

PROGRAM

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

The Senate will convene at 9 a.m., following a recess. After the two leaders have been recognized, the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) will be recognized for 15 minutes, the order for the recognition of the distinguished Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH) having been vacated at his own request.

The Senate will then resume its consideration of S. 3617, the Headstart bill. The pending question at that time will be on adoption of the amendment by the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK), No. 1251.

Consideration of the bill will be under a time limitation of 6 hours—part of which has already been consumed, of course—with 1 hour on any amendment, and one-half hour on any amendment to an amendment, debatable motion or appeal.

There will be several rollcall votes dur-

ing the day on amendments to the Headstart bill, S. 3617.

It is anticipated that the first rollcall vote will not—will not—occur before 10:30 a.m.

After the Headstart bill is disposed of—hopefully, on tomorrow—the Senate will return to the consideration of the unfinished business, S. 3390. The first amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act which would be considered tomorrow afternoon would be the amendment by the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), which deals with Cambodia.

It is my understanding that a sizable number of amendments are in the offing and are proposed to be called up and offered to S. 3617, the Headstart bill.

It is the intention of the leadership to complete action on the Headstart bill, S. 3617, on tomorrow, which then, hopefully, will permit the Senate to resume consideration of the unfinished business tomorrow early enough for progress to be made thereon.

RECESS TO 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 9 a.m. tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and, at 6:09 p.m., the Senate recessed until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 20, 1972, at 9 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 19, 1972:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Chester M. Wiggin, Jr., of New Hampshire, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1973, vice Donald L. Jackson, resigned.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

George S. Ives, of Maryland, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring July 1, 1975. Reappointment.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, June 19, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Charles D. Beatty, Lovely Lane United Methodist Church, Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, we invoke Thy blessing upon this company of our Nation's legislators, that Thou wilt inspire and strengthen them to lead us in the way of truth and justice, in the achievement of sound manners and pure laws.

Bless our people, that we may never forget where we have come from, nor lose sight of what has brought us along.

Let not the hard beginnings be forgotten, nor the struggles farther along.

Restore the unity and common understanding that has been our strength.

Help us to gainsay the mockers and deniers: And let vision and hope never fade.

May we, whose forefathers would go anywhere, holding nothing impossible in the genius of man, follow in their train: To be a nation of people, free and brave. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12143. An act to provide for the establishment of the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in

which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3808. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act, to provide additional free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges for certain members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9092. An act to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13089. An act to provide for acceleration of programs for the planting of trees on national forest lands in need of reforestation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14989. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15097. An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 14989) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. FONG, and Mr. YOUNG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 15097) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr.

PASTORE, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. CASE, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. COTTON, Mr. STEVENS, and Mr. YOUNG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. 916. An act to include firefighters within the provisions of section 8336(c) of title 5, United States Code, relating to the retirement of Government employees engaged in certain hazardous occupations;

S. 2699. An act to authorize the acquisition of lands within the Vermejo Ranch, New Mexico and Colorado, for addition to the national forest system, and for other purposes;

S. 3105. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to develop and carry out a forestry incentives program to encourage a higher level of forest resource protection, development, and management by small non-industrial private and non-Federal public forest landowners, and for other purposes;

S. 3414. An act for the relief of Alexandria Nicholson; and

S. 3645. An act to further amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948.

THE REVEREND CHARLES DAVID BEATTY

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to welcome today to the House of Representatives the Reverend Charles David Beatty.

Reverend Beatty has been since June of 1965 the pastor of the Lovely Lane United Methodist Church in Baltimore. This church is the lineal successor to the Lovely Lane Meeting House in which the Methodist Episcopal Church was organized at the famous Christmas Conference in 1784 and it is widely known as "the Mother Church of American Methodism." This pulpit has over the years been occupied by outstanding leaders of

the Methodist Church and Reverend Beatty has strengthened and contributed significantly to that great tradition.

Reverend Beatty served for 20 years in the Armed Forces of the United States as a chaplain in the U.S. Navy serving both on ships at sea and at various shore stations. Upon his retirement from the Navy he came to Baltimore and served as the assistant pastor at Towson United Methodist Church, 1963-65.

Prior to his naval service he was, from 1938 to 1942, pastor of the Freedom, Pa., Methodist Church.

He is a native of Pittsburgh and attended the public schools in that city and graduated from Duke University and the Drew Theological Seminary.

Those of us in Baltimore are happy that he married a Baltimore girl, Carolin Rieffe. They have three daughters, Carolin Beatty Head, Ann Beatty Welch, and Florence Elizabeth Beatty.

Reverend Beatty is giving outstanding leadership to our community, Mr. Speaker; he is one of our most respected churchmen and we are privileged to have him here with us today.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day for the call of the Consent Calendar.

The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

COTTON STATISTICAL REPORTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13169) to amend existing statutes to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to issue cotton crop reports simultaneously with the general crop reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE), what this will do for the producers of the agricultural commodities covered by the bill.

Mr. POAGE. It will give them all the crop reports at one time. Heretofore they have had the cotton crop report coming out at one time and the grain reports coming out at another time.

The Department of Agriculture thinks it will be a little more convenient for them to handle these crop reports all at one time.

Mr. GROSS. What will it do for the actual producers, if anything?

Mr. POAGE. It gives them the crop reports all at one time rather than giving it to them at several different times throughout the month.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, the producers are interested in crop reports. There can be no question about that. But what will this change do? Is this in the interest of the investor or speculator, or is it in the interest of the producer, or is it in the interest of all three? The reports are made at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, as I understand it, on given dates in the month. Does this give the producer as much time as it does, for instance, to those who may be interested in speculation in grains as a result of crop reports?

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Does this do as much for the producer as it will do for others who are interested?

Mr. POAGE. It will put the cotton producers on the same basis on which we now have other producers. Frankly, I do not think it will change the producers' position materially one way or the other, but it will put them on the same basis with other producers.

Mr. GROSS. Is the cotton crop report now to be issued, or has it been in existence for a number of years?

Mr. POAGE. Oh, it has been in existence for a great many years. It is probably one of the oldest crop reports.

Mr. GROSS. There are five members on this board?

Mr. POAGE. It is the same board. We did not enlarge it.

Mr. GROSS. Do they all draw a per diem?

Mr. POAGE. No, they are all regular officials of the Department of Agriculture who are ex officio.

Mr. GROSS. All five are employees paid by the Department of Agriculture; is that correct?

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. There are no public members who have to be called in?

Mr. POAGE. No, the board is exactly the same as it is at the present time. There is no change in the board. There is a change only in time.

Mr. GROSS. How are these reports disseminated? Through the press, the news service, and that sort of media?

Mr. POAGE. The news services and in other ways we know what the reports will be.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for the explanation. I withdraw the reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 3104), to amend existing statutes to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to issue cotton crop reports simultaneously with the general crop reports, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

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

S. 3104

An act to amend existing statutes to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to issue cotton crop reports simultaneously with the general crop reports

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of the Act of May 3, 1924, as amended (43 Stat. 115, 44 Stat. 1373, 60 Stat. 940, 72 Stat. 149; 7 U.S.C. 475), is amended to read as follows:

"COTTON CROP REPORTS.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall cause to be issued as of the first of each month during the cotton growing and harvesting season from August to January inclusive, reports describing the condition and progress of the crop and stating the probable number of bales which will be ginned, these reports to be issued simul-

taneously with the cotton ginning reports of the Bureau of the Census relating to the same dates, the two reports to be issued from the same place at 3 o'clock postmeridian on or before the 12th day of the month to which the respective reports relate. No such report shall be approved and released by the Secretary of Agriculture until it shall have been passed upon by a cotton crop reporting board consisting of five members or more to be designated by him. Not less than three members of the board shall be supervisory field statisticians of the Department of Agriculture who are located in different sections of the cotton-growing States, are experienced in estimating cotton production, and have firsthand knowledge of the condition of the cotton crop based upon recent field observations. A majority of the members of the board shall be familiar with the methods and practices of producing cotton."

SEC. 2. Section 1 of the Act of May 27, 1912, as amended (37 Stat. 118, 44 Stat. 1374, 72 Stat. 149; 7 U.S.C. 476), is amended by striking out "10th" and inserting in lieu thereof "12th" by deleting "August 1" and inserting in lieu thereof "or before the 12th day of August", and by deleting "December 1" and inserting in lieu thereof "on or before the 12th day of December".

SEC. 3. Section 45 of title 13, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 45. Simultaneous publication of cotton reports.

"The reports of cotton ginned to the dates as of which the Department of Agriculture is also required to issue cotton crop reports shall be issued simultaneously with the cotton crop reports of that department, the two reports to be issued from the same place at 3 o'clock postmeridian on or before the 12th day of the month to which the respective reports relate."

SEC. 4. Section 42, paragraph (a) of title 13, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The statistics of the quantity of cotton ginned shall show the quantity ginned from each crop prior to August 1, September 1, September 15, October 1, October 15, November 1, November 15, December 1, December 15, January 1, January 15, February 1, and March 1; but the Secretary may limit the canvasses of August 1 and September 1 to those sections of the cotton growing States in which cotton has been ginned."

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 13169) was laid on the table.

RURAL TELEPHONE BANK FUNDS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 14423) to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to enhance the ability of the Rural Telephone Bank to obtain funds for the supplementary financing program on favorable terms and conditions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know if there has been any reaction at all in the committee, or in hearings held by the committee, from those who at the present time provide the moneys for the Rural Telephone Bank fund under existing law?

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

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

Mr. POAGE. This is a matter which was considered at the time we passed the original Rural Telephone Bank bill. At that time it was felt that we should not authorize the Treasury Department to buy these debentures. There were certain Members who frankly representing your side felt that it would be inadvisable to do so. After operating a few months the Treasury Department asked for this bill.

This is a bill that was requested by the Treasury Department because they feel, as many members of the committee felt last year when we passed this bill, that it is wise to let the Treasury buy when they see that it is desirable to do so.

This bill only allows the Treasurer to come in and buy at his own discretion. It does not require him to buy. It only lets the Treasurer buy at his discretion, and the Treasurer has decided that it strengthens his position if he has an opportunity to come in and buy this paper at times it is offered.

The committee feels that having gone through this whole matter within such a recent time, if the gentleman will recall, last year, there was no need of going through it again, and therefore we would not hold hearings to cover the same matter we had covered.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I would presume, therefore, from the gentleman's attenuated answer, that he means there were no hearings held; and that private enterprise or the lenders who would be called on to furnish this funding at the going rate of interest up until now, have not been consulted.

Now, as far as the reference to "my side" is concerned, I am not quite clear. As I understand my likeable friend, the gentleman from Texas, whom I admire and revere; this request came from the Department of the Treasury, which was headed by someone on "his side," not "my side." I would say that I am not the least bit interested in partisanship, but I am interested in principle; and I have been known to oppose "my side" as a matter of principle when it upsets the marketplace, the laws of supply and demand, or free enterprise.

My question simply goes to the doubt as to whether or not private enterprise—or the money suppliers—have been consulted; because the existing law says they may borrow only from the private money market, which the gentleman has stated in his reply, and now we are taking that away from the money market and assuring the telephone bank the money at less than the going price for funding on the open market. Is that not true?

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman misunderstood me, or probably I did not make myself plain when I referred to the gentleman's side. What I referred to was what was happening in the committee last year at the time we were holding hearings on this matter, and this very matter was discussed in those hearings. What I meant to imply was that it was not the chairman or those who had the same feeling that I did on the matter when I placed the limitation in the bill at that time.

Mr. HALL. For which I certainly would applaud the gentleman and his committee. I do not like these changes.

Mr. POAGE. And now the Secretary of Agriculture is the one who sent the message—not the Secretary of the Treasury—but he does say in his statement that:

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation from the standpoint of the administration's program.

A similar letter is being sent to the President of the Senate.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's reply. I do not mean to press the point too far. I think we have had good fun and good faith in the colloquy between us on it, but is it not a fact that this may be a bit like funding under the participation sales certificates or the interagency borrowing that would be at a price less than they could get on the open market in times of high interest rates?

Mr. POAGE. It may or may not be. It gives the Secretary the authority if he sees fit to use it. It does not require the Treasury to furnish these funds.

Mr. HALL. I understand.

Mr. POAGE. It simply authorizes him to furnish these funds if he, in his discretion, feels it is for the good of managing the public debt.

Mr. HALL. I understand that. But would it not then be putting the Rural Telephone Bank in the position of getting the money from another agency, as we do in the participation sales certificates, at less than the going or commercial rate of interest; or would it be at the same rate as the costs at which other banks are supplying the funds?

Mr. POAGE. I think we would have to say it would depend upon the Treasurer of the United States. There is no requirement that the Treasurer provide any money even at any rate whatsoever.

Nor is there any requirement here that he give any special advantage in the rate. It does authorize the Treasurer, when he sees fit, to come in and buy these debentures. It also authorizes him to sell them.

It is the same authority that is now exercised by the Federal National Mortgage Association, the U.S. Postal Service, and the Federal home loan bank. They all have this same authority. The Secretaries of the Treasury and Agriculture say it is a good thing to have this authority in this case.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, that may well be, but here we are asked unanimous consent, and this one Member, at least, and some others I know, do not feel even those branches or quasi-civilian branches of Government, ought to necessarily have this authority. So I repeat, we are talking about a question of principle here.

I should like to ask the gentleman if, under any manner, this might put the telephone bank fund in the same situation of being able to borrow 2-percent money from other branches of Government which it could reinvest before implementing it for the primary use intended by the Congress?

Mr. POAGE. No; it would not.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Although I would much have preferred private enterprise had been heard and concurred before this was brought up under the Consent Calendar, I intend to withdraw my reservation.

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

Mr. HALL. I yield to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I will try not to ask an attenuated question; therefore, I hope I will not get an attenuated answer.

Will the gentleman tell me what is the limit of the obligations under this bill?

Mr. POAGE. Does the gentleman mean of the telephone bank?

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. \$30 million a year, I believe.

Mr. GROSS. There is nothing in the report or the bill or anything accompanying it that states the total obligations.

Mr. POAGE. The reason for that is that this does not change the law in that respect one iota. It leaves it just as it is.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

H.R. 14423

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the Rural Telephone Bank should have the capability of obtaining adequate funds for its supplementary financing program at the lowest possible costs. In order to effectuate this policy, it will be necessary to expand the market for debentures to be issued by the Telephone Bank. The Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 901-950(b)), is therefore further amended as hereinafter provided.

Sec. 2. Section 407 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately preceding the first sentence thereof and adding at the end thereof the following:

"(b) The Telephone Bank is also authorized to issue telephone debentures to the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury may in his discretion purchase any such debentures, and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds of the sale of any securities hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as now or hereafter in force, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act as now or hereafter in force are extended to include such purchases. Each purchase of telephone debentures by the Secretary of the Treasury under this subsection shall be upon such terms and conditions as to yield a return at a rate not less than a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturity. The Secretary of the Treasury may sell, upon such terms and conditions and at such price or prices as he shall determine, any of the telephone debentures acquired by him under this subsection. All purchases and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such debentures under this subsection shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States."

Sec. 3. The right to repeal, after, or amend this Act is expressly reserved.

Sec. 4. This Act shall take effect upon enactment.

With the following committee amendment:

Committee amendment: Page 3, line 8, strike out "after" and insert in lieu thereof "alter".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 209]

Abernethy	Fish	Minshall
Abourezk	Flowers	Monagan
Azuz	Flynt	Moorhead
Addabbo	Fountain	Murphy, N.Y.
Anderson,	Fraser	Nelsen
Tenn.	Fulton	Patman
Ashbrook	Fuqua	Pelly
Ashley	Galifianakis	Pepper
Aspin	Gallagher	Perkins
Badillo	Gettys	Peyser
Bevill	Grasso	Pirnie
Biaggi	Gray	Podell
Bingham	Hagan	Price, Tex.
Blanton	Halpern	Pryor, Ark.
Blatnik	Harsha	Rangel
Brasco	Hawkins	Rarick
Broomfield	Hébert	Reid
Brown, Mich.	Helstoski	Roe
Cabell	Holifield	Rogers
Caffery	Horton	Rooney, N.Y.
Carey, N.Y.	Hunt	Roush
Celler	Keith	Roy
Chisholm	Kluczynski	Ryan
Clark	Kyros	Satterfield
Clay	Landrum	Scheuer
Cleveland	Link	Schmitz
Conyers	Lloyd	Sebellus
Corman	Long, La.	Smith, Iowa
Cotter	McCloskey	Staggers
Daniels, N.J.	McDonald,	Steiger, Wis.
Davis, S.C.	Mich.	Stephens
Delaney	McEwen	Stratton
Dellums	McKinney	Stuckey
Diggs	McMillan	Symington
Dingell	Macdonald,	Talcott
Dorn	Mass,	Teague, Calif.
Dow	Mann	Terry
Dowdy	Mathias, Calif.	Thompson,
Edwards, Ala.	Melcher	N.J.
Erlenborn	Metcalf	Vander Jagt
Esch	Miller, Calif.	Whalley
Eshleman	Mills, Ark.	Winn

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 310 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill on the Consent Calendar.

IMPROVEMENT OF FEDERAL LEAVE SYSTEM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12602) to amend title 5, United States Code, to

improve the administration of the leave system for Federal employees.

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

H.R. 12602

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the second sentence of section 5551(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out ", except that it may not exceed pay for a period of annual or vacation leave in excess of thirty days, or the number of days carried over to his credit at the beginning of the leave year in which entitlement to payment occurs, whichever is greater"

(b) Section 5551(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The accumulated and current accrued annual leave to which an officer excepted from subchapter I of chapter 63 of this title by section 6301(2)(x)(xii) of this title, is entitled immediately before the date he is excepted under that section shall be liquidated by a lump sum payment in accordance with subsection (a) of this section or subchapter VIII of this chapter, except that the payment is based on the rate of pay which he was receiving immediately before the date on which section 6301(2)(x)(xii) of this title became applicable to him."

SEC. 2. Section 6303(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting the first sentence immediately after "an employee" the words "whose current appointment is limited to less than ninety days".

SEC. 3. Section 6304 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out of subsection (a) the phrase "subsection (b) of this section" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsections (b) and (d) of this section";

(2) by striking out the word "or" at the end of clause 1 of subsection (c);

(3) by adding the word "or" at the end of clause 2 of subsection (c);

(4) by adding a new clause to the first sentence of subsection (c) to read as follows: "(3) under subsection (a) or (b) of this section which was accumulated under subsection (d) of this section"; and

(5) by adding at the end thereof a new subsection to read as follows:

"(d) Annual leave accruing to an employee during a year which is in excess of the amount allowed under subsection (a) or (b) of this section and which is not used because of the exigencies of the public business, administrative error, or sickness of the employee shall accumulate for use in succeeding years without limitation."

With the following committee amendment:

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

H.R. 12602

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the second sentence of section 5551(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out ", except that it may not exceed pay for a period of annual or vacation leave in excess of 30 days or the number of days carried over to his credit at the beginning of the leave year in which entitlement to payment occurs, whichever is greater"

(b) Section 5551(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The accumulated and current accrued annual leave to which an officer excepted from subchapter 1 of chapter 63 of this title by section 6301(2)(x)-(xii) of this title, is entitled immediately before the date he is excepted under that section shall be

liquidated by a lump-sum payment in accordance with subsection (a) of this section or subchapter VIII of this chapter, except that the payment is based on the rate of pay which he was receiving immediately before the date on which section 6301(2)(x)-(xii) of this title became applicable to him."

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 6303 (b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "Notwithstanding subsection (a) of this section, an employee whose current employment is limited to less than 90 days is entitled to annual leave under this subchapter only after being currently employed for a continuous period of 90 days under successive appointments without a break in service."

SEC. 3. Section 6304 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out of subsection (a) the phrase "subsection (b) of this section" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsections (b) and (d) of this section"; and

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

"(d) (1) Annual leave which is lost by operation of this section because of—

"(A) administrative error when such error causes a loss of annual leave otherwise accruable after June 30, 1960;

"(B) exigencies of the public business when such annual leave was scheduled in advance; or

"(C) sickness of the employee when such annual leave was scheduled in advance; shall be restored to the employee.

"(2) Annual leave restored under paragraph (1) of this subsection which is in excess of the maximum leave accumulation permitted by law shall be credited to a separate leave account for the employee and shall be available for use by the employee within the time limits prescribed by regulations of the Civil Service Commission. Leave credited under this paragraph but unused and still available to the employee under the regulations prescribed by the Commission shall be included in the lump-sum payment under section 5551 or 5552(1) of this title but may not be retained to the credit of the employee under section 5552(2) of this title."

SEC. 4. Section 6302 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) An employee who uses excess annual leave credited because of administrative error may elect to refund the amount received for the days of excess leave by lump-sum or installment payments or to have the excess leave carried forward as a charge against later-accruing annual leave, unless repayment is waived under section 5584 of this title."

SEC. 5. With respect to former employees who are not on the rolls on the date of enactment of this Act, except former employees under section 6 of this Act, annual leave which accrued after June 30, 1960, but, because of administrative error, was lost by operation of section 6304 of title 5, United States Code, is subject to credit and liquidation by lump-sum payment only if a claim therefor is filed by or for the former employee, with the agency by which he was employed at the time the loss of leave occurred, within three years immediately following the date of enactment of this Act. Payment shall be at the salary rate in effect on the date of separation from the employment during which the loss of annual leave occurred.

SEC. 6. (a) With respect to an employee of the United States Postal Service or former employee of the former Post Office Department or of the United States Postal Service, annual leave which accrued after June 30, 1960, and before July 1, 1971, but, because of administrative error, was lost before July 1, 1971, by operation of section 6304 of title

5, United States Code, shall be liquidated by a lump-sum payment only if a claim therefor is filed or for such employee or former employee with—

(1) the Postal Service, if such leave was lost while such employee or former employee was an employee of the Post Office Department; or

(2) the agency (other than the Post Office Department) by which such employee was employed at the time the loss of leave occurred;

within three years immediately following the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) The lump-sum payment authorized under subsection (a) of this section shall be made at the salary rate in effect on—

(1) June 30, 1971, or the date of separation or transfer from the Post Office Department, as applicable, in the case of a claim filed under subsection (a) (1) of this section; or

(2) the date of separation or transfer from the agency (other than the Post Office Department) in the case of a claim filed under subsection (a) (2) of this section.

SEC. 7. Section 5562 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end of subsection (a) thereof the following sentence: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an employee in a missing status on or after January 1, 1965, is entitled to payment for annual leave which accrued to his account on or after January 1, 1965, but which was forfeited under section 6304 of this title because he was unable to use that leave by virtue of his missing status. Such payment shall be made at his rate of basic pay in effect at the time of forfeiture."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of H.R. 12602, along with my friend and distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. HANLEY), I strongly urge its unanimous approval. I wish at the outset to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANLEY) for the leadership he assumed in bringing this important piece of legislation to the floor. Without his sincere interest the measure would have been dead in committee.

On the first day of the 92d Congress I introduced a bill which contained the major provisions of H.R. 12602, marking the third consecutive Congress in which I introduced such legislation. By working closely with the distinguished chairman of the concerned subcommittee (Mr. HANLEY) we were able to develop a sound piece of legislation to benefit Federal employees who are presently being forced to forfeit hours, sometimes days, of annual leave, through circumstances completely beyond their control.

Briefly, H.R. 12602 would permit Federal employees to carry over leave earned during the workyear beyond the presently allowed ceiling, in cases where one of the following three circumstances exist to prevent the use of the leave: First, administrative error; second, sickness of the individual; or third, the exigencies of the public business.

In addition, the bill would make several minor administrative changes, permit annual leave during the first 90 days of employment, allow lump-sum payment for leave over present maximums in the year of an employee's separation, and improve provisions covering repayment for overcredit of leave.

Another major provision of H.R. 12602 would permit Federal civilian employees who are "missing in action" to accumulate leave over and above statutory maximums.

While there are many cases which may be cited, just one example should suffice to illustrate the inequities to which H.R. 12602 is addressed. In my files is the case of a man who lived for many months at a weather station at the South Pole. He could not, as you might well imagine, schedule any annual leave, and lost a number of hours because he exceeded the maximum carryover.

Mr. Speaker, the rationalization of our Federal leave policy, which H.R. 12602 proposes to accomplish, would entail negligible cost to the Government. If anything, the benefits from improved employee morale and cooperation would make this bill a profitmaking measure for the Government and the taxpayer.

H.R. 12602 was reported unanimously to the full committee by Mr. HANLEY's Employee Benefits Subcommittee and the full Post Office and Civil Service Committee ordered it reported by a unanimous 26-to-0 record vote. I strongly urge my colleagues to approve it, also unanimously, in order that the relatively minor, but very real, inequities might be eliminated.

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

COMMISSION ON AMERICAN SHIPBUILDING

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 15048) to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1970.

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

H.R. 15048

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 41(2) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-469) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "Provided, however, That members of the Commission who are not full-time employees of the United States may waive entitlement to per diem compensation for service heretofore or hereafter rendered."

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

COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL REPRESENTATIVES ON SOUTHERN AND WESTERN INTERSTATE NUCLEAR BOARDS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 14974) to amend certain provisions of law relating to the compensation of the Federal representatives on the Southern and Western Interstate Nuclear Boards.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask someone conversant with this bill what services these Boards perform?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. These Boards are established under interstate compacts. The representatives of the States meet, together with our Federal representatives and others, in pursuit of developing atomic energy within the regions.

The Board itself is created to perform these functions. I can say further to the gentleman that there are two acts under which the Congress defines in some detail what precisely the Board does.

Reading from the act of 1970, Public Law 91-461, which consented to the Western Interstate Nuclear Compact, the Board meets for the purpose of developing, coordinating, and correlating the sources of nuclear energy in each State in the Western Compact, consistent with the development of the economy of the region, and with the optimum benefit from nuclear and related scientific and technological resources.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any record of accomplishment? There are two boards, are there not?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. There are two.

Mr. GROSS. They are paid at the rate of \$138.40 a day, are they not? This is the rate paid to the members thereof.

What is the record of accomplishment, if any?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Well, of course, we are talking only about the compensation of two individuals here. The accomplishment of the Board is really related to the States involved. We have a single Federal representative on each of the Boards. He represents the Federal point of view as far as the Atomic Energy Commission, the President of the United States, and the executive branch are concerned, and so represents the interests of the United States. That is his whole function. What the regional board does beyond that is the business of the States collectively involved in the compact. They are not accountable to us, that is to say, to the United States. These are inter-State compacts affecting the collection of the States themselves. What we are talking about in this particular legislation is making the compensation of the two Federal representatives—and there are only two, one for each of the compacts—consistent with each other.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, to keep up with the pay as established for the other Board.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. It is for the purpose of making the compensation of the two coincide. I must say that what we have done in this bill is reasonable, and actually it places a limitation which did not exist in the 1970 act on the compensation of one of the representatives.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

H.R. 14974

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the third sentence of section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act granting the consent of Congress to the Southern Interstate Nuclear Compact, and for related purposes", approved July 31, 1962 (76 Stat. 249), is

amended to read as follows: "He shall be compensated for each day of service rendered in such capacity in an amount which is the daily equivalent of the maximum rate for grade GS-18 of the General Schedule prescribed in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code: *Provided*, That if the representative be an employee of the United States, he shall serve without such additional compensation."

SEC. 2. The third sentence of section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act granting the consent of Congress to the Western Interstate Nuclear Compact, and related purposes", approved October 16, 1970 (84 Stat. 979), is amended to read as follows: "He shall be compensated for each day of service rendered in such capacity in an amount which is the daily equivalent of the maximum rate for grade GS-18 of the General Schedule prescribed in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code: *Provided*, That if the representative be an employee of the United States, he shall serve without such additional compensation."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 8, strike out "which is" and insert in lieu thereof "fixed by the President not to exceed".

On page 2, line 9, strike out "which is" and insert in lieu thereof "fixed by the President not to exceed".

(Mr. McCULLOCH (at the request of Mr. POFF) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues from the Committee on the Judiciary in supporting the enactment of H.R. 14974, a bill to establish a uniform ceiling on compensation of the Federal representatives on the Southern and Western Interstate Nuclear Boards, respectively.

The present disparity between the authorization for compensation of the Federal representative on the Southern Interstate Nuclear Board and that of the Federal representative on the Western Interstate Nuclear Board is an historical accident which fails to reflect the equivalency of the two positions.

Both officers perform exactly the same functions for the respective Boards on which they serve, and there is no practical reason for their being compensated differently.

Rather than adopt either the once generous but now too restrictive limitation contained in the act passed a decade ago approving the Southern Interstate Nuclear Compact, or the completely open-ended authorization contained in the more recent act approving the Western Interstate Nuclear Compact, the bill allows the President to fix the per diem compensation of both Federal representatives as high as the GS-18 level. Hereafter, it will not be necessary for Congress to legislate changes in these compensation ceilings to take account of pay raises affecting comparable positions, since the ceilings will rise automatically in step with the GS-18 level.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have come to know the importance of the Federal interest in the use of atomic energy for the development of all regions of our Nation. I am satisfied that H.R. 14974 is appropriate legislation to promote that interest, and I urge its passage.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, on May 15, 1972, I introduced H.R. 14974, to change the statutory ceiling on compensation of the Federal representative on the Southern and Western Interstate Nuclear Boards.

In 1962 Congress, by Public Law 87-563, consented to the Southern Interstate Nuclear Compact, whereby several Southern States undertook to cooperate on a continuing basis in the development of nuclear energy facilities, materials and products and in their application toward the industrialization and economic growth of the region.

The act granting such consent authorized the President to appoint a Federal representative to serve on the Southern Interstate Nuclear Board created by the compact and provided that such appointee shall be compensated "in such amount not in excess of \$100 per diem, as the President shall specify, but the total amount of compensation payable in any one calendar year shall not exceed \$15,000" (76 Stat. 254).

Eight years later, in 1970, Congress passed similar legislation consenting to the Western Interstate Nuclear Compact and authorizing Presidential appointment of a Federal representative on the Western Interstate Nuclear Board, which serves the same functions within the western region as the Board created by the Southern Compact. However, Public Law 91-461 differed from the Southern act in providing that the Federal representative should be compensated "in such amount as the President shall specify" without limitation as to the amount payable either per diem or per annum (84 Stat. 986).

In reporting on H.R. 7705 which I introduced last session to change the formula for compensation of the southern representative, the Atomic Energy Commission recommended that both representatives be paid at the GS-18 level. The bill, as amended by the subcommittee, authorizes payment of a per diem as high as that of the GS-18 level.

Both representatives are Presidential appointees. There is no significant difference, either in theory or in practice, between the job qualifications or duties attending the two positions. They are, in short, exact analogs in the scheme for implementation of the two compacts. For precisely this reason, the President has exercised his discretion by setting the per diem compensation of the new Federal representative to the Western Board at the same rate as the ceiling set forth in the Southern Act.

The discrepancy in the two statutory compensation provisions was not noted in the committee reports on the Western Act, nor was it mentioned on the floor at the time of passage. There is no reason to believe that this discrepancy was intended as a device to relegate the Southern representative to a position of inferiority vis-a-vis the Western representative, though the statutes as presently worded do convey that impression. Rather, the compensation provision of

the Western Act simply embodies the more flexible approach to such matters favored in recent years, as illustrated by the Federal Salary Acts of 1967 and 1970, wherein the President has been delegated by Congress the authority to adjust pay schedules for large classes of Federal officers and employees in light of rising pay rates for comparable work levels in private enterprise.

The imposition, by statute in one case and by administrative action in the other, of fixed per diem and per annum dollar limitations upon the allowable compensation of the Federal representatives to the Southern and Western Boards work to the representatives' economic disadvantage both in absolute terms and relative to other Federal officers and employees.

On the one hand, it is obvious that as a result of inflation the real economic value of the allowable compensation has steadily decreased during the 9 years since the Southern Act was passed. Roughly speaking, it would take \$132 today to equal the \$100 per diem specified in the statute in 1962. The Federal representative to the Southern Board, therefore, has suffered the equivalent of a 32-percent cut in pay and cannot now legally be compensated at the true rate, in constant dollars, at which Congress in 1962 authorized his compensation.

On the other hand, he has lost ground economically in relation to other classes of Federal employees whose rates of compensation have been increased in recent years to take account of the shrinking value of the dollar and rising pay rates in private enterprise. Many persons supplying personal services to the Federal Government on a part-time basis, such as consultants, are paid a per diem which is equivalent to the per diem pay of level GS-18 Government employees. In July 1962, when the Southern Act became law, the per diem equivalent of a level GS-18 salary was slightly over \$71—less than the amount payable to the Federal representative. Today, however, the per diem equivalent of a level GS-18 salary is \$139, for a 9-year increase of nearly 95 percent, while the Federal representative's per diem has nominally remained constant.

In August 1969, the Atomic Energy Commission—which, by Presidential directive, actually pays the two Federal representatives—compensated its consultants at a rate of \$100 per diem; today the rate is \$139 per diem for such consultants. And they are not Presidential appointees.

If both acts are amended to authorize compensation up to the daily equivalent of the GS-18 level, it will hereafter not be necessary for Congress to enact new legislation if economic conditions require adjustment of these rates; such adjustments could and assuredly would be made by executive action. Since compensation for only two individuals is involved, that would be a more efficient and equitable manner of effecting whatever adjustments might be necessary in the future.

An additional reason for removing the present ceiling on annual compensation

is that, assuming a reasonable per diem payment, the Federal representatives should not be put in the position of possibly having to choose between first, working without pay near the end of a calendar year, or, second, not working at all, regardless of what they perceive the requirements of the job to be, because "the funds have run out." Even if a new per diem pay rate were fixed by statute, the Federal representatives should be entitled to compensation at that rate for every day that they actually serve in their official capacity, with no limitation of annual compensation to an amount smaller than what would be due them if the per diem rate were applied to full-time working conditions.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 6957, SAWTOOTH NATIONAL RECREATION AREA, IDAHO

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 6957), to establish the Sawtooth National Recreation Area in the State of Idaho, to temporarily withdraw certain national forest land in the State of Idaho from the operation of the U.S. mining laws, and for other purposes with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ASPINALL, TAYLOR, UDALL, SKUBITZ, and MCCLURE.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE REPORT ON TREASURY-POSTAL SERVICE APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the Treasury-Postal Service appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBISON of New York reserved all points of order on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, pressing business kept me away from voting on rollcall No. 204 on June 15, and I would therefore like to have the RECORD show that had I been present I would have voted "aye."

ATTEMPTED WIRETAPPING OF DEMOCRATIC HEADQUARTERS

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

minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, illegal wiretapping, electronic surveillance, and breaking and entering are despicable activities under all circumstances. They are particularly despicable when used as tools in a political campaign.

It is unbelievably despicable when such activities are engaged in by a national political party as a part of a presidential campaign.

The recent incident involving an attempt to plant electronic devices in the Democratic National Headquarters, allegedly masterminded by the chief security officer of the Republican National Committee and the Committee to Reelect the President demands an inquiry by the Fair Campaign Practices Committee as well as the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

It may be, as John Mitchell, the former Attorney General and now campaign manager for the reelection of Richard Nixon, states that James McCord was not authorized to bug the Democratic National Committee Headquarters—it may also not be.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 15097, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 15097) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McFALL, BOLAND, YATES, STEED, MAHON, CONTE, MINSHALL, EDWARDS of Alabama, and Bow.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE REPORT ON THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the Public Works and Atomic Energy Commission appropriations bill for 1973.

Mr. RHODES reserved all points of order on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

ATTEMPTED BUGGING OF DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, no one has asked me to serve this body as its poet laureate. But events of the weekend

and, indeed, the preceding remarks by the gentleman from California (Mr. WALDIE) have prompted me to update an ancient political ditty. Properly paraphrased, it would go like this:

Mother is merely a shoplifter,
Sister picks pockets with me.
Brother prowls only in pawn shops—
But Dad's with the G.O.P.!

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

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

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to set the record straight. Congratulations to my good friend and distinguished colleague, Congressman PAUL FINDLEY, and Pike County, which he represents, for their No. 2 position in U.S. hog sales for 1969.

On the House floor last Monday, Representative FINDLEY commended that well-deserving constituency and also commended Henry County—in my district—for its No. 1 position in U.S. hog sales—554,834 in 1969. He also added a challenge to the people of Henry County: "Do not look back; someone is gaining." Hogwash. Henry County has long been No. 1 in hog sales, and the people of Henry County are not about to relinquish their title. I have worked with Congressman FINDLEY on many matters of benefit to all Illinois residents, but on this one I must state that he has stars in his eyes.

Bravo, Henry County.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 16, 1972.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope from the White House, received in the Clerk's Office at 12 Noon on Friday, June 16, 1972, and said to contain a Message from the President transmitting the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1971.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely,

W. PAT JENNINGS, Clerk,
House of Representatives.

REPORT OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1971—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of Section 13, Public Law 806, 80th Congress, I transmit herewith the report of

the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1971.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 16, 1972.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 16, 1972.

HON. CARL ALBERT,

The Speaker, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope from the White House, received in the Clerk's Office at 12 Noon on Friday, June 15, 1972, and said to contain a Message from the President transmitting the second annual report on Hazardous Materials Control.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

W. PAT JENNINGS, Clerk,
House of Representatives.

SECOND ANNUAL REPORT ON HAZARDOUS MATERIALS CONTROL—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Second Annual Report on Hazardous Materials Control as required by the Hazardous Materials Transportation Control Act of 1970, Public Law 91-458. This report has been prepared in accordance with Section 302 of the Act and covers calendar year 1971.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 16, 1972.

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13694) to amend the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 13694

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, and for other purposes", approved July 4, 1966 (80 Stat. 259), as amended, is further amended as follows:

Section 7 (a) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 7. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of this Act and to remain available until expended \$6,712,000 for fiscal year 1973, of which not to exceed \$2,400,000 shall be for grants-in-aid pursuant to section 9(1) of this Act."

Sec. 2. Section 9 is amended by the addition of the following new subsections:

"(2) make grants to nonprofit entities including States, territories, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (or subdivisions thereof) to assist in

developing or supporting bicentennial programs or projects. Such grants may be up to 50 per centum of the total cost of the program or project to be assisted;

"(3) in any case where money or property is donated, bequeathed, or devised to the Commission, and accepted thereby for purposes of assisting a specified nonprofit entity, including States, territories, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (or subdivisions thereof), for a bicentennial program or project, grant such money or property, plus an amount not to exceed the value of the donation, bequest, or devise: Provided, That the recipient agrees to match the combined value of the grant for such bicentennial program or project."

Sec. 3. Add at the end thereof the following new section 11:

"Sec. 11. For a period of one year from the effective date of this section, whenever the President determines it to be in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, the functions authorized under this Act may be performed without regard to such provisions of law or limitations of authority regulating or relating to the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts, the acquisition and disposition of property, and the expenditure of Government funds, as he may specify."

Sec. 4. Section 6 is amended by the addition of the following new subsection:

"(4) In addition to the number of positions which may be placed in GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18, under section 5108 of title 5, United States Code, not to exceed ten positions may be placed in GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18, to carry out the functions of the Commission. The authority under this subsection shall be subject to the procedures prescribed under section 5108 of title 5 of the United States Code, and shall continue only for the duration of the exercise of functions of the Commission."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from New York opposed to the bill?

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from New York opposed to the bill?

Mr. SMITH of New York. I am not, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York does not qualify.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Iowa opposed to the bill?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. In its present form, Mr. Speaker, I certainly am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DONOHUE) will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DONOHUE).

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 13694, was introduced in accordance with the recommendations of an executive communication from the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. As outlined in the executive communication, the enactment of the amendments contained in

this bill are now required to enable the Commission to carry forward its work. At the present time, an important aspect of its work includes giving assistance and advice in connection with developing programs and activities planned by the States and local communities, civic and service organizations, Federal agencies and foreign governments.

Previously, the Bicentennial Commission has been engaged in preparing a basic blueprint for a national commemoration. Now, during the year 1973, the Commission will be emphasizing the actual initiation of programs and activities in connection with the observance of the bicentennial. Thus the authorization for appropriations for fiscal year 1973 contained in this bill is the first authorization which would have the purpose of beginning to fund implementation of the Commission's national plan.

This bill would authorize the amount of \$6,712,000 to be appropriated for fiscal year 1973, and this figure would include provision for \$2,400,000 for the second and final year of equal grants to the States, a program initiated in fiscal year 1972. Under Public Law 92-236, approved March 1, 1972, the 2-year program of grants to each State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories was authorized to assist in the establishment and implementation of a Bicentennial Commission.

Section 2 of the bill, H.R. 13694, adds two new subsections to section 9 of the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. Section 9 concerns grants in aid and includes in subsection 1 the provision for grants in aid to the States which I have just referred to. The new subsection 2 which would be added by this bill, as amended by the committee, would make grants to nonprofit entities, including States, territories, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or their subdivisions for the purpose of assisting them in developing or supporting bicentennial programs or projects. It is further provided that these grants may be up to 50 percent of the total cost of the program or project to be assisted. At the hearing it was explained that projects would be reviewed by the Commission and approved for grant support under the authority provided in the new subsection 2 on the basis of general criteria now being developed by the Commission.

At the hearing on April 13, 1972, the witness representing the Commission stated that the grant programs contemplated under section 9 are viewed as an essential inducement and stimulus for a truly national bicentennial commemoration. The Commission takes the position that these actions on a State and local basis both deserve and require encouragement and support by the Federal Government. It is contemplated that the limited financial support provided by the programs for Federal grants will have a catalytic effect in other areas of the public and private sector.

New subsection 3 added to section 9 of the bill authorizes the Commission to accept donations, bequests, or devises earmarked for specific nonprofit entities

for bicentennial programs or projects. The Commission would be authorized to grant that money or property to the specified nonprofit entity, plus an amount not to exceed the value of the donation, bequest, or devise on the condition that the recipient will agree to match the combined value of the grant for the program or project. It is hoped that these programs can be financed without the need of any appropriated funds. It was explained at the hearings that no appropriated funds were authorized or requested for these grants in fiscal year 1973. It is contemplated that the Commission will use revenues generated from the sale of bicentennial commemorative medallions and possibly from other licensing programs and donations for such grants during fiscal year 1973. It was stated that it is the Commission's hope that revenues and donations of this character will be adequate in subsequent years to preclude the need for appropriations.

Section 3 of the bill adds a new section 11 to the existing law which would authorize the President when he determines it to be in furtherance of the purposes of the act creating the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission to authorize the Commission to carry out its functions without regard to specified provisions of law or limitations of authority regulating or relating to the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts, the acquisition and disposition of property, and the expenditure of grant funds. The committee amendment is to provide that this authority would be granted for a period of 1 year from the effective date of the section.

The new section added by section 3 has the purpose of permitting a determination by the President that a waiver authorized by the section would further the purposes of the act. In the executive communication transmitted to the Congress on March 7, 1972, it is pointed out that the pressing time schedule under which the Commission is presently operating, together with the absolute deadline of the years 1975-76, as a practical culmination of its efforts for commemoration of the bicentennial dictates a requirement of flexibility in its operations.

At the hearing it was pointed out that the language of proposed section 11 is patterned after section 108a of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2458a). It was explained at the hearing that the Commission had concluded that the considerations which led to the enactment by the Congress of the waiver provisions contained in the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act are also valid consideration for granting similar authority to the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. It is also relevant to note that the legislation providing for the George Rodgers Clark Sesquicentennial Commission (45 Stat. 723) and the Civil War Centennial Commission Act (36 U.S.C. 745(b); 71 Stat. 626) contains similar language.

The fourth and final section of the bill would amend section 6 of the law by the addition of a new subsection 4 which would authorize 10 supergrade positions

to carry out the functions of the Commission. At the hearing it was explained that these positions are necessary in view of the expansion of the scope of the Commission's work as the observance gains its full momentum. It was explained that the positions will be subject to applicable Civil Service Commission procedures under section 5108 of title 5 of the United States Code. These procedures permit a position to be placed in GS-16, -17 or -18 only by action or approval by a majority of the Civil Service Commissioners. In addition, the qualifications of the individuals to be placed in such positions must be approved by the Civil Service Commission. The committee further notes that new subsection 4 expressly provides that the positions authorized under that section will be limited to the life of the Commission.

The committee has concluded that these amendments are necessary to the effective functioning of the Commission and it is recommended that the bill be considered favorably.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, yield?

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

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Will the gentleman explain why this new section 11 was added to the bill?

Mr. DONOHUE. I might point out to the gentleman if he will permit me to, that we were following a precedent that was established when two other commissions were authorized by the Congress. Similar language is now included in the Mutual Education and Cultural Exchange Act. As to commissions, the precedent was established at the time the George Rodgers Clark Sesquicentennial Commission was established, and also in the case of the Civil War Centennial Commission some years ago.

It was requested by the Commission that the authority be granted during the full life of the Commission. We amended that request by limiting it to 1 year, so that at the end of each year the Commission would have to come back to us and tell us in what way they waived the provisions of the existing law.

Mr. GROSS. This is one of the broadest delegations of power I have ever heard of. I understand that it is for a period of 1 year, but a great deal of abuse can occur in that period of time. It says:

For a period of one year from the effective date of this section, whenever the President determines it to be in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, the functions authorized under this Act may be performed without regard to such provisions of law or limitations of authority regulating or relating to the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts, the acquisition and disposition of property, and the expenditure of Government funds, as he may specify.

I would not vote for any bill with that kind of provision in it, no matter how meritorious it might be. Congress has already delegated far too much power to the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. DONOHUE. The explanation that was offered to us, I might suggest to the gentleman from Iowa, was this, that in negotiating with the Federal Government for contracts, there is a very time-consuming process and procedure that

must be followed and because of the shortness of time necessary to get the activities of this Commission into proper perspective, it was necessary, as it was in a number of cases, to have such a provision in the authorizing legislation.

Mr. GROSS. If my friend from Massachusetts—and I do admire him—would yield further, let me say this. Here again we are yielding to expediency, overturning the orderly procedures, and delegating too much power to any President.

Mr. DONOHUE. I quite agree with the gentleman, up to a certain point, but in a situation such as this, where they requested the waiver of those provisions for the time the Commission will be in existence, we did not subscribe to that, and we eliminated that provision to the point where it could only be waived for a period of 1 year, and then they would have to come back to the Congress again and explain to what degree and on how many occasions they have waived the provisions of existing law.

Mr. GROSS. Once having been waived, it can be waived again and again. The time to stop it is now.

Let me say to the gentleman, I will not be surprised if this bicentennial observance goes on for 10 years.

Mr. DONOHUE. I will suggest to the gentleman from Iowa, when they come back and we have an opportunity to review any of the contracts they have waived, if there have been any abuses the gentleman can be sure it will not be in the next bill before the Congress.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I find myself in a peculiar position today, apparently opposing the commemoration of the bicentennial. This is not true. I am not against the bicentennial. Indeed, I am very much in favor of a proper and adequate commemoration of the bicentennial.

The record is quite clear that Congress can respond adequately, when we set up the Commission for the Civil War Centennial, for the Centennial of the Lincoln First Inaugural, and the Second Inaugural, and the sesquicentennial of the birth of Lincoln, which was commemorated here, we created, as reports will show, a magnificent display of literature relating to these events. In addition, we quickened the interest in American history while we evolved a better understanding of the history and its effects.

Mr. Speaker, one of the high points of the sesquicentennial of the birth of Lincoln was in this Hall and some of you were there when Carl Sandburg spoke. It was a high moment and it evolved one of the best bits of historical literature of that time.

So I am not against commemoration; indeed, I am for commemorating what I believe is the greatest birthday and the most significant birthday of any nation in all the history of time. But I believe that under the present leadership of the Commission nothing really good is going to happen, certainly based upon the record so far.

For awhile, when Wallace Sterling, retired president of Stanford, was chairman, he started heading this in the right direction. He did what the leaders and officers of the present Commission should have done; that is, go to those who have

had experience. Wally Sterling did. He went to Dr. James Robertson, now head of the departmental history of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, as executive director of the Civil War Centennial Commission and he counseled earlier with Allan Nevins, who was Chairman of the Civil War Centennial Commission, a historian of great note. He counseled with Carl Haverlin, one of the great and respected historians, and a successful businessman, now retired, president of Broadcast Music, Inc. Wally Sterling was beginning to head this thing in the right direction.

Now the Commission has come under new leadership.

From the beginning, Mr. Speaker, I tried my best to reach the Chairman. I wrote him a letter. It took 6 weeks to get an answer, and it was inadequate.

Mr. Speaker, when I was Chairman of the Civil War Centennial Commission and when I was vice chairman of the other commemorations dealing with that time, with the leadership of the Commission, we made some of the right things happen by working with people all across our Nation who understand history and who have had experience in promoting these kinds of things. This the present Commission has not done.

People like we have in the Library of Congress, where they had a symposium not long ago, are intensely interested, and the Chairman of the Bicentennial Commission was not even there, nor was the executive director there. What a shame.

Here was a collection of America's greatest historians, among them Dr. Henry Steele Commager, and Mr. Mahoney, who was invited to be there, was not even present.

Mr. Speaker, there is much evidence of the inadequacy of the Commission's leadership. Their concepts of the commemoration indicate a lack of understanding and appreciation of what can and cannot be done. Let me cite a bicentennial newsletter, volume III, No. 1, special bicentennial parks issue. Here are some pictures of a proposed park they are going to build in every State and spend between \$15 million and \$20 million and then give it to the State, without even asking of the proper officials of the State whether they are interested or have a place or the ways and means to maintain it. This idea might have been worthy of consideration if we did not already have the finest park system in the world—a park system that has been dedicated to recalling, displaying, and promoting a better understanding of history wherever the opportunity is presented. This has happened, of course, because of the leadership in this country of former President Teddy Roosevelt, who set up the original park system and other great men who had a feel for this, including former President Franklin Roosevelt, President Harding, President Hoover, indeed, all the Presidents, who aided and abetted the building of the park system so as to cultivate the history that was made there. The result is a happy conclusion we can recall and that is that we have the greatest park system telling the story, indeed, the American story that can be found in any part of this globe and it is a tragedy that

representatives of the Bicentennial Commission have not even counseled or used the talent of the park system in evaluating this kind of program. It is tragic, too, that we have wasted the time and talent in presenting the kind of display that the Bicentennial Commission has presented.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. I share the gentleman's concern about the lack of progress under the Bicentennial Commission, but I am wondering what would be accomplished by rejecting this bill. What would then follow?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am glad the gentleman raised that question. I think that the bill needs amending. We ought not to spend \$6 million until we are sure it is going to be spent for what it was really intended to be spent for; that is, to cultivate, to recall, and to promote the history of this great country.

One thing we can do, I think, is arrange somehow to get new leadership in the Commission. I have mentioned the Civil War Centennial Commission, which provided in a bill passed by this Congress that the Commission name the Chairman of the Commission from its own ranks. They could counsel and find out who on that Commission could spend necessary time to fulfill the responsibilities of the Chairman. This is one reason the Civil War Centennial Commission selected Allan Nevins when he became Chairman. He was here every week and, on every occasion he could, he attended conferences in every State of the Union and did those things necessary to enlist the help of volunteers, individuals, and organizations, to promote enthusiastic interest, writings, and understanding. This is the kind of Chairman we need.

The present executive director of the Commission has no background in this, apparently no interest in history or experience that justifies being hired as executive director of this Commission.

While I am on that, let us talk about employees. During the Civil War centennial celebration, because we had a tremendous amount of help, voluntary help, and there were thousands of them in every category of American life, we had only five paid employees, and for a while we loaned—or, rather, we borrowed—two from the Department of the Interior. And historians—and everyone who knows anything about the activities of that Commission knows that was one of the greatest commemorations in the history of our country.

So, Mr. Speaker, this bill needs to go back into the committee so that we can look at it again, and let us have the Commission come before the Congress so we can hear from people like Julian Boyd, who is one of the leading authorities on the Declaration of Independence.

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

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

Mr. DONOHUE. I understood from your remarks that you are strongly in favor of celebrating the 200th anniversary of the founding of our country. Is that correct?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I certainly am.

Mr. DONOHUE. That being so, are you not willing to provide for certain financial funds to carry out that objective?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I certainly am, but not until we have some adequate leadership.

Mr. DONOHUE. Having that in mind, under what authority were members of the Commission named and who appointed the members of this Commission?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. The gentleman knows the provisions of the law. I am not satisfied with some of those appointments.

Mr. DONOHUE. It was the President who selected the members of this Commission.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. That is right. And if we will not respond to this request now, maybe we will get some people to take a second look at this down in the White House and find some better leadership for this Commission. But, more than that, I think that the Congress has a responsibility in this matter also. We can, if the bill comes up under the proper rule, amend and improve it as we did when we created the Civil War Centennial Commission.

Mr. DONOHUE. If the gentleman will yield further, in the event that the White House has confidence in the members that it selected who are on the Commission, and will not change them, are we then going to hold up this entire commemoration?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. My consideration is this: That if we do what we ought and should do, withhold this, then I am sure they will act very quickly.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN).

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have one suggestion, and that is if we really want to have a change then as the gentleman from Iowa suggests vote Democratic in November, and that will settle this committee.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say as a member of the American Revolutionary Bicentennial Commission appointed by the very distinguished Speaker of this House, that in the discussions we have had in the Commission—and they have been long and extensive—there are three things that the Commission is emphasizing: one is heritage, the past; second, open house, that is our present; and the third is horizons.

Just burying ourselves in what American revolutionary history gave us is but one phase of this entire matter. What do we do with the goals that were set out in one of the greatest documents ever written for mankind? So we have looked ahead, and we have not spent all our energies merely on history. But if it were history—and may I point out that we have many distinguished people working on the various committees, and we have people representing all facets of the most learned groups in the United States—I also happen to have some high regard for history, myself.

I have done a lot of research on this. I just do not speak as a political character trying to assassinate the bill.

But I want to point out that in America today groups of young people, the

blacks, the Indians and women are looking for what our horizons are going to be in the future—which are guaranteed if you please by other immortal documents. And immortality is something that lives on, goes on and moves on.

I have in my hand a review from the woman who is in charge of the women's part of the ARBC program, a group representing 20 million American women who voted on which phase of the bicentennial meant most to them. By an overwhelming vote it was the "horizons."

So I think, and this has been said in my committee where we review their budgets, that a well thought out program is: yesterday, today, and tomorrow. But the horizons are really our greatest heritage from the American Revolution. I speak not only as a member of appropriation, but as a descendant of several of those men who fought and died during the American Revolution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this House—and not for the sake of politics and a few other things that I might go into, such as the matter of change because of personalities—that we support this bill today and get on with the job of commemorating and celebrating those magnificent men's gift to the America of yesterday, today, and tomorrow.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Does the gentlelady also speak as a member of this Commission?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Yes. Who really knows what the Commission is doing or trying to do? All I know is that the bicentennial is a very complex subject, and there are many people who would make it into just a commemorative thing—just a matter of the issuance of commemorative medals as was the implication. This is not another civil war. This is the lifeblood of our Nation today and 200 years from now—its development and its freedom.

In discussing a certain project I said at a Commission meeting, I think it is important that we look at all of our national goals—what are they? An opportunity for everyone to have an education; an opportunity to eliminate poverty; an opportunity to eat and an opportunity to realize what the Bill of Rights gives us—freedom. It is more than a mere look backwards. This is a look ahead.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I was appointed to the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission by the Speaker of this House. I have attended the meetings with great regularity. I have done everything within my power to try to move along with the work of this Commission and I find it to be a virtually impossible task under the present setup.

I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DONOHUE) when he says that the celebration of our 200th anniversary is very, very important.

I agree with the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) when she states that we must stress the past, the

present and the future. I just do not believe that the way we are structured right now that we are going to accomplish this.

Let me tell you the sort of thing that is going on in the ARBC right now.

The law says that the Director of the ARBC shall be appointed by the Chairman with the advice of the ARBC, the entire Commission.

At last December's meeting the Chairman Mr. Mahoney introduced to us a Mr. Levant and reported that Mr. Levant was going to be taking on the duties of Director who then was Mr. Spector and Mr. Spector was going to return to the State Department.

At no time did we take any vote. That is the complete and entire report that we received on Mr. Levant. Yet on April 19 Mr. Levant, a former employee of the company of which Mr. Mahoney is president, was sworn in as Director of the ARBC at a salary of \$38,000 annually.

At the February 21 meeting, which was Washington's Birthday, I returned to Washington to attend a meeting of the ARBC. The meeting started at 9 o'clock. At 10:30 we had a coffee break, and when we came back, the door was locked. We were finally let in, and there was a model of the so-called American Revolution bicentennial park system. The model was about as big as the top of a normal desk, and we received a speech about how great these parks would be—one for every one of the 50 States.

We were then permitted to look at the model, and then we were shown colored slides of the model. It looked something like the picture in my hand, if you can imagine these colored slides being taken from something approximately the size of a normal desk top.

After the presentation we were handed a two-page resolution all ready to be passed, virtually making this an official project of the ARBC.

I raised the point immediately that the next day we were meeting with the State representatives of the various State ARBC's, and I said, "Why should we be taking an action like this before we even consult with the various States?"

When the staff was asked certain questions, like, "How much is this going to cost?" and "Do we have 100 to 500 acres of surplus Federal land near urban centers?"—which is what the proposal contained—nobody knew any answers.

So finally we passed a resolution to have the ARBC staff make a feasibility study of the bicentennial parks, using also the facilities of the executive agencies of the Government, and report back to the ARBC as soon as possible. This was on the 21st of February.

As of today the ARBC staff has not started the feasibility study. Rather, a small group from the executive branch of the Government started a study. As of last Thursday they have found zero feasible sites for these parks near urban centers, and they have gotten very little input from any one member of the ARBC staff.

This bill calls for 10 more supergrades. No one knows exactly what anybody is doing about the past, the present, or the future in the ARBC, even though we have 87 employees. The salaries paid to date for the balance of this year, we

have 21 people making over \$30,000 annually, for a total payroll in excess of \$1.7 million.

If we are going to accomplish our aim of celebrating properly the 200th birthday of this country, we are not going to do it with this type of organization.

My district borders the city of Philadelphia. The staff projected a cost of a Philadelphia International Expo to the Federal Government at between \$1.5 billion and \$1.7 billion. Yet, when Philadelphia made their presentation, they said the cost would be \$600 million. When I asked the representative of Philadelphia that if we allow them a 2-percent overrun up to \$612 million, would they accept that, they said, yes. I then asked the question that if more money was needed "Where will the rest of the money come from?" and the representatives said, "From the city of Philadelphia and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania."

It is already provided for in the resolutions passed by the city and the Commonwealth.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania 30 additional seconds.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recommend that what we do is defeat this bill today, and then bring it up just as soon as we can next week or after our July recess under a rule. Only by doing this are we going to be able to make amendments and have an organization that can move forward to put on the type of bicentennial celebration we need.

In conclusion, if I did not make the point clear before, on May 16 the ARBC killed the Philadelphia International Exposition, therefore excluding wide international participation in our bicentennial commemoration.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, in 4 years our Nation will celebrate its 200th birthday. Coming from the great city of Philadelphia, this occasion is of great moment to me. And, I know it is of great import to the people of Philadelphia, the "City of Brotherly Love." We very much have a personal interest and concern because it was in our fair city that this great Nation was born.

We are, therefore, particularly concerned with the plans and programs being prepared for the celebration of that occasion. Our Government expressed its foresight and concern with the upcoming event by establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission on July 4, 1966. The Commission was established to prepare an overall program for commemorating the bicentennial of the American Revolution, and to plan, encourage, develop, and coordinate observances and activities focusing on the national and international significance of the American Revolution, and its implications for present and future generations.

The bill before us, H.R. 13694, is in furtherance of that purpose, and while I may not wholeheartedly agree with all of

the decisions of the Commission, I urge its adoption.

The selection of Philadelphia as a center of activity during our 200th birthday celebration is an excellent choice, for it is the most historic spot in our country. As the birthplace of freedom in the modern world, no better selection could be made. This occasion will serve as a great opportunity for people from all over the world to visit our country and particularly Philadelphia, the cradle of our Nation.

It was in Philadelphia, in September 1774, that the delegates from 12 Colonies assembled as the first Continental Congress. On October 14, 1774, the assembly adopted what has come to be known as the Declaration and resolves of the first Continental Congress. In that instrument, addressed to His Majesty and to the people of Great Britain, there was embodied a statement of rights and principles, many of which were later to be incorporated in the Declaration of Independence and the Federal Constitution.

The following year, 1775, by general necessity and by common consent, for the battle of Lexington had been fought, the delegates again met in Philadelphia as the second Continental Congress and assumed control of the "Twelve United Colonies," which soon became "Thirteen United Colonies." It became a de facto government; it called upon the other Colonies to assist in the defense of Massachusetts; it issued bills of credit; it took steps to organize a military force and appointed George Washington commander in chief of the Army.

It was on June 7, 1776, that a resolution was introduced declaring the union with Britain dissolved, proposing the formation of foreign alliances, and suggesting the drafting of a plan of confederation to be submitted to the respective colonies.

Independence was declared in Philadelphia on July 4, 1776.

The site of all this activity is preserved as a historic shrine in Independence Square.

The people of Philadelphia are proud of their heritage and the history of our city and I hope that the Bicentennial Commission will duly consider these factors when programming the activities of our country's 200th anniversary.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, again I want to say I am regretful for having to take the position I am taking, because by some it will be misunderstood, but I would not be faithful to the historical interests if I did not stand here and tell the Members what I think are the facts of life.

We are not, under the present leadership with the kind of concept they now have, going to have a commemoration worthy of the name, except as the commemoration might happen with the association or organizations entirely independent. Mr. Speaker, North Carolina has a master plan. North Carolina's plan makes a great deal more sense, and it conceives some ideas that have been completely ignored by the present Commission, and especially by the leaders. Some people who are on the Board of the Bicentennial Commission, understand, but the leadership does not understand. The only way to do something about this is to

say no, to vote "no" on this question, and then have the President do something about it. Only he, now, as I see it, can do something about it, meeting this challenge, this greatest opportunity any country has ever had to commemorate a birthday, a 200th anniversary.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the Members and to the Speaker that I have had extensive communication with the State's ARBC's that have been formed. They are moving ahead with plans to celebrate their own ARBC's in their own way, but they do not feel—in almost every instance—that they have not received sufficient cooperation from the Federal ARBC.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DONOHUE), that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13694, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 174, nays 165, not voting 93, as follows:

[Roll No. 210]

YEAS—174

Adams	Edmondson	Matsunaga
Alexander	Edwards, Calif.	Meeds
Andrews,	Esch	Miller, Calif.
N. Dak.	Evins, Tenn.	Mills, Md.
Annunzio	Fascell	Mink
Arends	Foley	Mizell
Aspin	Ford, Gerald R.	Moorhead
Aspinall	Ford,	Morgan
Baring	William D.	Mosher
Barrett	Forsythe	Moss
Begich	Fraser	Murphy, Ill.
Bell	Frelinghuysen	Myers
Blatnik	Frenzel	Natcher
Boggs	Garmatz	Nedzi
Boland	Gibbons	Obey
Bolling	Gonzalez	O'Hara
Brademas	Green, Pa.	O'Neill
Brinkley	Griffiths	Patten
Brooks	Hamilton	Pike
Brotzman	Hanley	Poage
Broyhill, N.C.	Hanna	Poff
Broyhill, Va.	Hansen, Idaho	Preyer, N.C.
Burke, Mass.	Hansen, Wash.	Price, Ill.
Burleson, Tex.	Harrington	Pucinski
Burlison, Mo.	Harvey	Purcell
Burton	Hathaway	Rallsback
Carlson	Heckler, Mass.	Randall
Carney	Hicks, Mass.	Rees
Casey, Tex.	Hicks, Wash.	Reuss
Cederberg	Hollifield	Riegle
Chamberlain	Howard	Roberts
Chappell	Johnson, Calif.	Robison, N.Y.
Clancy	Jones, Ala.	Rodino
Clausen,	Karth	Rooney, Pa.
Don H.	Kastenmeier	Rostenkowski
Collier	Kazen	Roybal
Conable	Keating	St Germain
Conte	Kee	Sandman
Curlin	Latta	Shipley
Danielson	Leggett	Shriver
Davis, Ga.	Lujan	Sikes
de la Garza	McClory	Sisk
Denholm	McCloskey	Skubitz
Dennis	McCormack	Smith, Iowa
Derwinski	McCulloch	Smith, N.Y.
Dickinson	McDade	Springer
Donohue	McFall	Stanton,
Dorn	McKay	J. William
Drinan	McKevitt	Stanton,
Dulski	McKinney	James V.
du Pont	Madden	Steele
Dwyer	Mahon	Stratton
Eckhardt	Mailliard	Stubblefield

Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thornson, Wis.
Tiernan
Udall
Ullman

Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
White
Wiggins
Winn

Wolf
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Young, Tex.
Zablocki

NAYS—165

Abbt	Grover	O'Konski
Anderson,	Gubser	Passman
Calif.	Gude	Pettis
Anderson, Ill.	Haley	Pickle
Andrews, Ala.	Hall	Powell
Archer	Hammer-	Quie
Ashley	schmidt	Quillen
Baker	Harsha	Rhodes
Belcher	Hastings	Robinson, Va.
Bennett	Hays	Roncallo
Bergland	Hebert	Rosenthal
Betts	Hechler, W. Va.	Roussellot
Bevill	Heinz	Runnels
Biaggi	Henderson	Ruppe
Biester	Hillis	Ruth
Blackburn	Hogan	Sarbanes
Bow	Hosmer	Satterfield
Bray	Hull	Saylor
Brown, Ohio	Hungate	Scherle
Buchanan	Hunt	Schneebeli
Burke, Fla.	Hutchinson	Schwengel
Byrne, Pa.	Ichord	Scott
Byrnes, Wis.	Jacobs	Seiberling
Byron	Jarman	Shoup
Camp	Johnson, Pa.	Slack
Carter	Jonas	Smith, Calif.
Clark	Jones, N.C.	Snyder
Clawson, Del.	Jones, Tenn.	Spence
Collins, Ill.	Keith	Staggers
Collins, Tex.	Kemp	Steed
Colmer	King	Steiger, Ariz.
Conover	Koch	Stokes
Coughlin	Kuykendall	Teague, Calif.
Crane	Kyl	Terry
Culver	Landgrebe	Thompson, Ga.
Daniel, Va.	Lennon	Thone
Davis, Wis.	Lent	Vander Jagt
Dellenback	Long, Md.	Veysey
Dellums	McClure	Waldie
Dent	McCollister	Wampler
Devine	McMillan	Ware
Downing	Mallary	Whalen
Duncan	Martin	Whitehurst
Ellberg	Mathis, Ga.	Whitten
Findley	Mayne	Widnall
Fisher	Mazzoli	Williams
Flood	Michel	Wilson, Bob
Fountain	Mikva	Wilson,
Frey	Miller, Ohio	Charles H.
Gaydos	Minish	Wyllie
Gladmo	Minshall	Wyman
Glauwater	Mitchell	Yates
Goodling	Mollohan	Yatron
Green, Oreg.	Montgomery	Young, Fla.
Griffin	Nichols	Zion
Gross	Nix	Zwach

NOT VOTING—93

Abernethy	Eshleman	Mills, Ark.
Abourezk	Evans, Colo.	Monagan
Abzug	Fish	Murphy, N.Y.
Addabbo	Flowers	Nelsen
Anderson,	Flynt	Patman
Tenn.	Fulton	Pelly
Ashbrook	Fuqua	Pepper
Badillo	Galifianakis	Perkins
Bingham	Gallagher	Peyser
Blanton	Gettys	Pirnie
Brasco	Grasso	Podell
Broomfield	Gray	Price, Tex.
Brown, Mich.	Hagan	Pryor, Ark.
Cabell	Halpern	Rangel
Caffery	Hawkins	Rarick
Carey, N.Y.	Helstoski	Reid
Celler	Horton	Roe
Chisholm	Kluczynski	Rogers
Clay	Kyros	Rooney, N.Y.
Cleveland	Landrum	Roush
Conyers	Link	Roy
Corman	Lloyd	Ryan
Cotter	Long, La.	Scheuer
Daniels, N.J.	McDonald,	Schmitz
Davis, S.C.	Mich.	Sebelius
Delaney	McEwen	Steiger, Wis.
Diggs	Macdonald,	Stephens
Dingell	Mass.	Stuckey
Dow	Mann	Symington
Dowdy	Mathias, Calif.	Talcott
Edwards, Ala.	Melcher	Thompson, N.J.
Erlenborn	Metcalfe	Whalley

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Monagan with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Pirnie.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Horton.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.

Mr. Brasco with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Cleveland.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Roe with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Lloyd.
Mrs. Grasso with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Kyros with Mr. Sebellus.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Conyers with Mrs. Abzug.
Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Metcalfe.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Badillo.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Schmitz.

Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Link with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Caffery with Mr. Price of Texas.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Peyser.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Mathias of California.
Mr. Perkins with Mr. Eshleman.
Mr. Podell with Mr. Clay.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Galifianakis.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Cotter with Mr. Rangel.
Mr. Davis of South Carolina with Mr. Abernethy.

Mr. Mann with Mr. Flowers.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Melcher with Mr. Hagan.
Mr. Abourezk with Mr. Corman.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Evans of Colorado.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Dow.
Mr. Daniels of New Jersey with Mr. Rogers.
Mr. Ryan with Mr. Symington.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Gettys.
Mr. Roy with Mr. Pryor of Arkansas.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Roncallo with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Roush with Mr. Dowdy.

Messrs. NIX, NICHOLS, BYRNE of Pennsylvania, KOCH, RUNNELS, HALEY, BAKER, COUGHLIN, BRAY, DEL CLAWSON, HILLIS, and PETTIS, and Mrs. GREEN of Oregon changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 15495, MILITARY PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION, 1973

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services have until midnight tonight to file a report to accompany the bill H.R. 15495, the military procurement authorization bill for fiscal year 1973.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON CONSUMER FINANCE

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 211) to amend title IV of the Consumer Credit Protection Act establishing the National Commission on Consumer Finance.

The Clerk read as follows:

S.J. RES. 211

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title IV of the Consumer Credit Protection Act (82 Stat. 165) is amended as follows:

(1) in section 404(b), by striking out "July 1, 1972" and inserting "December 31, 1972" in lieu thereof;

(2) in section 406(c), by striking out "Ninety days after" and inserting "After" in lieu thereof; and

(3) in section 407, by striking out "\$1,500,000" and inserting "\$2,000,000" in lieu thereof.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Missouri is recognized.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there is a general impression among Members of the House that national commissions, once established to carry out a specific assignment within a fixed period of time at a set cost, never seem to finish their work within the time allotted and always end up costing more money than anticipated. I know that this has happened often enough in the past to make many of the Members wary of any proposal to establish a commission or to extend its life.

I served on one very major Commission which accomplished its task within the time specified in its authorizing legislation and never had to come back for additional time or funds. It was the National Commission on Food Marketing, on which Representatives PURCELL and ROSENTHAL and former Representatives Catherine May and Glenn Cunningham also served, along with Senators MAGNUSON, HART, MCGEE, and HRUSKA, and former Senator Thruston Morton, and five public members. From 1964 to 1966 this Commission conducted the most far-reaching investigation ever made into the operations of the Nation's food industry, from farm gate to supermarket shelf and checkout counter. The work of the Commission gave us the best and most reliable economic information ever made available about the food industry, on profit margins, advertising costs, price spreads, middleman costs, and so on. This information has been of invaluable help to the Congress, to Government agencies, to businessmen, and consumers and has been used and cited over and over again by Government and private economists in establishing or recommending economic policy in food distribution.

The report and 10 technical studies were not filed and forgotten. They were widely used. I also served on the National Commission to Study Mortgage Interest Rates. As in the case of the Food Marketing Commission, the members of this Commission disagreed on specific recommendations but there was complete agreement on the great value of the basic data assembled in the study. That data formed the basis for important subsequent legislation. But, as I remember, we had to extend the life of the Mortgage

Interest Rate Commission because we could not complete the work within the time originally estimated.

The main justification for the creation of any national study commission is not to have a few Members of Congress and a few outsiders sit around a table and debate policy issues based on their own predilections or hunches or prejudices or ideas, but to dig through all of the available information in the field and find out what gaps there are in this information which need fillings in and fleshing out, and then obtaining that information so that when Congress does legislate on a complex issue, it has the kind of facts necessary to make informed judgments. This is particularly important in an area such as the \$138 billion consumer credit industry, on which so much of the private enterprise of the United States depends for distribution of its goods and services; in addition, there is more than \$300 billion of residential real estate credit outstanding, in one-to-four family units, most of which is issued subject to the provisions of the Truth in Lending Act and thus within the purview of the National Commission on Consumer Finance.

So we are dealing here with the economic lifeblood of our competitive enterprise system. The work is of vital importance to every one who uses credit, or extends credit, and to the Congress, to the executive agencies which administer programs involving such credit, to the legislatures of all of the States, and to the general public.

When we were working in 1967 on the drafting of the bill which became the Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1968—one of the most important consumer laws ever enacted—I included in the original bill a number of provisions dealing with the regulation of creditor-debtor relationships in areas which were then covered only in State laws. The State laws varied so widely that there was truly a chaotic situation for creditors operating nationally. The States themselves recognized this problem and attempted to solve it through the development of a proposed uniform consumer credit code. But the more I looked into this problem, the more impressed I became with the lack of reliable statistics and basic information on how the credit industry actually functions in the respective States and how many gaps there were in our knowledge.

Remembering the work done by the National Commission on Food Marketing between 1964 and 1966, in assembling such heretofore unavailable information in that field, I included in the draft of the consumer credit protection bill a title creating the National Commission on Consumer Finance, and this was agreed to by five subcommittee cosponsors on the bill, Congressmen GONZALEZ, MINISH, ANNUNZIO, BINGHAM, and HALPERN. The House later confirmed this proposal when we debated the consumer credit protection bill, and the Senate conferees also agreed to it. So it was an integral part of the Consumer Credit Protection Act from its inception. In conference on the consumer credit protection bill, we had to make many compromises on House-passed provisions of the truth-in-lending title of the bill, so

we assigned to the National Commission additional responsibilities to research and evaluate these compromises in truth-in-lending legislation to see whether they would reduce the effectiveness of truth in lending or whether they would be justified in operation—such things as exemptions from truth in lending annual percentage rate disclosure of certain minimum charges for both revolving and installment credit, the special exemption for utilities late charges, and so on. But basically, the Commission's assignment was to establish an encyclopedia of factual economic data on how credit is extended, who receives credit and under what terms and conditions, the impact on credit availability of State usury laws and creditor remedies which vary widely from State to State, and the role of finance companies and small loan companies in the overall credit picture.

There are now pending before the Banking and Currency Committee numerous bills to expand or amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act which are very controversial. No one is more anxious that I am, as the principal sponsor of that law, to speed the work of the National Commission so that we may have available for the committee's deliberations the kind of economic data we need in order to act intelligently on some of these additional proposals.

However, the National Commission was plagued with delays in getting started. Although authorized in 1968, it was not made operative until 2 years later. The estimated cost of \$1,500,000 which we set in 1967—when the bill creating the Commission was written—was based on the money actually spent by the National Commission on Food Marketing. Despite the fact that average Government salaries have risen 40 percent since 1967, and printing costs more than 50 percent, we tried our best to keep within the same figure as the Food Marketing Commission. But unanticipated delays within the Census Bureau in structuring and carrying out the most important study undertaken by the Commission, and unanticipatable increases in the cost of that study, which doubled and then nearly tripled during the course of the work, have made it necessary for us to ask for this 6 months' extension, until December 31, and for an increase of \$500,000 in the authorization for appropriations to cover the extra cost of the census work, the printing of the reports, and staff salaries and rent for the remaining period.

The surveys undertaken by the Commission are now being put into form for the Commission's review and for our policy determinations in deciding upon our eventual recommendations. We cannot report, as scheduled, by July 1. We must have this additional 6 months. Otherwise, much of the \$1,500,000 already spent or committed would be for material which is not yet in usable form.

The Commission consists of Representatives GONZALEZ and WILLIAMS and myself, from the House, Senators SPARKMAN, PROXMIRE, and BROCK, and three public members, Chairman Ira M. Millstein of New York, Dr. Robert W. Johnson of Purdue University, Indiana, and

former Minnesota Attorney General Douglas M. Head. Mr. Head succeeded Prof. Robert Braucher of Harvard Law School, who had been Chairman of the Commission from its organization in 1970 until his appointment last year to the Supreme Court of Massachusetts.

All of the public members were appointed by President Nixon. The congressional delegation is bipartisan. Among congressional Members who have served on the Commission are Chairman PATMAN of the Committee on Banking and Currency, Congressman HALPERN, and Senator TOWER. They all helped to develop the basic approaches the Commission has taken. Congresswoman DWYER and Senator BROOKE were appointed to the Commission during the 90th Congress but the Commission did not begin to function until the second session of the 91st Congress.

The Commission, through its public hearings, has already accomplished very significant improvements in consumer credit practices. These include the elimination of a debtor's prison provision from Maine law, under which individuals were still being sent to jail for debt as recently as 1 or 2 years ago; the curtailment of "flipping" practices operating in some States where small debts were pyramided into very large ones by unconscionable added fees and charges; action by the FCC to end harassment of debtors by collection agencies calling at all hours of the day or night; and exposure of other reprehensible procedures practices on the poorly educated, low-income borrower. We also brought about a coordination of the work of the Federal and State bank regulatory agencies in investigating violations of both Federal and State consumer protection laws during their periodic examinations. And in recent hearings we spotlighted—and thus, I hope, have speeded the correction of—untenable and outmoded discriminations against working women in obtaining credit which they are fully qualified to handle.

But our biggest task remains unfinished because of the delays in the work contracted out to the Census Bureau for basic data gathering. This particular survey will show in documented detail what amounts of credit are being extended in each of the 50 States in all areas of consumer credit—and at what rates; what creditor remedies are used and how they are used and how effective they are in making more credit available to credit-worthy individuals or in reducing the availability of credit. As a result of this study, when we talk about creditor remedies and consumer defenses in the consumer credit field, we will have for the first time the facts to show whether low ceilings on credit terms result in higher prices for goods, whether high ceilings on credit rates encourage competition in actual rates or lead to everyone charging the maximum, to what extent garnishment is used and by whom, the necessity, or lack of it, of the "holder in due course" doctrine in making credit available, the role of confession of judgment notes in actual transactions, and so on and on.

I might point out that one of the reasons the Census Bureau took much longer than expected in developing the data we

asked it to obtain was that the response from the credit industry to the questionnaires was unusually heavy—up to 90 percent of those contacted, and in some fields of credit the response was as high as 98 percent. Normally, a 60-percent response is considered excellent. The high response added to the cost of the survey, but it also increased the accuracy and scope of the information obtained. So it has been worth the expense. The credit industry's cooperation and assistance have been excellent, reflecting the fact that the information which will finally come from the Commission will be of great importance to creditors as well as to consumers.

Ahead of us yet are many long hours of Commission deliberation on the meaning and legislative implication of the facts we are developing. That six Members of Congress, four of whom are candidates for reelection this year, are willing to devote the additional time through the fall and early winter that this assignment is going to require from us is certainly evidence of the fact that we consider the work vitally important in the national interest.

So I respectfully ask, Mr. Speaker, that the House agree to this Senate-passed joint resolution and permit the work to go forward to its conclusion by the end of this year.

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

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I will be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Do we now have assurance that this report, with the expenditure of another half a million dollars, will be completed and made available by the end of this year?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. We are certain that we will complete the work by then, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa. The Census Bureau gave the commission an estimate that fell far short. This is the first time a survey of this type was ever done by them. It took much longer than Census had expected and it cost far more than estimated.

At first we were given one figure and then it was nearly doubled and later went up to almost three times the original amount the Census intended to charge us in compiling these figures. That is the big reason for the fact that we must have an extension of time and more money, plus the fact that they have gone so deeply into this. It is such a tremendous job they could not bring the data back to the commission members in time for us to be able to digest it, and have the report written by this July 1.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentlewoman will yield further, we may be assured that the report will be evaluated and ready by the end of this year, is that right, without additional expenditure?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. That is right. I can assure the gentleman that is so.

Mr. GROSS. One minor observation. Apparently there is a Member of this House with whom I am not acquainted whose name is on this report, Mr. P-A-T-N-A-M.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I am not sure what the gentleman from Iowa means.

Mr. GROSS. On the first page of the report.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I now see what the gentleman is referring to, a typographical error on the committee report. I see that Mr. PATMAN's name was misspelled.

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

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to concur with the answer of the gentleman from Missouri that the report will be ready by the end of this year. The fact of the matter is that almost all of the chapters have been completed in rough draft, and they have to be revised. We are truly going down the home-stretch, and this is not something that is going to drag on. I am sure that the \$500,000 will be enough to complete the job, and we will have the report ready by the end of this year.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 211. When we went into the hearings before the Consumer Affairs Subcommittee on Senate Joint Resolution 211, I was somewhat skeptical, just as the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) apparently was, but I was impressed with the testimony of the witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee, especially the chairman of the committee, Mr. Ira M. Millstein. And we were assured that all of the studies would be completed by the end of the year, and that the Commission is not initiating any new inquiries or any new studies. It is merely completing the studies which have already been commenced, and for reasons, as stated by the gentleman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN) have been delayed.

This Commission on National Consumer Finance has done in my judgment an outstanding job.

In fact, I think it is fair to say that the need for the additional amounts of time and money provided by this resolution are the results of the commission's successes. I think it is important that we study all aspects of credit extensions, who extends the credit, to whom it is extended, whether there are discriminatory practices, if any, in the lending business, the various types of credit being extended, who collects the debts, how they are being collected, garnishment procedures, and so forth. All of these things are being taken into account and being studied by the Consumer Finance Commission.

Mr. Speaker, the Commission's achievements in the collection of information relative to the extension, uses, and abuses of consumer credit will be of immeasurable help to the Congress and the administration in the formulation of laws and regulations. In an economy which uses billions of dollars of credit annually we cannot afford to be without such sound factual information about its use. Recognizing this, both those who use credit, and those who extend it, have cooperated with the Commission to such an extent that it has been overwhelmed. The extension of the Commission's life by 6 months, and the provision of an additional \$500,000 are necessary if the valuable information the Commission has collected to date are to be put in usable

form for us. As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee I know how badly this information is needed. It can provide the basis for uniformity of information so a consumer can shop intelligently which is the real purpose of the original legislation. Again, I urge favorable consideration of the resolution.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate Joint Resolution 211.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate Joint Resolution 211.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS' COMPENSATION AND RELIEF ACT OF 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 15439) to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of compensation for disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 15439

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Veterans' Compensation and Relief Act of 1972".

TITLE I—COMPENSATION AND OTHER BENEFITS

SEC. 101. (a) Section 314 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

- (1) by striking out "\$25" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$28";
- (2) by striking out "\$46" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$51";
- (3) by striking out "\$70" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$77";
- (4) by striking out "\$96" in subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$106";
- (5) by striking out "\$135" in subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$149";
- (6) by striking out "\$163" in subsection (f) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$179";
- (7) by striking out "\$193" in subsection (g) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$212";
- (8) by striking out "\$223" in subsection (h) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$245";
- (9) by striking out "\$250" in subsection (i) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$275";
- (10) by striking out "\$450" in subsection (j) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$495";
- (11) by striking out "\$500" and "\$784" in subsection (k) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$616" and "\$862", respectively;
- (12) by striking out "\$560" in subsection (l) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$616";
- (13) by striking out "\$616" in subsection (m) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$678";
- (14) by striking out "\$700" in subsection (n) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$770";
- (15) by striking out "\$784" in subsections

(o) and (p) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$862";

(16) by striking out "\$336" in subsection (r) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$370"; and

(17) by striking out "\$504" in subsection (s) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$554".

(b) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may adjust administratively, consistent with the increases authorized by this section, the rates of disability compensation payable to persons within the purview of section 10 of Public Law 85-857 who are not in receipt of compensation payable pursuant to chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 102. Section 315(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "\$28" in subparagraph (A) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$31";

(2) by striking out "\$48" in subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$53";

(3) by striking out "\$61" in subparagraph (C) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$67";

(4) by striking out "\$75" and "\$14" in subparagraph (D) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$83" and "\$15", respectively;

(5) by striking out "\$19" in subparagraph (E) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$21";

(6) by striking out "\$33" in subparagraph (F) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$36";

(7) by striking out "\$48" and "\$14" in subparagraph (G) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$53" and "\$15", respectively;

(8) by striking out "\$23" in subparagraph (H) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$25"; and

(9) by striking out "\$44" in subparagraph (I) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$48".

SEC. 103. (a) Chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 362. Clothing allowance

"The Administrator under regulations which he shall prescribe, shall pay a clothing allowance of \$150 per year to each veteran who because of disability which is compensable under the provisions of this chapter, wears or uses a prosthetic or orthopedic appliance or appliances (including a wheelchair) which the Administrator determines tends to wear out or tear the clothing of such a veteran."

(b) The analysis of such chapter 11 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"§ 362. Clothing allowance."

SEC. 104. (a) Subsection (a) of section 3203 of title 38, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) Subsection (d) of such section 3203 is redesignated as subsection (a) of such section 3203.

(c) Paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b) of such section 3203 are redesignated as paragraph (1) and as so redesignated are amended to read as follows:

"(b) (1) In any case in which a veteran having neither wife nor child is being furnished hospital treatment, institutional or domiciliary care without charge or otherwise by the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, is rated by the Veterans' Administration in accordance with regulations as being incompetent by reason of mental illness, and his estate from any source equals or exceeds \$1,500, further payments of pension, compensation, or emergency officers' retirement pay shall not be made until the estate is reduced to \$500. The amount which would be payable but for this paragraph shall be paid to the veteran in a lump sum; however, no payment of a lump sum herein authorized shall be made to the veteran until after the expiration of six months following a finding of competency and in the event of the veteran's death before payment of such lump sum no part thereof shall be payable."

(d) Paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (b) of such section 3203 are redesignated as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively; and the references in said redesignated paragraph (2) to "paragraph (2)" and "Paragraph (2)" are

changed to "paragraph (1)" and "Paragraph (1)", respectively.

(e) Subsection (c) of such section 3203 is amended by deleting "(a) or".

(f) Subsection (e) of such section 3203 is amended by deleting "compensation, or retirement pay"; and as so amended is redesignated as subsection (d).

(g) Subsection (f) of such section 3203 is redesignated as subsection (e).

SEC. 105. (a) Subsection (d) of section 3202 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "No payment shall be made under the two preceding sentences of this subsection unless claim therefor is filed with the Veterans' Administration within five years after the death of the veteran, except that, if any person so entitled under said two sentences is under legal disability at the time of death of the veteran, such five-year period of limitation shall run from the termination or removal of the legal disability."

(b) Section 3021(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting "section 3203(a)(2)(A) of this title and".

SEC. 106. All compensation or retirement pay which is being withheld pursuant to the provisions of subsections (a) and (b)(1) of section 3203, title 38, United States Code, in effect on the day before the effective date of this Act, shall be paid to the veteran, if competent, in a lump sum. If the veteran is incompetent, the withheld amounts shall be paid in a lump sum, or successive lump sums, subject to the \$1,500 and \$500 limitations of subsection (b)(1) of such section 3203 as amended by this Act. If a competent veteran dies before payment is made the withheld amounts shall be paid according to the order of precedence, and subject to the time limitation, of subsection (a)(2) of such section 3203 in effect the day before the effective date of this Act. In the event of the death of an incompetent veteran before payment of all withheld amounts, no part of the remainder shall be payable.

SEC. 107. Section 536 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(d)(1) Any widow eligible for pension under this section shall, if she so elects, be paid pension at the rates prescribed by section 541 of this title, and under the conditions (other than the service requirements) applicable to pension paid under that section to widows of veterans of World War I. If pension is paid pursuant to such an election, the election shall be irrevocable, except as provided in paragraph (2).

"(2) The Administrator shall pay each month to the widow of each Spanish-American War veteran who is receiving, or entitled to receive, pension based on a need of regular aid and attendance, whichever amount is greater (A) that which is payable to her under subsections (a) and (b) of this section as increased by section 544 of this title; or (B) that which is payable under section 541 of this title, as increased by such section 544, to a widow of a World War I veteran with the same annual income and corpus of estate. Each change in the amount of pension required by this paragraph shall be effective as of the first day of the month during which the facts of the particular case warrant such change, and shall be made without specific application therefor."

TITLE II—RELIEF FROM ADMINISTRATIVE ERROR, OVERPAYMENTS, AND FORFEITURE

SEC. 201. Section 210(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding an additional subsection (3), reading as follows:

"(3) If the Administrator determines that any veteran, widow, child of a veteran, or other person, has suffered loss as a consequence of reliance upon a determination by the Veterans' Administration of eligibility or entitlement to benefits, without knowledge that it was erroneously made, he is authorized to provide such relief on account

of such error as he determines equitable, including the payment of moneys to any person whom he determines equitably entitled thereto."

SEC. 202. (a) Section 3102 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3102. Waiver of recovery of claims by the United States

"(a) There shall be no recovery of payments or overpayments of any benefits under any of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration whenever the Administrator determines that recovery would be against equity and good conscience, if an application for relief is made within two years from the date of notification of the indebtedness by the Administrator to the payee.

"(b) With respect to any loan guaranteed, insured, or made under chapter 37 of this title, the Administrator may waive payment of an indebtedness to the Veterans' Administration by the veteran (as defined in sections 101 and 1801), or his spouse, following default and loss of the property, where the Administrator determines that collection of such indebtedness would be against equity and good conscience.

"(c) The Administrator may not exercise his authority under subsection (a) or (b) of this section to waive recovery of any payment or the collection of any indebtedness if, in his opinion, there exists in connection with the claim for such waiver an indication of fraud, misrepresentation, material fault, or lack of good faith on the part of the person or persons having an interest in obtaining a waiver of such recovery or the collection of such indebtedness.

"(d) No certifying or disbursing officer shall be liable for any amount paid to any person where the recovery of such amount is waived under subsection (a) or (b).

"(e) Where the recovery of a payment or overpayment made from the National Service Life Insurance Fund or United States Government Life Insurance Fund is waived under this section, the fund from which the payment was made shall be reimbursed from the National Service Life Insurance appropriation or the military and naval insurance appropriation, as applicable."

(b) The waiver authority provided by section 3102(a) of title 38, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a) of this section shall apply to improper payments, overpayments, and indebtedness established by the Administrator prior to the effective date of this Act if application for relief was pending on the date of enactment of this Act, or such an application is made within two years from the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 203. The analysis of chapter 53 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking therefrom "3102. Waiver of recovery of overpayments." and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"3102. Waiver of recovery of claims by the United States."

SEC. 204. Section 1817 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately before "Whenever any veteran" and by adding a new subsection (b) as follows:

"(b) If any veteran disposes of residential property securing a guaranteed, insured, or direct loan obtained by him under this chapter without receiving a release from liability with respect to such loan under subsection (a), and a default subsequently occurs which results in liability of the veteran to the Administrator on account of the loan, the Administrator may relieve the veteran of such liability if he determines, after such investigation as he deems appropriate, that the property was disposed of by the veteran in such a manner, and subject to such conditions, that the Administrator would have issued the veteran a release from liability under subsection (a) with respect to the loan if the veteran had made appli-

cation therefor incident to such disposal. Failure of a transferee to assume by contract all of the liabilities of the original veteran-borrower shall bar such release of liability only in cases in which no acceptable transferee, either immediate or remote, is legally liable to the Administrator for the indebtedness of the original veteran-borrower arising from termination of the loan. The failure of a veteran to qualify for release from liability under this subsection does not preclude relief from being granted under subsection 3102(b) of this title, if eligible thereunder."

SEC. 205. Section 1820(a)(4) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out that part of the section beginning with "and the authority to waive" and ending with "a severe hardship upon the veteran";

"SEC. 206. Subsection (d) of section 3503 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(d)" and adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) The Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to review all cases in which, because of a false or fraudulent affidavit, declaration, certificate, statement, voucher, or paper, a forfeiture of gratuitous benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration was imposed, pursuant to this section or prior provisions of law, on or before September 1, 1959. In any such case in which he determines that the forfeiture would not have been imposed under the provisions of this section in effect after September 1, 1959, he shall remit the forfeiture, effective the date of enactment of this amendatory Act. Benefits to which the individual concerned becomes eligible by virtue of any such remission may be awarded, upon application therefor, and the effective date of any award of compensation, dependency and indemnity compensation, or pension made in such a case shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of section 3010(g) of this title."

TITLE III—EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 301. (a) Sections 101 through 107 of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month which begins after the date of enactment.

(b) Sections 201 through 206 of this Act shall take effect upon the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from California (Mr. TEAGUE) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the first of two veterans' bills which we are considering today was developed, after 2 days of open hearings, by our very diligent and capable Subcommittee on Compensation and Pension headed by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DORN). I wish to commend him and his fellow members, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS), the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY), the

gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR), and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

H.R. 15439 is basically a disability compensation increase bill, but it also provides for the first time an annual clothing allowance for service-disabled veterans who must wear or use a prosthetic or orthopedic appliance and, finally, it embodies several recommendations made by the Veterans' Administration for improvements in our various veterans' benefit programs.

I yield such time as he may desire to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the kind remarks of the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Texas, concerning the activities of our Subcommittee on Compensation and Pension which were only possible, of course, through his full cooperation and support.

The major purpose of H.R. 15439 is to increase the rates of disability compensation payable to service-connected disabled veterans by 10 percent. While the Veterans' Administration recommended a 6-percent bill, this was based on price indexes up to last January. As we are now midway in June and additional time will be involved before the law is finally approved and even further time before the new rates become effective, our committee felt that a 10-percent figure is both reasonable and justified. The first year's additional cost is estimated at \$260 million.

The bill would also authorize for the first time a clothing allowance of \$150 per year for veterans who must wear or use a prosthetic or orthopedic appliance, including the use of a wheelchair, which the Administrator determines

tends to wear out or tear the clothing of the veteran. This provision was strongly supported by practically all of the veterans' organizations who testified at our hearing. The cost has been estimated at \$6.6 million the first year.

The following additional provisions were either specifically recommended by the Veterans' Administration or were the subject of a no objection position:

First, abolish the withholding, after 6 months, of compensation of single veterans while they are in a hospital or domiciliary. This was recommended by the Veterans' Administration and there is no cost involved.

Second, extend to Spanish War widows the option to elect, if to their benefit, to receive pension under the "new" pension law we enacted in 1959, now available to widows of veterans of World Wars I and II, the Korean conflict, and Vietnam era. The Spanish War veterans themselves have had this option since 1960 and the failure to include their widows was obviously inadvertent. The Veterans' Administration does not object to this provision and the cost would probably not be significant.

Third, existing law authorizes the Administrator to extend certain relief in cases where veterans or their dependents have been denied benefits because of administrative error. This provision liberalizes the existing authority, is recommended by the Veterans' Administration, and the cost would be insignificant.

Fourth, this provision liberalizes and simplifies the authority of the Veterans' Administration to waive recovery of overpayments. It also liberalizes a veteran's release from liability under loan guaranty when he has disposed of the property. I am sure many of my fellow Members have run into hardship cases in this area and we are pleased to note that the

Veterans' Administration has recommended this long-overdue change in the law.

Fifth, this final provision would authorize the Administrator to review all forfeiture for fraud cases which had been applied prior to September 1, 1959. On that date the law was changed to abolish forfeitures for fraud under the rationale that since criminal statutes were also applicable the administrative forfeiture was, in effect, a double penalty. Unfortunately, the 1959 law was prospective in effect only. This proposal is also recommended by the Veterans' Administration and they are unable to estimate the cost.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 15439 carries the joint sponsorship of 25 members of our committee.

I believe it represents a reasonable and fully justified increase in the rates of monthly compensation payable to our service-connected disabled veterans—a group which deserves our prime consideration. I strongly recommend approval of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, under consent previously granted, I include at this point in my remarks a detailed explanation of the various provisions of the bill, together with relevant statistical data which I believe will be of interest to the Members:

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

TITLE I—COMPENSATION AND OTHER BENEFITS

Sections 101 and 102

These sections provide the new increased rates of disability compensation and additional allowances for dependents previously discussed. There follows at this point a chart showing the history of wartime service-connected compensation increases since the modern program was instituted in 1933, up to and including the rates payable under current law, and finally, the increased rates for each category proposed by the bill.

HISTORY OF WARTIME SERVICE-CONNECTED COMPENSATION¹ INCREASES FOR DISABLED VETERANS,² JULY 1, 1933 THROUGH JULY 1, 1970

Disability ¹	July 1, 1933	Percent increase	Jan. 19, 1934	Percent increase	P.L. 312, 78th Cong., June 1, 1944	P.L. 182, 79th Cong., Oct. 1, 1945	Percent increase	P.L. 662, 86th Cong., Sept. 1, 1946	Percent increase	P.L. 339, 81st Cong., Dec. 1, 1949	Percent increase	P.L. 356, 82d Cong., July 1, 1952	Percent increase	P.L. 427, 82d Cong., Aug. 1, 1952
(a) Rated at 10 percent ¹	\$9	11.1	\$10	15	\$11.50	20	\$13.80	8.7	\$15	5	\$15.75	5		
(b) Rated at 20 percent ¹	18	11.1	20	15	23.00	20	27.60	8.7	30	5	31.50	5		
(c) Rated at 30 percent ¹	27	11.1	30	15	34.50	20	41.40	8.7	45	5	47.25	5		
(d) Rated at 40 percent ¹	36	11.1	40	15	46.00	20	55.20	8.7	60	5	63.00	5		
(e) Rated at 50 percent ¹	45	11.1	50	15	57.50	20	69.00	8.7	75	15	86.25	15		
(f) Rated at 60 percent ¹	54	11.1	60	15	69.00	20	82.80	8.7	90	15	103.50	15		
(g) Rated at 70 percent ¹	63	11.1	70	15	80.50	20	96.60	8.7	105	15	120.75	15		
(h) Rated at 80 percent ¹	72	11.1	80	15	92.00	20	110.40	8.7	120	15	138.00	15		
(i) Rated at 90 percent ¹	81	11.1	90	15	103.50	20	124.20	8.7	135	15	155.25	15		
(j) Rated at total	90	11.1	100	15	115.00	20	138.00	8.7	150	15	172.50	15		
(k) (1) Additional monthly payment for anatomical loss or loss of use of, any of these organs: 1 foot, 1 hand, blindness in 1 eye (having light perception only), 1 or more creative organs, both buttocks, organic aphonia (with constant inability to communicate by speech), deafness of both ears (having absence of air and bone conduction)—for each loss ²	\$25		40.0			\$35	20	\$42.00				11.9		\$47
(2) Limit for veterans receiving payments under (a) to (j) above						300						33.3		400
(3) Limit for veterans receiving payments under (i) to (n) below														
(l) Anatomical loss or loss of use of both hands, both feet, 1 foot and 1 hand, blindness in both eyes (5/200 visual acuity or less), permanently bedridden or so helpless as to require regular aid and attendance	150		33.3			200	20	240.00				10.8		266
(m) Anatomical loss or loss of use of 2 extremities so as to prevent natural elbow or knee action with prosthesis in place, blind in both eyes, either with light perception only or rendering veteran so helpless as to require regular aid and attendance	175		34.3			235	20	282.00				11.0		313
(n) Anatomical loss of 2 extremities so near shoulder or hip as to prevent use of prosthesis or anatomical loss of both eyes	200		32.5			265	20	318.00				11.0		353
(o) Disability under conditions entitling veteran to 2 or more of the rates provided in (i) through (n), no condition being considered twice in the determination, or deafness rated at 60 percent or more (impairment of either or both ears service-connected) in combination with total blindness (5/200 visual acuity or less)	250		20.0			300	20	360.00				11.1		400

See footnotes at end of table.

HISTORY OF WARTIME SERVICE-CONNECTED COMPENSATION¹ INCREASES FOR DISABLED VETERANS,² JULY 1, 1933 THROUGH JULY 1, 1970—Continued

Disability ¹	July 1, 1933	Percent increase =	Jan. 19, 1937	Percent increase =	P.L. 312, 78th Cong., June 1, 1944	Percent increase =	P.L. 182, 79th Cong., Oct. 1, 1945	Percent increase =	P.L. 662, 79th Cong., Sept. 1, 1946	Percent increase =	P.L. 339, 81st Cong., Dec. 1, 1949	Percent increase =	P.L. 356, 82d Cong., July 1, 1952	Percent increase =	P.L. 427, 82d Cong., Aug. 1, 1952
(p) (1) If disabilities exceed requirements of any rates prescribed, Administrator of VA may allow next higher rate or an intermediate rate, but in no case may compensation exceed.....							\$300	20	\$360.00					11.1	\$400
(2) Blindness in both eyes (with 5/200 visual acuity or less) together with (a) bilateral deafness rated at 40 percent or more disabling (impairment of either or both ears service-connected) next higher rate is payable, or (b) service-connected total deafness of 1 ear next intermediate rate is payable, but in no event may compensation exceed.....															
(q) Arrested tuberculosis, minimum monthly compensation rate.....															467
(r) If veteran entitled to compensation under (o) or to the maximum rate under (p), and is in need of regular aid and attendance, he shall receive a special allowance of the amount indicated at right for aid and attendance in addition to (o) or (p) rate.....															
(s) Disability rated as total, plus additional disability independently ratable at 60 percent or over, or permanently housebound.....															
Disability ¹	Percent increase =	P.L. 695, 83d Cong., Oct. 1, 1954	Percent increase =	P.L. 85-168, Oct. 1, 1957	Percent increase =	P.L. 87-645, Oct. 1, 1962	Percent increase =	P.L. 89-311, Oct. 31, 1965	Percent increase =	P.L. 90-493, Jan. 1, 1969	Percent increase =	P.L. 91-376, July 1, 1970	Percent increase from July 1, 1933, to July 1, 1970	Rate proposed by H.R. 15439	
(a) Rated at 10 percent ¹	7.9	\$17	11.8	\$19	5.3	\$20	5.0	\$21	9.5	\$23	8.7	\$25	177.8	\$28	
(b) Rated at 20 percent ¹	4.8	33	9.1	36	5.6	38	5.3	40	7.5	43	7.0	46	155.6	51	
(c) Rated at 30 percent ¹	5.8	50	10.0	55	5.5	58	3.4	60	8.3	65	7.7	70	159.3	77	
(d) Rated at 40 percent ¹	4.8	66	10.6	73	5.5	77	6.6	82	8.5	89	7.9	96	166.7	106	
(e) Rated at 50 percent ¹	5.5	91	9.9	100	7.0	107	5.6	113	8.0	122	10.7	135	200.0	149	
(f) Rated at 60 percent ¹	5.3	109	10.1	120	6.7	128	6.3	136	8.1	147	10.9	163	201.9	179	
(g) Rated at 70 percent ¹	5.2	127	10.2	140	6.4	149	7.4	161	8.1	174	10.9	193	206.3	212	
(h) Rated at 80 percent ¹	5.0	145	10.3	160	6.3	170	9.4	186	8.1	201	10.9	223	209.7	245	
(i) Rated at 90 percent ¹	5.0	163	9.8	179	6.7	191	9.4	209	8.1	226	10.6	250	208.6	275	
(j) Rated at total ¹	4.9	181	24.3	225	11.1	250	20.0	300	33.3	400	12.5	450	400.0	495	
(k) (1) Additional monthly payment for anatomical loss or loss of use of, any of these organs: 1 foot, 1 hand, blindness in 1 eye (having light perception only), 1 or more creative organs, both buttocks, organic aphonia (with constant inability to communicate by speech), deafness of both ears (having absence of air and bone conduction) — for each loss ³													88.0		
(2) Limit for veterans receiving payments under (a) to (j) above.....															
(3) Limit for veterans receiving payments under (l) to (n) below.....	5.0	420	7.1	450	16.6	525	14.3	600	16.6	700	12.0	784		616	
(l) Anatomical loss or loss of use of both hands, both feet, 1 foot and 1 hand, blindness in both eyes (5/200 visual acuity or less), permanently bedridden or so helpless as to require regular aid and attendance.....	4.9	279	10.8	309	10.0	340	17.6	400	25.0	500	12.0	560	273.3	616	
(m) Anatomical loss or loss of use of 2 extremities so as to prevent natural elbow or knee action with prosthesis in place, blind in both eyes, either with light perception only or rendering veteran so helpless as to require regular aid and attendance.....	5.1	329	9.1	359	8.6	390	15.4	450	22.2	550	12.0	616	252.0	678	
(n) Anatomical loss of 2 extremities so near shoulder or hip as to prevent use of prosthesis or anatomical loss of both eyes.....	5.1	371	8.1	401	9.7	440	19.3	525	19.0	625	12.0	700	250.0	770	
(o) Disability under conditions entitling veteran to 2 or more of the rates provided in (l) through (n), no condition being considered twice in the determination, or deafness rated at 60 percent or more (impairment of either or both ears service-connected) in combination with total blindness (5/200 visual acuity or less).....	5.0	420	7.1	450	16.7	525	14.3	600	16.7	700	12.0	784	213.6	862	
(p) (1) If disabilities exceed requirements of any rates prescribed, Administrator of VA may allow next higher rate or an intermediate rate, but in no case may compensation exceed.....	5.0	420	7.1	450	16.7	525	14.3	600	16.7	700	12.0	784		862	
(2) Blindness in both eyes (with 5/200 visual acuity or less) together with (a) bilateral deafness rated at 40 percent or more disabling (impairment of either or both ears service-connected) next higher rate is payable, or (b) service-connected total deafness of 1 ear next intermediate rate is payable, but in no event may compensation exceed.....								600	16.7	700	12.0	784		862	
(q) Arrested tuberculosis, minimum monthly compensation rate.....															
(r) If veteran entitled to compensation under (o) or to the maximum rate under (p), and is in need of regular aid and attendance, he shall receive a special allowance of the amount indicated at right for aid and attendance in addition to (o) or (p) rate.....				150	33.3	200	25.0	250	20.0	300	12.0	336		370	
(s) Disability rated as total, plus additional disability independently ratable at 60 percent or over, or permanently housebound.....				265	9.4	290	20.7	350	28.6	450	12.0	504		554	

ADDITIONAL FOR DEPENDENTS* (NONE IF DISABILITY LESS THAN 50 PERCENT IN DEGREE)

Degree of disability	Wife only	Wife, 1 child	Wife, 2 children	Wife, 3 children	No wife, 1 child	No wife, 2 children	No wife, 3 children	Dependent parent or parents (each)
50 percent.....	\$14	\$24	\$31	\$38	\$10	\$17	\$24	\$12
60 percent.....	17	29	37	45	11	20	29	14
70 percent.....	20	34	43	53	13	23	34	16
80 percent.....	22	38	49	60	15	26	38	18
90 percent.....	25	43	55	68	17	30	43	21
100 percent.....	28	48	61	75	19	33	48	23

¹ The basic rates payable for those 10 percent through 100 percent disabled, subsection (a) through (j), may be increased if the veteran qualifies for additional payments listed in subsection (k) or (q), and if veteran is 50 percent or more disabled, the following additional amounts are payable for dependents:

² Rates for wartime service. Rates for peacetime are 80 percent of wartime rate.

³ Payment generally made for 1 loss only, until enactment of Public Law 90-77, effective Oct. 1, 1967, which permitted payment to be made for each loss, to a maximum monthly payment of \$500 per month.

⁴ Veterans who have active tuberculosis are rated as totally disabled, and receive compensation at the 100 percent rate. When the disease becomes inactive, the degree of disability is reduced over a period of several years, so that after it has been inactive for at least 6 years, the veteran receives the monthly payment of \$67. Public Law 90-493 repealed subsection (q) on Aug. 19, 1968, with a savings provision under which any veteran who was receiving or entitled to receive the \$67 minimum on that date continues to receive this payment.

⁵ In lieu of foregoing rates for children, \$44 monthly is payable to 100 percent disabled veterans (proportionate amounts for veterans disabled 50 to 60 percent for each child age 18 to 23 who is pursuing course of instruction at approved educational institution.

⁶ \$14 for each additional child of 100 percent disabled veterans (proportionate amounts for disabled 50 to 90 percent).

Section 103

This section provides, for the first time, a clothing allowance of \$150 per year to each veteran who, because of a service-connected disability which is compensable, wears a prosthetic or orthopedic appliance or uses an appliance or device (including a wheelchair) which the Administrator determines tends to wear out or tear the clothing of such veteran.

For many years various veterans' groups have urged such an allowance and have cited specific examples of the added expense for torn and worn clothing which has to be borne by so many of the amputees, paraplegics and others who suffer such crippling disabilities. The VA has pointed out that under existing law (38 U.S.C. 623) it may furnish "special clothing made necessary by the wearing of prosthetic appliances" to veterans entitled to medical services from the VA. However, this applies only to special clothing and it has been interesting to learn that only about 200 cases were benefited by this provision last year at a total cost of less than \$4,000. The Committee is persuaded that adequate justification has been presented for including this new benefit in the bill.

Sections 104, 105, and 106

For many years the law has provided that where a single veteran is furnished hospital treatment or domiciliary care by the VA his disability compensation or retirement pay shall be reduced after the first 6 months of treatment or care to \$30 monthly or 50 percent of the benefit, whichever is greater. Upon authorized release from such treatment or care, however, the veteran is paid in a lump sum the amount by which his benefit was reduced.

Time and experience have shown that the withholding of compensation and retirement pay in the case of a single hospitalized veteran has caused undue hardship, since his needs are not necessarily substantially met merely because he is receiving bed and board from the Veterans' Administration. While such withheld amounts are payable to him upon release from hospitalization, there exists the temporary dislocation and possible inability to satisfy continuing obligations caused by his reduced income while hospitalized. Even though hospitalized, the single veteran has continuing obligations, such as payments on a house, rent, furniture, automobile, etc. These expenses often cannot be met while he receives reduced benefits. Thus, the current system often leaves a veteran with the difficult choice of remaining in the hospital until well, and losing his home and personal possessions, or of leaving the hospital prematurely in order to meet his continuing obligations.

The Committee agrees with the Veterans' Administration that considering all aspects the withholding provision does not in general serve the best interest of the single hospitalized veterans concerned and, moreover, does not justify the administrative costs involved. Accordingly, the mentioned withholding authorization is abolished.

SECTION 107

In 1959, by Public Law 86-211, the Congress established the so-called "new" pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II and the Korean Conflict, and their widows and children. This law was effective January 1, 1960. Shortly thereafter (Public Law 86-670), a law was enacted to permit veterans of the Indian Wars and the Spanish American War to make an irrevocable decision, if they felt it to be to their advantage, to receive pension under the "new" law rather than under their separate pension programs. Apparently, through an inadvertence, the widows of such deceased veterans were not afforded the same opportunity. This section of the bill would extend to Spanish

American War widows the same right of election which has been the privilege of veterans of the earlier wars. It would also extend to such widows in need of aid and attendance the automatic feature which section 111 of Public Law 90-77 provided for veterans of the earlier wars who need aid and attendance. In the case of such veterans, payment of the greater pension is automatic without any action on their part. The Veterans' Administration interposes no objection to this legislation.

TITLE II—RELIEF FROM ADMINISTRATIVE ERROR, OVERPAYMENTS, AND FORFEITURE

Section 201

Since 1966, with the enactment of section 301, Public Law 89-785, the Administrator has been empowered under section 210(c) (2) to provide equitable relief to any person to whom "benefits administered by the Veterans Administration have not been provided by reason of administrative error" by officials or employees of the Government. This provision applies, however, in limited cases and only where basic entitlement to the particular benefit already existed, and where because of administrative error, a claim therefore was improperly denied.

It should be borne in mind that prior to this enactment the only means of providing relief from administrative errors of this sort was by private legislation. This remedy, of course, was time-consuming and burdensome for the Congress.

However, even with the present liberalized provision in section 210(c) (2) there is no authority under which the Administrator may grant any form of relief where the agency has erroneously determined that eligibility existed and a veteran, his dependent or some third person, without knowledge, has relief and changed his position to his detriment. This situation is illustrated by a case involving an erroneous issuance of a certificate of entitlement for an automobile and adaptive equipment for a disabled veteran under chapter 39 where basic entitlement did not in fact exist. The veteran, having applied for and been granted benefits, albeit erroneously, purchases the new car and trades in his old car. The dealer makes delivery of the new car in reliance upon the erroneous certificate. The veteran incurs a further indebtedness which he may not be able to afford and would not have incurred, but for the erroneous issuance by the Veterans Administration of a certificate of eligibility. Other similar situations have arisen resulting in losses to innocent veterans, their dependents, or third parties.

The proposed legislation, contained in this section, and recommended by the Veterans Administration, would permit the Administrator to extend relief to veterans, their dependents, and other innocent third persons, from the consequences of reliance on such an administrative error where loss is suffered without knowledge of the error. The Administrator would be authorized to provide such relief as he determines equitable, including the payment of monies, to the person or persons whom he determines equitably entitled.

The Veterans Administration advises the Committee that the current equitable relief provisions in section 210(c) (2) have been most conservatively construed and applied. The implementing regulations require a personal determination by the Administrator on a recommendation which may originate only with a Department head or other staff official and it must be reviewed by the General Counsel. The Veterans Administration plans to implement this new provision by applying the same restrictive procedures.

Sections 202, 203, 204 and 205

These sections concern another proposal introduced at the request of the Veterans

Administration. They apply to both the general authority in section 3102(a) of title 38, USC, to waive recovery of overpayments, and the authority for waiver of an indebtedness to the Veterans Administration after a default and loss occurs with respect to a loan guaranteed, insured, or made under chapter 37.

Section 3102(a) now provides, in substance, that the Administrator may waive a recovery of payments or overpayments on the basis of a determination that the payee was without fault in creating the overpayment, and either that a recovery would defeat the purpose of benefits or would be against equity and good conscience.

Two basic changes regarding the general waiver authority which would be effected by the first section of the bill are: (1) removal of fault on the part of the payee as a bar to waiver; and (2) deletion of the present alternative standard for waiver—"recovery would defeat the purpose of benefits otherwise authorized". Thus, "equity and good conscience" would remain as the only substantive standard for a waiver of recovery. Equity and good conscience, however, would not apply if, in the opinion of the Administrator, there exists in connection with the request for waiver an indication of fraud, misrepresentation, material fault or lack of good faith on the part of the person or persons having an interest in obtaining a waiver of overpayment or recovery of collections. Except for a minor difference, the waiver authority sought is the same used by the Comptroller General in waiving an indebtedness arising out of overpayment of pay.

The proposed new subsection (b) to be added to section 3102 of title 38 would clarify the Administrator's authority to waive an indebtedness of a veteran or his wife which resulted from a default and loss of the property securing a loan guaranteed, insured, or made to the veteran, and thus, would consolidate the Administrator's waiver authority to apply the single criterion of "equity and good conscience." The Committee is well aware that the interpretative regulations implementing section 1820(a) (4), as amended by Public Law 88-151, have been the subject of continuing controversy. Enactment of this proposal will resolve the matter in a manner which, we believe, will be more acceptable to all concerned.

The purpose of subsection 3(a) of the proposal is to liberalize the authority now contained in section 1817 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the Administrator to release the original veteran-borrower from liability on the Veterans Administration guaranteed, insured, or direct loan after the veteran conveyed title to residential property securing such loan, provided the veteran disposed of the property in a manner which would have qualified him for release if he had applied therefor incident to his sale or transfer of the property. There are many instances where a veteran disposes of property, without applying for a release from liability on the note and mortgage, and the position of the Veterans Administration would be substantially the same as it would have been if he had previously obtained a release from liability to the Government under the present section 1817.

Section 206

This section of the bill, also recommended by the Veterans Administration, would authorize the Administrator to review certain forfeiture actions imposed by the VA prior to September 2, 1959, because of the submission of fraudulent evidence in connection with gratuitous veterans' benefits, and to grant remission of those forfeitures if they would not have been imposed under the law in effect after September 1959.

From 1921 until 1959, the Veterans Administration had authority to administratively forfeit the rights of veterans and dependents to gratuitous VA benefits for the submission of a false or fraudulent statement made in connection therewith. Those provisions of law still appear in section 3503(a) through (c) of title 38, United States Code. This forfeiture for fraud was in addition to the penalties imposed by Federal criminal statutes. In 1959, the law was amended discontinuing the administrative forfeiture for fraud in domestic cases where the person who submitted the fraudulent statement would be subject to criminal prosecution for such act. The change was predicated upon the conclusion that criminal conviction should constitute sufficient penalty.

There were approximately 4,100 forfeitures for fraud prior to 1959. The Veterans Administration has become aware of a number of cases in which the forfeiture penalty,

in retrospect, is obviously too severe. Since the 1959 remedial act is specifically limited to situations arising thereafter, authority would be extended under this proposal to review those cases and grant remission of those forfeitures imposed prior to 1959 which would not be forfeited under the 1959 law. This would, in effect, apply the philosophy of the 1959 enactment so as to cover similar cases which arose prior to that amendment.

TITLE III—EFFECTIVE DATES

Section 301

This section provides that sections 101 through 107 of the Act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month which begins after the date of enactment. Sections 201 through 206 shall take effect upon the date of enactment of the Act.

Cost

The Committee has ascertained the following cost estimates of sections 101 and 102 for the first five years as follows:

		Millions
First year	-----	\$260.0
Second year	-----	262.4
Third year	-----	263.9
Fourth year	-----	264.2
Fifth year	-----	264.4

The Committee has ascertained the following cost estimate of section 103, for the first five years as follows:

		Millions
First year	-----	\$6.6
Second year	-----	6.9
Third year	-----	7.2
Fourth year	-----	7.5
Fifth year	-----	7.8

The Committee has been advised, and concurs in the conclusion, that the remaining sections of the bill will either involve no additional cost or the cost aspects are not ascertainable. In the latter case, however, the Committee is confident that they would be relatively insignificant.

DISABILITY, DEGREE OF IMPAIRMENT, TYPE OF MAJOR DISABILITY, PERIOD OF SERVICE—JUNE 1971

Degree of impairment	Total				Tuberculosis (lungs and pleura)				Psychiatric and neurological diseases				General medical and surgical conditions			
	Number	Percent of total	Monthly value	Average monthly value	Number	Percent of total tuberculosis	Percent of degree of impairment	Average monthly value	Number	Percent of total psychiatric and neurological diseases	Percent of degree of impairment	Average monthly value	Number	Percent of total general medical and surgical conditions	Percent of degree of impairment	Average monthly value
Total	2,146,085	100.0	\$226,113,336	\$105.36	65,541	100.0	3.1	\$121.46	466,987	100.0	21.8	\$174.95	1,613,557	100.0	75.1	\$84.57
No disability	29,211	1.4	1,889,154	64.67	27,289	41.6	93.4	66.04	1,922	0.4	6.6	45.73	1,922	0.1	6.6	45.73
10 percent	846,834	39.5	21,135,993	24.96	1,187	1.8	1	57.47	147,660	31.6	17.4	24.84	697,987	43.3	82.5	24.93
20 percent	332,651	15.5	15,421,774	46.36	9,113	13.9	2.7	65.45	26,221	5.6	7.9	46.82	297,317	18.4	89.4	45.71
30 percent	307,508	14.3	21,628,837	70.34	12,500	19.1	4.1	68.33	80,915	17.3	26.3	69.33	214,093	13.3	69.6	70.83
40 percent	173,405	8.1	17,036,678	98.25	1,690	2.6	1.0	98.49	25,877	5.6	14.9	96.74	145,838	9.0	84.1	98.51
50 percent	110,399	5.1	17,326,556	156.94	3,118	4.8	2.8	153.57	40,254	8.6	36.5	152.50	67,027	4.2	60.7	159.77
60 percent	107,507	5.0	27,420,311	255.06	1,698	2.6	1.6	242.57	18,241	3.9	17.0	223.69	87,568	5.4	81.4	261.83
70 percent	65,152	3.0	20,490,279	314.50	1,362	2.1	2.1	247.90	30,669	6.6	47.1	334.26	33,121	2.1	50.8	298.94
80 percent	34,001	1.6	11,649,669	342.63	2,092	3.2	6.2	286.51	9,029	1.9	26.6	349.91	22,880	1.4	67.2	344.76
90 percent	11,634	.5	4,525,436	388.98	151	.2	1.3	372.13	3,013	.7	25.9	395.07	8,470	.5	72.8	387.12
100 percent	127,783	6.0	67,588,649	528.93	5,341	8.1	4.2	406.73	85,108	18.2	66.6	515.49	37,334	2.3	29.2	566.14
World War I:																
Total	78,261	100.0	12,721,698	162.55	12,100	100.0	15.5	124.89	16,032	100.0	20.5	242.00	50,129	100.0	64.0	146.24
No disability	967	1.2	56,829	58.77	569	4.7	58.8	67.00	398	.8	41.2	47.00	398	.8	41.2	47.00
10 percent	11,715	15.0	362,898	30.98	34	.3	.3	59.74	774	4.8	6.6	31.88	10,907	21.8	93.1	30.82
20 percent	18,670	23.9	1,125,686	60.29	8,486	70.1	45.5	66.38	2,146	13.4	11.5	59.94	8,038	16.0	43.0	53.96
30 percent	10,106	12.9	777,502	76.93	738	6.1	7.3	80.07	1,842	11.5	18.2	77.81	7,526	15.0	74.5	76.41
40 percent	7,774	9.9	818,488	105.29	420	3.5	5.4	107.69	1,315	8.2	16.9	107.48	6,039	12.0	77.7	104.64
50 percent	6,709	8.6	1,020,380	152.09	125	1.0	1.9	151.32	2,373	14.8	35.4	152.19	4,211	8.4	62.7	152.06
60 percent	6,677	8.5	1,840,332	275.62	141	1.2	2.1	340.13	1,065	6.7	16.0	202.05	5,471	10.9	81.9	288.28
70 percent	3,063	3.9	898,062	293.20	49	.4	1.6	270.53	1,093	6.8	35.7	294.33	1,921	3.8	62.7	293.13
80 percent	1,876	2.4	608,583	324.40	23	.2	1.2	320.70	519	3.2	27.7	291.05	1,334	2.7	71.1	337.42
90 percent	411	.5	156,434	380.62	10	.1	2.4	322.70	51	.3	12.4	369.29	350	.7	85.2	383.95
100 percent	10,293	13.2	5,056,504	491.26	1,505	12.4	14.6	473.53	4,854	30.3	47.2	489.06	3,934	7.9	38.2	500.75
World War II:																
Total	1,395,911	100.0	136,989,397	98.14	33,920	100.0	2.4	124.17	317,650	100.0	22.8	154.29	1,044,341	100.0	74.8	80.21
No disability	18,194	1.3	1,202,110	66.07	17,349	51.1	95.4	67.00	115,148	36.3	20.0	25.10	845	.1	4.6	47.00
10 percent	577,561	41.4	14,598,216	25.28	749	2.2	.1	59.10	17,882	5.6	8.5	46.18	461,664	44.3	79.9	25.27
20 percent	210,107	15.0	9,727,147	46.30	425	1.3	.2	66.70	17,882	5.6	8.5	46.18	191,800	18.4	91.3	46.26
30 percent	206,164	14.8	14,675,855	71.19	7,039	20.8	3.4	70.14	58,781	18.6	28.5	70.15	140,344	13.5	68.1	71.67
40 percent	114,401	8.2	11,307,261	98.84	807	2.4	.7	98.20	18,268	5.8	16.0	96.88	95,326	9.1	83.3	99.22
50 percent	70,076	5.0	11,213,598	160.02	1,274	3.7	1.8	163.22	25,515	8.0	36.4	155.96	43,287	4.1	61.8	162.32
60 percent	68,276	4.9	17,601,093	257.79	1,098	3.2	1.6	242.26	11,580	3.6	17.0	222.72	55,598	5.3	81.4	265.41
70 percent	40,166	2.9	12,973,079	322.99	1,104	3.3	2.7	248.32	18,784	5.9	46.8	352.78	20,278	1.9	50.5	299.45
80 percent	21,431	1.5	7,265,946	339.04	1,880	5.5	8.8	289.06	5,462	1.7	25.5	359.99	14,089	1.3	65.7	341.08
90 percent	6,801	.5	2,600,169	382.32	126	.4	1.9	377.77	1,606	.5	23.6	386.35	5,069	.5	74.5	381.16
100 percent	62,734	4.5	33,824,923	539.18	2,069	6.1	3.3	514.62	44,624	14.0	71.1	530.64	16,041	1.5	25.6	566.11
Korean conflict:																
Total	239,606	100.0	28,559,686	119.19	11,452	100.0	4.8	87.91	45,345	100.0	18.9	258.63	182,809	100.0	76.3	89.40
No disability	7,552	3.2	499,890	66.19	7,248	63.3	96.0	67.00	10,521	23.2	12.1	25.35	304	.2	4.0	47.00
10 percent	86,703	36.2	2,223,330	25.64	244	2.1	.3	64.16	2,063	4.5	5.5	46.35	75,938	41.4	87.6	25.56
20 percent	37,186	15.5	1,728,389	46.48	102	.9	.3	66.43	6,519	14.4	19.7	70.31	35,021	19.1	94.2	46.43
30 percent	33,101	13.8	2,377,708	71.83	2,530	22.1	7.6	70.16	2,371	5.2	11.7	98.01	24,052	13.2	72.7	72.42
40 percent	20,215	8.4	2,017,876	99.82	278	2.4	1.4	96.85	3,746	8.3	31.9	163.35	17,566	9.6	86.9	100.11
50 percent	11,732	4.9	1,955,616	166.69	398	3.5	3.4	160.63	2,171	4.8	17.2	248.48	7,588	4.2	64.7	168.66
60 percent	12,656	5.3	3,362,586	265.69	211	1.8	1.7	228.43	3,924	8.7	46.7	356.28	10,274	5.6	81.1	270.09
70 percent	8,416	3.5	2,838,129	337.23	105	.9	1.2	270.00	1,104	2.4	27.3	389.67	4,387	2.4	52.1	321.80
80 percent	4,046	1.7	1,518,384	375.28	78	.7	1.9	320.36	428	.9	28.6	416.46	2,864	1.6	70.8	371.23
90 percent	1,497	.6	610,617	407.89	7	.1	.5	423.00	1,042	.5	23.6	386.35	1,062	.6	70.9	404.34
100 percent	16,502	6.9	9,427,161	571.27	251	2.2	1.5	501.38	12,498	27.6	75.7	560.02	3,753	2.1	22.8	613.42

DISABILITY, DEGREE OF IMPAIRMENT, TYPE OF MAJOR DISABILITY, PERIOD OF SERVICE—JUNE 1971.—Continued

Degree of impairment	Total				Tuberculosis (lungs and pleura)				Psychiatric and neurological diseases				General medical and surgical conditions			
	Number	Percent of total	Monthly value	Average monthly value	Number	Percent of total tuberculosis	Percent of degree of impairment	Average monthly value	Number	Percent of total psychiatric and neurological diseases	Percent of degree of impairment	Average monthly value	Number	Percent of total general medical and surgical conditions	Percent of degree of impairment	Average monthly value
Vietnam era: Total.....	244,567	100.0	\$29,972,703	\$122.55	2,095	100.0	.9	\$297.81	48,391	100.0	19.8	\$204.00	194,081	100.0	79.3	\$100.35
No disability.....	121	.0	5,807	47.99	6	.3	2.5	67.00					115	.1	95.0	47.00
10 percent.....	49,223	38.5	2,382,511	25.29	56	2.7	.1	25.00	11,612	24.0	12.3	25.13	82,555	42.5	87.6	25.31
20 percent.....	38,305	15.7	1,773,985	46.31	10	.5	.0	46.00	2,634	5.4	6.9	46.20	35,661	18.4	93.1	46.32
30 percent.....	30,736	12.6	2,196,534	71.46	42	2.0	.1	70.00	7,626	15.8	24.9	70.42	23,068	11.9	75.1	71.81
40 percent.....	18,722	7.7	1,882,220	100.54	30	1.4	.2	96.00	2,529	5.2	13.5	98.71	16,163	8.3	86.3	100.83
50 percent.....	14,511	5.9	2,190,883	150.98	854	40.8	5.9	151.75	5,142	10.6	35.4	146.05	8,515	4.4	58.7	153.88
60 percent.....	11,194	4.6	2,642,153	236.03	103	4.9	.9	195.84	2,197	4.5	19.6	219.53	8,894	4.6	79.5	240.58
70 percent.....	8,082	3.3	2,347,979	290.52	30	1.4	.4	234.10	3,524	7.3	43.6	286.80	4,528	2.3	56.0	293.78
80 percent.....	4,450	1.8	1,594,460	358.31	11	.5	.3	325.18	1,296	2.7	29.1	356.20	3,143	1.6	70.6	359.29
90 percent.....	2,275	.9	938,307	412.44	1	.0	.0	293.00	752	1.6	33.1	417.65	1,522	.8	66.9	409.95
100 percent.....	21,948	9.0	12,017,864	547.56	952	45.5	4.3	478.11	11,079	22.9	50.5	510.17	9,917	5.1	45.2	596.00
Regular Establishment: Total.....	187,712	100.0	17,857,906	95.13	5,973	100.0	3.2	101.49	39,564	100.0	21.1	195.29	142,175	100.0	75.7	67.00
No disability.....	2,377	1.3	124,518	52.38	2,117	35.5	89.1	54.23					260	.2	10.9	37.60
10 percent.....	76,631	40.9	1,569,013	20.47	104	1.8	.1	46.78	9,605	24.4	12.5	20.23	66,922	47.1	87.4	20.47
20 percent.....	28,383	15.1	1,066,567	37.58	90	1.5	.3	52.82	1,496	3.8	5.3	37.36	26,797	18.8	94.4	37.54
30 percent.....	27,401	14.6	1,601,237	58.44	2,151	36.0	7.9	56.20	6,147	15.5	22.4	56.52	19,103	13.4	69.7	59.31
40 percent.....	12,293	6.5	1,010,834	82.23	155	2.6	1.3	78.47	1,394	3.5	11.3	79.16	10,744	7.6	87.4	82.68
50 percent.....	7,369	3.9	945,795	128.35	467	7.8	6.3	125.14	3,478	8.8	47.2	125.18	3,424	2.4	46.5	132.00
60 percent.....	8,701	4.6	1,973,085	226.77	145	2.4	1.7	203.75	1,228	3.1	14.1	215.31	7,328	5.2	84.2	229.14
70 percent.....	5,423	2.9	1,432,578	264.17	74	1.2	1.4	200.96	3,343	8.4	61.6	267.46	2,006	1.4	37.0	261.02
80 percent.....	2,196	1.2	661,554	301.25	100	1.7	4.6	228.71	648	1.6	29.5	307.62	1,448	1.0	65.9	303.42
90 percent.....	650	.3	219,909	338.32	7	.1	1.1	301.71	176	.4	27.1	333.59	467	.3	71.8	340.66
100 percent.....	16,288	8.7	7,252,816	445.29	563	9.4	3.5	392.45	12,049	30.5	74.0	428.78	3,676	2.6	22.5	597.47
Spanish American War: Total.....	28	100.0	11,946	426.64	1	100.0	3.6	478.00	5	100.0	17.9	413.80	22	100.0	78.5	427.23
No disability.....																
10 percent.....	1	3.6	25	25.00									1	4.5	100.0	25.00
20 percent.....																
30 percent.....																
40 percent.....																
50 percent.....	2	7.1	284	142.00									2	9.1	100.0	142.00
60 percent.....	3	10.7	1,063	354.33									3	13.6	100.0	354.33
70 percent.....	2	7.1	453	226.50									1	4.5	50.0	240.00
80 percent.....	2	7.1	742	371.00									2	9.1	100.0	371.00
90 percent.....																
100 percent.....	18	64.4	9,379	521.06	1	100.0	5.6	478.00	4	80.0	22.2	464.00	13	59.2	72.2	541.92

DISABILITY: CLASS OF DEPENDENT, PERIOD OF SERVICE—JUNE 1971

Class of dependent	Total			World War II		World War I		Korean conflict		Vietnam era		Regular Establishment		Spanish-American War	
	Number	Monthly value	Average monthly value	Number	Average monthly value	Number	Average monthly value	Number	Average monthly value	Number	Average monthly value	Number	Average monthly value	Number	Average monthly value
Total veterans.....	2,146,085	\$226,143,336	\$105.36	1,395,911	\$98.14	78,261	\$162.55	239,606	\$119.19	244,567	\$122.55	187,712	\$95.13	28	\$426.64
Veterans less than 50 percent disabled (no dependency benefit).....	1,687,955	76,913,137	45.57	1,126,426	45.73	47,578	61.82	184,758	47.89	182,108	45.26	147,084	36.52	1	25.00
Veterans 50 percent or more disabled.....	458,130	149,200,199	325.67	269,485	317.19	30,683	318.76	54,848	359.41	62,459	347.92	40,628	307.32	27	441.52
Without dependents.....	121,869	39,490,265	324.04	57,431	332.40	11,993	304.50	10,843	353.89	29,367	332.34	12,220	304.34	15	441.73
With dependents.....	336,261	109,709,934	326.26	212,054	315.78	18,690	327.91	44,005	360.76	33,092	361.75	28,408	308.60	12	441.25
Wife only.....	135,742	43,250,093	318.62	89,691	312.82	18,093	327.00	8,624	354.93	10,928	341.16	8,394	295.68	12	441.25
Wife, child or children.....	168,173	54,086,024	321.61	103,918	307.98	474	354.67	28,803	350.50	19,049	365.51	15,929	304.77		
Wife, child or children, and parent or parents.....	4,038	1,731,854	428.89	2,422	409.14	1	784.00	956	477.90	282	448.33	377	416.00		
Wife, parent or parents.....	1,857	768,535	413.86	1,344	406.19	5	316.80	218	453.96	175	432.05	115	404.00		
Child or children only.....	16,523	5,529,482	334.65	8,942	320.95	104	343.91	3,456	360.92	1,734	383.57	2,287	311.03		
Child or children and parent or parents.....	680	302,390	444.69	325	428.86			193	485.54	63	469.81	99	401.01		
Parent or parents only.....	9,248	4,041,556	437.02	5,412	434.97	13	462.46	1,755	468.40	861	445.42	1,207	394.32		
Total dependents on whose account additional compensation was being paid.....	759,968			457,482		19,391		137,822		71,788		73,473		12	
Wives.....	309,810			197,375		18,573		38,601		30,434		24,815		12	
Children.....	431,971			249,589		799		95,532		39,518		46,533			
Parents.....	18,187			10,518		19		3,689		1,836		2,125			

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 15439. This bill will increase by 10 percent the monthly compensation payments to 2,177,000 service-connected disabled veterans. It has been approximately 2 years since the monthly payments to this deserving group have been adjusted. Meanwhile the

cost of living has risen by more than 7 percent in this same period.

The bill, Mr. Speaker, contains additional provisions that will provide more equitable treatment to the Nation's veterans, their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans. The ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee on Compensation and Pension, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMER-SCHMIDT), will explain them in detail.

I want to commend Subcommittee Chairman DORN and the members of his subcommittee for developing this legislation that will benefit the Nation's service-connected disabled veteran.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMER-SCHMIDT).

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speak-

er, I rise in support of H.R. 15439. This bill will authorize a 10 percent increase in the monthly rates of compensation payable to more than 2 million service-connected disabled veterans. Included in the group that will share in this modest increase are our war wounded. These are former service personnel who have suffered physical or mental disability in this Nation's struggle for freedom and national security.

This group, Mr. Speaker, has always received the highest priority consideration from the Congress, in recognition of the sacrifices they have made. The rates of compensation for this deserving group were last increased July 1, 1970. Since that time, almost every segment of our society that receives Federal payments for any reason have received an increase in those payments. We can do no less for the Nation's disabled veteran.

The bill also authorizes a clothing allowance of \$150 annually for amputees and other seriously disabled veterans who must wear a prosthesis or an orthopedic appliance. The committee has received testimony that artificial limbs, braces, and other devices tend to wear out or rip clothing at an unusually accelerated pace, much faster than the normal wear and tear experienced by the average person. The committee believes a clothing allowance is justified.

Another provision of the bill, Mr. Speaker, will permit Spanish-American War widows to elect pension benefits presently available only to widows of veterans of later wars. Under existing law, a Spanish-American War widow may receive a maximum payment of \$75 monthly. In many cases, particularly in the case of the widow with no additional income, it would be to her advantage to elect the benefits available to later war widows, with a maximum payment of \$87 monthly if she has no dependents. This discrimination contained in existing law appears unwarranted.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill revises the provisions of existing law that permit relief from administrative error, overpayment, and forfeiture. These provisions have been requested by the Veterans' Administration and the cost is estimated to be relatively insignificant. They will, however, permit the Veterans' Administration to extend relief in cases where the agency has erroneously determined that eligibility existed, and the veteran, without knowledge, has relied and changed his position to his detriment.

It will permit the Veteran's Administration to more equitably determine when overpayments should be recovered and when they should be waived.

It will permit the Veterans' Administration to review certain cases in which benefits had been forfeited prior to September 1959 and grant remission of forfeiture, if otherwise warranted.

Mr. Speaker, this is a carefully drawn bill. It has been cosponsored in a bipartisan basis by 25 members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. It authorizes needed increases in monthly payments to a most deserving group—the Nation's disabled veterans. I urge that it be passed.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE).

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 15439, the Veterans' Compensation and Relief Act of 1972, and as a cosponsor, urge the House to pass the bill immediately. To reiterate that inflation has caused great hardship among our veteran population states the obvious. In reaction to the rise in the cost of living, increased rates for veterans' compensation were enacted into law by the 91st Congress effective July 1, 1970. Since the effective date of that legislation, the cost of living index has again registered an increase. I feel there is an acute need to increase the service-connected compensation to veterans by 10 percent. And we should provide additional allowances for dependents, payable to the service-connected disabled veterans who are rated 50 percent or more disabled.

In a predecessor bill to the measure at hand, the Veterans' Administration recommended a 6 percent boost in the aforementioned rates of compensation. When you consider the time period involved since this was first offered, and the further delay involved before the increased benefits are received, I share the committee's view that the 10-percent rate boost in the reported bill is entirely reasonable.

I urge the House to vote in favor of this bill as justifiable recognition of those who have so valiantly defended, and sacrificed so much for their country.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILLIS).

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 15439 has as its most important element a cost of living increase of 10 percent for all veterans and their dependents who are receiving compensation. This is considerably overdue. The last increase was effective July 1, 1970.

The bill also provides for the payment of a \$150 clothing allowance annually to the veteran whose service-connected disability requires the wearing or use of a prosthetic appliance or device. These devices cause unusual wear and tear on wearing apparel.

At the present time if a single veteran receives hospitalization or domiciliary care for a period in excess of 6 months, his compensation or retired pay is reduced to \$30 or 50 percent of the benefit whichever is the greater. The amount withheld is paid to him upon his release, but in certain instances this procedure causes a hardship. There are times when a veteran has continuing expenses such as maintenance of a home or purchase of an automobile and the reduction in benefits prevents him from meeting his obligations. H.R. 15439 will eliminate the withholding requirement.

The "new" pension program as established by Public Law 86-211 and subsequently amended permitted veterans of the Spanish-American War to elect to receive their pension under the "new" law. Inadvertently, this right was not extended to their widows. The bill before us will correct this.

There are certain other changes that are authorized, providing a liberalization of the law as it relates to adminis-

trative error, overpayments, and forfeitures.

There is a provision of particular interest to the veteran who may be confronted with an indebtedness arising from a default on the GI loan. This bill will permit the Veterans' Administration to release the original veteran borrower, if it is shown that he would have qualified for a release of liability had he applied at the time he sold his GI home. At present a release of liability may only be requested at the time the home is sold. It is granted in those instances where the purchaser is accepted as being sound financially and able to afford the costs of the mortgage and general maintenance of the home.

This is necessary legislation and I will vote for it.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 15439, the Veterans' Compensation and Relief Act of 1972.

The major purpose of this bill is to provide a 10-percent increase in the rates of compensation for service-connected disabled veterans.

The following is a chart illustrating the effect this measure would have on the monthly compensation rates of service-connected disabled veterans:

Disability (percent)	Current monthly allotment	Monthly allotment as proposed by H.R. 15439
10.....	\$25	\$28
20.....	46	51
30.....	70	77
40.....	96	106
50.....	135	149
60.....	163	179
70.....	193	212
80.....	223	245
90.....	250	275
100.....	450	495

Disability rates were last adjusted July 1, 1970. Since that time and by the end of this year, the cost of living will have increased by an estimated 9 percent.

Thus, a 10-percent increase will do little other than allow the disabled veteran to retain the same purchasing power that he had in 1970.

Mr. Speaker, I am not convinced that we are computing rates to reflect the actual loss suffered by the veteran. Let us compare the 100-percent disabled veteran with his counterpart who also served, but through the grace of God, was spared from receiving disabling wounds. The totally disabled veteran presently receives \$450 a month, or \$5,400 per year. His comrade, without a disability, earns \$721 a month, or \$8,660 per year—based on the median income of male veterans in the civilian noninstitutional population for 1970.

Thus, the disabled veteran not only receives \$271 a month less than his comrade, he also suffers the psychological burden of not enjoying a prosperous career, such as a skilled carpenter or dentist.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that there is no way to adequately compensate a veteran who has lost a limb or an eye in service of our country. But, we have an obligation to at least insure that we are compensating our veterans for their average economic loss resulting from a disease or an injury.

Therefore, I feel that this bill is only

a stopgap measure. I feel that a comprehensive reform is needed so that the rates reflect the actual loss suffered by the veteran.

But, until that reform is forthcoming, I believe that we must take every step to insure that the compensation due those who gave so much of themselves in the service of our country is adequate to meet their basic needs.

The bill before us today is such a step, and it deserves our strong support. Thus, I urge my colleagues to join with me in voting for the passage of H.R. 15439, a bill to increase the rates of compensation for service-connected disabled veterans by 10 percent.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 15439. It provides for a cost-of-living increase of 10 percent in compensation for veterans and their dependents, and since compensation is paid only to those whose disabilities were the result of their service in the Armed Forces, it will go to the most deserving of our veteran population.

This bill would authorize certain liberalizations of the existing law, pertaining to administrative error, overpayments, and forfeitures. These changes have been recommended by the Veterans' Administration in order that the agency may deal more fairly with its beneficiaries.

The agency also has proposed a change with regard to veterans who incur an indebtedness resulting from the foreclosure on a GI home loan, where the veteran failed to obtain a release of liability prior to selling the house. The change in law would permit the Veterans' Administration to release the veteran if the facts showed that at the time he sold his home he would have been eligible for a release of liability had he applied for it. This could provide relief to a number of deserving veterans.

For a period of years, legislation has been sought which would reimburse certain veterans for the wear and tear on their clothing, resulting from prosthetic devices or equipment they are forced to employ by reason of the nature of their service-connected disabilities. This bill provides for an annual clothing allowance of \$150.

Another important change in law that would be permitted, is one that affects the single veteran who is hospitalized for a period in excess of 6 months. At present his compensation or retired pay is reduced to \$30 or 50 percent whichever is the greater beginning with the seventh month. In many cases this has caused a hardship where the veteran has continuing expenses such as maintenance of a home or apartment, extended payments on furniture, appliances or an automobile. As soon as his income is reduced because of his hospitalization he can no longer meet his financial obligations. Under this bill the withholding of compensation or retired pay will cease.

There is another provision which would overcome an earlier legislative inadvertence. It would permit the widow of a Spanish-American War veteran to elect to come under the provisions of the

"new" pension program, Public Law 86-211, as amended. This is a privilege that was granted previously, to the veteran, and, of course, should be extended to the widow as has been customary.

I am voting for this bill because it is absolutely necessary that we keep our veterans compensation payments in step with the expanding economy and I believe that the other features of the bill are very meritorious.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 15439, to increase the rates of compensation for disabled veterans and to provide a clothing allowance for veterans whose disability requires him to wear an appliance which tends to wear out or tear his clothing.

Since the disability compensation program was first established the Congress has periodically reviewed the rates of compensation and has made adjustments when deemed necessary. The rates of compensation were last increased on July 1, 1970.

The bill before us today, H.R. 15439, would, if enacted, provide for a 10-percent increase in the monthly rates of compensation payable to veterans with service-connected disabilities and a similar increase in the rates of additional allowances for dependents payable to service-connected disabled veterans who are rated 50 percent or more disabling. Over the past weekend, I was privileged to attend the annual convention of the State of Florida Disabled American Veterans as a member of DAV Chapter 41 in Hollywood, Fla. Further, I was accorded the privilege of addressing this convention held in the Galt Ocean Hotel, in Fort Lauderdale, on the matter of legislation passed by the Congress which benefits them. Happily the 92d Congress has compiled a good record in the area of veterans legislation. Nonetheless, the basic purpose of the disability compensation program—to provide relief for the impaired earning capacity of veterans disabled as the result of their military service—is still not wholly implemented.

In talking with the members of the DAV in attendance at the Florida State Convention, I found they were intensely interested in the passage of an increase in disability compensation. These people suffer doubly: First, because they live on a fixed income in a period of upward spiraling inflation, and second, because the wounds they received prevent them from earning a decent living for themselves and their families, as other Americans are able to do.

Income maintenance programs, like service-connected disability compensation have been exempted from coverage under the President's economic stabilization program. Further, the amount payable varies according to the degree of disability which represent the average impairment in earning capacity resulting from such disability or combinations of disabilities in civil occupations. Additional compensation for dependents is payable to any veteran entitled to basic compensation for disability rated at not less than 40 percent.

H.R. 15439 contains six other improvements and liberalizations in addition to an increase in compensation. They are: First, a clothing allowance of \$150 per year to each veteran who, because of a service-connected disability which is compensable, wears a prosthetic or orthopedic appliance or uses an appliance or device which tends to wear out or tear the clothing of such veteran; second, abolishes the withholding authorization whereby a single veteran who was furnished hospital treatment or domiciliary care by the VA has his disability compensation or retirement pay reduced after the first 6 months of treatment or care to \$30 monthly or 50 percent of the benefit and the amount of the reduction was paid to him in a lump sum upon his release; third, extends to Spanish-American War widows the privilege of making an irrevocable decision to receive pensions under the "new" pension plan passed in 1959 rather than existing program; fourth, permits the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration to extend relief to veterans, their dependents, and other innocent third persons, from the consequences of reliance on an administrative error where loss is suffered without knowledge of the error; fifth, liberalization of the authority of the VA to waive recovery of overpayments and the authority for waiver of an indebtedness to the VA after a default and loss occurs with respect to a loan guaranteed, or insured by VA; and sixth, authorizes a review of forfeiture actions imposed by the VA prior to September 2, 1959, because of the submission of fraudulent evidence in connection with gratuitous veterans' benefits, and to grant remission of those forfeitures if they would not have been imposed under the law in effect after September 1959.

It is my feeling that this measure is very timely and will relieve some of the hardships facing those whose earning capacity has been reduced as a result of their military service. I, therefore, urge speedy passage by the House of Representatives.

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 15439, the Veterans Compensation and Relief Act of 1972. As a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I have worked closely with our distinguished chairman, Congressman TEAGUE of Texas. I know of his tireless dedication to the problems of our veterans, particularly those who are disabled in the course of serving their country. I am proud to join as a cosponsor with Chairman TEAGUE, and proud to cast my vote today for final passage of this important legislation.

Those who have followed the hearings and other deliberations of the committee know of the need for the improvements that this bill would bring. The major purpose of the bill is to provide a much-needed increase in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities. This would amount to a 10-percent increase in the monthly payments. There would be a

similar increase in the rates of additional allowances for dependents payable to service-connected disabled veterans who are 50 percent or more disabled.

Throughout its history, the compensation program has been designed to furnish relief to a veteran to the extent that his earning capacity has been impaired as a result of his military service. This requires that there be periodic reviews and adjustments of the rates. Congress last took action to increase the rates in July 1970, and we are all aware of the economic changes and price increases which have occurred since that date.

However, the bill includes more than this increase in monthly compensation. It provides for payment of a "clothing allowance" of \$150 per year to a veteran who requires special clothing or medical devices; it revises the system for the payment of pensions to widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War; it allows new procedures for the redress of grievances when a person suffers loss due to an administrative error; and it creates several other necessary revisions within the Veterans' Administration.

For too long we have neglected our veterans and their dependents, who have given this Nation so much, and it is my hope that this bill will receive the prompt approval by both the House and the Senate so that these much needed reforms may go into effect as soon as possible. It is only a small measure of the debt we owe the American veteran.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 15439.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a similar Senate bill (S. 3338) to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of compensation for disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 3338

An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of compensation for disabled veterans, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 314 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "\$25" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$28";

(2) by striking out "\$46" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$51";

(3) by striking out "\$70" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$77";

(4) by striking out "\$96" in subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$106";

(5) by striking out "\$135" in subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$149";

(6) by striking out "\$163" in subsection (f) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$179";

(7) by striking out "\$193" in subsection (g) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$212";

(8) by striking out "\$223" in subsection (h) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$245";

(9) by striking out "\$250" in subsection (i) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$275";

(10) by striking out "\$450" in subsection (j) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$495";

(11) by striking out "\$560" and "\$784" in subsection (k) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$616" and "\$862", respectively;

(12) by striking out "\$560" in subsection (l) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$616";

(13) by striking out "\$616" in subsection (m) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$678";

(14) by striking out "\$700" in subsection (n) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$770";

(15) by striking out "\$784" in subsections (o) and (p) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$862";

(16) by striking out "\$336" in subsection (r) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$370"; and

(17) by striking out "\$504" in subsection (s) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$554".

(b) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may adjust administratively, consistent with the increases authorized by this section, the rates of disability compensation payable to persons within the purview of section 10 of Public Law 85-857 who are not in receipt of compensation payable pursuant to chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code.

Sec. 2. Section 315(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "\$28" in subparagraph (A) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$31";

(2) by striking out "\$48" in subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$53";

(3) by striking out "\$61" in subparagraph (C) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$67";

(4) by striking out "\$75" and "\$14" in subparagraph (D) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$83" and "\$15", respectively;

(5) by striking out "\$19" in subparagraph (E) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$21";

(6) by striking out "\$33" in subparagraph (F) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$36";

(7) by striking out "\$48" and "\$14" in subparagraph (G) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$53" and "\$15", respectively;

(8) by striking out "\$23" in subparagraph (H) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$25"; and

(9) by striking out "\$44" in subparagraph (I) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$48".

Sec. 3. (a) Chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 362. Clothing allowance

"The Administrator, under regulations which he shall prescribe, shall pay a clothing allowance of \$150 per year to each veteran who, because of disability which is compensable under the provisions of this chapter, wears or uses a prosthetic or orthopedic appliance or appliances (including a wheelchair) which the Administrator determines tends to wear out or tear the clothing of such veteran."

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter 11 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"362. Clothing allowance."

Sec. 4. (a) Section 334 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "equal" and all that follows down through the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "that specified in section 314 of this title."

(b) Section 335 of such title is amended by striking out "equal" and all that follows down through the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "as provided in section 315 of this title and subject to the limitations thereof."

(c) Section 336 of such title is hereby repealed.

(d) The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter IV of chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out the following:

"336. Conditions under which wartime rates are payable."

SEC. 5. This Act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month which begins after the date of enactment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TEAGUE OF TEXAS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 3338 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 15439, as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 15439) was laid on the table.

HOUSING FOR DISABLED VETERANS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3343), to amend chapter 21 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum amount of the grant payable for specially adapted housing for disabled veterans, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 3343

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 802 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "\$12,500" and inserting in lieu thereof \$17,500.

Sec. 2. Section 1803(c)(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out the semicolon and all that follows thereafter and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the second veterans' bill which has recently been favorably reported, with amendments, by our committee is S. 3343, a bill designed to increase the maximum amount of the grant payable for specially adapted housing for disabled veterans. A major amendment of the bill gives the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs independent authority to adjust the rate of interest on guaranteed home loans consistent with changing market demands. His present authority, held jointly with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, expires June 30 of this year—less than 2 weeks hence.

This bill and its amendments are the product of recommendations of our Subcommittee on Housing, ably chaired by

the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CARNEY). I am pleased to note the diligent and prompt action taken by the chairman and his fellow members, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. BARING), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SATTERFIELD), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HELSTOSKI), the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER), the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMER-SCHMIDT), the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WINN), and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILLIS).

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CARNEY), chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, this bill would increase the maximum amount of a grant payable by the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration to provide specially adapted housing for disabled veterans. Under present law, a severely disabled veteran is entitled to a grant of not more than 50 percent of the cost of a home and necessary land up to a maximum of \$12,500. The bill, as passed by the Senate, would amend section 802 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum grant authority to \$20,000.

Veterans eligible for housing assistance grants are principally service-connected quadriplegics, paraplegics, and others who require the use of a wheelchair. Their condition requires ramps, special bathroom equipment, extra large rooms, exercising facilities, and other devices which are essential for many of them to live comfortably outside a hospital.

In 1948, Public Law 80-703 was enacted, which legislation authorized the granting of \$10,000 for paraplegic and quadriplegic veterans whose disability is service connected of a permanent and total quality resulting in the loss or loss of use of both lower extremities so as to preclude locomotion without the aid of crutches, canes, or a wheelchair. The original enactment covered all those individuals who served on or April 20, 1898, and was subsequently amended to broaden its eligibility—Public Law 81-286—and in 1959, Public Law 83-239, to include those veterans who had blindness in both eyes with loss or loss of use of one lower extremity.

In 1969, by Public Law 91-22, the eligible classes were enlarged to include those veterans who from service-connected causes have lost or lost use of one lower extremity together with a residual of a disease which so affected the functions of balance or propulsion as to preclude locomotion without resorting to a wheelchair. In the course of this legislation, the bill was amended by our committee to increase the original amount of the grant to an amount which was ultimately compromised at \$12,500. Now, just 3 years later, the Senate is proposing to raise the grant to \$20,000, an increase of 60 percent. Our committee believes that such an increase is unduly excessive.

The Veterans' Administration advises that the average cost of a new house under the regular loan guaranty program is

presently \$25,502. On the other hand, it has been estimated that the average price today on a specially adapted house for paraplegics is slightly over \$38,000. In view of the fact that housing costs are continuing to rise, the committee fully agrees that there is some justification for raising the special housing grant. In opposing the \$20,000 grant recommended by the Senate, the Veterans' Administration expressed the view that "we consider the present \$12,500 maximum grant to be generous." The committee definitely disagrees with this observation but feels that an increase to \$17,500—40 percent—would be reasonable and represent a justifiable increase in the benefit afforded to this group of service disabled veterans who are making every effort to lead a normal life under such serious physical handicaps. The first committee amendment, therefore, would set the new grant figure at \$17,500.

As of March 31, 1972, the Veterans' Administration had made a total of 11,863 grants since the inception of the program, involving total expenditures of \$118,501,627.

The second committee amendment would eliminate the existing statutory requirement in section 1803(c)(1) of title 38, United States Code, that the interest rate on Veterans' Administration loans shall not exceed that rate in effect under section 203(b)(5) of the National Housing Act.

Section 1803(c)(1) now reads as follows:

Loans guaranteed or insured under this chapter shall be payable upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon by the parties thereto, subject to the provisions of this chapter and regulations of the Administrator issued pursuant to this chapter, and shall bear interest not in excess of such rate as the Administrator may from time to time find the loan market demands except that such rate shall in no event exceed that in effect under the provisions of section 203(b)(5) of the National Housing Act.

The amendment would strike out the present language, reading "except that such rate shall in no event exceed that in effect under the provisions of section 203(b)(5) of the National Housing Act."

The effect of this amendment would be to give the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs independent authority to adjust the rate of interest on guaranteed loans commensurate with changing loan market demands without regard or reference to the maximum interest rate on FHA home loans insured under section 203(b) of the National Housing Act.

Prior to the approval of Public Law 90-301 on May 7, 1968, the maximum interest rate limitation under section 203(b)(5) of the National Housing Act was 6 percent. Public Law 90-301 authorized the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to adjust mortgage rates above the statutory limitation of 6 percent, as he finds necessary to meet the mortgage market, after consulting with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. This authority of the Secretary to adjust home mortgage rates was extended by Public

Law 91-351 until January 1, 1972, and again extended for 6 months by Public Law 92-213. Accordingly, the authority will terminate on June 30 of this year.

Unless the authority of the Secretary is further extended or some other provision is made to permit interest rates above 6 percent on FHA loans, the maximum rate on such loans will revert to the statutory limitation of 6 percent under section 203(b)(5) of the National Housing Act. Under the present provisions of section 1803(c)(1) of title 38, United States Code, the maximum interest rate on VA guaranteed loans would also revert to 6 percent. The same rate would also be applicable to direct loans.

Under current mortgage money market conditions, a maximum interest rate of 6 percent on VA guaranteed loans would seriously curtail the availability of mortgage funds for such financing. It is apparent that a reduction of the maximum interest rate to 6 percent as of June 30, 1972, will seriously jeopardize the availability of financing for GI loans, and such financing as would be available would involve discounts that would be considered prohibitive by most sellers and many lenders.

The flexible authority to adjust home loan interest rates is desirable in that it makes possible the prevention of a substantial cutback in available funds for VA home loans. It allows veterans to better compete for funds in tight money periods and, by minimizing loan discounts, increases the number of properties builders and other sellers offer for sale through VA financing.

The omnibus housing bill now under consideration in the Banking and Currency Committee contains a provision which would continue the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to administratively set rates, but there appears to be no prospect that the housing bill will be passed by June 30. We cannot, under any circumstances, allow our veterans' housing program, which is very vigorous, to go into default; therefore, the Veterans' Affairs Committee strongly urges legislative action, as proposed in the second amendment, at the earliest possible date.

COST

The first full fiscal year cost of the first section of the bill, as amended, is estimated to be \$3.5 million. This estimate is based upon an average of 700 grants a year at an additional outlay of \$5,000 per grant. This annual cost would continue at approximately the same level for each of the succeeding 4 years, resulting in a total cost for the first 5 years of approximately \$17.5 million.

Enactment of section 2 of the amended bill would not result in any significant cost impact on the administration of the VA loan guaranty program.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to place in the RECORD for the information of the Members a table setting forth the history of the FHA and VA interest rates on loans since the inception of each program.

HISTORY OF FHA AND VA INTEREST RATES

[In percent]

Period	FHA rate, sec. 203		VA rate, guaranteed loans			Period	FHA rate, sec. 203		VA rate, guaranteed loans		
	Pre- scribed	Author- ized	Pre- scribed	Author- ized	Statute		Pre- scribed	Author- ized	Pre- scribed	Author- ized	Statute
November 1934 to June 1935.....	5½	6				July 2, 1959 to Sept. 23, 1959.....	5½	6	5½	5½	Do.
June 1935 to July 1939.....	5	6				Sept. 23, 1959 to Feb. 1, 1961.....	5½	6	5½	5½	Do.
July 1939 to June 22, 1944.....	4½	6				Feb. 2, 1961 to May 28, 1961.....	5½	6	5½	5½	Do.
June 22, 1944 to Aug. 10, 1948.....	4½	6	4	4	Public Law 346, 77th Cong.	May 29, 1961 to Feb. 6, 1966.....	5½	6	5½	5½	Do.
Aug. 10, 1948 to April 1950.....	4½	6	4	4½	Public Law 901, 80th Cong.	Feb. 7, 1966 to Apr. 10, 1966.....	5½	6	5½	5½	Do.
April 1950 to May 1953.....	4½	6	4	4½	Do.	Mar. 3, 1966 to Apr. 10, 1966.....	5½	6	5½	5½	Public Law 89-358, Do.
May 1953 to Dec. 3, 1956.....	4½	6	4½	4½	Do.	Apr. 11, 1966 to Oct. 2, 1966.....	5½	6	5½	6	Do.
Dec. 4, 1956 to Aug. 5, 1957.....	5	6	4½	4½	Do.	Oct. 3, 1966 to May 6, 1968.....	6	6	6	6	Do.
Aug. 6, 1957 to April 1958.....	5½	6	4½	4½	Do.	May 7, 1968 to Jan. 24, 1969.....	6½	(1)	6½	(1)	Public Law 90-301, Do.
April 1958 to June 30, 1959.....	5½	6	4½	4½	Public Law 85-364, Do.	Jan. 24, 1969 to Jan. 4, 1970.....	7½	(1)	7½	(1)	Do.
June 30, 1959 to July 2, 1959.....	5½	6	4½	5½	Public Law 86-73, Do.	Jan. 5, 1970 to Dec. 2, 1970.....	8½	(1)	8½	(1)	Public Law 91-152, Do.
						Dec. 2, 1970 to Jan. 13, 1971.....	8	(1)	8	(1)	Public Law 91-351, Do.
						Jan. 13, 1971 to Feb. 18, 1971.....	7½	(1)	7½	(1)	Do.
						Feb. 18, 1971.....	7	(1)	7	(1)	Do.

1 Loan market demands.

Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Member of this Congress, I want to say it is a great honor to serve on the Veterans' Affairs Committee under the leadership of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) and the able and astute assistance given him by the ranking minority Member, the gentleman from California (Mr. TEAGUE). The great firm of Teague and Teague are doing a great job for the veterans of this Nation. I salute them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to pass this very much needed legislation.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I support this bill also.

I concur in the statement just made by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CARNEY), except with a degree of modesty I believe I had better go no further than to thank the gentleman regarding the fine words he said about the ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation that will adjust the special housing grant payable to certain seriously disabled veterans so that it is more compatible with today's housing construction costs. Equally important, Mr. Speaker, the committee amendment will permit the continuing flow of mortgage financing for the GI home loan program.

The authority for adjusting the interest rate on FHA and VA home loans above the statutory FHA ceiling of 6 percent is scheduled to expire June 30 of this year. The committee amendment will eliminate the provision that the VA rate cannot exceed the FHA rate. This will insure a continuation of the present 7-percent rate on VA home loans, despite the expiration of the authority to adjust the FHA rate above 6 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Housing is to be commended for their vigilance and prompt action in bringing this matter to our attention. I urge that the bill be passed.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may con-

sume to the ranking minority member of our subcommittee, which had charge of this bill, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER).

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 3343 with House committee amendments thereto.

This bill liberalizes a benefit available only to certain veterans with serious service-connected disabilities. Under existing law, veterans with service-connected disabilities that preclude locomotion without the aid of crutches, canes, or a wheelchair, are entitled to a \$12,500 grant toward the purchase of a specially adapted home. These are homes having ramps instead of steps, hand rails in strategic locations, extra wide doorways, special bathroom equipment, and other devices that are necessary for the safety of the occupant.

The grant, of course, is designed to help defray the added costs of these specially constructed homes. Since housing costs continue to rise, there appears to be some justification for increasing the existing grant. Our committee believes that a 40-percent increase to \$17,500 is warranted.

The other committee amendment, Mr. Speaker, will have the effect of extending the Veterans' Administrator's authority to adjust the interest rates on GI home loans.

Existing law, Mr. Speaker, vests the VA Administrator with authority to adjust interest rates provided the rate does not exceed the FHA rate. Existing law also permits the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development after consulting with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to adjust the interest rate above the statutory limitation of 6 percent. This authority, granted by Public Law 92-213, will expire on June 30 of this year.

Should this authority be permitted to expire, the permissible interest rate on FHA and Veterans' Administration home loans will revert to 6 percent. This ac-

tion would seriously impede the flow of mortgage financing for both programs. Even today, the more competitive existing interest rate of 7 percent is not sufficient to attract all of the needed mortgage capital to the two programs. If we permit the rate to revert to 6 percent, I fear the home buying veteran will be unable to avail himself of this benefit of the GI bill because of circumstances beyond his control.

The committee amendment will preserve the status quo with respect to GI home loans by eliminating the statutory requirement that the VA rate cannot exceed the FHA rate.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is sound and the committee amendment is essential if we are to have a viable GI home loan program. I urge that it be passed.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in complimenting the leadership on both the majority and minority sides of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, on which it is a privilege to serve.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 3343, as amended. This bill as it reached us from the Senate proposed to increase the current grant of \$12,500 to \$20,000 for the so-called "wheel chair homes." These are homes either specially constructed or remodeled to accommodate and make as comfortable as possible certain veterans whose service-connected conditions are of such severity that without special housing they might well be confined to a nursing home.

The program of specially adapted housing was launched in 1948 by the enactment of Public Law 702, 80th Congress. The aim has been to defray the costs of special equipment and adaptations necessary to make the veteran comfortable. It has never been the goal to purchase the entire home for him. Accordingly, the present law authorizes the payment of 50 percent of the total cost, but not to exceed \$12,500. In my opinion, the committee amendment limiting the maximum grant to \$17,500

should be ample to provide for the increased construction costs in today's market.

The second amendment would permit the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to adjust interest rates on guaranteed loans according to the prevailing rates of the loan market. The existing statute requires that adjustments be made by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in consultation with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. This statute expires on June 30 of this year. The authority to continue it is contained in the omnibus housing bill under consideration by the Banking and Currency Committee, but there seems little expectation of its passage by June 30.

It is essential that GI loans remain competitive in the changing loan market. If the existing statute expires, the maximum loan rate permissible will revert to 6 percent. Obviously, this will almost close the door to the loans for veterans and certainly whatever financing that may remain will be subject to exorbitant discounts to make up for the low interest rate.

It is my opinion that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs should be vested with the flexible authority to adjust loan rates in keeping with the prevailing market. This is the most satisfactory solution that I can think of if we are to maintain the integrity of the GI loan program.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 3343, to increase the maximum amount of the grant payable for specially adapted housing for disabled veterans.

This past weekend it was my privilege to address the annual convention for the State of Florida Disabled American Veterans which was held in Fort Lauderdale, Fla., in my congressional district. Many of those who attended this convention expressed strong support for an increase in the maximum amount of a grant payable by the Veterans' Administration to provide specially adapted housing for disabled veterans.

Under the present law, a severely disabled veteran is entitled to a grant of not more than 50 percent of the cost of a home and the necessary land up to a maximum of \$12,500. We are all aware that land prices and home costs have gone up at a faster rate than most other items in the present upward inflationary spiral. Veterans eligible for housing assistance grants are principally service-connected quadriplegics, paraplegics, and others who require the use of a wheelchair. Their various conditions require ramps, special bathroom equipment, extra large rooms, exercising facilities and other devices which are essential for many of them to live comfortably outside a hospital.

Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Administration says that the average cost of a new house under the regular loan guaranty program is \$25,502. It has been estimated that the average price today on a specially adapted house for paraplegics is over \$38,000.

The Senate passed S. 3343 calling for an increase to \$20,000 as the maximum amount of the grant payable for special-

ly adapted housing for disabled veterans on April 26. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives feels that a 60-percent increase is too much at this time and recommends instead of a 40-percent increase of \$17,500.

While I personally feel that the \$20,000 figure is more realistic, I am voting for this measure today to expedite an increase this year. It is my hope that when the conferees meet to iron out the difference in the amount between the Senate-passed version and the House-passed version, that the higher figure will be recommended for adoption.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill being considered.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 3343, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 341, nays 0, not voting 91, as follows:

[Roll No. 211]

YEAS—341

Abbott	Broyhill, N.C.	Davis, Wis.
Adams	Broyhill, Va.	de la Garza
Alexander	Buchanan	Dellenback
Anderson,	Burke, Fla.	Dellums
Calif.	Burke, Mass.	Denholm
Anderson, Ill.	Burleson, Tex.	Dennis
Andrews, Ala.	Burlison, Mo.	Dent
Andrews,	Burton	Derwinski
N. Dak.	Byrne, Pa.	Devine
Annunzio	Byrnes, Wis.	Dickinson
Archer	Byron	Donohue
Arends	Camp	Dorn
Ashley	Carlson	Downing
Aspin	Carney	Drinan
Aspinall	Carter	Dulski
Baker	Casey, Tex.	Duncan
Baring	Cederberg	du Pont
Barrett	Chamberlain	Dwyer
Begich	Chappell	Eckhardt
Belcher	Clancy	Edmondson
Bennett	Clark	Edwards, Calif.
Bergland	Clausen,	Ellberg
Betts	Don H.	Evans, Colo.
Bevill	Clawson, Del.	Evins, Tenn.
Biaggi	Collier	Fascell
Biester	Collins, Ill.	Findley
Blackburn	Collins, Tex.	Fisher
Blatnik	Colmer	Flood
Boggs	Conable	Foley
Boland	Conover	Ford, Gerald R.
Bolling	Conte	Ford,
Bow	Coughlin	William D.
Brademas	Crane	Forsythe
Bray	Culver	Fountain
Brinkley	Curlin	Fraser
Brooks	Daniel, Va.	Frelinghuysen
Brown	Danielson	Frenzel
Brown, Ohio	Davis, Ga.	Frey

Garmatz	McCormack	Ruppe
Gaydos	McCulloch	Ruth
Gettys	McDade	St Germain
Gialmo	McFall	Sandman
Gibbons	McKay	Sarbanes
Goldwater	McKevitt	Satterfield
Gonzalez	McKinney	Saylor
Goodling	McMillan	Scherle
Green, Pa.	Macdonald,	Schneebeli
Griffin	Mass.	Schwengel
Griffiths	Madden	Scott
Gross	Mahon	Seiberling
Grover	Mailliard	Shipey
Gubser	Mallory	Shoup
Gude	Martin	Shriver
Haley	Mathis, Ga.	Sikes
Hall	Matsunaga	Sisk
Hamilton	Mayne	Skubitz
Hammer-	Mazzoli	Slack
schmidt	Meeds	Smith, Calif.
Hanley	Michel	Smith, Iowa
Hanna	Mikva	Smith, N.Y.
Hansen, Idaho	Miller, Ohio	Snyder
Hansen, Wash.	Mills, Md.	Spence
Harrington	Minish	Springer
Harsha	Mink	Staggers
Harvey	Minshall	Stanton,
Hastings	Mitchell	J. William
Hathaway	Mizell	Stanton,
Hawkins	Molohan	James V.
Hays	Montgomery	Steed
Hébert	Moorhead	Steele
Hechler, W. Va.	Morgan	Steiger, Ariz.
Heckler, Mass.	Mosher	Stokes
Heinz	Moss	Stratton
Henderson	Murphy, Ill.	Stubblefield
Hicks, Mass.	Myers	Sullivan
Hicks, Wash.	Natcher	Taylor
Hillis	Nedzi	Teague, Calif.
Hogan	Nichols	Teague, Tex.
Holifield	Nix	Terry
Hosmer	Obey	Thompson, Ga.
Howard	O'Hara	Thomson, Wis.
Hull	O'Konski	Thone
Hungate	O'Neill	Tiernan
Hunt	Passman	Ullman
Hutchinson	Patten	Van Deerlin
Ichord	Pettis	Vander Jagt
Jacobs	Pickle	Vanik
Jarman	Pike	Veysey
Johnson, Calif.	Poage	Vigorito
Johnson, Pa.	Poff	Waggonner
Jonas	Powell	Waldie
Jones, Ala.	Preyer, N.C.	Wampler
Jones, N.C.	Price, Ill.	Ware
Jones, Tenn.	Price, Tex.	Whalen
Karth	Pucinski	White
Kastenmeier	Purcell	Whitehurst
Kazen	Quile	Whitten
Keating	Quillen	Widnall
Kee	Rallsback	Wiggins
Keith	Randall	Williams
Kemp	Rees	Wilson, Bob
King	Reuss	Wilson,
Koch	Rhodes	Charles H.
Kuykendall	Riegle	Wolff
Kyl	Roberts	Wright
Landgrebe	Robinson, Va.	Wyatt
Latta	Robison, N.Y.	Wydler
Leggett	Rodino	Wyllie
Lennon	Roe	Wyman
Lent	Rogers	Yates
Lloyd	Roncallo	Yatron
Long, Md.	Rooney, Pa.	Young, Fla.
Lujan	Rosenthal	Young, Tex.
McClary	Rostenkowski	Zablocki
McCloskey	Roussetot	Zion
McClure	Roybal	Zwach
McCollister	Runnels	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—91

Abernethy	Cotter	Halpern
Abourezk	Daniels, N.J.	Helstoski
Abzug	Davis, S.C.	Horton
Addabbo	Delaney	Kluczynski
Anderson,	Diggs	Kyros
Tenn.	Dingell	Landrum
Ashbrook	Dow	Link
Badillo	Dowdy	Long, La.
Bell	Edwards, Ala.	McDonald,
Bingham	Erlenborn	Mich.
Blanton	Esch	McEwen
Brasco	Eshleman	Mann
Broomfield	Fish	Mathias, Calif.
Brown, Mich.	Flowers	Melcher
Cabell	Flynt	Metcalf
Caffery	Fulton	Miller, Calif.
Carey, N.Y.	Fuqua	Mills, Ark.
Celler	Galifianakis	Monagan
Chisholm	Gallagher	Murphy, N.Y.
Clay	Grasso	Nelsen
Cleveland	Gray	Patman
Conyers	Green, Oreg.	Pelly
Corman	Hagan	Pepper

Perkins	Rooney, N.Y.	Stephens
Peyser	Roush	Stuckey
Pirnie	Roy	Symington
Podell	Ryan	Talcott
Pryor, Ark.	Scheuer	Thompson, N.J.
Rangel	Schmitz	Udall
Rarick	Sebellius	Whalley
Reid	Steiger, Wis.	Winn

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Cleveland.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Perkins with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Daniels of New Jersey with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Sebellius.
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Schmitz.

Mrs. Grasso with Mr. Pirnie.
Mr. Roush with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Horton.

Mr. Metcalfe with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Peyser.

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Mathias of California.

Mr. Flowers with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.

Mr. Udall with Mr. Winn.
Mr. Symington with Mr. Brown of Michigan.

Mr. Kyros with Mr. Eshleman.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Pepper.
Mr. Podell with Mr. Link.

Mr. Reid with Mr. Melcher.
Mrs. Abzug with Mr. Caffery.
Mr. Ryan with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Cabell with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Clay with Mr. Corman.
Mr. Roy with Mr. Davis of South Carolina.

Mr. Rarick with Mr. Cotter.
Mr. Rangel with Mr. Dow.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Diggs.

Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Gallfianakis.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Mann.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Landrum.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Pryor of Arkansas.

Mr. Delaney with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Fuqua.

Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Blanton.
Mr. Badillo with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Dowdy.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum amount of the grant payable for specially adapted housing for disabled veterans, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 9580, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INTER- STATE AGREEMENTS

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9580) to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enter into agreements with the Commonwealth of Virginia and the State of Maryland concerning the fees for the operation of certain motor vehicles, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the gentleman from South Carolina, what happened so far as the Senate amendments were concerned, and particularly with reference to those adverse to the position of the House or increasing costs?

Mr. McMILLAN. I do not believe I understood the question.

Mr. HALL. I am asking what the Senate amendments are, whether or not they are germane, and if there is an increase in cost in the agreed-to conference?

Mr. McMILLAN. No, sir. There is no change either in the bill or in the cost.

Mr. HALL. In other words, it is the same as the House-passed version?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct.

At present, large dump trucks—65,000 pounds maximum weight—operating from points within the District of Columbia, regardless of where they are registered, must pay the District an annual registration fee of \$269.50, plus an annual hauling permit fee of \$680, for a total of \$949.50 per year.

Similarly, such trucks operating from point to point within the State of Maryland, regardless of where they are registered, must pay an annual fee of \$845 to the State of Maryland.

Many dump truck operators in the District and in Maryland are obliged to operate in both jurisdictions in the normal course of their business, and thus are obliged to pay both of these large annual fees. This is a real financial hardship at least to the small operators.

The bill H.R. 9580, as approved by the House on August 4, 1971, and by the Senate with amendments on May 23, 1972, provides a solution to this problem by authorizing the District of Columbia Commissioner to enter into interstate agreements with Maryland and Virginia, whereby such dump trucks may operate in all these jurisdictions without payment of any fees except in the jurisdiction in which they are registered. The Maryland legislature has already authorized that State to enter into such agreement.

At this time, the State of Virginia poses no problem in this respect, because they do not allow dump trucks heavier than 50,000 pounds to operate on their roads, and they do reciprocate with the District regarding registration fee payments for such vehicles. However, it is anticipated that Virginia may soon permit the modern larger trucks in that State, and in this case there is no doubt that substantial fees will be levied for such operation. Thus, the inclusion of Virginia in this legislation is a precautionary measure for future use.

The one Senate amendment to this bill agreed upon in conference was the addition of a new section authorizing the District of Columbia Commissioner to enter into interstate agreements with Maryland and Virginia also to the effect that each jurisdiction will refuse annual registration of motor vehicles to its

residents who have outstanding traffic violation tickets in either of the other two jurisdictions. In calendar year 1971, the District lost \$118,700 in revenues from unpaid parking violation tickets issued to Maryland and Virginia motorists.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 12, 1972.)

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A MAN OF COURAGE AND INTEGRITY, A CHAMPION OF FAIR PLAY AND JUSTICE: CHET HOLIFIELD

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, long before I began my career as a Member of the House of Representatives, I knew of CHET HOLIFIELD's outstanding service to his country as a Member of this body.

He was elected to the House for the first time in 1942, the very year when the tragic Executive order was issued which resulted in the uprooting of 110,000 Americans of Japanese ancestry from their west coast homes, and their eventual imprisonment in what were called "relocation centers." Along with only a few others, CHET HOLIFIELD spoke out, at great financial and political risk, against that outrageous act.

As a young man lobbying for Statehood for Hawaii, I found in CHET HOLIFIELD one of my most sympathetic listeners.

Mr. Speaker, a recent article paid well-deserved tribute to the dean of the California delegation. Written by Mike Masaoka, Washington representative of the Japanese American Citizens League, the article expresses quite well the esteem in which CHET HOLIFIELD is held among those who value human rights and dignity. At this point, I offer for inclusion in the RECORD the text of Mike Masaoka's column, so that my colleagues might share this tribute to CHET HOLIFIELD, a man I am proud to call my friend.

[From the Pacific Citizen, June 2, 1972]

CHET HOLIFIELD

(By Mike Masaoka)

WASHINGTON.—We have known Chet Holifield since he first was elected to the National House of Representatives in 1942. We know that during the World War II period, when persons of Japanese ancestry were most unpopular, Chet Holifield was among the very few, about five in number, who consistently advocated fair play and justice for Japanese Americans in the halls of Congress, who fought against repressive and racist bills directed against those of our ancestry, and who took advantage of every possible opportunity to use his good offices with the Administra-

tion to promote our welfare and civil rights. Indeed, those who can remember some of those campaigns of the 1940s and early 1950s will recall that his political opposition charged him with being "a Jap lover." He was always willing to stake his political and business life on his belief in Japanese Americans.

After World War II, he was among the most aggressive in working for the enactment of corrective and remedial legislation, such as those providing partial compensation for some of the property losses suffered in the Evacuation, for naturalization privileges for Japanese and other Asian aliens, for the elimination of the Japanese and other Oriental Immigration Quota System and the doubly racist Asia-Pacific Triangle, for Statehood for Hawaii, and many, many other good and beneficial statutes.

A progressive, liberal, and humanitarian lawmaker, he helped found and was twice President of the Democratic Study Group, that unofficial group of about 150 Congressmen who work for civil and human rights, for decency and dignity, for equality of opportunity in employment, housing, education, public facilities etc.

Today, after serving more than 30 consecutive years in Congress, he is the dean of the entire West Coast Congressional Delegation. He is also Chairman of the House Government Operations Committee and has been chairman of the Joint House and Senate Atomic Energy Committee. His seniority, his friendship with the leadership and other members, and his legislative craftsmanship have accomplished much for the constituents of his District, the State of California, and the Nation.

Last year, he joined with Congressman Spark Matsunaga in the leadership that resulted in the repeal of Title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950, which authorized arbitrary detention and concentration camps under certain conditions. At this moment, he and his office are helping to make the 1972 National JACL Convention in Washington the great success that it deserves to be.

In spite of JACL's prohibition against endorsements, as the Washington Representative for more than a quarter of a century I wish to pay tribute to Congressman Chet Holifield for all that he has done to help Japanese Americans and others who are denied, disadvantaged, deprived, and disillusioned. Few, if any, in the entire Congress has done more. Without doubt, he deserves the support of every American of Japanese ancestry, not to mention others of decency and goodwill.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING VOTE

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

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I was required to be in my district on official business which necessitated my leaving during legislative business late Thursday afternoon, June 1, and being absent from proceedings of the House during the following week. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

THURSDAY, JUNE 1, 1972

Rollcall No. 179—An amendment to H.R. 13918. I would have voted "no" on the amendment to the Public Broadcasting Act, to prohibit the corporation from conducting voter polls or public opinion surveys pertaining to Federal, State, or local elections. The amendment was agreed to by a vote of 203 ayes to 135 noes.

Rollcall No. 180—An amendment to

H.R. 13918. I would have voted "no" on the amendment that sought to prohibit the authorization of any funds after fiscal year 1973 until GAO audits funds through fiscal year 1972. This amendment was agreed to while the House was in the Committee of the Whole by a vote of 169 ayes to 165 noes.

Rollcall No. 181—I would have again voted "no" on the amendment to H.R. 13918 described in Roll No. 180. The amendment was rejected by the House on a vote of 166 yeas to 170 nays, following a demand for a separate vote by the House.

Rollcall No. 182—I would have voted "yea" on the passage of H.R. 13918, the Public Broadcasting Act of 1972. The bill was approved by a vote of 256 yeas to 69 nays.

Rollcall No. 183—I would have voted "yea" on House Resolution 965, authorizing the Speaker to appoint delegates and alternates to attend the International Labor Organization Conference in Geneva. The resolution was approved by a vote of 192 yeas to 80 nays.

MONDAY, JUNE 5, 1972

Rollcall No. 185—I would have voted "yea" on the conference report on S. 1736, the Public Buildings Amendments of 1972. The conference report was approved by a vote of 277 yeas to 40 nays.

Rollcall No. 186—I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 12674, to establish a national cemetery system within the Veterans' Administration. The bill was approved by a vote of 310 yeas to 4 nays.

Rollcall No. 187—I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 10310, to establish the Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge. The bill was approved by a vote of 314 yeas.

Rollcall No. 188—I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 14731, to provide for the effective enforcement of the provisions of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 prohibiting the shooting at birds, fish, and other animals from aircraft. The bill was approved by a vote of 310 yeas to 5 nays.

Rollcall No. 189—I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 14106, to amend the Water Resources Planning Act to authorize increased appropriations. The bill was approved by a vote of 317 yeas.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 7, 1972

Rollcall No. 192—I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 15259, making appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1973. The bill was approved by a vote of 302 yeas to 67 nays.

Rollcall No. 193—I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 14990, to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission. The bill was approved by a vote of 367 yeas to 2 nays.

THURSDAY, JUNE 8, 1972

Rollcall No. 195—I would have voted "yea" on the conference report on S. 659, the Higher Education Act of 1972. The conference report was approved by a vote of 218 yeas to 180 nays.

AIR PIRACY

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

ute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the effort by American pilots to force positive action against sky pirates is commendable. The effort is, in part, abortive because it does not take in a broad enough group of pilots and it could not be fully effective because it does not reach the countries chiefly responsible for international hijacking. Nevertheless, it shows the American pilots are in a mood to demand action.

The United Nations could be helpful in this area and should be. All of the nations which encourage hijacking are members of the U.N. The member states which deplore this practice should make the subject an important part of the United Nations agenda until something constructive is achieved. The U.S. State Department has not worked as hard at achieving the cooperation of other nations as it should. The Congress should tighten the laws which deal with air piracy.

The fact remains that the pilots have broken the ice in an effort to discourage one very serious aspect of hijacking. For this they should receive gratitude and commendation. It is to be hoped their efforts will continue.

WORKING TOGETHER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, communication between constituents and Members of Congress is the vital ingredient in a successful representative democracy.

There is no such thing as too much communication. Because understanding begins with communication and there cannot be too much understanding if this Republic is to grow and prosper.

This is the reasoning behind my latest newsletter and the questionnaire it includes which has been mailed to 175,000 constituents in Massachusetts. I submit it as "exhibit 1" in making a case for a continuing dialog between the people and those they elect to represent them:

WORKING TOGETHER

A continuing dialogue with the people of the Tenth District is most important. Communication between constituents and member of Congress is the key to good representation in Washington. Our communication enables me to act upon your views and assist in your dealings with the Federal Government.

The lines of our communication in the Tenth District are strong and varied. There are two offices in the District, one in Wellesley, telephone 235-3350, and one in Fall River, telephone 672-1855. They are in constant telecommunication with me in Washington for the instant transmission of information and/or documents.

And I am happy to announce that we will soon have a third office in the Tenth District, this one in Taunton to serve that area plus the Attleboros and the Bridgewater. Watch for the grand opening.

In addition, I will be visiting many other communities in my mobile Office and I will be pleased if you can join me to discuss your views and problems.

The mail bag brings us more than 500 letters a week on every imaginable subject. I am always glad to hear from you.

I have personal visits with many of you, both in the District and in Washington, in meetings with businessmen, union members, state, city and town officials, housewives, students, senior citizens and other groups. I find these meetings most valuable.

Your communications—in person, by mail, by phone—provide me the information I need to represent you in Washington, to bring your views to the Congress, and to get the Government to respond to your needs.

Some examples of how this can work are listed in the box on your left.

COMMUNICATION = ACTION

The Taunton Neighborhood Youth Corps project was in danger of being transferred to New Bedford. I objected and the Regional Manpower Administration yielded, leaving the program under Taunton control.

The North Attleboro Industrial Development Commission sought my assistance in untangling government red tape delaying its application for Federal aid. We were successful and the application is presently close to final approval.

Several months after her husband's death, a widow complained that she could not obtain the Social Security death benefits due her. I contacted the Social Security Administration and within a short time the widow received a lump sum for past benefits and will continue to receive payments on a monthly basis.

In Israel last year, I met Dr. Michael Zand, who was having trouble getting a visa to this country to lecture on the problem of Jews in Russia, from which he had recently fled. I was able to arrange for the visa and he began his talks at Brandeis University.

The Environmental Protection Association of Southern New England, centered in the Mansfield-Rehoboth area, sought my help in interesting Federal officials in its proposals to bring the ecology story to the public. The responsible officials were contacted and a meeting was arranged.

Another widow, the wife of a veteran who died from service-connected illness, was finding it difficult to obtain information from the Veterans Administration on benefits for her family. Regular monthly checks are now being received by the widow and her children.

THE ECONOMY = JOBS

The economic reawakening in the rest of the nation is not being duplicated in Massachusetts.

The best way to cope with the situation is to meet it head on. And the best weapon is jobs.

There are two sources of jobs: expansion of existing industries and the attraction of new industry.

I have been meeting with the other members of the Massachusetts Congressional delegation, with economists, employers, labor representatives in a continuing effort to solve the problem.

At the same time, I have been working with city and town officials in the Tenth District on developing the best climate for keeping and attracting industry.

I have also supported the Emergency Employment Act which has created 500 jobs in public service areas in the Tenth District as well as legislation to extend Unemployment Compensation Benefits for those who have exhausted their normal payments.

Mansfield and the Attleboros, to cite two examples, have done very well in attracting industry. Taking advantage of their location near the anchor point for Interstate 495, they have succeeded in attracting new industry into a climate in which it can flourish.

It is going to take the best efforts of all of us—industry, labor, government at all levels and private citizens—to restore Massachusetts to a healthy, growing economy.

REVENUE SHARING

An important first step toward much-needed tax reform is being taken as the Congress debates revenue sharing.

The return of Federal tax revenues to states and communities, which I support, is not tax relief as such, but it is tax reform because it is designed to pave the way for a reordering of state and local tax systems.

Basically, the revenue-sharing bill before the House provides a total of \$5.3 billion to be apportioned among state and local governments the first year.

Massachusetts' share of these funds in 1972, if the bill passes, will be \$104.4 million to local communities and \$74.6 million to the state, for a total of \$179 million.

Under the formula in the bill approved by the House Ways and Means Committee, the estimated first year fund allocation to Tenth District cities is:

\$598,007 to Attleboro; \$1,973,469 to Fall River; and \$867,383 to Taunton.

Under the same formula, the approximate amounts for Tenth District towns are:

Berkley, \$10,000; Bridgewater, \$119,000; Dighton, \$24,000; East Bridgewater, \$84,000; Easton, \$82,000; Foxboro, \$182,000; Free-town, \$22,000; Halifax, \$36,000; Hanson, \$72,000; Lakeville, \$44,000.

Mansfield, \$50,000; Medfield, \$126,000; Middleboro, \$137,000; Millis, \$73,000; Natick, \$226,000; Norfolk, \$60,000; North Attleboro, \$94,000; Norton, \$48,000; Plainville, \$63,000; Raynham, \$34,000.

Rehoboth, \$33,000; Seekonk, \$56,000; Sharon, \$159,000; Sherborn, \$24,000; Somerset, \$92,000; Swansea, \$64,000; Wellesley, \$360,000; West Bridgewater, \$72,000; Westport, \$50,000; Wrentham, \$94,000.

The money given to city and town governments cannot be used as local funds to match Federal grants for other programs.

Fundamental purpose of the bill is to supply the additional revenue municipalities say they must have to meet their increasing needs. A five-year period is written into the legislation to give local and state governments "breathing room", not only to solve revenue shortages, but also to reform their own tax structures.

SENIOR CITIZENS

The country owes senior citizens something for the investment of themselves in decent, hard-working, law-abiding lifetimes that, in the aggregate, built America.

I believe it owes them economic security, comfort, ease, good health care, Social Security income equal to their needs, adequate housing suitable to their needs, easy transportation, protection from crime, and the opportunity for social activities.

Thus I have been supporting and working for a 20-percent increase in Social Security benefits and other legislation needed to provide these things for seniors.

Of more immediate importance is the Federal money I was recently able to obtain for additional senior citizens' housing in Taunton.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development has provided initial funds for planning and design work on an 80-unit complex for seniors.

The project had been snarled in red tape, but we worked it out with city and Federal officials, and it is now proceeding on schedule.

SOME OF MY OTHER MAJOR LEGISLATION

Urge definite withdrawal date from Viet Nam, concurrent with release of American prisoners.

Create a Joint Committee on the Environment.

Prohibit discrimination against the physically and mentally handicapped.

Provide tax credits for private non-profit elementary and secondary education and for higher education expenses.

Authorize programs to promote the cultural heritage of ethnic groups.

Established a Comprehensive Child Development Program.

Permit tax exemption of the first \$5,000 of retirement income.

Establish a Commission on Penal Reform.

Establish a Consumer Protection Agency.

Recognize Bangladesh.

Establish a Department of Peace.

Establish a quota on imported shoes and textiles.

Provide additional compensation for prisoners of war.

Provide improved medical care for veterans.

Provide funds for Coast Guard protection of U.S. fishermen.

CONSUMERS

Two issues affecting Massachusetts consumers the most are food and fuel oil.

I have been working to bring price relief on both.

I called for a White House study of the entire food price situation which finds neither farmer nor housewife the beneficiary. Uncontrolled food prices defeat any attempt to check inflation by controlling wages and other prices.

The price Commission held hearings on the subject, as I urged, but whatever little result there has been is not enough.

Massachusetts oil consumers—victimized by high prices resulting from restrictions on imports of foreign crude oil—may be helped by two recent developments, but, again, not enough.

One is that the foreign oil import quota for New England has been slightly increased, boosting the supply and, hopefully, lowering prices.

The other is the decision to build a pipeline to bring Alaskan oil to California. I urged that the pipeline be built in Canada to bring the oil closer to New England. I just hope some of the additional oil from Alaska finds its way to Massachusetts to ease the price pressure.

I have been working on the oil situation with the bipartisan Congressional delegation from Massachusetts since I came to Congress. But the problem is that the big oil-producing states in the West and Southwest, which have money and a lot of votes, want foreign imports controlled to protect the domestic oil industry. That is New England's chief competition and it is formidable.

REPRESENTATIVE MARGARET HECKLER'S SIXTH ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

(Please check appropriate spaces and mail it back to me at 318 House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515)

Vietnam: Would you favor a national referendum on the war?

Which alternative would you vote for?

A. The present mining and bombing policy.

B. Immediate and total withdrawal of U.S. forces.

C. Withdrawal by a date certain concurrent with release of U.S. prisoners.

D. Total military victory.

Tax reform: Would you favor appointment of a blue-ribbon national commission to conduct a two-year study of our tax system and recommend needed reforms?

Equal rights: Should the Massachusetts Legislature ratify the proposed U.S. Constitutional amendment granting men and women equal rights?

Education: Which would you support?

A. Continued public school financing by local property taxes.

B. State financing of public school system.

C. Increased Federal financing of public schools.

D. Federal income tax credits for private non-profit elementary and secondary education expenses.

Power-environment: Would you like to see a New England Regional Power Commission representing the six states which would decide power usage, plant sites, and the environmental impact for the whole region?

Day care: Do you favor a Federal program to provide day care facilities?

Health insurance: Do you favor a national health insurance program?

Which of several proposed programs do you prefer?

A. Complete medical and hospital coverage for everyone financed by payroll tax and employer and Federal matching contributions.

B. Limited coverage financed by 75-25 employer-employee contributions with separate Federal plan for poor and low-income families.

C. Limited coverage with employer-employee or individual financing options and separate state-Federal plan for poor and low-income.

D. Limited coverage with individuals granted credit on their Federal income tax liability for health insurance premiums they pay.

OFFICERS ACCUSED OF ILLEGAL ACTIVITY IN VIETNAM

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, I am publicly releasing today a series of Defense Department and U.S. Customs documents that reveal several senior American military officers "violated military laws and regulations" by giving merchandise to one of Danang's most notorious black marketeers and smugglers.

According to these documents, American officials cooperated with Miss Hoang Thi Nam by providing her with goods that apparently were in turn sold on the black market. These documents named five U.S. colonels, two lower ranking officers and an enlisted man who allegedly illegally gave Miss Nam air conditioners, refrigerators, motor scooters and stoves.

Two of these documents were written by officers of a special Crime Suppression Team of the military police and another by the U.S. customs advisory team in Vietnam.

A check I had made with independent sources familiar with the situation in Danang had revealed Miss Nam has been the recipient of major U.S. contracts since 1962 and has been involved in alleged corruption and kickbacks.

The documents also indicate that Miss Nam holds a bank account with a U.S. bank in Guam containing millions of dollars. The documents raise the possibility that some American income tax may be owed on these accounts that have been accruing interest at approximately \$100,000 per year.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that Miss Nam's black market business has been in existence for at least 5 years and undoubtedly involves millions of dollars of goods. I have called upon Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird to disclose what actions, if any, he has taken concerning these alleged illegal activities. While many Americans are fully aware of corruption by the South Vietnamese, it is shocking to hear allegations that our own senior military officers work hand-in-glove with top Vietnamese officials.

It is interesting to note that earlier attempts to raid Miss Nam's home by U.S. and Vietnamese officials were

thwarted on at least two occasions by the presence of either an American or Vietnamese general at her home. As a result I have asked Secretary Laird to initiate an investigation to determine if there were any illegal involvement between the American general, whose presence prevented one of the raids on Miss Nam's home. The presence of Vietnamese and American generals at Miss Nam's home only raises new questions about the involvement of senior American officials with this alleged criminal.

The letter to Secretary Laird follows:
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 19, 1972.

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense,
the Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to you today in order to inquire about the progress of an investigation of the alleged illegal activities of Miss Hoang Thi Nam in Danang.

About a year ago, U.S. and South Vietnamese officials raided her home and removed approximately three and one half truckloads of merchandise intended for the black market. Information I have obtained indicates that the South Vietnamese were not being fully cooperative in the investigation of Miss Nam's activities.

I have also learned that the special Crime Suppression Team of the military police in Vietnam and the U.S. Customs Advisory Team in Vietnam, believe that at least five U.S. colonels, two lower ranking officers and an enlisted man illegally gave Miss Nam air conditioners, refrigerators, motor scooters, stoves and other goods.

I hope that you can disclose what actions, if any, have been taken concerning these alleged activities. While many Americans are fully aware of corruption by the South Vietnamese, it is shocking to hear allegations that our own senior military officers worked hand in glove with a top Vietnamese criminal.

I also understand that two earlier attempts to raid Miss Nam's home were thwarted because of the presence of an American and a South Vietnamese general. I hope that you will immediately initiate an investigation to determine if there was an illegal involvement between the American general whose presence prevented one raid on Miss Nam's home and Miss Nam. The presence of Vietnamese and American generals at Miss Nam's home only raises new questions about the involvement of senior American officials with an alleged criminal.

I hope that you will forward me a complete report on what has been done to investigate allegations against these American officers and an enlisted man as well as what actions have been taken to curtail Miss Nam's illegal activity.

I believe that the American government and the American military should not tolerate any form of corruption within its ranks. I hope that your Department through its investigations, will determine if any senior American officials have been involved.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

LES ASPIN,
Member of Congress.

BEEF PRICES

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

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my dismay at the skyrocketing price of beef in this country. On April 12 I addressed a Price Commission hearing

on the subject of food prices and called for the imposition of controls on raw agricultural products so that food prices could be stabilized.

At that time, I cited the Department of Labor's figures for the month of February which showed a consumers' price index rise of one-half of 1 percent, the largest increase in 1 year, which was, of course, before we had any controls at all. Three-fourths of that increase was in higher food prices. Grocery prices rose by 2 percent, the biggest monthly increase in 14 years.

The news today with regard to beef prices is even worse. In that record month of February, the average weekly price of 100 pounds of choice-grade beef on the hoof reached a 24-year high of \$36.68. Mr. Speaker, I was appalled to read that despite all of the efforts which we have made to hold the line on food prices, the comparable figure for beef last week had jumped to \$37.36.

I am deeply distressed about the fact that the average American is being called upon, in a controlled economy, to make huge personal sacrifices in order to obtain the basic necessities of life. I think, frankly, that the continued increase in food prices is a very sad commentary on the effectiveness of our economic stabilization program.

It is very difficult for me to advocate that the consumer make yet another sacrifice when it is really the producer who should help to hold the line on inflation. But considering the way in which the administration has acted in the past, it seems that only by direct consumer action to cut the demand will the producers cut the prices at the wholesale level. Both ends of the pipeline must take steps to stop inflation. If the producers would not do it voluntarily, and if the Government would not undertake the necessary action, then consumers must take action themselves. The only real answer to the problem in view of regulatory inaction is to cut down demand. I know of no better way than to propose a return to "Meatless Tuesdays." If the housewife does not serve meat 1 day each week and the restaurants do not serve meat 1 day per week we can cut demand by about 15 percent.

Yesterday's edition of Newsday quoted Mr. Russell Ives, vice president of the American Meat Institute, to the effect that:

You're going to have some higher prices. . . . Meat is one of the things that is truly supply-and-demand-influenced.

The same article quotes a Government economist, John Larsen, as saying of the public:

They'll write and complain about it, but they'll still pay the prices.

Meanwhile, C. W. McMillan, vice president of the American National Cattlemen's Association, said that cattlemen were "in the net-profit picture solidly for the first time in 20 years" and he predicted that the heavy demand would keep beef prices high for the rest of the year.

Mr. Speaker, my analysis and recommendations on this intolerable situation are twofold. First it is painfully obvious that the lack of controls on raw agri-

cultural products—and I am aware of the difficulties involved in setting controls on this—the lack of controls is directly responsible for the continued unconscionable rise in food prices. In the case of beef in particular, the continued heavy demand and apparently smaller than expected supply has forced the prices beyond all reasonable bounds.

At this time, I renew my demand that the Price Commission take affirmative action on the matter of controlling raw agricultural product prices. I find it entirely inequitable that farmers be allowed to charge what the traffic will bear at a time when the average consumer is lining in a controlled economic situation.

However, I do not expect any more action by the Price Commission on this matter than it has made to date, which is zero and since that is the case we, the consumers, are the ones who must take action. I am calling on the American public to begin a voluntary program of meatless Tuesdays. Everyone whom I quoted above spoke on the supply-and-demand correlation in beef prices. Let us join together to lower the demand and thereby lower the prices.

I plan to bring this program for lowering beef prices to the attention of the people in my district through whatever means I can: the media, my regular newsletter report, my walking tours and speaking engagements. I urge my colleagues who are similarly outraged at the high cost of beef to call on their constituents to join in this important effort by having meatless Tuesdays.

A BILL TO RESTORE THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE REGULATORY COMMISSIONS

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the House passed legislation intended to bring order to the establishment and use of governmental advisory committees. During the floor debate, I expressed my concern, however, that in acting to impose needed controls, the Congress was about to give the Office of Management and Budget and the President still another means of influencing the decision-making processes of the independent regulatory commissions which we have created to regulate highly sensitive aspects of our economic system.

The administrative powers given to OMB under that bill relating to the function and use of advisory committees, by themselves, do not offer great potential for abuse. However, they fit into a pattern which extends over the past 35 years by which the executive branch has gained extensive control of the regulatory agencies. In each case, these administrative controls have been achieved by the Executive with the acquiescence or express permission of the Congress in the interest of economy and organization.

One of the most highly respected men to serve on a regulatory agency, former ICC Commissioner Joseph Eastman, once observed:

That to be successful, (the Regulatory Commissions) must be masters of their own souls, and known to be such.

I sincerely believe that the erosion of regulatory independence of the agencies has now progressed to the point where no agency is seriously regarded as the "master of its own soul." And today many doubt whether these agencies are any longer able to faithfully and vigorously carry out their assigned legislative functions with the cold neutrality that the public and the Congress has a right to expect of them.

As my colleagues know, each of these agencies was created as a subordinate arm of the Congress to carry out assigned legislative and judicial functions within general statutory standards of legislative policy. Great care was taken in the enabling statutes to create agencies which would be as far removed as possible from partisan politics or political influence. From the first day of their creation, however, every President who has held office—whether Republican or Democratic—has attempted to subject the regulatory agencies to Executive control and dominance. Indeed, Presidents of my own party—Roosevelt, Truman, and Kennedy—have been most responsible for encroaching on the independence of these agencies.

I believe that the time has come—and is perhaps long overdue—for Congress to act affirmatively to return to the legislative branch the influence over these regulatory commissions which through the years we have permitted the executive department to acquire and abuse. I am today, therefore, introducing legislation designed to restore to these agencies the regulatory freedom which the Congress originally intended them to have.

Reduced to its barest terms this legislation would break the influence of the executive branch by narrowly limiting its exercise of administrative control over the independent agencies and, in some cases, by revoking existing authority. To briefly summarize its basic provisions this legislation would—

First. Require Senate confirmation for appointments of agency chairmen. Today the Senate only examines the appointment of chairman if a Commissioner is designated as chairman at the time he is appointed to the Commission.

Second. Require that chairmen, once designated, shall continue to serve as such for the duration of their terms as members of the Commission.

Third. Prevent removal of agency chairmen or Commissioners except for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office.

Fourth. Permit the regulatory commissions to control civil litigation to which they are a party and to appeal lower court decisions of their own motion and on their own behalf.

Fifth. Eliminate the requirement that the agencies obtain the prior approval of OMB before distributing questionnaires or requests for information—however the agencies would still be required to submit such questionnaires and requests to OMB and allow a reasonable opportunity for the Director to comment on them.

Sixth. Direct the agencies to submit legislative recommendations or comments on pending bills directly to Congress and not to seek or obtain prior clearance or review of such submissions by any department of the executive branch.

Seventh. Require the President, in submitting his budget to the Congress, to include the agency requests originally submitted to OMB together with any supporting materials furnished by the agency so that Congress may have a clear understanding of what resources the agencies themselves believe are necessary to carry out their assigned duties.

I should note parenthetically that this legislation deals only with the regulatory commissions subject to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of which I am a member. Thus, its terms will relate to the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission. It does not attempt to restore the regulatory freedom of the Federal Maritime Commission which is subject to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; nor does it deal with the National Labor Relations Board which has a different cross-industry function and a peculiar status among the regulatory commissions.

I will not take the time to discuss the merits of each of these proposals today. In passing, however, I would like to make one point with respect to the suggestion that the budgetary process be amended to provide greater visibility of the agencies' determination of need. As we all know, the independent agencies are vested with enormous powers to regulate the essential industries of land and air transportation, gas and electric power, communications, and the securities markets and to control competitive practices employed by all business enterprises.

As one commentator has noted:

The decisions of these agencies directly affect the national economy and influence the quality, service, and prices paid by consumers in well-nigh every category of trade and commerce.

Yet, in a total budget for fiscal year 1973, of \$271 billion, only \$159 million has been requested for these agencies—or less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the Federal budget. Perhaps no other single fact than the failure of the executive branch to request adequate funding for these vital agencies argues more strongly for this legislation.

I have incorporated in this bill what I believe to be a workable plan to restore the independence of the regulatory commissions. Hopefully, it will serve also to restore public confidence in the ability of these agencies to fairly and impartially administer their regulatory responsibilities.

In the words of Mr. Justice Jackson, while the power to legislate belongs to the Congress, "only Congress itself can prevent power from slipping through its fingers." This we have allowed to hap-

pen. Accordingly, we now must act to return that power to the Congress, to clarify the role of the regulatory agencies, to provide them with the direction which they need and which the President now seeks to give them in the place of the Congress, and to greatly improve and augment our means of legislative investigation and oversight over these agencies so that they may more properly carry out their functions as arms of the legislative department. This legislation is an important first step in that direction.

LEAA: SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in 1968 Congress enacted the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act which established the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Under the block grant programs of LEAA, States receive specific amounts of Federal assistance based on their relative populations. Shortly after LEAA was established, as the then chairman of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, I directed the subcommittee to closely monitor LEAA's programs because of the great importance of that agency's mission. After the House rules were amended, the chairmanship of the subcommittee was assumed by my distinguished colleague from Connecticut (JOHN S. MONAGAN) who continued the review of LEAA's programs and intensified the investigation when it became apparent that serious management deficiencies were impeding the attainment of congressional goals. The culmination of the subcommittee investigation is a recently issued report by the House Government Operations Committee titled "Block Grant Programs of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration"—House Report No. 92-1072.

There has been considerable public and press attention to the report on LEAA and to the investigation by the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, as there should be, because an agency of this importance should receive greater scrutiny.

Recently the Wall Street Journal editorialized about the committee's work relative to LEAA. Subcommittee Chairman MONAGAN responded to that editorial, and his response as published in the WSJ on June 14, 1972, deserves the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 14, 1972]

LEAA CRITICIZED

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL: I take this occasion shortly after the official release of the report by the House Government Operations Committee on the block grant programs of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) to address matters raised in your editorial "Is LEAA a Flop?" (May 16). First of all, the editorial is a welcome continuation of the dialogue on the operations of that important agency. Unfortunately, it contains certain inaccuracies and draws conclusions that distort the function of the Government Operations Committee

and depreciate a thorough and fully documented two-year investigation.

LEAA received 698 million taxpayer dollars last year and was just voted \$850 million for next year by the House. This agency has had no discernible effect upon the incidence of crime in this country and millions of dollars have been misapplied through its ineptness. It is not encouraging to those of us trying to ride herd on the activities of free-spending bureaucrats to find The Wall Street Journal taking such a benign view of waste and incompetence in government. The record of the subcommittee's investigation uncovered numerous examples of poor management, poor planning and poor administration of the tax funds entrusted to LEAA.

The question really is simple enough—accountability. Given enactment of the block grant concept the issue is whether the block grant programs can achieve measurable results under the lax management that LEAA and the states have given them. Whether I was "in the forefront" of the legislative attempt in 1968 to defeat the block grant concept of the Safe Streets Act, a statement which is not correct, is not in point. I do not wish to "replay" that debate, but merely want these programs to provide results commensurate with the \$1.5 billion taxpayer investment.

With regard to auditing by LEAA and the states, the report makes clear that at both levels little has been done. In 1969 LEAA promised to perform annual audits of every state program. After three years of operation, LEAA had completed audit reports on only two states. In fact, LEAA does not have an "auditing staff of 50" as you say. The President's budget requested only 43 audit positions at LEAA. The states themselves have shown very little interest in a thorough self-auditing process as the report documents.

It is useful to highlight a few of the disturbing deficiencies and abuses highlighted therein:

(1) Of the \$552 million in block grants awarded to the states in the program's first three years, the states had disbursed to their subgrantees only \$138 million as of June 30, 1971, a rate of 25 cents to the dollar. Federal and state bureaucratic tiers between the crime problem and the source of funds, many of which added nothing to the sufficiency of program supervision, are among the principle causes of this inertia. In New York City, for example, more than 170 procedural-bureaucratic steps must be taken for the funding of a single project.

(2) Tens of millions of block grant dollars have been spent in the purchase of law enforcement equipment, most of it not evaluated and often purchased under very lax and highly irregular procurement procedures. The inordinate commitment of state block grant funds to hardware and the improper procurement procedures have taken place with the acquiescence of LEAA or without its awareness. It was not until the subcommittee's hearings that LEAA realized an expenditure of \$84,000 in federal funds had been made by Indiana for an airplane which served as a handy air taxi for the governor, his family, and state LEAA officials.

The result of this type of "supervision" by LEAA in the state of Arkansas is underscored by the fact that 37% of that state's block grant funds in the first three years of the program was spent on police two-way radio equipment. During that same period about 7% of that state's block grant funds were committed to corrections programs despite corrections facilities within the state that are so inadequate that they have been declared unconstitutional.

(3) Consultant abuses have also plagued the programs of a number of states. In Alabama, for example, a consultant firm with no demonstrated criminal justice experience was

incorporated on one day and received a \$91,000 payment the next day for preparation of the 1971 state LEAA plan. The plan produced by the consultant was merely a compilation of other LEAA-funded consultant-prepared plans.

(4) In Alabama, Florida and Indiana, partisan political meddling in the programs weakened public confidence, caused substantial waste, and retarded attainment of the goals of the Safe Streets Act. In one case, \$117,000 was used to establish an Alabama "police cadet" program which evolved into a source of free tuition for sons and relatives of high state officials.

Numerous other examples could be cited. The disturbing aspect of the Committee's finding is that LEAA simply has no information to assure that what has been uncovered is not the "tip of the iceberg."

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Chairman, Legal and Monetary Affairs
Subcommittee of the Committee on
Government Operations, Washington.

INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL PARK

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the conservationists in the Middle West are happy over the increase of \$1,177,000 which was allocated this week for additional expansion of the Indiana Dunes State Park. I do hope that the Interior Committee and the administration will take immediate steps to proceed with the necessary work in developing this exceptional, wooded, sand-dune area on the South Shore of Lake Michigan into one of the most outstanding national parks of the Nation.

Hundreds of thousands of families in the Middle West are waiting anxiously for complete development and construction of all facilities necessary to accommodate the vacationers awaiting the grand opening of the Indian Dunes National Park. Three weeks ago I was present at a big anniversary dinner by the "Save the Dunes Council" of Indiana celebrating the 20th anniversary of the organization of this group who sparked the plan and worked hard over the years to get legislation to bring about this necessary recreational area for the Middle West.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks a letter from President Nixon to Mrs. Sylvia Troy, president, Save the Dunes Council, Munster, Ind., for the great work which they have done for conservation and environmental enhancement.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., May 2, 1972.

Mrs. SYLVIA TROY,
President, Save the Dunes Council,
Post Office Box 303, Chesterton, Ind.

DEAR MRS. TROY: It is my pleasure to congratulate each member of the Save the Dunes Council for their dedicated work in the cause of conservation and environmental enhancement. I understand that the interest you have shown over the past decade in Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore greatly influenced its establishment and is now a major factor in the proper development of the Lakeshore. It is also encouraging to note that the Council has cooperated with other citizen groups and individuals in furthering the best use of natural resources in the entire Lake Michigan area.

In a time when Americans are more concerned than ever before about the ecological health of the nation, it is heartening to know that a major volunteer effort is being exerted to assure a bright future for the Great Lakes region.

With my best wishes,
Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN RECEIVES DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD FROM THE CONSUMER FEDERATION OF AMERICA

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, one of our distinguished and outstanding colleagues last week received a special recognition from the Consumer Federation of America at a banquet honoring her at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington.

The formal presentation of this outstanding honor was made by Mr. George E. Myers, CFA vice president. I hereby ask unanimous consent to include his tribute made on that occasion honoring our colleague, Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN:

PRESENTATION REMARKS BY GEORGE E. MYERS,
CFA VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

George Bernard Shaw, the great English playwright, made this observation in his work, "The Devil's Disciple," early in this century: "The worst sin towards our fellow creatures is not to hate them, but to be indifferent to them: 'that's the essence of inhumanity.'"

Tonight we are here to pay well deserved honor to a distinguished member of the United States Congress whose record proves beyond all question that she is not indifferent to her fellow citizens and their needs; we are here to show our gratitude to a woman of compassion and understanding for the "little man". We are here to extend tribute to a public official who has proven time and time again that she is a champion of the average citizen—the American consumer.

No elected public official in America today has done more to improve the lot of the American consumer than Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN. It is not surprising that the voters in her district in Missouri have enthusiastically returned her to the House of Representatives time after time, until she is now serving her tenth term. And we consumers hope fervently that this is just the beginning of her legislative career!

Long a defender of the cause of the ordinary American citizen, Congresswoman SULLIVAN gained national fame with her brilliant legislative leadership which resulted in the enactment of the Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1968, popularly known as the Truth-in-Lending law. Mrs. Sullivan, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Banking and Currency Committee, took a weak, watered down, Senate-passed bill and built it into a strong, workable measure with real teeth in it. She added provisions on garnishment and extortionate credit transactions—provisions which seasoned political observers said were ahead of their time. She won support for her greatly strengthened bill in the full committee; she forced big business interests to capitulate; and with the support of her Committee chairman, Rep. Wright Patman, she led a determined and successful fight for passage of the bill on the House floor. Then

in a major legislative achievement, she battled for the bill in the Senate-House Conference Committee and came through with a strong, protective measure which has become a landmark in effective consumer protective legislation. They said it couldn't be done, but the gracious lady we honor tonight didn't hear them. She fought doggedly ahead, and proved that determination and dedication, coupled with legislative know-how, can win the people's battle despite overwhelming odds.

The Consumer Credit Protection Act may well be Congresswoman Sullivan's major victory for the American consumer, but it is far from being her only consumer triumph. They include such subjects as fair credit reporting, wholesome meat and poultry, hazardous substances labeling, food and drug measures, and liberal housing provisions—these and many more consumer protective laws clearly bear Congresswoman Sullivan's unmistakable imprint upon them. The impressive list of consumer legislation which she has written or supported is far too long to repeat here tonight.

Today this champion of the American consumer carries on her battles just as aggressively in Congress. Her loyalty and devotion to the consumer cause continue unabated as in the past.

Congresswoman Sullivan: to a charming and gracious lady with a fighting heart and a compassion for her fellow men, on behalf of the consumers of America for your dedicated and distinguished service in their cause, the Consumer Federation of America is honored to present to you its Distinguished Service Award.

A FEDERAL LIGHT ON CRIME PROGRAM

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the response to the questionnaire I recently sent constituents reflected a great concern with the menace of street crime. For many people the streets have become corridors of fear after dark.

One practical way to deter street crime is to improve street lighting. On March 22, I introduced a bill, H.R. 14022, to establish a "Federal light on crime program." This legislation would mandate the expenditure of \$30 million in each of the next 3 years specifically for the purchase and installation of high-pressure sodium-type lights. The funds would come in grants made directly to local governments on a 75 percent Federal, 25 percent local share basis.

High pressure sodium lights are able to illuminate a city street far better than our traditional street lighting; using the same amount of electrical power, high-pressure sodium lights give approximately four times the lighting level provided by traditional lights. In a sense, they turn night into day and their effectiveness as a deterrent against crime is undeniable.

In Washington D.C., after installation of high-level lighting in high-crime areas, crime decreased by 31 percent.

Gary, Ind. installed 5,000 new street lights. Criminal assaults dropped 70 percent and robberies 60 percent.

In Chattanooga, Tenn., crime in a 12-block area dropped 70 percent after lighting.

The program I have proposed involves relatively low costs and can have an immediate impact on reducing street crime. This is a program designed to light our streets for people rather than just for cars; it is a program designed to return the streets to the people.

New York City and other localities have initiated their own high-level lighting plans on a limited scale, combining private and local government funding. Some such lights illuminate parts of our own East Side even now. But in a time of budgetary crisis in local government, it is clear that the Federal Government should provide funding for high-intensity lighting.

An infusion of Federal funds would allow the type of massive lighting program which I believe we need in our urban areas, and which localities can never finance alone. Rather than having only individual blocks sporadically lighted, Federal funding could conceivably insure that whole communities would be illuminated, to the benefit of residents and merchants alike.

I hope that the Congress will give prompt consideration to H.R. 14022. We must do what we can to move the country to the date when we can all "see the light" and end the terror in our streets.

A PARK FOR SZOLD PLACE INSTEAD OF A RAT'S NEST

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, it is no surprise that many people in our central cities have become disillusioned with Government. Surely New York and other cities need vast amounts of Federal aid. But when a city uses its available resources ineptly, no Federal aid can cure the resentment that is bred.

On New York's Lower East Side, I have recently witnessed an example of how local government, through error and inaction, breeds alienation and discontent. Henrietta Szold Place is located at 10th Street and Avenue D in my new congressional district, and in the heart of a predominately Puerto Rican community. Recreational facilities are scarce in the area, so when a public outdoor pool was completed late last summer an important step was taken to improve the quality of life. However, a large area surrounding the pool, scheduled to be a park some distant day, has been left covered with garbage and other rubble ever since the pool's completion. In fact, much of the debris on the site results from the pool construction.

Now, almost a year later, the area around the pool, despite the pleas to city government by local leaders, remains rubble strewn. Rats inhabit the lot and in all probability swim in or drink from the pool.

One child was allegedly infected by pool water last year.

The city, of course, should never have let the pool's builder leave rubble all around. But the city's failure to remedy

this initial error during the many months that have passed is inexcusable.

On May 16 of this year, I wrote to the heads of three city departments—parks, sanitation, and highways—urging immediate coordinated action to clear, level, and transform the area into a temporary park before summer. I have received assurances from Administrators Heckscher and Kretschmer that the Departments of Parks will provide benches and plant greenery, and that the Department of Sanitation will clear the lot of all except the heaviest rubble. That job is up to the Department of Highways which has made no commitment yet.

No more planning is necessary, no more delays are tolerable, work must begin now. I have written to Mayor John V. Lindsay urging that he intervene personally to insure that Szold Place is cleared for temporary park use. I have also asked that he allocate the necessary funds in the city budget for construction of a permanent park there.

Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 17, the day the pool officially opened, I joined local residents of this community in a demonstration to protest the city's inaction. I joined the picket line and heard the people chant:

I've got a feeling
I've got a feeling this pool is full of rats
And we ain't going to take no filth like that
Cause the brothers and the sisters
Are going to fight them back

If local governments do not use their present resources more responsively, then I have a feeling that we are heading for a confrontation that is totally unnecessary.

GOVERNMENTAL EFFICIENCY BILL INTRODUCED

(Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, our present budget situation is unenviable. Our large and continuing deficits clearly indicate that our Government is living beyond its means. This is, perhaps, an almost inevitable result of our hit-and-miss process of creating Government programs to deal with the problems of our people.

I am not suggesting that the Government has no role to play in the solution of these problems. It certainly has. But our deteriorating budgetary situation demands that we take some action to either stem the continuing rise of Federal expenditures, provide for additional revenues, or institute new efficiencies in our programs.

Today I am introducing a bill which I hope will, upon enactment, give the Congress means to improve the efficiencies of the program which it calls into being.

The bill I offer today provides that every new Federal program which is anticipated to cost \$500 million or more per year will be field tested in three States for a period of 2 years. These pilot tests would enable the Congress to see how effective the program is in dealing with the problem at which it is aimed. The Congress could then write into law

an improved program which would enable the administering agency to avoid many of the built-in administrative difficulties common to all programs passed under our present system. The legislation provides that the Congress can specifically exempt any bill from coverage of this field test program if it feels a field test would be inappropriate.

We need a program of field testing to stretch our tax resources and to tighten up the administration of programs that miss their marks or are based more on fancy than on fact.

No business would commit millions of dollars to new programs or products without testing to determine if they work or not. But the Government does. Continuing this needless and wasteful process is a betrayal of the public trust.

WHY DOES NOT THE U.N. SPEAK OUT ON VIETNAM?

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is a remarkable thing that in the United Nations, the world forum for peace and understanding, so little is heard about bringing an end to the conflict in Vietnam. The U.N. could at any moment intervene in an effort to bring about a cease-fire as a first step toward peace negotiations but it has not done so. Even the prospect of a cut in the generous appropriations to the U.N. by the Congress has failed to stimulate that body into worthwhile action.

There have been many times when the United States and South Vietnam were denounced in the U.N. Many times when the North Vietnamese were praised. Why is it there have not been more protests against the tactics of the Communists and particularly against the massive and cruel invasion of South Vietnam in recent weeks.

In the not so distant past, statements by the then Secretary of the U.N., U Thant, made it appear that he was actually sympathetic to Communist aims. Let it be said for the present Secretary General, Kurt Waldheim, that he has appealed for the "utmost restraint" by all parties and has been considering the convening of an urgent meeting of the Security Council. At least he appears neutral.

The U.N. could well perform the task of international supervision of the cease-fire which President Nixon has called for. Notably the U.N. could undertake negotiations as a neutral tribunal and hopefully achieve a settlement acceptable to both sides. American POW's-MIA's could be processed through a U.N. group.

The field of potential contribution by the U.N. is unlimited. It is unfortunate that it accomplishes so little. There are many areas of world concern. There is the matter of airplane hijacking. Only about one-third of the nations of the world have agreed to join forces for concerted effort to stop hijacking, yet practically every country is a member of the U.N. Is this not an area for a studied and determined effort to bring about an

end to hijacking and air piracy? However, there is no better example of immediate need for U.N. action than Vietnam and no more disheartening area of failure by the U.N. From the time the U.N. was born there has been conflict in Southeast Asia. The U.N. looks the other way. Its only accomplishments are in the field of world relief organizations and there also we are expected to pay the major share.

Those who seek to maintain the exorbitantly high level of payments by the United States to the U.N. will do well to think on the lack of return for our investment.

A SALUTE TO TEACHERS AS WELL AS TO EDUCATION

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that we pause during this month to offer a salute to education, for it is during June that graduates traditionally leave colleges or high schools and embark on further studies or on careers which place stress on the knowledge they have acquired during their years in school.

Perhaps too often we are prone to forget that it is this basic education which stands graduates in good stead. So today is a proper time for us to pause and say "thank you" to the more than two and a quarter million teachers who undertake each year to guide more than 48 million young people to and into the world of knowledge.

True, this is a salute to education and not a salute to teachers, but I believe that to a great extent they are one and the same. For every young man or woman who gets a good education, there are dedicated, sensitive teachers who have helped provide the incentive and the encouragement which are so essential to a good and useful life.

For many years the school system of America was upheld as an ideal, but it has multiplied in size and in cost. There have been demonstrations and disturbances, and growing concern about dope and crime. Now questions are being raised all across the land. Are our schools on the right track? Is there too much permissiveness, not enough discipline? Are there too many people who see education as a social tool rather than an educational process?

In addition to the social pressure applied to our schools, there also is the very real problem of financing the classrooms. Inflation has hit the schools just as hard as it has hit everything else. Costs continue to soar, yet classroom expenditures, including teacher salaries, have not kept pace. Education is perhaps the most important victim of the inflationary pinch, for unless education does its job our young people will not be able to fulfill their mission for America in the years ahead.

Despite all these problems, I am convinced that the teachers, the administrators and the majority of the students have held fast to the goal of learning rather than evolution as the prime aim

of education. This is a heartening realization.

Somehow, I am confident education will manage to fulfill its mission, but it remains to those in public and private life to help provide the money, the moral support and, as is the case today, occasional expressions of gratitude for all that educators are doing for America and for all mankind.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. HAGAN (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for June 19 and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. HELSTOSKI (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today and tomorrow, on account of official business.

Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. CORMAN, for Monday, June 19, on account of official business.

Mr. MANN (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for June 19 and 20, on account of official business.

Mr. ESHLEMAN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and the balance of the week, on account of continued recuperation.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOLDWATER), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHWENDEL, today, for 1 hour.

Mr. FREY, today, for 5 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, today, for 10 minutes.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MAZZOLI), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ASPIN, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. WOLFF, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. REUSS, on June 20, for 5 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MADDEN, and to include extraneous material.

Mr. DONOHUE to revise and extend his remarks on H.R. 13694, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOLDWATER), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. SCHWENDEL.

Mr. SPRINGER, in four instances.

Mr. WHALEN.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. MCKEVITT.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. PRICE of Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of California.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.

Mr. RAILSBACK in five instances.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas in three instances.

Mr. VEYSEY in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MAZZOLI), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. CASEY of Texas in two instances.

Mr. GAYDOS in 10 instances.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas.

Mr. NIX.

Mr. DELANEY.

Mr. KARTH.

Mr. LEBERT in two instances.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

Mr. RONCALIO in six instances.

Mr. HUNGATE in three instances.

Mr. HELSTOSKI in 10 instances.

Mr. PATTEN in three instances.

Mr. WRIGHT.

Mrs. ABZUG in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. ROGERS in five instances.

Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.

Mr. HAGAN in three instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON.

Mr. BRASCO.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 916. An act to include firefighters within the provisions of section 8336(c) of title 5, United States Code, relating to the retirement of Government employees engaged in certain hazardous occupations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2699. An act to authorize the acquisition of lands within the Vermejo Ranch, New Mexico and Colorado, for addition to the national forest system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3105. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to develop and carry out a forestry incentives program to encourage a higher level of forest resource protection, development, and management by small non-industrial private and non-Federal public forest landowners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3414. An act for the relief of Alexandria Nicholson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3645. An act to further amend the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 12143. An act to provide for the establishment of the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 20, 1972, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Pursuant to the order of the House on June 15, 1972, the following report was filed on June 16, 1972:]

Mr. HOLIFIELD: Committee on Government Operations. Report on U.S. Economic Assistance for the Khmer Republic (Cambodia) (Rept. No. 92-1146). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2085. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the budget for fiscal year 1973 relating to appropriations for the General Services Administration (H. Doc. No. 92-312); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2086. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting 12 reports of violations of section 3679, Revised Statutes, and Department of Defense Directive 7200.1, "Administrative Control of Appropriations within the Department of Defense," pursuant to section 3679(1)(2), Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2087. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according certain beneficiaries third and sixth preference classification, pursuant to section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2088. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Oil Pollution Act, 1961 (75 Stat. 402), as amended, to implement the 1969 and the 1971 amendments to the International Convention for the Prevention of the Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2089. A letter from the Chairman, U. S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend civil service Federal employees group life insurance and Federal employees health benefits coverage to U. S. Nationals employed by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2090. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report covering made by the Department of the Interior during calendar year 1971 to non-profit institutions and organizations for support of scientific research programs, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1891; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

2091. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a supplemental report on experience under the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1971, containing recommendations for extension and financing

of the act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2092. A letter from the Deputy Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on U.S. disaster relief to Pakistan following the November 1970, cyclone in East Pakistan; 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. HOLIFIELD: Committee on Government Operations. Report on District of Columbia food inspection and licensing (Rept. No. 92-1147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 12101. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, relating to annuities of widows of Supreme Court Justices; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-1148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HEBERT: Committee on Armed Services. 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 (Rept. No. 92-1149). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STEED: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 15585. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-1150). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 15586. A bill making appropriations for public works for water and power development, including the Corps of Engineers-Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration and other power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Appalachian regional development programs, the Federal Power Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-1151). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 15569. A bill to amend section 103 of title 23 of the United States Code relating

to additional mileage for the Interstate System and the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 by extending the duration of the highway trust fund for the construction of certain highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 15570. A bill to suspend the procedure, with respect to fiscal year 1973, for increasing certain Federal salary rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 15571. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to require the Secretary of Labor to recognize the difference in hazards to employees between the heavy construction industry and the light residential construction industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida:

H.R. 15572. A bill to liberalize the granting of assistance for certain Vietnam disabled veterans requiring specially equipped automobiles; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15573. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for expenses incurred by a taxpayer in making repairs and improvements to his residence, and to allow the owner of rental housing to amortize at an accelerated rate the cost of rehabilitating or restoring such housing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. CORDOVA, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. PODELL, Mr. SISK, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.R. 15574. 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. DINGELL, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. PODELL, and Mr. SISK):

H.R. 15575. 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 State "off" indicator; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 15576. A bill to establish a Commission on Medical Technology and Dignity of Dying; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 15577. A bill to give the consent of Congress to the construction of certain international bridges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN (for himself, Mrs.

ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GUDE, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. KYROS, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOSS, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHWENGEL, Mr. WARE, Mr. WINN, and Mr. STEELE):

H.R. 15578. A bill to protect art collectors by requiring disclosures in connection with the sale of certain fine prints and reproductions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOSMER (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BELL, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONTE, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. PETTIS):

H.R. 15579. A bill to provide that daylight saving time shall be observed on a year-

round basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 15580. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to increase salaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. CELLER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ECKHARDT, and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 15581. A bill to restore the independence of the Civil Aeronautics Board, to the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 15582. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance for programs for the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of, and research in, Cooley's anemia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 15583. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to establish a national system of minimum retirement payments for all aged, blind, and disabled individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 15584. A bill to provide for the field testing of each new Federal program; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 15585. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H.R. 15586. A bill making appropriations for public works for water and power development, including the Corps of Engineers-Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration and other power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Appalachian regional development programs, the Federal Power Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H. J. Res. 1230. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEMP:

H. Con. Res. 634. Concurrent resolution: Policies and procedures to end the war in Indochina; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

399. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to resource recovery; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

400. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.