliate, or subsidiary of such entity if the establishment of such branch, affiliate, or subsidiary will not result in an increase in unemployment in the area of original location or in any other area where such entity conducts business operations unless there is reason to believe that such branch, affiliate, or subsidiary is being established with the intention of closing down the operations of the existing business entity in the area of its original location or in any other area where it conducts such operations.

(2) No financial or other assistance shall be extended under any provision of sections 304(b), 310B, and 312(b) which is calculated to or likely to result in an increase in the production of goods, materials, or commodities, or the availability of services or facilities in the area, when there is not sufficient demand for such goods, materials, commodities, services, or facilities, to employ the efficient capacity of existing competitive commercial or industrial enterprises, unless such financial or other assistance will not have an adverse effect upon existing competitive enterprises in the area.

(3) No financial or other assistance shall be extended under any provision of sections 304(b), 310B, and 312(b) if the Secretary of Labor certifies within 60 days after the matter has been submitted to him by the Secretary of Agriculture that the provisions of paragraph (1) and (2) of this subsection have not been complied with. The Secretary of Labor shall, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture, develop a system of certification which will insure the expeditious processing of requests for assistance under this section.

(b) Section 333 of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by inserting "310B," in paragraph (b) after "306,".

SEC. 119. GUARANTEED RURAL HOUSING LOANS.—Subtitle A of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"Sec. 310C. (a) Rural Housing Loans which (1) are guaranteed by the Secretary under section 517(a) (2) of the Housing Act of 1949, (2) are made by other lenders approved by the Secretary to provide dwellings in rural areas for the applicants' own use, and (3) bear interest and other charges at rates not above the maximum rates prescribed by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for loans made by private lenders for similar purposes and guaranteed by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under the National Housing Act or superseding legislation shall not be subject to sections 501(c) and 502(b) (3) of the Housing Act of 1949."

"(b) For the purposes of title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, a guarantee of payment given under the color of law by the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands (or its successor in function) shall be found by the Secretary reasonably to assure repayment of any indebtedness so guaranteed."

SEC. 120. YOUNG FARMERS' LOANS.—(a) Section 311 of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by—

(1) inserting "(a)" before the first word; and

(2) adding at the end of the section a new subsection as follows:

"(b) (1) Loans may also be made under this subtitle without regard to the requirements of clauses (2) and (3) of subsection (a) to youths who are rural residents to enable them to operate enterprises in connection with their participation in 4-H Clubs, Future Farmers of America, and similar organizations and for the purposes specified in section 312."

"(2) A person receiving a loan under this subsection who executes a promissory note therefor shall thereby incur full personal

liability for the indebtedness evidenced by such note in accordance with its terms free of any disability of minority.

"(3) For loans under this subsection the Secretary may accept the personal liability of a cosigner of the promissory note in addition to the borrowers' personal liability."

(b) Section 312 of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by inserting "(a)" after "311".

SEC. 121. RURAL ENTERPRISE OPERATING LOANS.—Section 312 of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended by this title, is amended by—

(1) inserting "(a)" before the first word; and

(2) further amending subsection (a) (as so designated by paragraph (1)) by striking out "and (9) for loan closing costs," and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(9) loan closing costs, and (10) for assisting farmers or ranchers in effecting additions to or alterations in the equipment, facilities, or methods of operation of their farms or ranches in order to comply with the applicable standards promulgated pursuant to section 6 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 or standards adopted by a State pursuant to a plan approved under section 18 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, if the Secretary determines that any such farmer or rancher is likely to suffer substantial economic injury due to such compliance without assistance under this paragraph."

(3) adding at the end of the section new subsections as follows:

"(b) Loans may also be made under this subtitle to residents of rural areas without regard to the requirements of clauses (2) and (3) of section 311(a) to operate in rural areas small business enterprises to provide such residents with essential income."

"(c) Loans may also be made to eligible applicants under this subtitle for pollution abatement and control projects in rural areas."

"(d) The Secretary may make grants, not to exceed \$25,000,000 annually, to eligible applicants under this subtitle for pollution abatement and control projects in rural areas. No such grant shall exceed 50 per centum of the development cost of such a project."

SEC. 122. MAXIMUM SIZE.—Section 313 of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by changing "\$35,000" to "\$50,000".

SEC. 123 INSURED OPERATING LOANS.—SUBTITLE B of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"Sec. 317. Loans meeting the requirements of this subtitle (except section 312(b)) may be insured, or made to be sold and insured, in accordance with and subject to sections 308 and 309 and the last sentence of section 307 of this title."

SEC. 124. AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 331.—Section 331 of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, is amended—

(1) by inserting before the semicolon, in paragraph (a), the following: "and until January 1, 1975, make contracts for services incident to making, insuring, collecting, and servicing loans and property as determined by the Secretary to be necessary for carrying out the purposes of this title; and the Secretary shall prior to June 30, 1974, report to the Congress through the President on the experience in using such contracts, together with recommendations for such legislation as he may see fit"; and

(2) by changing the period at the end of any lettered paragraph thereof to a semicolon and adding at the end of such section the following additional paragraphs:

"(g) Obtain fidelity bonds protecting the Government against fraud and dishonesty

of officers and employees of the Farmers Home Administration in lieu of faithful performance of duties bonds under section 14, title 6, United States Code, and regulations issued pursuant thereto, but otherwise in accordance with the provisions thereof;

"(h) Not require borrowers to pay interest accrued after December 31, 1972, on interest which is not more than 90 days overdue on any loan held or insured by the Farmers Home Administration;

"(i) Consent to the transfer of property securing any loan or financed by any loan or grant made, insured, or held by the Secretary under this title, or the provisions of any other law administered by the Farmers Home Administration, upon such terms as he deems necessary to carry out the purpose of the loan or grant or to protect the financial interest of the Government."

SEC. 125. CREDIT ELSEWHERE DETERMINATION.—Paragraph (a) of section 333 is amended by inserting after "in writing" the following: "and the Secretary shall determine,".

SEC. 126. REPEAL OF COUNTY COMMITTEE APPROVAL REQUIREMENT FOR ASSOCIATION AND DISTRICT LOANS.—Section 333(b) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by striking out the words "said sections" and inserting "section 321 (b) (2)".

SEC. 127. DISPOSITION OF REAL PROPERTY.—Section 335(c) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by—

(1) striking out "subtitle A" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "the provisions of any law administered by the Farmers Home Administration";

(2) striking out "the provisions of subtitle A" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "such provisions";

(3) striking out in the fourth sentence "of at least 20 per centum" and "not more than five annual"; and

(4) adding at the end of the fourth sentence before the period the following: "but not in any event at rates and terms more favorable than those legally permissible for eligible borrowers".

SEC. 128. (a) GUARANTEE OF LOANS.—Section 343 of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by inserting at the end thereof before the period the following: "and (4) the word 'insure' as used in this title includes guarantee, which means to guarantee the payment of a loan originated, held, and serviced by a private financial agency or other lender approved by the Secretary, and (5) the term 'contract of insurance' includes a contract of guarantee".

(b) Section 307(b) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by changing "shall" to "may" in the second sentence.

SEC. 129. ORDER OF PREFERENCE, EXTENT OF GUARANTY.—The Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 344. No loan (other than one to a public body or nonprofit association (including Indian tribes on Federal and State reservations or other federally recognized Indian tribal groups) for community facilities or one of a type authorized by section 306(a) (1) prior to its amendment by the Rural Development Act of 1972) shall be made by the Secretary either for sale as an insured loan or otherwise under section 304(b), 306(a) (1), 310B, 312(b), or 312(c) unless the Secretary shall have determined that no other lender is willing to make such loan and assume 10 per centum of any loss sustained thereon. No contract guaranteeing any such loan by such other lender shall require the Secretary to participate in more than 90 per centum of any loss sustained thereon."

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO THE WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT, AS AMENDED

SEC. 201. AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAW 83-566.—The Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (68 Stat. 666), as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 1 is amended by striking out the words "the purpose of preventing such damages and of furthering the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water, and thereby of preserving and protecting the Nation's land and water resources" and substituting therefor the words "the purpose of preventing such damages, of furthering the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water, and the conservation and utilization of land and thereby of preserving, protecting, and improving the Nation's land and water resources and the quality of the environment."

(b) Section 2 is amended by substituting a comma for the word "or" after clause (1) and adding after the phrase "(2) the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water" a comma and the following: "or

"(3) the conservation and proper utilization of land".

(c) Section 3 is amended by changing the period at the end of paragraph (5) to a semicolon and adding the following:

"(6) to enter into agreements with landowners, operators, and occupiers, individually or collectively, based on conservation plans of such landowners, operators, and occupiers which are developed in cooperation with and approved by the soil and water conservation district in which the land described in the agreement is situated, to be carried out on such land during a period of not to exceed ten years, providing for changes in cropping systems and land uses and for the installation of soil and water conservation practices and measures needed to conserve and develop the soil, water, woodland, wildlife, and recreation resources of lands within the area included in plans for works of improvement, as provided for in such plans, including watershed or subwatershed work plans in connection with the eleven watershed improvement programs authorized by section 13 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), as amended and supplemented. Applications for assistance in developing such conservation plans shall be made in writing to the soil and water conservation district involved, and the proposed agreement shall be reviewed by such district. In return for such agreements by landowners, operators, and occupiers the Secretary shall agree to share the costs of carrying out those practices and measures set forth in the agreement for which he determines that cost sharing is appropriate and in the public interest. The portion of such costs, including labor, to be shared shall be that part which the Secretary determines is appropriate and in the public interest for the carrying out of the practices and measures set forth in the agreement, except that the Federal assistance shall not exceed the rate of assistance for similar practices and measures under existing national programs. The Secretary may terminate any agreement with a landowner, operator, or occupier by mutual agreement if the Secretary determines that such termination would be in the public interest, and may agree to such modifications of agreements, previously entered into hereunder, as he deems desirable to carry out the purposes of this paragraph or to facilitate the practical administration of the agreements provided for herein. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary, to the extent he deems it desirable to carry out the purposes of this paragraph, may provide in any agreement hereunder for (1) preservation for a period not to exceed the period covered by the agreement and an equal period thereafter of the cropland, crop acreage, and allotment history applicable to

land covered by the agreement for the purpose of any Federal program under which such history is used as a basis for an allotment or other limitation on the production of any crop; or (2) surrender of any such history and allotments."

(d) Paragraph (1) of section 4 is amended by inserting after "without cost to the Federal Government" the words "from funds appropriated for the purposes of this act".

(e) Clause (A) of paragraph (2) of section 4 is amended by striking all words after "fish and wildlife", and substituting therefor the words "development, recreational development, ground water recharge, water quality management, or the conservation and proper utilization of land: *Provided*, That works of improvement for water quality management shall consist primarily of water storage capacity in reservoirs for regulation of streamflow, except that any such storage and water releases shall not be provided as a substitute for adequate treatment or other methods of controlling waste at the source, and shall be consistent with standards and regulations adopted by the Water Resources Council on Federal cost sharing for water quality management, and".

(f) All that part of clause (B) of paragraph (2) of section 4 which follows the word "Provided," where it first appears therein is amended to read as follows: "That, in addition to and without limitation on the authority of the Secretary to make loans or advancements under section 8, the Secretary may pay for any storage of water for present or anticipated future demands or needs for municipal or industrial water included in any reservoir structure constructed or modified under the provisions of this Act as hereinafter provided: *Provided further*, That the cost of water storage to meet future demands may not exceed 30 per centum of the total estimated cost of such reservoir structure and the local organization shall give reasonable assurances, and there is evidence, that such demands for the use of such storage will be made within a period of time which will permit repayment within the life of the reservoir structure of the cost of such storage: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall determine prior to initiation of construction or modification of any reservoir structure including such water supply storage that there are adequate assurances by the local organization or by an agency of the State having authority to give such assurances, that the Secretary will be reimbursed the cost of water supply storage for anticipated future demands, and that the local organization will pay not less than 50 per centum of the cost of storage for present water supply demands: *And provided further*, That the cost to be borne by the local organization for anticipated future demands may be repaid within the life of the reservoir structure but in no event to exceed fifty years after the reservoir structure is first used for the storage of water for anticipated future water supply demands, except that (1) no reimbursement of the cost of such water supply storage for anticipated future demands need be made until such supply is first used, and (2) no interest shall be charged on the cost of such water-supply storage for anticipated future demands until such supply is first used, but in no case shall the interest-free period exceed ten years. The interest rate used for purposes of computing the interest on the unpaid balance shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of section 8."

(g) Subsection (4) of section 5 is amended to read as follows: "(4) Any plans for works of improvement involving an estimated Federal contribution to construction costs in excess of \$250,000 or including any structure having a total capacity in excess of twenty-five hundred acre-feet (a) which includes works of improvement for reclamation or irrigation, or which affects public or other lands or wildlife under the jurisdiction of

the Secretary of the Interior, (b) which includes Federal assistance for good water detention structures, (c) which includes features which may affect the public health, or (d) which includes measures for control or abatement of water pollution, shall be submitted to the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, or the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, respectively, for his views and recommendations at least thirty days prior to transmission of the plan to the Congress through the President. The views and recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, if received by the Secretary prior to the expiration of the above thirty-day period, shall accompany the plan transmitted by the Secretary to the Congress through the President."

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO THE BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT, AS AMENDED

SEC. 301. BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT AMENDMENTS.—Section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1011), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The Secretary shall also be authorized in providing assistance for carrying out plans developed under this title:

"(1) To provide technical and other assistance, and to pay for any storage of water for present or anticipated future demands or needs for rural community water supply included in any reservoir structure constructed or modified pursuant to such plans: *Provided*, That the cost of water storage to meet future demands may not exceed 30 per centum of the total estimated cost of such reservoir structure and the public agency or local nonprofit organization shall give reasonable assurances, and there is evidence, that such demands for the use of such storage will be made within a period of time which will permit repayment of the cost of such water supply storage within the life of the reservoir structure: *Provided further*, That the public agency or local nonprofit organization prior to initiation or construction or modification of any reservoir structure including water supply storage, make provision satisfactory to the Secretary to pay for not less than 50 per centum of the cost of storage for present water supply demands, and all of the cost of storage for anticipated future demands: *And provided further*, That the cost to be borne by the public agency or local nonprofit organization for anticipated future demands may be repaid within the life of the reservoir structure but in no event to exceed fifty years after the reservoir structure is first used for the storage of water for anticipated future water supply demands except that (1) no payment on account of such cost need be made until such supply is first used, and (2) no interest shall be charged on such cost until such supply is first used, but in no case shall the interest-free period exceed ten years. The interest rate used for purposes of computing the interest on the unpaid balance shall be the average rate, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, payable by the Treasury upon its marketable public obligations outstanding at the beginning of the fiscal year in which the advancement for such water supply is first made which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue;

"(2) To provide, for the benefit of rural communities, technical and other assistance and such proportionate share of the costs of installing measures and facilities for water quality management, for the control and abatement of agriculture-related pollution, for the disposal of solid wastes, and for the storage of water in reservoirs, farm ponds,

or other impoundments, together with necessary water withdrawal appurtenances, for rural fire protection, as is determined by the Secretary to be equitable in consideration of national needs and assistance authorized for similar purposes under other Federal programs."

SEC. 302. SOIL, WATER, AND RELATED RESOURCE DATA.—In recognition of the increasing need for soil, water, and related resource data for land conservation, use and development, for guidance of community development for a balanced rural-urban growth, for identification of prime agriculture producing areas that should be protected, and for use in protecting the quality of the environment, the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to carry out a land inventory and monitoring program to include, but not be limited to, studies and surveys of erosion and sediment damages, flood plain identification and utilization, land use changes and trends, and degradation of the environment resulting from improper use of soil, water, and related resources. The Secretary shall issue at not less than five-year intervals a land inventory report reflecting soil, water, and related resource conditions.

TITLE IV—RURAL COMMUNITY FIRE PROTECTION

SEC. 401. WILDLIFE PROTECTION ASSISTANCE.—In order to shield human and natural resources, financial investments, and environmental quality from losses due to wildfires in unprotected or poorly protected rural areas there is a need to strengthen and synergize Federal, State, and local efforts to establish an adequate protection capability wherever the lives and property of Americans are endangered by wildfire in rural communities and areas. The Congress hereby finds that inadequate fire protection and the resultant threat of substantial losses of life and property is a significant deterrent to the investment of the labor and capital needed to help revitalize rural America, and that well-organized, equipped, and trained fire-fighting forces are needed in many rural areas to encourage and safeguard public and private investments in the improvement and development of areas of rural America where organized protection against losses from wildfire is lacking or inadequate. To this end, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to provide financial, technical, and other assistance to State foresters or other appropriate officials of the several States in cooperative efforts to organize, train, and equip local forces, including those of Indian tribes on Federal and State reservations or other federally recognized Indian tribal groups to prevent, control, and suppress wildfires threatening human life, livestock, wildlife, crops, pastures, orchards, rangeland, woodland, farmsteads, or other improvements, and other values in rural areas as defined in section 306(a) (7) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act.

SEC. 402. MATCHING.—The Secretary shall carry out this title in accordance with cooperative agreements, made with appropriate State officials, which include such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems necessary to achieve the purposes of this title. No such agreement shall provide for financial assistance by the Secretary under this title in any State during any fiscal year in excess of 50 per centum of the total budgeted expenditures or the actual expenditures, whichever is less, of the undertaking of such agreement for such year, including any expenditures of local public and private nonprofit organizations, including Indian tribal groups, participating in the activities covered by the agreement. Payments by the Secretary under any such agreement may be made on the certificate of the appropriate State official that the expenditures provided for under such agreement have been made.

SEC. 403. REPORT.—The Secretary of Agri-

culture shall submit to the President within two years after the date of enactment of this title a written report detailing the contribution of the rural fire protection program toward achieving the purposes of this title. The Secretary shall also include in such report such recommendations regarding the rural fire protection program as he deems appropriate. The President shall transmit the report to the Congress for review and appropriate action.

SEC. 404. APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this title \$7,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1973, June 30, 1974, and June 30, 1975.

TITLE V—RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND SMALL FARM RESEARCH AND EDUCATION

SEC. 501. PURPOSES.—The purpose of this title is to encourage and foster a balanced national development that provides opportunities for increased numbers of Americans to work and enjoy a high quality of life dispersed throughout our Nation by providing the essential knowledge necessary for successful programs of rural development. It is further the purpose of this title—

(a) to provide multistate regional agencies, States, counties, cities, multicounty planning and development districts, businesses, industries, organizations, Indian tribes on Federal and State reservations or other federally recognized Indian tribal groups, and other involved with public services and investments in rural areas or that provide or may provide employment in these areas the best available scientific, technical, economic, organizational, environmental, and management information and knowledge useful to them, and to assist and encourage them in the interpretation and application of this information to practical problems and needs in rural development;

(b) to provide research and investigations in all fields that have as their purpose the development of useful knowledge and information to assist those planning, carrying out, managing, or investing in facilities, services, businesses, or other enterprises, public and private, that may contribute to rural development;

(c) to enhance the capabilities of colleges and universities to perform the vital public service roles of research, transfer, and practical application of knowledge in support of rural development;

(d) to expand research on innovative approaches to small farm management and technology and extend training and technical assistance to small farmers so that they may fully utilize the best available knowledge on sound economic approaches to small farm operations.

SEC. 502. PROGRAMS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Agriculture (hereafter referred to as the "Secretary") is directed and authorized to conduct in cooperation and in coordination with colleges and universities the following programs to carry out the purposes of this title.

(a) RURAL DEVELOPMENT EXTENSION PROGRAMS.—Rural development extension programs shall consist of the collection, interpretation, and dissemination of useful information and knowledge from research and other sources to units of multistate regional agencies, State, county, municipal, and other units of government, multicounty planning and development districts, organizations of citizens contributing to rural development, business, Indian tribes on Federal or State reservations or other federally recognized Indian tribal groups, or industries that employ or may employ people in rural areas. These programs also shall include technical services and educational activity, including instruction for persons not enrolled as students in colleges or universities, to facilitate and encourage the use and practical applica-

tion of this information. These programs also may include feasibility studies and planning assistance.

(b) RURAL DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH.—Rural development research shall consist of research, investigations, and basic feasibility studies in any field or discipline which may develop principles, facts, scientific and technical knowledge, new technology, and other information that may be useful to agencies of Federal, State, and local government, industries in rural areas, Indian tribes on Federal and State reservations or other federally recognized Indian tribal groups, and other organizations involved in rural development programs and activities in planning and carrying out such programs and activities or otherwise be practical and useful in achieving increased rural development.

(c) SMALL FARM EXTENSION, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.—Small farm extension and research and development programs shall consist of extension and research programs with respect to new approaches for small farms in management, agricultural production techniques, farm machinery technology, new products, cooperative agricultural marketing, and distribution suitable to the economic development of family size farm operations.

SEC. 503. APPROPRIATION AND ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—(a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of this title not to exceed \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, not to exceed \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and not to exceed \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976.

(b) Such sums as the Congress shall appropriate to carry out the purposes of this title pursuant to subsection (a) shall be distributed by the Secretary as follows:

(1) 4 per centum to be used by the Secretary for Federal administration, national coordination, and program assistance to the States;

(2) 10 per centum to be allocated by the Secretary to States to finance work serving two or more States in which universities in two or more States cooperate or which is conducted by one university to serve two or more States;

(3) 20 per centum shall be allocated equally among the States;

(4) 66 per centum shall be allocated to each State, as follows: One-half in an amount which bears the same ratio to the total amount to be allotted as the rural population of the States bears to the total rural population of all the States as determined by the last preceding decennial census current at the time each such additional sum is first appropriated; and one-half in an amount which bears the same ratio to the total amount to be allotted as the farm population of the State bears to the total farm population of all the States as determined by the last preceding decennial census current at the time such additional sum is first appropriated.

(c) Funds appropriated under this title may be used to pay salaries and other expenses of personnel employed to carry out the functions authorized by this title, to obtain necessary supplies, equipment, services, and rent, repair, and maintenance of other facilities needed, but may not be used to purchase or construct buildings.

(d) Payment of funds to any State for programs authorized under section 502(a), (b), and (c) shall be contingent upon the Secretary's approval of an annual plan and budget for programs conducted under each part and compliance with such regulations as the Secretary may issue under this title. Funds shall be available for use by the State in the fiscal year for which appropriated and the next fiscal year following the year for which appropriated. Funds shall be budgeted and accounted for on such forms and at such times as the Secretary shall prescribe.

(e) Funds provided to each State under this title may be used to finance programs through or at private and publicly supported colleges and universities other than the university responsible for administering the programs authorized by this title.

SEC. 504. COOPERATING COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.—(a) Each of the programs authorized by this title shall be organized and conducted by one or more colleges or universities in each State so as to provide a coordinated program in each State.

(b) To assure national coordination with programs under the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 and the Hatch Act (as amended, August 11, 1955), administration of each State program shall be a responsibility of the institution or university accepting the benefits of the Morrill Act of 1862 (12 Stat. 503) as amended. Such administration shall be in association with the programs conducted under the Smith-Lever Act and the Hatch Act. The Secretary shall pay funds available to each State to said institution or university.

(c) All private and publicly supported colleges and universities in a State including the land-grant colleges of 1890 (26 Stat. 417) shall be eligible to conduct or participate in conducting programs authorized under this title. Officials at universities or colleges other than those responsible for administering programs authorized by this title who wish to participate in these programs shall submit program proposals to the university officials responsible for administering these programs and they shall be responsible for approval of said proposals.

(d) The university in each State responsible for administering the program authorized by this title shall designate an official who shall be responsible for programs authorized by each part of section 502 and an official who shall be responsible for the overall coordination of said programs.

(e) The chief administrative officer of the university in each State responsible for administering the program authorized by this title shall appoint a State Rural Development Advisory Council, consisting of not more than fifteen members. The administrative head of agriculture of that university shall serve as chairman. The administrative head of a principal school of engineering in the State shall be a member. There shall be at least ten additional members who shall include persons representing farmers, business, labor, banking, local government, multicounty planning and development districts, public and private colleges and Federal and State agencies involved in rural development.

It shall be the function of the Council to review and approve annual program plans conducted under this title and to advise the chief administrative officer of the university on matters pertaining to the program authorized.

SEC. 505. AGREEMENTS AND PLANS.—(a) Programs authorized under this title shall be conducted as mutually agreed upon by the Secretary and the university responsible for administering said programs in a memorandum of understanding which shall provide for the coordination of the programs authorized under this title, coordination of these programs with other rural development programs of Federal, State, and local government, and such other matters as the Secretary shall determine.

(b) Annually said university shall submit to the Secretary an annual program plan for programs authorized under this title which shall include plans for the programs to be conducted by each cooperating and participating university or college and such other information as the Secretary shall prescribe. Each State program must include research and extension activities directed toward identification of programs which are likely to have the greatest impact upon accomplishing the objectives of rural development in

both the short and longer term and the use of these studies to support the State's comprehensive program to be supported under this title.

SEC. 506. WITHHOLDING FUNDS.—When the Secretary determines that a State is not eligible to receive part or all of the funds to which it is otherwise entitled because of a failure to satisfy conditions specified in this title, or because of a failure to comply with regulations issued by the Secretary under this title, the facts and reasons therefor shall be reported to the President, and the amount involved shall be kept separate in the Treasury until the expiration of the Congress next succeeding a session of the legislature of the State from which funds have been withheld in order that the State may, if it should so desire, appeal to Congress from the determination of the Secretary. If the next Congress shall not direct such sum to be paid, it shall be covered into the Treasury. If any portion of the moneys received by the designated officers of any State for the support and maintenance of programs authorized by this title shall by any action or contingency be diminished or lost, or be misapplied, it shall be replaced by said State.

SEC. 507. DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this title—

(a) "Rural development" means the planning, financing, and development of facilities and services in rural areas that contribute to making these areas desirable places in which to live and make private and business investments; the planning, development, and expansion of business and industry in rural areas to provide increased employment and income; the planning, development, conservation, and use of land, water, and other natural resources of rural areas to maintain or enhance the quality of the environment for people and business in rural areas; and processes and procedures that have said objectives as their major purposes.

(b) The word "State" means the several States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

SEC. 508. REGULATIONS.—The Secretary is authorized to issue such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 601. LOCATION OF OFFICES IN RURAL AREAS.—Section 901(b) of the Act of November 30, 1970 (84 Stat. 1383), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Congress hereby directs the heads of all executive departments and agencies of the Government to establish and maintain departmental policies and procedures giving first priority to the location of new offices and other facilities in rural areas as defined in the private business enterprise exception in section 306(a)(7) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended (7 U.S.C., 1926). The President is hereby requested to submit to the Congress not later than September 1 of each fiscal year a report reflecting the efforts during the immediately preceding fiscal year of all executive departments and agencies in carrying out the provisions of this section, citing the location of all new facilities, and including a statement covering the basic reasons for the selection of all new locations."

SEC. 602. DESERTLAND ENTRYMEN.—(a) The first sentence of the Act entitled "An Act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend financial assistance to homestead entrymen, and for other purposes", approved October 19, 1949 (63 Stat. 883; 7 U.S.C. 1006a), is amended by striking out "homestead entry" and inserting in lieu thereof "homestead or desertland entry".

(b) The last sentence of the first section of such Act is amended by striking out "reclamation project" and inserting in lieu

thereof "reclamation project or to an entryman under the desertland laws".

SEC. 603. COORDINATION OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.—(a) Section 520 of the Revised Statutes (7 U.S.C. 2201) is amended by—

(1) inserting the words "and rural development" after the words "with agriculture", and;

(2) striking "that word" and inserting in lieu thereof "those terms".

(b) Section 526 of the Revised Statutes (7 U.S.C. 2204) is amended by—

(1) inserting "(a)" before the first sentence;

(2) inserting the words "and rural development" after the words "concerning agriculture";

(3) striking out the period at the end of the section and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "; and he shall advise the President, other members of his Cabinet, and the Congress on policies and programs designed to improve the quality of life for people living in the rural and nonmetropolitan regions of the Nation."; and

(4) adding at the end of the section a new subsection as follows:

"(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to provide leadership and coordination within the executive branch and shall assume responsibility for coordinating a nationwide rural development program utilizing the services of executive branch departments and agencies and the agencies, bureaus, offices, and services of the Department of Agriculture in coordination with rural development programs of State and local governments. In carrying out this responsibility the Secretary of Agriculture shall establish employment, income, population, housing, and quality of community services and facilities goals for rural development and report annually prior to September 1 to Congress on progress in attaining such goals. The Secretary is authorized to initiate or expand research and development efforts related to solution of problems of rural water supply, rural sewage and solid waste management, rural housing, and rural industrialization."

(c) (1) The Secretary of Agriculture shall utilize to the maximum extent practicable State, regional, district, county, local, or other Department of Agriculture offices to enhance rural development, and shall to the maximum extent practicable provide directly, or, in the case of agencies outside of the Department of Agriculture, through arrangements with the heads of such agencies for—

(A) the location of all field units of the Federal Government concerned with rural development in the appropriate Department of Agriculture offices covering the geographical areas most similar to those covered by such field units, and

(B) the interchange of personnel and facilities in each such office to the extent necessary or desirable to achieve the most efficient utilization of such personnel and facilities and provide the most effective assistance in the development of rural areas in accordance with State rural development plans.

(2) The Secretary shall include in the report required by this section a report on progress made in carrying out paragraph (1) of this subsection, together with such recommendations as may be appropriate.

SEC. 604. ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.—(a) In addition to the Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture now provided for by law, there shall be one additional Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(b) Section 5315(11) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(11) Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture (4)."

SEC. 605. LONG-TERM RURAL ENVIRONMEN-

TAL PROTECTION CONTRACTS.—Subsection (b) of section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (49 Stat. 163; 16 U.S.C. 590a), is further amended by adding a new paragraph at the end thereof as follows:

"In carrying out the purposes of subsection (a) of section 7, the Secretary may enter into agreements with agricultural producers for periods not to exceed ten years, on such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems desirable, creating obligations in advance of appropriations not to exceed such amounts as may be specified in annual appropriation Acts. Such agreements (1) shall be based on conservation plans approved by the soil and water conservation district or districts in which the lands described in the agreements are situated, and (11) may be modified or terminated by mutual consent if the Secretary determines such action would be in the public interest. The Secretary also may terminate agreements if he determines such action to be in the national interest and provides public notice in ample time to give producers a reasonable opportunity to make arrangements for appropriate changes in the use of their land."

SEC. 606. COST SHARING FOR AGRICULTURE-RELATED POLLUTION PREVENTION AND ABATEMENT MEASURES.—The Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (49 Stat. 165; 16 U.S.C. 590a), is further amended—

(1) By striking in section 7(a) the word "and" immediately before clause (5), substituting a semicolon for the period at the end of clause (5), and adding the following: "(6) prevention and abatement of agriculture-related pollution."

(2) By changing the first sentence of section 8(b) to read as follows: "The Secretary shall have power to carry out the purposes specified in clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of section 7(a) by making payments or grants of other aid to agricultural producers, including tenants and sharecroppers, in amounts determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable in connection with the effectuation of such purposes during the year with respect to which such payments or grants are made, and measured by (1) their treatment or use of their land, or a part thereof, for soil restoration, soil conservation, the prevention of erosion, or the prevention or abatement of agriculture-related pollution; (2) changes in the use of their land; (3) their equitable share, as determined by the Secretary, of the normal national production of any commodity or commodities required for domestic consumption; (4) their equitable share, as determined by the Secretary, of the national production of any commodity or commodities required for domestic consumption and exports adjusted to reflect the extent to which their utilization of cropland on the farm conforms to farming practices which the Secretary determines will best effectuate the purposes specified in section 7(a); or (5) any combination of the above."

(3) By inserting in the second paragraph of section 8(b) after the words "soil-building services" in the two places where they occur the words "or pollution prevention or abatement aids" and after the words "soil-conserving practices" the words "or pollution prevention or abatement practices".

(4) By striking "or (5)" in the first sentence of section 8(d) and substituting "(5), or (6)".

(5) By inserting in the proviso of section 8(e) after the words "soil-building or soil-conserving practices" the words "or agriculture-related pollution prevention or abatement practices".

(6) By striking the words "soil-building practices and soil- and water-conserving practices" in the penultimate sentence of section 15 and substituting "soil-building practices, soil- and water-conserving prac-

tices, and agriculture-related pollution prevention and abatement practices".

And the Senate agrees to the same.

W. R. POAGE,
GRAHAM PURCELL,
THOMAS S. FOLEY,
ED JONES,
JOHN KYL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
JAMES B. ALLEN,
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
LAWTON CHILES,
JACK MILLER,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
CARL T. CURTIS,

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 amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12931) to provide for improving the economy and living conditions in rural America, 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 amendment struck all after the enacting clause of H.R. 12931. There were 52 specific points of difference between the House bill and the Senate amendment. These differences and their resolution by the conferees are as follows:

1. Senate changed the title of Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1931 to "Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act".

Conference substitute adopts Senate provision.

2. Senate specifically mentioned Indian tribes as eligible for: small business enterprise loans and pollution abatement loans and grants; loans under section 306 of the Farmers Home Administration Act; priority for water supply loans and grants where there is an unanticipated diminution or deterioration of the water supply; interest at five percent on community facility loans; rural development loans and pollution abatement grants under new section 310B; direct loans for community facilities without regard to the possibility of obtaining a guaranteed loan; rural community fire protection; and research, extension and education.

Conference substitute specifically mentions Indian tribes as eligible for programs available to public bodies.

3. House extended section 306 of the Farmers Home Administration Act to authorize loans for "essential community facilities". Senate extended section 306(a) (1) to:

(a) include participations with other financial institutions (for similar House provision, see item 24);

(b) authorize loans to a number of specifically described borrowers and "others" (in addition to the associations, non-profit corporations and public and quasi-public bodies now covered);

(c) authorize loans for a number of specified purposes and "other rural community development projects";

(d) authorize financial and other assistance in planning rural development projects (for related House provisions, see items 7 and 8);

(e) authorize loans for projects "providing employment for" (as well as "serving") rural residents, and

(f) limit assistance in any year to the amount specified in appropriation acts.

Conference substitute adopts House provision.

It is the intent of the conferees that "essential community facilities" means that assistance under section 306(a) (1) would be

available to associations, including corporations not operated for profit, and public and quasi-public agencies which will provide facilities needed for the orderly development of a rural community. These facilities would include, but would not necessarily be limited to, such items as community centers, firehouses, industrial parks, and fire and rescue equipment, including ambulances.

4. House increased annual authority for grants to finance water and waste disposal projects under such section 306(a) (2) to \$500 million (from \$100 million).

Conference substitute adopts House provision with an amendment limiting the authority for these grants to \$300 million annually.

5. Senate prohibited grants under such section 306 if the project is inconsistent with multi-jurisdictional (as well as state, county or municipal) rural development plans, if any; requires submission of plans for financial assistance to such districts (as well as to county and municipal governments) for review and comment within a specified time period; prohibits loans under such section 306 that are inconsistent with the multi-jurisdictional plan; and authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to reimburse such agency or government for the cost of the review.

Conference substitute adopts Senate provision with an amendment limiting the time for review to not to exceed 30 days, and making technical language changes to make the provision more compatible with other existing law in the planning field.

6. Senate extended to October 1, 1973, the authority (now expired) to make water and waste disposal grants under such section 306 (a) (2) prior to the completion of comprehensive plans.

Conference substitute adopts Senate provision.

7. House increased authority for water and waste disposal planning grants under section 306(a) (6) to \$30 million (from \$15 million) and deleted the provision in section 306 that plans be "official." House also changed the term "sewer" to "waste disposal."

Conference substitute adopts House provision.

8. Senate authorized grants under such section 306(a) (6) (b) for preparing comprehensive plans for the development of "community services and facilities and areawide development".

Conference substitute does not include Senate provision.

9. House extended the 5,500 population rural area definition to all rural and rural area provisions of the Farmers Home Administration Act (now applicable only to section 306 of such Act).

Senate in titles I and II defined "rural areas" as all territory of a state, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam not within a city of 50,000 or more or its adjacent urban or urbanizing area with a population density of more than 100 per square mile. (Under section 331(a) of existing law the FHA Act is now applicable to the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.) Title I makes this definition applicable to the entire Farmers Home Administration Act; provided for special consideration to areas that do not include a city of more than 10,000; and requires that at least 60 percent of the assistance rendered under sections 304(b), 306, 310A, 312(b), (c), and (d) shall be in counties not having a city of more than 25,000. Senate title V (fire protection) was applicable to rural areas and rural communities having a population of 5,500 or less not included in a standard metropolitan statistical area. Senate title VI provided for research, extension, and education useful in rural areas, but did not define rural areas.

Conference substitute defines rural areas for purposes of the Act to include towns of

10,000, except that for purposes of loans and grants for private business enterprises under sections 304(b), 310(B), and 312(b) it includes all areas not within cities of 50,000, special consideration being given to areas other than cities of more than 25,000. Conference substitute also deletes American Samoa and Guam.

10. Senate defined "rural community development project" as a broad range of rural development undertakings for the purposes of the Farmers Home Administration Act.

Conference substitute does not include Senate provision, but see item 3.

11. House authorized \$10 million annually in grants for plans for rural development.

Conference substitute adopts House provision.

12. Senate required the Secretary to accord the highest priority to water supply loans and grants for communities of 5,500 or below suffering an unanticipated diminution or deterioration of their water supply.

Conference substitute adopts Senate provision, but extends it to waste disposal systems.

13. Senate provided for a minimum interest rate on rural development loans under subtitle A of the Farmers Home Administration Act (other than guaranteed loans or loans to public bodies or nonprofit associations for community facilities or loans of a type made under section 306(a) (1) prior to its amendment by the bill) equal to (1) a rate fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury after consideration of market yields on U.S. obligations, prevailing private rates, U.S. insurance of the loans, plus (2) a charge to cover losses and costs of administration.

House left existing law unchanged to provide a maximum rate of five percent for all loans under subtitle A.

Conference substitute adopts Senate provision, but makes a technical correction to permit guaranteed loans for the new rural development purposes to be made at any rate agreed upon by the borrower and the lender.

14. Senate authorized the Secretary to require borrowers under such subtitle A to prepay taxes and insurance in escrow.

Conference substitute adopts Senate provision.

15. Senate authorized the Secretary to pay noteholders annually or semi-annually even though payments are made by borrowers at shorter intervals.

Conference substitute adopts Senate provision.

16. House authorized use of the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund to pay interest subsidies to lenders who make guaranteed loans or who provide funds to make insured loans. At present it is used for this purpose for loans sold from the fund.

Conference substitute adopts House provision.

17. Senate authorized use of the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund to pay for contract services (such as appraisal, management, advisory, administrative, and other services).

Conference substitute adopts Senate provision.

18. House transferred assets and liabilities of the direct and emergency loan accounts to the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund, thereby making it possible to sell loans in those accounts as insured loans; made the interest on loans for such purposes sold from the fund fully taxable; required the fund to pay interest on the government's equity therein; and made it clear that the Secretary may guarantee loans made by other lenders for the purposes of the Farmers Home Administration Act.

Conference substitute adopts House provision.

19. Senate created a revolving fund, the Rural Development Insurance Fund, similar to the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund, to be used in the guaranteeing or insuring

of rural development loans. Assets and liabilities of the ACIF applicable to loans for water and waste disposal systems would be transferred to the new fund. Interest on loans sold from the new fund would be fully taxable.

Conference substitute adopts Senate provision with an amendment to subsection (g) (7) to extend that provision to guaranteed loans, thereby making it possible for the Secretary to pay interest subsidies on such loans in the same manner that he could on other insured loans.

20. House authorized insurance of loans meeting the requirements of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act and title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (R C and D projects). The interest on any such loans sold from the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund, like other loans sold from that fund, would be fully taxable.

Conference substitute adopts House provision.

21. House prohibited rural development loans and grants under new section 310B in connection with the relocation of any industrial establishment employing more than 25 persons.

Senate prohibited any financial or other assistance under any provision of the bill that will result in the transfer from one area to another of any employment or business activity of the applicant or a directly competing firm.

Senate also prohibited any assistance which would increase goods, services, or facilities when there is not sufficient demand in the area to employ the efficient capacity of existing enterprises.

Senate also required certification by the Secretary of Labor that the above two provisions have been complied with, and requires that the Secretaries of Labor and Agriculture cooperate in developing a system of certification which will insure expeditious processing of applications for assistance.

Conference substitute adopts Senate provision with amendments—

(1) making it applicable to new sections 310B, 304(b) and 312(b).

(2) clarifies and refines the language in a number of respects, and

(3) requires the Secretary of Labor to act on any matter submitted to him within 60 days.

While allowing a maximum of 60 days, the conferees feel strongly that except in unusual circumstances the Secretary of Labor would and should act within not more than 30 days.

22. Senate limited pollution control loans and grants under the bill to rural areas.

Conference substitute adopts Senate provision.

23. House authorized \$50 million annually in grants to public bodies for planning and other specified purposes.

Conference substitute adopts House provision with amendment deleting the authority for grants for planning. The conferees emphasize their intent that no grants will be made under this authority for planning purposes.

24. House provided for "joint" loans and grants with others.

Conference substitute adopts House provision with technical amendments to make it clear that only assistance to facilitate industrial development is intended.

25. House excepts rural development loans under section 310B from requirements of section 333 (a) and (c) that the applicant must certify that he cannot obtain credit elsewhere and must agree to refinance elsewhere when possible. The Conferees intend that the opportunity to participate in the rural development loan program shall extend to the banks and associations of the Farm Credit System.

Conference substitute retains the "credit elsewhere" rule, but makes it clear that this would not prevent the Secretary of Agricul-

ture from guaranteeing loans at market interest rates as agreed to by lenders and borrowers.

26. House provided that no recommendation shall be required of the county committee with respect to rural development loans under new section 310B.

Senate had same effect and, in addition, repealed the requirement (which now applies to loans under sections 306, 314, and 321(b) (2)) for county committee recommendation.

Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision with an amendment retaining county committee recommendation on loans under section 321(b) (2).

27. House exempted applicants for rural housing loans under sections 517(a) (2) for dwellings for their own use from the "credit elsewhere" and "mandatory refinancing" provisions of title V of the Housing Act of 1949.

Conference substitute adopts the House provision with an amendment.

As in the case of rural development loans, the "credit elsewhere" rule is retained, but for above moderate housing loans it makes it clear that this would not prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from guaranteeing these rural housing loans.

The Conferees intend that the opportunity to participate in the rural housing loan program extends to the banks and associations of the Farm Credit System.

28. House authorized FHA operating loans to assist farmers to comply with the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970.

Conference substitute adopts House provision.

29. House specifically required the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the truth of the applicant's certification under existing section 333 that he is unable to obtain credit elsewhere.

Conference substitute adopts House provision.

30. Senate prohibited the collection of interest on interest on FHA loans (to relieve the Secretary of the necessity of calculating interest on interest on late payments under existing contracts which provide for such interest on interest).

Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision with the modification that borrowers need not pay interest on interest on loans that are not more than 90 days overdue.

31. Senate authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to contract for services in connection with FHA loans.

Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision with amendments.

In order that rural residents may receive the benefits of this Act at the earliest possible date provision has been made for Farmers Home Administration to contract for services to supplement and reinforce these services provided by agency employees. This authority extends to January 1, 1975, by which time it is expected that sufficient personnel will be employed by FHA to provide for the handling of all applications and loans in an orderly manner.

The report to Congress directed at the end of this authorization period should outline the progress made in obtaining adequate personnel and document any need for contracting for such outside services in the future.

32. Senate reorganized Farmers Home Administration into a Farm Development Administration and a Rural Enterprise and Community Development Administration, each headed by an Administrator appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation, at level V (\$36,000) under an additional Assistant Secretary in level IV (\$38,000).

Conference substitute provides only for a new Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, thereby bringing to four the total number of Assistant Secretaries in that Department.

The conferees wish to make it clear that

the additional Assistant Secretary of Agriculture created by this Act is expected to be employed for purposes of adding emphasis to rural development and to provide for improved direction and emphasis within the Department of Agriculture regarding its policies, programs, and activities relating to rural development.

33. House permitted Secretary to consent to transfer of property securing any loan or financed by any loan or grant under any law administered by FHA.

Conference substitute adopts House provision.

34. House extended section 335 (which deals with disposition of real property administered under the Farmers Home Administration Act) to any law administered by FHA; repealed the provisions requiring the down payment on sale of such property to other than eligible borrowers to be at least 20 percent and the remainder to be paid "in not more than five annual" installments; and provided that the terms of such sale not be more favorable than those permissible for sale to eligible borrowers.

Conference substitute adopts House provision.

35. Senate prohibited direct and insured loans for new rural development purposes (except to public bodies and nonprofit associations for community facilities) if guaranteed loans can be obtained, and prohibits guarantee of more than 90 percent of the risk on any such loan.

Conference substitute adopts Senate provision.

36. House made it clear that liens securing guaranteed loans may run to the lender, rather than the United States.

Conference substitute adopts House provision.

37. Senate provides for sharing of Federal revenue with States, substate multijurisdictional areawide general purpose planning and development districts, and local governments for rural community development.

(a) This title authorized the appropriation of \$500 million annually.

(b) This money would be apportioned among the States according to the following formula:

(i) 50 percent on the basis of the State's rural population;

(ii) 25 percent on a basis varying inversely with the State's rural per capita income; and

(iii) 25 percent on the basis of the decrease in the State's rural population.

(c) All funds would go to the States, but each State would be required to pass on one-third of these funds to substate multijurisdictional areawide general purpose planning and development districts and it must pass on one-third of the funds to local governments within the State.

The two-thirds passed on to districts and local "governments" would be apportioned within each State on a similar formula basis, using the percentages 40-20-40, instead of 50-25-25.

(d) The amounts so apportioned could be used by the recipients for any rural development purpose, including the local matching share under other Federal programs, in rural areas.

(e) To become eligible for funds each State would have presented to the Secretary of Agriculture a rural development plan which is (i) developed by a statewide rural development planning system, with the participation of officials of multijurisdictional districts and local governments, and (ii) took into account plans prepared by districts and local governments.

(f) States, districts, and local units of government could enter into agreements for joint expenditures of shared revenue funds for rural development activities in one or more of them.

(g) Expenditures of shared revenues would

be subject to requirements of section 901 (a) and 901(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1970.

Conference substitute does not include Senate provision.

38. Senate inserted in Congressional policy of the Watershed Act "particularly reclamation and revegetation of land that has been mined, stripmined, or abandoned by its owners".

Conference substitute does not include Senate provision.

39. Senate authorized the Secretary to pay costs of privately owned Indian lands needed for lands, easements, and rights of way under the Watershed Act.

Conference substitute does not include Senate provision.

40. Senate authorized cost sharing for ground water recharge. At present such cost sharing is not possible when use of the water cannot be identified as being a purpose for which cost sharing is authorized.

Conference substitute adopts Senate provision.

41. House limited water quality management under the Watershed Act primarily to streamflow regulation which is not a substitute for adequate treatment of waste at source and is consistent with standards of Water Resources Council.

Conference substitute adopts House provision.

42. Senate provided with respect to cost sharing on future municipal water supply that assurances of reimbursement may be provided by an agency of the State having authority to give such assurances.

Conference substitute adopts Senate provision.

43. Senate specified that the land inventory program shall include studies of flood plain identification and utilization, in addition to the studies specified in the House bill.

Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision.

44. Senate authorized the appropriation of \$5 million for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1973, June 30, 1974, and June 30, 1975, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to provide financial, technical, and other assistance through appropriate State officials to local public and private nonprofit organizations for cooperative efforts to organize, train, and equip local forces to prevent, control, and suppress wildfires in rural areas and rural communities of 5,500 or less outside of standard metropolitan statistical areas.

An additional \$2,000,000 annually was authorized for the purposes of this provision to be used in those States where the average per capita income in rural areas is below the national average per capita income in rural areas and where the timber reserves are of such importance as to warrant special consideration. The States could have used these additional funds only in the multijurisdictional planning districts where the rural per capita income is below the national average.

Financial assistance could not exceed 50 percent of budgeted or actual expenditure, whichever is less.

Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision with modifications which would:

(1) make the program apply to rural areas as defined in the conference agreement;

(2) establish the annual appropriation authority at \$7 million instead of \$5 million; and

(3) eliminate the extra \$2 million annual authorization for States with lower than average per capita income and those areas near timber reserves.

The Conferees expect the Secretary, prior to initiating this pilot program, to designate areas of the United States which are particularly vulnerable to the hazards of wildfires. In addition the Conferees expect the Secretary, in implementing the Rural Community Fire Protection Program, to give spe-

cial attention to those areas and communities that have inadequate or nonexistent fire protection facilities.

45. Senate authorized the appropriation and apportionment of funds to States for (1) rural development extension programs; (2) rural development research; (3) rural development undergraduate, graduate, and adult education; and (4) small farm extension, research and development programs.

Funds would be administered by the land grant colleges in each State subject to advice and program approval of an advisory council composed of a representative group of professional and lay leaders. Private and publicly supported colleges in a State, including the land grant colleges of 1890, would be eligible to conduct, or participate in the conduct of, programs authorized and will be represented on the advisory council.

Appropriation authorizations were scheduled to increase from a total of \$75 million for fiscal 1974 to a total of \$160 million for fiscal 1976 and subsequent years.

Of this amount, \$25,000,000 was to be distributed among those States where the per capita income of those living on small farms in rural areas is below the national average per capita income in rural areas. These funds would be allocated among such States on the basis of the number of persons in each such State who live on small farms in rural areas and whose income is below the poverty level.

Of the remaining funds, apportionment would be as follows:

(a) 4 percent to the Secretary of Agriculture for administration;

(b) 10 percent to be allocated by the Secretary to finance work serving two or more States;

(c) 20 percent equally among the States;

(d) 33 percent among the States on the basis of rural population as determined by the last preceding decennial census at the time each such additional sum is first appropriated; and

(e) 33 percent among the States on the basis of farm population, determined in a similar manner.

Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision with the following substantive changes:

(1) The program is limited to a pilot basis for a three year period beginning July 1, 1973, and ending June 30, 1976.

(2) The level of authorized appropriations is set at \$10 million for FY 1974; \$15 million in FY 1975 and \$20 million in FY 1976, and

(3) The formula in the Senate amendment for the priority distribution of a portion of the funds to States with below-average per capita small farm income is deleted.

(4) The provision in the Senate amendment authorizing undergraduate, graduate and adult education is deleted.

46. House amended section 901(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1970 to assign "first priority" to the location of new offices and facilities in "rural areas" (rather than areas of "lower population density" as in present law). This provision also deleted the words "insofar as practicable" of existing law.

Conference substitute adopts the House provision.

While accepting the House provision designed to strengthen Section 901(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1970, the conferees wish to make clear that "first priority" does not mean that all new Federal offices and facilities must be located in "rural areas" as defined for rural industrialization loans if there is an overwhelming reason that any such office or facility should not be located in a "rural area".

47. House increased limit on additional annual payments to State or local agencies contracted for under Greenspan program each year to \$40 million (from \$10 million).

Conference substitute does not include the House provision.

48. House accorded desertland entrymen the same consideration as homestead entrymen with respect to financial assistance available through the Farmers Home Administration, by accepting as security for FHA mortgages the entered desertland prior to issuance of a patent.

Conference substitute adopts the House provision.

49. Senate required the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire, preserve, and disseminate useful information on "rural development" as well as agriculture.

The Secretary was also authorized and directed to provide leadership and coordination within the executive branch and assume responsibility for a nationwide rural development program utilizing all agencies of the executive branch in coordination with rural development programs of State and local governments.

The Secretary was required to establish employment, income, population, housing, and quality of community services and facilities goals for rural development and report annually to Congress.

The Secretary was authorized to initiate or expand research and development efforts related to rural water supply, rural sewage and solid waste management, rural housing, and rural industrialization.

The Secretary also was directed to utilize all USDA field offices to enhance rural development, provide for the location of all field units of the Federal Government concerned with rural development in such offices, and provide for the interchange of personnel and facilities in such offices.

Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision.

50. Senate authorized ten-year cost sharing payments under section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act based on conservation plans by soil and water conservation districts.

Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision.

51. Senate authorized cost sharing under such section 8(b) for agriculture-related pollution prevention or abatement practices unrelated to soil or water conservation.

Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision.

52. Senate authorized the Rural Telephone Bank to sell telephone debentures to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Conference substitute does not include the Senate provision.

W. R. POAGE,
GRAHAM PURCELL,
THOMAS S. FOLEY,
ED JONES,
JOHN KYL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
JAMES B. ALLEN,
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
LAWTON CHILES,
JACK MILLER,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
CARL T. CURTIS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. DENHOLM) leave of absence was granted to Mr. NICHOLS for today on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 60 minutes, on

June 20, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SEIBERLING, for 5 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENHOLM), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter to:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAMILTON, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. GIBBONS, today, for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ABZUG, today, for 30 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. SIKES in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MICHEL, and to include extraneous material, during his remarks today while in the Committee of the Whole, on the HEW appropriation bill.

Mr. FINDLEY, and to include extraneous matter during debate on HEW appropriation bill.

Mr. FLOOD to revise and extend his remarks made in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa to revise and extend his remarks made in the Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHWENGLER and Mr. CARTER, at the request of Mr. MICHEL, to extend their remarks in the Committee of the Whole, today, on the Labor-HEW appropriation bill.

Mr. MAHON to include extraneous matter with his remarks made today in the Committee of the Whole on H.R. 15417.

All Members, at the request of Mr. FREY for 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the Flag Day services, today.

All Members, at the request of Mr. DENHOLM, for 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the subject matter of the special order of Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, today.

Mr. SATTERFIELD and to include an editorial.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FREY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RIEGLE.

Mr. GUDE.

Mr. KEATING.

Mr. BAKER.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. BOW.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. WIGGINS.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. SKUBITZ.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. BELCHER.

Mr. SHRIVER in two instances.

Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. HEINZ.

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. BELL.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.

Mr. FREY.

Mr. RAILSBACK.

Mr. BUCHANAN.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. HARSHA.

Mr. BURKE of Florida.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENHOLM) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. GRIFFITHS in two instances.

Mr. SARBANES in three instances.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.

Mr. CHAPPELL.

Mr. BARING.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois.

Mr. YATRON.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in two instances.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. HAGAN in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.

Mr. ROGERS in five instances.

Mr. STAGGERS.

Mr. TIERNAN.

Mr. BINGHAM in three instances.

Mr. STOKES in two instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. ANNUNZIO.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

Mr. PATTEN.

Mr. FISHER in three instances.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. ROE in two instances.

Mr. FAUNTROY in five instances.

Mr. WOLFF.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3166. An act to amend the Small Business Act.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 13, 1972 present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11417. To amend the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 in order to provide financial assistance to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 15, 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:

2080. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a copy of a preliminary finding that there may be a need

for a flammability standard for sleepwear worn by children of ages 6-12; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2081. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a survey of the application of the Government's policy on self-insurance; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 13694. A bill to amend the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-1127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS or Arkansas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 15390. A bill to provide for a 4-month extension of the present temporary level in the public debt limitation (Rept. No. 92-1128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 12931 (Rept. No. 92-1129). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABOUREZK:

H.R. 15486. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1970; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 15487. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1970 to authorize the cancellation of 90 percent of the principal of certain loans; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 15488. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to make grants to certain law enforcement officers in reimbursement for costs incurred by such officers in certain legal actions arising out of the performance of official duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPIN:

H.R. 15489. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first \$5,000 of compensation paid to firemen shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 15490. 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. FAUNTROY:

H.R. 15491. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers Salary Act of 1955 to increase salaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 15492. A bill to authorize appropriations for the construction of certain highways and public mass transportation facilities in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, to establish an urban transportation program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FREY:

H.R. 15493. A bill to guarantee the right of criminal defendants to a speedy trial and to reduce crime and injustice by improving the supervision of persons released on bail and probation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY (for himself and Mr. ABBITT):

H.R. 15494. A bill to amend the Federal Contested Election Act to limit to \$4,500 the amount which may be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives to any party to a contested election case as reimbursement of expenses incurred by him in such case; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HEBERT (for himself and Mr. ARENDT):

H.R. 15495. A bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1973 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize construction at certain installations in connection with the Safeguard antiballistic missile system, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER (for himself and Mr. ASPIN):

H.R. 15496. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to preserve competition among corporations engaged in the production, transportation, and refining of oil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIKVA (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRASER, Mrs. GRASSO, and Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 15497. A bill to provide for the compensation of innocent victims of violent crime in need; to make grants to States for the payment of such compensation; to authorize an insurance program and death and disability benefits for public safety officers; to provide civil remedies for victims of racketeering activity; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIKVA (for himself, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. METCALFE, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. SYMINGTON):

H.R. 15498. A bill to provide for the compensation of innocent victims of violent crime in need; to make grants to States for the payment of such compensation; to authorize an insurance program and death and disability benefits for public safety officers; to provide civil remedies for victims of racketeering activity; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEYSER:

H.R. 15499. A bill to provide additional readjustment assistance to veterans by providing improved job counseling, training, and placement service for veterans; by providing an employment preference for disabled veterans and veterans of the Vietnam era under contracts entered into by departments and agencies of the Federal Government for the procurement of goods and services; by providing for an action program within the departments and agencies of the Federal Government for the employment of disabled veterans and veterans of

the Vietnam era; by providing a minimum amount that may be paid to ex-servicemen under the unemployment compensation law; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself and Mr. LENT):

H.R. 15500. A bill to establish the Airport Noise Curfew Commission and to define its functions and duties; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 15501. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide an incentive plan for participation in the Ready Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 15502. A bill to provide for the recycling of used oil and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 15503. A bill to amend the tariff and trade laws of the United States to promote full employment and restore a diversified production base; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to stem the outflow of U.S. capital, jobs, technology and production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. KEMP, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. CONOVER, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. MALARY, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. O'HARA, and Mr. STRATTON):

H.R. 15504. A bill to expand the membership of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to include elected school board officials and elected town and township officials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. COTTER, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, Mr. ULLMAN, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. VANIK, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. NIX, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. PEPPER and Mr. MONAGAN):

H.R. 15505. A bill to provide for a 6-month extension of the emergency unemployment compensation program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DENT, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, Mr. ULLMAN, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. VANIK, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. NIX, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, and Mr. PEPPER):

H.R. 15506. A bill to amend section 203(e) (2) of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 to permit the States to suspend the application of the 120-percent requirement for purposes of determining whether there has been a State "off" indicator; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CABELL (for himself, Mr. FRASER, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. LINK, Mr. REES, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, and Mr. GUDE):

H.R. 15507. A bill to amend the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969 to provide for Federal guarantees of obligations issued

by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, to authorize an increased contribution by the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 15508. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that renewal licenses for the operation of a broadcasting station may be issued for a term of 5 years and to establish certain standards for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcasting licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ESCH (for himself, Mr. HORTON, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. McKEVITT, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. McCURE, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. MALLARY, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, and Mr. FRENZEL):

H.R. 15509. A bill to provide greater assurance of Federal fiscal responsibility to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 15510. A bill to amend the Judiciary and Judicial Procedure Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS (for himself and Mr. ABBITT):

H.R. 15511. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to change the times for the filing of reports of receipts and expenditures by political committees and candidates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MILLS of Arkansas:

H.R. 15512. A bill to protect suppliers of property in trade and commerce with respect

to credit card promotions, to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 15513. A bill to amend section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to extend benefits thereunder to officially recognized or designated members of a legally organized volunteer fire department, ambulance team or rescue squad not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15514. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to correct certain inequities in the crediting of National Guard technician service in connection with civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHOUP:

H.R. 15515. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 in order to increase the authorization of appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, for public works and development facilities grants, and to require that a larger percentage of such appropriations be expended in certain redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STRATTON (for himself, Mr. ABOUREZK, and Mr. COLLINS of Illinois):

H.R. 15516. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to increase benefits and improve eligibility and computation methods under the OASDI program, to make improvements in the medicare, medicaid, and maternal and child health programs with emphasis on improvements in their operating effectiveness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 15517. 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. WHALEN:

H.J. Res. 1229. Joint resolution directing the President to seek international agreements establishing uniform standards for the protection of persons utilizing aircraft and airport facilities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DEVINE (for himself and Mr. WYLIE):

H. Res. 1017. Resolution praising Columbus, Ohio, and her residents on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of Columbus Day, U.S.A.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 15518. A bill for the relief of David B. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUILLLEN:

H.R. 15519. A bill for the relief of Carl W. Houston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHOUP:

H.R. 15520. A bill for the relief of Jung Sup Shin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE REVEREND ROBERT RIVES

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, the Reverend Robert Rives, of the Garden City, Mich., Presbyterian Church, has stepped down from the pulpit after 34 years of devoted service.

From my boyhood days in Garden City, I have had the privilege of knowing Rev. Dr. Rives. He was our family minister when I was growing up, and he has been a good friend through the years.

I ask unanimous consent that several newspaper articles concerning the retirement of Rev. Dr. Rives be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wayne (Mich.) Daily Eagle, Apr. 27, 1972]

REV. RIVES STEPS DOWN

(By Dann Barkume)

At approximately 12 noon on Sunday, the Rev. Robert Rives will step down from the pulpit at the Garden City Presbyterian Church for the last time.

Rev. Rives is retiring from the ministry after 35 years of service. He has been pastor of the Garden City church since May 14, 1939.

In that span, Rev. Rives has performed 702 marriages, 1,285 baptisms and has conducted 622 funerals. His career in Garden City spans not only ministerial duties, but also includes involvement in several fraternal groups and civic associations.

The Garden City Presbyterian Church has been in existence since Aug. 15, 1840 with the original congregation numbering 13. But most of the church's growth has been under Rev. Rives leadership.

Under Rev. Rives, the church has thrived and has a full program of activities, including four choirs—adult, youth, children's and cherub—Sunday School program, Women's Association, Men's Club and Boy Scout Troop 784.

Rev. Rives and his wife arrived in Garden City when it was a small community with a population of 3,000. The existing church, located on Middlebelt Road just south of Ford Road, was dedicated on Oct. 28, 1928.

The original half-acre site has expanded to its present 3.5 acres and three additions have been added.

Rev. Rives is the 46th minister to serve the congregation during its 132-year history.

He is also retiring from the board of directors of the People's Community Hospital Authority, a position that he has held longer than all but one member of the 46-man-board.

He also served as chaplain in various Army and Navy hospitals. During World War II he was chaplain of the Garden City branch of the Red Cross and also served on the Rationing Board.

Rev. Rives enlisted in the Navy as a chaplain on Veteran's Day in 1944 and served until June 18, 1947, attaining the rank of commander. He served as chaplain aboard the aircraft carriers Midway and Wake and remained in the service after the end of World War II to serve as chaplain of the Naval facility in Dearborn.

Last night he was named Pastor Emeritus by the Michigan Presbytery, just four days before his retirement from active ministerial work.

Mrs. Rives, who received a master's degree in education from the University of Michi-

gan, will retire in June after more than 30 years as a teacher. For the past 25 years, she has taught in the Wayne-Westland school system.

They have two children, Mary Luella Wade, who lives in Detroit with her husband, a director of student activities at Wayne State University, and Janet Ruth Rives, an elementary school teacher in Homewood, Ill.

A reception honoring the Rives is scheduled for 4 p.m. Sunday at Garden City West High School. Rev. Rives will be introduced by way of an Honor Guard from the U.S. Navy and many dignitaries will join an estimated 1,500 to 2,000 well-wishers to honor the retiring pastor.

Messages of commendation will be read from President Richard Nixon and Gov. William G. Milliken. A personal appearance is expected by U.S. Sen. Robert Griffin (R-Mich.), a longtime friend of the Rives.

The Rives plan to leave in June for an extended European vacation, hoping to travel around the continent for most of the year before returning to their home in Garden City.

A native of Texas, the 65-year-old pastor's only comment was "I just really can't imagine not being pastor of this church. So often people don't realize what a fine community we have to live in."

Three generations of Garden City residents will gather on Sunday to say goodbye to a man who helped build the community, but as one member of the congregation put it, "We won't be saying good-bye, we're giving him a new commission and new duties."

For Robert Rives, forced to retire at the age of 65, Sunday will culminate a 35 year relationship with a community, a relationship which he voluntarily took upon himself to build and nurture. For 35 years, Rev. Rives worked for the spiritual growth of his congregation. His congregation, almost to a person, agree that Rev. Rives will be sorely missed.