

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, June 28, 1972

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

O taste and see that the Lord is good; blessed is the man that trusteth in Him.—Psalms 34: 8.

Our Father God, who dost reveal Thyself in the good, the true, and the beautiful, make us aware of Thy presence as we seek guidance and strength for this day.

We thank Thee for Thy love which our neglect cannot discourage, for Thy wisdom which our worried ways cannot weary, and for Thy patience which our own impatience cannot exhaust.

Though we are disturbed by the difficulties which darken our world we lift our souls to the light of Thy spirit which no darkness can overcome.

Grant unto each one of us a realization of the needs of our Nation and a faith in America which will heal divisions, foster good will, and promote justice among our people.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MEAT IMPORTS

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I was distressed to learn that quotas on meat imports have been lifted. This will simply open the door of this country to cheap, low-wage imports of beef, pork, and other meat products. For the first time in the modern history of our country, our farmers are beginning to receive a fair price for meat grown on the farm.

Mr. Speaker, farmers are not the cause of the high cost of living. For instance, the farmer only receives 3 cents for the wheat in a loaf of bread costing the housewife 35 cents. Unrestricted imports of beef and pork will be a serious blow to the American farmer and will not curb inflation. It will be a serious setback to the growing cattle industry in the South where we have been encouraged to restrict row cropping and go into cattle raising which conserves our soil and water resources.

Mr. Speaker, these cheap, low-wage imports of beef cannot possibly be processed with the same health standards and protection provided for the American people through our own industry and high standards. Some years ago, I recall that tons of kangaroo meat were sold in this country from a foreign na-

tion and sold as hamburger. We must protect the American people from such an outrage. I greatly fear that the door is now open for the importation of meat products from Communist countries that operate with a slave economy. In the future, this could be disastrous for the American people.

THE MILLS-MANSFIELD TAX REFORM BILL

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I note from this morning's Washington Post that the Democratic Platform Committee yesterday endorsed the so-called Mills-Mansfield tax reform bill which would eliminate 54 categories of tax exemption from the American public. This is really an indictment of those responsible for writing tax legislation over the past 18 years when a Democratic majority has controlled the Congress by a large margin.

This new Democratic plan is aimed at extracting billions from the small individual taxpayer and would throw the economy into chaos. It would force homeowners, for example, to pay heavy taxes on the sale of their homes; would remove mortgage interest payments as a tax deduction and in general depress the housing industry.

Current Democratic demands that tax reform be tied into any increase in the debt ceiling is sheer political hokum, but to soak the little taxpayer is irresponsible in the extreme and is a public confession by the Democratic Party that it has made a mess of our taxing system, that all of the talk about helping the little man is insincere, and they have no remedy for overspending but to soak the average taxpayer.

THE CASE OF JOHNNY NO DOE, ET AL.

(Mrs. GRIFFITHS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you the glad story of little Johnny No Doe who was born on the same day in New York City that little Johnny Gotrocks and little Johnny Rich were born.

Little Johnny Gotrocks' father was so happy he put \$100 in the bank for his son, and Johnny Rich's grandfather was so happy he bought him a share of General Motors stock. Do you know, that banker and that investment broker both demanded social security numbers for those investments. So both of those little children on the first day they were born were asked for social security numbers, which were given to them.

But little Johnny No Doe's father was nowhere around, and his mother applied

on Johnny's behalf and her own for aid to dependent children and received \$260 a month.

And do you know what really made Johnny No Doe happy, Mr. Speaker? Nobody suggested he have a social security number.

The moral of the story, Mr. Speaker, is that if you do not want the long arm of the Federal Government butting into your affairs on the day you are born, be a bastard.

We give you a number if we think you are going to get any money out of it, but if we are giving it away, no number, no accurate record. If we knew where we were giving it away, Mr. Speaker, we might not have to collect so much.

If the social security system is to be equitable we should give numbers to all children at birth.

AMENDING THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of two extreme emergencies, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3715) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, since this request was denied yesterday by the gentleman from Missouri on the basis that it did not comply with the requirements of the Reorganization Act for 1970; namely, that any bill called for consideration would be in the hands of the Members for at least 3 calendar days prior to it being so called; I have had a chance to review not only the other bodies' bill, but the report by the House Committee on Banking and Currency pertaining thereto and, indeed, have gone out of my way to discuss it with the staff. Therefore, I would like to ask the gentleman who is making the unanimous-consent request, Mr. Speaker, if this is a true emergency, and whether he could outline under my reservation of objection what might evolve if this was not handled by fragmenting the rules of the House between now and the 30th of June.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman for an answer.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Missouri that this legislation expires on June 30 at midnight. It involves the stockpiling of strategic and valuable materials involving billions of dollars in value. The Banking and Currency Committee

think it is very necessary that we pass this before midnight on June 30.

The Senate has passed the legislation. We are considering their bill here.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Texas if those Senate amendments are going to increase the cost to the Federal taxpayers, and whether they are all germane to any thinking or action of the House, or the gentleman's committee that he is privileged to chair?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HALL. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the inquiry of the gentleman from Missouri I will say that they are germane; there is no question about that, and this will make the Government money because we can intelligently deal in the future on contracts to sell the stockpile involving billions of dollars.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I have served on the critical and strategic Stockpile Committees that are under the control of the Congress in past years, and I have some knowledge concerning that, and also concerning defense production and its procurement contracts.

Let me ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas why, since we have known all along that this was going to expire on the 30th of June, that we are just now bringing it up as a "terminal spasm" prior to adjournment for one of the national party conventions, at this late date by bending the Rules of the House?

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

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

Mr. PATMAN. That is a good question and I can give the gentleman a good reason for it.

The Senate started on this bill some time ago and since they started and we were advised what they were going to do, we were waiting on the Senate to pass it. Then they passed it and we considered it satisfactory. We took it up in committee and discussed it and the Senate bill was unanimously passed.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I submit that that does not explain the "emergency procedure" request, or the delay in properly acting before that, or within 72 hours prior to the expiration date.

In view of my knowledge and in view of the statement of the gentleman from Texas that it is urgently necessary lest we suffer contractual and other dire consequences, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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. 3715

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That section 303(b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2093(b)), is amended by striking out "June 30, 1975" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1985".

Sec. 2. The first sentence of section 717(a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2166(a)), is amended by striking out "June 30, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1974".

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.

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 15692, INTEREST RATE ON SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION DISASTER LOANS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 15692) to amend the Small Business Act to reduce the interest rate on Small Business Administration disaster loans.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Has the bill been reported?

Mr. PATMAN. It was reported yesterday unanimously.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. O'NEILL. 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. 238]

Abbott	Dowdy	McKinney
Abernethy	Ellberg	Macdonald,
Anderson,	Erlenborn	Mass.
Tenn.	Esch	Moorhead
Baring	Fascell	Mosher
Barrett	Ford,	Moss
Betts	Gerald R.	Nelsen
Blanton	Ford,	Pirnie
Blatnik	William D.	Rangel
Boggs	Fraser	Reld
Bow	Fulton	Rogers
Broomfield	Gallagher	Rosenthal
Brown, Ohio	Griffin	Scheuer
Burke, Fla.	Hagan	Schneebell
Caffery	Hansen, Idaho	Smith, Calif.
Chisholm	Harsha	Staggers
Clark	Hébert	Stokes
Clausen,	Jarman	Teague, Calif.
Don H.	Karth	Teague, Tex.
Clay	Leggett	Wilson, Bob
Davis, S.C.	McDade	Young, Tex.
Dent	McDonald,	Zablocki
Diggs	Mich.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 370 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 15692, INTEREST RATE ON SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION DISASTER LOANS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I re-submit my request?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 15692) to amend the Small Business Act to reduce the interest rate on Small Business Administration disaster loans, which contains a series of related amendments to the bill, amendments which have been approved by the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be considered en bloc.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, on yesterday when a similar unanimous consent request was made, I objected "out of hand," because of lack of compliance with the Reorganization Act of 1970, and specifically thereunder is the so-called 3-day rule that a print of the bill and/or the committee report should be in the hands of Members for 3 calendar days prior to consideration by this body.

At 12:05 p.m. today, just prior to the last quorum call, I was supplied a rough committee copy of the bill with many marks on it. Ten minutes thereafter, the document room was supplied for the first time, with a copy of the report.

I now have it in hand and, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that no one likes to be put in the position of objecting at any time to any consideration of disaster relief. This country has had its sinews and its vessels taut and filled with compassion for those who suffer natural or manmade disaster. Our very beings are historically filled with the red blood of humanitarianism.

But, I certainly believe there are points about H.R. 15692, as considered by the committee and brought forth from the committee according to this report, that should be known if, and before, we grant unanimous consent.

Only recently the gentleman from Texas had pleaded mightily against taking away the rights of individual Members by granting unanimous consent, by waivers of points of order, and by closed rules and other procedures, which admittedly would expedite the business of the Congress, if homework had been done and there were no substantive objections.

Certainly when disasters are rampant in the land, we do wish to expedite any relief that is in truth a veritable Federal responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to know, first of all, from the gentleman from Texas, who asks this unanimous consent, if there were any hearings held on H.R. 15692.

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

Mr. HALL. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I have great respect for the gentleman. I know he is sincere in doing this, and I should be very glad to answer, to the best of my knowledge. Mr.

STEPHENS of Georgia is chairman of the subcommittee to which this bill was referred, and he had hearings on this legislation. This bill was thoroughly considered not only by the subcommittee, but when it was reported back to the whole committee. Consideration was given before the whole committee.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the rambling answer. It would seem to me it should be affirmative or negative. Were hearings held on H.R. 15692?

Mr. PATMAN. Absolutely; yes, sir.

Mr. HALL. Now, Mr. Speaker, my information is that the hearings were held by the subcommittee on another bill, but that at no time were there any hearings, nor were hearings printed as far as H.R. 15692 is concerned, and I have searched the Document Room and the Government Printing Office and find none available. But, of course, the Member's word is good enough for me.

Mr. Speaker, I would further submit that perhaps the Committee on Banking and Currency, although they have had hearings, according to the word of the gentleman from Massachusetts, maybe attempting to assert its jurisdiction over legislation pertaining to disaster loans. I just believe that the membership should know this, because Public Law 91-606 emanated from and has been handled by the Committee on Public Works of both this body and the other body of the Congress.

Second, Mr. Speaker, I believe the Members should know in view of this urgent and now twice repeated—on successive days—unanimous-consent request, that this bill would require the Small Business Administration downtown to reopen all disaster loans since July 1, 1971, go back and contact the borrowers under emergency circumstances and offer them the option of forgiveness and 3 percent interest on the balance of the loan, or no forgiveness and a 1-percent interest. This is a hodgepodge of so-called emergency legislation.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the bill does not provide direction to the agency for handling the situation where "forgiveness" already given is greater than that which would be available under the new loan, for example, on loans of less than \$10,000.

Point No. 3, the pending bill would give prospective buyers the option of a 1-percent loan with no forgiveness, or a loan bearing 3 percent interest with forgiveness of 25 percent of the principal, not to exceed \$2,500. The processing of these loans would be most difficult, inasmuch as loan officers would be required to compute and apprise prospective buyers of the most favorable situation insofar as their repayment posture is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, another reason for not considering this without the right of amendment, without the right of floor debate, and by unanimous consent—although I am anxious to expedite this business—would be that it would invite loan shopping.

Prior to the enactment of the Disaster Relief Act of 1970, Public Law 91-606, the

Small Business Administration and the Farmers Home Administration disaster loan programs carried different rates of interest. The 1970 act sought to eliminate the need for a prospective borrower to shop for the best loan.

It further attempted to establish the Office of Emergency Preparedness as a single coordinating agency of the executive branch in disaster situations. The bill reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee would initiate anew the need for individual loan shopping and, as I said before, would undoubtedly create confusion in the minds of prospective borrowers. Further, it is obvious that the loan forgiveness modifications proposed in the reported bill are much more stringent insofar as the small borrower is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, the Office of Management and Budget is presently considering additional legislative proposals in the disaster area which will certainly be expedited by our unexpected recent natural disasters, all of which point out a need for a coordinated omnibus type of legislation instead of the so-called emergency or highly piecemeal legislation.

Finally, there is no cost estimate reported in the report of the committee which has just been available to me less than an hour. In fact, they state it cannot be estimated. It is open ended, and without limitation. I think we want to aid and abet those in disaster, to be sure, but a greater disaster would be the bankruptcy of this Nation. For these reasons including a poor legislative proposal, subject to further reasoning and further study, I must now object.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman please reserve his objection and yield to me?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri has objected.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman to reserve his objection and yield to me for an answer to his suggestions?

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Regular order is demanded.

Objection is heard.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 13955, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 13955) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes, 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 22, 1972.)

Mr. CASEY of Texas (during the

reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report, as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 22, 1972, is available in the regular form at the desk. We have just heard the Clerk read the joint explanatory statement of the action of the conferees on each of the amendments.

SUMMARY OF CONFERENCE ACTION

There were 42 amendments and 29 of those amendments related solely to Senate housekeeping matters. Of the remaining 13, two related to joint committees, eight to the Architect of the Capitol, one to the Library of Congress, one to the Government Printing Office, and one to the General Accounting Office.

As is shown in the tabulation at the end of the joint statement, the conference agreement is \$86,183,216 over the House bill; however, \$84,185,940 of this amount is for Senate items not considered by the House. Conforming to long practice, funds exclusively for operations and activities of the Senate—including two items jurisdictionally under the Architect of the Capitol—are left for decision and insertion by that body.

The conference total is \$513,787,980.

The conference total is \$50,340,499 under 1972 appropriations due primarily to the one-time appropriation in the 1972 Act of \$71,090,000 for construction of the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial building.

Also, \$18.4 million was provided in the 1972 act to enable the Congress to get on a current basis with the U.S. Postal Service on official congressional mail cost.

There is a total net increase over 1972 of approximately \$38 million.

The amount of \$13.5 million is to cover the cost of the 5.5 percent pay increase, and over \$3 million is to meet the increased costs of materials and services. Another \$3.3 million is attributable to the requirements of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. About \$150,000 relates to provisions of House resolutions which the House has passed. About \$13 million is to meet increased workload. And \$4 million is for the initial outfitting of the new library building.

Except for the Senate items these increases were all thoroughly explained when the bill was on the floor.

Also included is \$1,521,000 for the restoration of the old Supreme Court and Senate chambers here in the Capitol, which has been delayed for some time. We believe it is necessary to get these chambers in order for the bicentennial celebration.

The conference total is \$934,900 below the Senate bill. I will insert in the Record under leave to extend, when I revise my remarks, a tabulation summarizing these figures by major activities in the bill.

The tabulation follows:

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1973 (H.R. 13955), CONFERENCE SUMMARY

Agency and item	Conference action compared with—									
	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1972 (enacted to date)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended by conference action	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1972 (enacted to date)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	
Senate.....	\$76,034,419	\$79,124,795		\$79,127,640	\$79,127,640	+\$3,093,221	+\$2,845	+\$79,127,640		
House of Representatives.....	136,768,970	141,961,270	\$141,601,770	141,601,770	141,601,770	+4,832,800	—359,500			
Joint items.....	38,428,390	29,340,634	26,095,144	25,923,220	26,011,320	—12,417,070	—3,329,314	—83,824	+\$88,100	
Architect of the Capitol.....	96,633,200	25,791,000	19,764,900	26,332,300	26,359,300	—70,273,900	+568,300	+6,594,400	+27,000	
Botanic Garden.....	763,350	784,400	771,600	771,600	771,600	+8,250	—12,800			
Library of Congress.....	68,462,250	79,955,900	78,161,450	78,576,450	78,291,450	+9,829,200	—1,664,450	+130,000	—285,000	
Government Printing Office.....	56,329,900	63,739,900	63,739,900	63,739,900	63,739,900	+7,410,000				
General Accounting Office.....	89,208,000	97,000,000	95,820,000	97,000,000	96,235,000	+7,027,000	—765,000	+415,000	—765,000	
Cost-Accounting Standards Board.....	1,500,000	1,650,000	1,650,000	1,650,000	1,650,000	+150,000				
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority.....	564,128,479	519,347,899	427,604,764	514,722,880	513,787,980	—50,340,499	—5,559,919	+86,183,216	—934,900	
Consisting of—										
1. Appropriations.....	563,819,479	519,347,899	426,882,764	514,000,880	513,065,980	—50,753,499	—6,281,919	+86,183,216	—934,900	
Definite appropriations.....	(563,739,479)	(519,347,899)	(426,882,764)	(514,000,880)	(513,065,980)	(—50,673,499)	(—6,281,919)	(+86,183,216)	(—934,900)	
Indefinite appropriations.....	(80,000)					(—80,000)				
2. Reappropriations.....	309,000		722,000	722,000	722,000	+413,000	+722,000			
Appropriations to liquidate contract authorization.....	(285,000)					(—285,000)				
Memorandum—										
1. Appropriations and reappropriations including appropriations for liquidation of contract authorization.....	564,413,479	519,347,899	427,604,764	514,722,880	513,787,980	—50,625,499	—5,559,919	+86,183,216	—934,900	

With further reference to the restoration of the Senate and Supreme Court chambers, this will, as Members will recall, restore the chamber on the ground floor which was originally the Supreme Court chamber, now being used for storage, and on the second floor the chamber that was last used by the Supreme Court in the Capitol Building but is truly the original U.S. Senate chamber. This sum will include furniture and furnishings.

The Architect of the Capitol will have charge of this project under the direction of the Commission on Arts and Antiquities of the Senate and a similar group to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, to give the House of Representatives some oversight with respect to the restoration of the Supreme Court chamber. The House conferees insisted that we have this House representation insofar as the Supreme Court chamber was concerned.

The Architect estimates it will take about 2 years to do this restoration work, so that it will be completed in time for the bicentennial celebration in 1976.

Incidentally, these two chambers can still be used after restoration, if necessary, for joint conference rooms. The Architect has been instructed to design them so they can be so used, and he has stated they will be so designed, with furniture installed in such a manner that they can be utilized for conference meetings.

WEST CENTRAL FRONT

The major item we will have under consideration here today relates to the extension of the west central front of the Capitol. The Senate inserted an amendment to the bill to prohibit the use of any funds for the preparation of final plans or the initiation of construction for the extension of the west front. The conferees have met four times since their appointment early in April and have been unable to resolve this question. We bring back our report with a recommendation that the House vote to

further insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate.

The Senate amendment is a little misleading. I want to note that. The Senate amendment, which is No. 36, reads:

Funds available under this appropriation may be used for the preparation of preliminary plans for the extension of the west central front: *Provided, however,* That no funds may be used for the preparation of the final plans or initiation of construction of said project until specifically approved and appropriated therefor by the Congress.

The history of the west front proposal is well known to the Members of this House, and it has been documented fully.

When I revise my remarks I will see to it that the legislative history and chronology of the events to date relating to the west central front are included in the RECORD and now I will summarize a little bit of that history.

The material referred to follows:

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY AND CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS LEADING TO DEVELOPMENT OF PLAN 2 FOR EXTENDING THE WEST FRONT

AUTHORIZATION

Public Law 242, 84th Congress, approved August 5, 1955, is the original basic statute. It authorized the "extension, reconstruction, and replacement of the central portion" of the Capitol, based on a 1905 architectural plan to be carried forward in accordance with such modifications and additions as approved by the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol. It created a joint congressional commission to direct the Architect of the Capitol in carrying out the project.

Public Law 406, 84th Congress, approved February 14, 1956, amended Public Law 242—a technical amendment.

Public Law 87-14, approved March 31, 1961, made the appropriation "Extension of the Capitol" available for furniture and furnishings.

Public Law 88-248, approved December 30, 1963, amended Public Law 242, as amended, by deleting from the basic act the authority "to obligate the additional sums herein authorized prior to the actual appropriation thereof" and by substituting in lieu thereof: "and, prior to any appropriations being

provided for extension, reconstruction, and replacement of the west central portion of the United States Capitol, to obligate such sums as may be necessary for the employment of nongovernmental engineering and other necessary services and for test borings and other necessary incidental items required to make a survey, study and examination of the structural condition of such west central portion, to make reports of findings, and to make recommendations with respect to such remedial measures as may be deemed necessary including the feasibility of corrective measures in conjunction with the extension of such west central portion."

The complete authorization act, as amended, is set forth in the preceding section of this report.

ENGINEERING STUDY

As a result of the changes made by Public Law 88-248 and pursuant to direction of the Commission, and in line with the thinking of the Appropriations Committees, the Architect of the Capitol entered into a contract, March 13, 1964, with The Thompson and Lichtner Company, Inc. of Brookline, Massachusetts, for a fresh engineering survey of the conditions of the west central front, an outstanding firm with no previous connection with the project. Their report was received in November, 1964 and is summarized elsewhere in these justifications.

PUBLIC HEARING BY COMMISSION

A public hearing was held by the Commission on June 24, 1965, with Dr. Miles N. Clair, President of The Thompson and Lichtner Co., Inc., testifying as to the dangerous conditions requiring immediate action and the plan for permanent corrective action.

DECISION TO DEVELOP PRELIMINARY PLANS AND COST ESTIMATES

At the close of the hearing, the Commission agreed unanimously, that the Architect of the Capitol be authorized and directed to submit to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate request for funds for preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost for the extension in marble of the West Central front of the Capitol, based on the findings in The Thompson & Lichtner report.

WOOD BRACES INSTALLED IN 1965

As a result of The Thompson and Lichtner study and recommendations, the most obviously dangerous portions of the West front

were shored with heavy wood timbers in 1965 as a temporary expedient.

FUNDS FOR PRELIMINARY PLANS AND COST ESTIMATES

In September 1965, the Architect of the Capitol, pursuant to the direction of the Commission, appeared before the House Appropriations Committee and requested \$300,000 for preliminary plans, cost estimates, and a model (see pages 334 through 363 of Part I of printed hearings on the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966). The \$300,000 was included by the House in the bill.

In October 1965, the Architect of the Capitol appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee and requested the \$300,000 planning money (see pages 379 to 404 of the printed Senate hearings on the Supplemental Appropriations for 1966). The Senate deleted the \$300,000 from the bill.

The \$300,000 was restored in conference between the House and Senate conferees. The bill carrying these funds was approved October 31, 1965 by the President.

ARCHITECTS DIRECTED TO PROCEED WITH PRELIMINARY PLANS

In December 1965, the Architect of the Capitol, upon direction of the Commission, ordered the Associate and Advisory Architects for the extension of the Capitol Project to proceed with the preliminary plans and estimates of cost. The first stage of their work was completed in May 1966, and a progress report and study model were furnished.

COMMISSION'S CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF PLAN 2

The Commission in charge held a meeting June 17, 1966, for the purpose of considering the report of the architects. At this meeting the architects reviewed with the Commission the basic historic, architectural, and engineering information relating to the West Front and demonstrated three basic plans by use of a study model and drawings. The Commission approved Plan 2 and directed that this plan be completed and perfected; that the final scale model be prepared for exhibition to Members of Congress and the public; and that the Architect of the Capitol be directed to seek necessary funds for proceeding with the project.

MODEL PLACED ON DISPLAY

In November 1966, the scale model of the West Front extension as approved by the Commission was placed on public display in Statuary Hall in the Capitol. In January 1967, the Speaker sent a letter to all Members of the Senate and House calling attention to the model and asking each Member to examine the model. The model has been on continuous display since 1966.

DELAY IN REQUESTING CONSTRUCTION FUNDS

During the Summer of 1966, when the Legislative Branch Appropriation Bill for 1967 was under consideration, although no funds were provided in the bill for the West front extension, the Senate amended the bill to provide:

"Provided, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for administrative or any other expenses in connection with the plans referred to as Schemes 1, 2 and 3 for the Extension of the West Central Front of the Capitol."

This amendment was deleted by the Senate and House conferees on the bill and the following statement appears in the conference report dated August 15, 1966:

"There are no funds in the bill for the west front extension project, nor is there any authority to proceed with construction contracts, or even detailed plans and specifications. The work can proceed only if and when the Congress should appropriate the money for the work in a future bill.

"\$300,000 was, however, appropriated by the Congress last year for preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost, includ-

ing a model, and incidental expenses looking to the extension of the west central front. Most of that fund is already contracted. While the associate architects engaged for this purpose completed the first stage study and plans earlier this year, from which Schemes 1, 2, and 3 were developed, and for which a study model (of Scheme 2) was made, more time is necessarily required for perfection of plans and drawings and preparation of a full scale model for the scheme (No. 2) selected by the special Extension Commission. At its meeting with the architects in June, the Commission directed the Architect to get the full-scale model ready for exhibition to Members of Congress and the public generally.

"A full-scale model showing the entire Capitol building—both East and West Fronts—should be of great, almost inestimable visual-aid value in helping Members, the press, and the public generally form sound opinions about the appearance of the building if extended and the effect of the particular proposals in Scheme 2 on the architectural features of the present West Front. But the conferees understand that the full-scale model will not be ready to place on display until about mid-November.

"In the circumstances, then, it would be premature, and illogical, to consider any further appropriations for the West Front project at this session."

COMPLETED PRELIMINARY PLANS SENT TO THE CONGRESS

In May 1967, the full report and recommendations of the architects relating to the authorized preliminary plans and estimates of cost, were completed and sent by the Architect of the Capitol to Speaker John W. McCormack, Chairman of the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol and other Members of the Commission. This report, with illustrations, was printed and sent by Speaker McCormack to all Members of the House and Senate with his letter of June 21, 1967.

ADDITIONAL WOOD BRACING IN 1968

Late in 1967 additional dangerous sagging and cracking in certain sections of the west side of the building were observed. With approval of the Commission, the Architect of the Capitol sought and the Congress granted \$135,000 for additional temporary wood shoring and for repointing, filling cracks, and painting the west central front. This work was finished in the Summer of 1968.

DELAY IN REQUESTING CONSTRUCTION FUNDS

The preliminary plans and estimates of cost for the extension of the West central front were completed and published in 1967. The Commission did not direct the Architect of the Capitol to request funds for the contract plans and construction from 1967 to 1969. It is understood that the Commission's reluctance was due to the conflict in Viet Nam and the resulting heavy stresses on the national budget.

LATEST ACTION OF THE COMMISSION

Late in July, 1969, Chairman McCormack after discussing the seriousness of further delay with fellow Commission Members and Members of the House Appropriations Committee, requested that other Members of the Commission join him in approving planning funds for extending the west central front in accord with the previously approved Plan 2. All Members of the Commission agreed to direct the Architect of the Capitol to seek planning funds, in the amount of \$2,000,000 at this time. The opinion of the Commission was unanimous, and was reached during the first week of August, 1969.

LETTER FROM CHAIRMAN M'CORMACK TO APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEES

Upon receipt of unanimous approval of all Members of the Commission, Chairman Mc-

Cormack directed a letter on August 8, 1969, to Chairman Andrews of the Legislative Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, pointing out the urgent need to proceed with planning the extension, advising of the Commission's decision, and expressing the hope that this request could be heard in connection with the then current hearings on the Legislative Branch Appropriation Bill, 1970.

After the Legislative Subcommittee indicated informally to the Speaker that a hearing would probably be scheduled on the item early in September after the recess, the Speaker sent similar letters of recommendation to Chairman Russell of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and Chairman Montoya of the Legislative Subcommittee.

Copies of the Speaker's letters to Chairman Andrews and Chairman Montoya are contained in the appendix to these justifications.

COMMENTS ON "RESTORATION" OF THE WEST CENTRAL FRONT

In past hearings before your committee and in other sections of this report, we have indicated the reasons why the so-called "restoration" of the Capitol's west central front is not a feasible, economical, or thoughtful proposition. We shall once again touch the highlights.

These sections of the building are 150 to more than 170 years old. The exterior is of soft, local sandstone of a generally poor quality. There are no expansion joints in the structure, so when pressures have been put on the walls by fires, an explosion, settlement, expansion and contraction, the walls have cracked—in many cases from top to bottom—or bulged out of alignment.

The most serious cracking has required shoring with wood timbers during the last 4 or 5 years, in order to prevent collapse.

At the present time, there is no longer one exterior west wall, but rather a series of sections of "walls" created by the extensive cracking. Stone has broken off and fallen due to pressure and movement. Emergency measures have had to be taken to keep pedestrians away from the sides of the walls. Stones have become displaced in many locations. Keystones have settled leaving voids which have had to be filled with cement. Engineering studies have shown that there are many voids throughout the interior of the walls, due to poor workmanship many years ago and movement since that time.

The foundations of the walls in some prominent locations are inadequate.

The walls are made up of an exterior of sandstone, an interior of stone rubble and brick, and a central core of loose stone rubble. Each stone in each vertical "layer" of the wall has a different expansion and contraction ratio, thus further complicating the provision for anything like a cohesive "whole." The building is, as you know of wall-bearing arched floor construction, and these are the walls that carry the thrust from the arches which support the interior loads.

This, then, is a brief description of the walls the restorationists would have us preserve as "a textbook of architecture."

Dr. Clair of The Thompson and Lichtner Company, who did the engineering studies on the condition of the west front and the remedial action required, as pointed out previously in this report and in prior hearings, gave careful consideration to many possibilities for correcting the conditions of the west walls and concluded in his 1964 report that a properly designed extension would provide the desired lateral support for the west central portion and would be the least hazardous and cause the least interference to continued Congressional use of the building during the construction period. He confirmed that position in his recent report to the Architect of the Capitol. In his 1964 report, quoted previously in this justification, Dr. Clair spelled

out his reason for rejecting such possibilities as

1. Retention and repair of the existing walls.
2. Refacing the existing walls.
3. Removal of the outside sandstone completely and replacement by high quality marble and granite.
4. Removal of the entire wall and foundation and replacement by reinforced concrete with a facing of high quality marble and granite.

This is to say that Dr. Clair, an expert in the field of structural engineering related especially to old buildings in this country and abroad, did not recommend any of the "cosmetic" treatments recommended by some who have not given thorough study to the building and who do not shoulder the responsibility for the proper care, preservation and use of the National Capitol. His conclusions and recommendations are shared by the Capitol Commission in charge of the project, the Architect of the Capitol and his professional staff, and every private-practicing architect and engineer who has been engaged to study the project and advise the Commission and the Architect of the Capitol.

For the reasons recited herein and previously to your committee, I strongly recommend against any further action toward so-called "restoration" of the Capitol's west front for the following cogent reasons:

1. Restoration does not provide a permanent solution. Whatever the form of restoration or the method, it would result in a makeshift job.
2. The appearance, if piecemeal repairs are made, would be more objectionable than the present painted surface.
3. If refaced, the cracks and bulges would again appear after a few years.
4. If the walls are rebuilt completely, the danger and risks would be too great.
5. The whole west central portion of the building, between the House and Senate Wings, including some interior rooms and spaces, would have to be vacated by the Congress over a long period of time.
6. The costs of restoration were estimated several years ago to be between \$10,000,000 and \$50,000,000. They have escalated since that time. Furthermore, a true cost figure is impossible to obtain. A leading advocate of restoration has stated publicly that restoration could exceed the cost of the proposed extension.
7. There are so many uncertainties involved in restoration or rebuilding in place, the work would have to be done under a cost-plus contract, with leeway as to the ultimate total cost.
8. No space would be gained in the Capitol for the vital operations of the Congress and for the use of the public.

Mr. Campioli, Assistant Architect of the Capitol, is prepared to elaborate on these points.

CONSTRUCTION, CHANGES, AND ADDITIONS, CAPITOL BUILDING

United States Capitol

First Unit

The first unit constructed was the old North Wing, now commonly referred to as the old Supreme Court section of the Capitol. The cornerstone was laid September 18, 1793. This wing was completed and occupied by the Senate from 1800 to 1859 when the Senate moved to its present Chamber. It was also occupied by the House from 1800-1801 and from 1804-1807. It was, in addition, occupied by the Supreme Court from 1801 to 1935 when the Court moved to its present building and by the Library of Congress from 1800-1824.

The Senate originally met in a large room, two-stories in height, from 1800-1808. In 1808-1809 this room was divided into two rooms, one above the other. The Senate occupied the upper room, on the second or

principal floor, from 1810 to 1859 as its Chamber. The Supreme Court, which had been provided with quarters elsewhere in the North Wing from 1801 to 1809, occupied the lower room, on the first or ground floor as its Chambers from 1810 to 1860.

Temporary Unit

On the present site of Statuary Hall, a temporary structure was erected, known as the "Oven", connected by an enclosed passageway to the North Wing, was occupied by the House from 1801 to 1804 when the temporary structure was removed from the site.

Second Unit

The old South Wing, now known as the Statuary Hall section, was the second unit to be constructed. It was completed and occupied by the House from 1807 to 1857. The House Chamber was located in the room now known as Statuary Hall.

Interrupted Occupancy

Due to the burning of the Capitol by the British in August 1814, the Senate and House, Supreme Court, and Library had to occupy other quarters outside the Capitol until 1819. During the period 1815-1819, the Old North and South Wings were reconstructed and restored.

Third Unit

The central section of the Capitol, between the old North and South Wings, was constructed during the period 1818-1829. The west side of the central section was occupied by the Library of Congress from 1824 to 1897 when the Library moved to its own building. The quarters in the Capitol vacated by the Library in 1897, were reconstructed into office and committee space.

Fourth Unit

The present Senate and House Wings, containing the present Senate and House Chambers, were added during the period 1851-1859. The House has occupied the House Wing from 1859 to the present day. The Senate has occupied the Senate Wing from 1859 to the present day. During the period 1856 to 1865, the old low wooden dome over the original central section was replaced with the present 4,500-ton cast-iron dome.

Interrupted Occupancy

Following a fire in 1851, the west central section occupied by the Library was reconstructed. After an explosion under the old Supreme Court Chamber in 1898, the old North Wing was restored through repair and reconstruction.

Fifth Unit

The terraces on the north, south, and west sides of the Capitol were added during the period 1884 to 1892.

Reconstruction Work

The old wooden roof construction over the original sections of the Capitol was replaced with steel and concrete construction in 1902. During the period 1949 to 1951, the Senate and House Chambers were completely remodelled in the manner they exist today. In addition to remodelling of the interior of the Chambers, the old cast-iron and glass skylights, which from 1857 to 1949 had served as the roofs over the two Chambers, were eliminated and replaced with new roof construction of steel and concrete covered with copper. During this period, it was necessary for the Senate and House to vacate their Chambers and occupy other quarters for three short periods.

Sixth Unit

During the period 1958 to 1962, the East Front Central Section of the Capitol was extended eastward 32½ feet. The new Front is constructed of marble and is a faithful reproduction of the old sandstone front. During the period 1958 to 1969, other improvements have also been effected in the Capitol, including a major program of improvement

of the lighting and wiring in the Capitol and repairs to the Dome.

CONSTRUCTION OF SENATE AND HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL ACCOMMODATIONS FOR THE SENATE AND HOUSE

Senate Office Buildings

The first 3 wings of the Old Senate Office Building, facing Constitution Avenue, Delaware Avenue, and C Street, were completed and occupied in 1909. The fourth, or 1st Street Wing, was constructed in 1931-1933 and occupied in 1933.

The New Senate Office Building was completed and occupied in 1958.

House Office Buildings

The Old, or Cannon House Office Building, was completed and occupied in 1908. The New, or Longworth House Office Building, was completed and occupied in 1933. The Rayburn House Office building was completed and occupied in 1965.

EXPENDITURES AND OBLIGATIONS—WEST CENTRAL FRONT OF CAPITOL, 1964-69

Surveys, studies, preliminary plans and estimates and emergency repairs, west central front, 1964-69

Engineering study of condition of West Front, 1964	
Engineering services (consultant)...	\$30,000
Exploratory work (test pits, soil borings, and cores of wall construction)	71,393
Total	101,393

Emergency repairs, 1965	
Engineering services (consultant) ..	3,500
Shoring and bracing	26,573
Total	30,073

Preliminary plans and estimates of cost for extension of the West Central Front, in accordance with Plan 2 approved by the Commission in charge of project, 1965-67	
Architect-engineer fees	240,000
Advisory architects' fees	4,500
Model of Capitol (as it would appear, extended pursuant to Plan 2)	21,024
Total	265,524

Administrative and miscellaneous expenses	50,845
Total, 1964-67	447,835

Emergency repairs, 1968-69	
Engineering services (consultant) ..	\$10,000
Engineering (surveyor) services, to measure and record movements of building	7,273
Additional emergency shoring and bracing for old Senate and House Wings at basement level, and for unsupported architrave stones of West Central Portico not supported by emergency shoring in 1964 or 1965; also repointing joints, filling cracks, and repainting sandstone masonry	70,163
Administrative and miscellaneous ..	26,243
Total, 1968-69	113,679

Total, West Central Front, 1964-69	561,514
---	----------------

Funds appropriated for West Central Front, fiscal year 1970, and legislative provisions governing use of such funds

An appropriation of \$2,275,000 for the West Central Front and legislation governing the use of such funds were provided in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1970, Public

Law 91-145, approved December 12, 1969, as follows:

"EXTENSION OF THE CAPITOL"

"For an additional amount for 'Extension of the Capitol', \$2,275,000, to be expended under the direction of the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol as authorized by law: *Provided*, That such portion of the foregoing appropriation as may be necessary shall be used for emergency shoring and repairs of, and related work on, the west central front of the Capitol: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$250,000 of the foregoing appropriation shall be used for the employment of independent nongovernmental engineering and other necessary services for studying and reporting (within six months after the date of the employment contract) on the feasibility and cost of restoring such west central front under such terms and conditions as the Commission may determine: *Provided, however*, That pending the completion and consideration of such study and report, no further work toward extension of such west central front shall be carried on: *Provided further*, That after submission of such study and report and consideration thereof by the Commission, the Commission shall direct the preparation of final plans for extending such west central front in accord with Plan 2 (which said Commission has approved), unless such restoration study report establishes to the satisfaction of the Commission:

(1) That through restoration, such west central front can, without undue hazard to safety of the structure and persons, be made safe, sound, durable, and beautiful for the foreseeable future;

(2) That restoration can be accomplished with no more vacation of west central front space in the building proper (excluding the terrace structure) than would be required by the proposed extension Plan 2;

(3) That the method or methods of accomplishing restoration can be so described or specified as to form the basis for performance of the restoration work by competitive, lumpsum, fixed price construction bid or bids;

(4) That the cost of restoration would not exceed \$15,000,000; and

(5) That the time schedule for accomplishing the restoration work will not exceed that heretofore projected for accomplishing the Plan 2 extension work: *Provided further*, That after consideration of the restoration study report, if the Commission concludes that all five of the conditions hereinbefore specified are met, the Commission shall then make recommendations to the Congress on the question of whether to extend or restore the west central front of the Capitol.

Expenditures, 1970-71, for emergency repairs to temporary shoring and other miscellaneous related work, including measuring and recording movements of building

During the period, 1970-71, \$23,170 was expended for emergency repairs to the temporary shoring installed in 1965 and 1968 and other miscellaneous related work, including additional measurement and recording of movements of the west central wall.

Procedures followed by the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol in selection of engineers-architects to make the feasibility study required by Public Law 91-145

The following procedures were followed by the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol in making their selection of engineers-architects to make the study and report on the feasibility and cost of restoring the West central front required by Public Law 91-145.

December 16, 1969.—Four (4) days after the President signed the Act, the Speaker, as Chairman of the Commission in charge of this project, sent letters to all Members of

the Commission, outlining the action taken by the Congress through the Appropriations Committees and quoting pertinent provisions of the conference report on this matter. He proposed that the American Society of Civil Engineers, a professional engineering society, which had taken no position on either extension or restoration and who could offer "independent judgment on this proposition in the spirit of the conference report" be requested to review the material available and then suggest to the Commission the names of several engineers or engineering firms, with experience in restoration and reconstruction of old buildings such as the Capitol.

December 20, 1969.—Several members of the House Appropriations subcommittee approached the Speaker and asked him to consider also asking the deans of engineering of several of the leading universities throughout the Country to offer their opinions on well qualified firms to make the study. The Speaker agreed with this proposal and the other Members of the Commission were contacted and asked to consider requesting the opinions of the deans, in addition to the American Society of Civil Engineers.

January 2, 1970.—The Speaker received concurrence from all Commission members in this procedure.

January 12, 1970.—The Speaker sent letters to the deans and the American Society of Civil Engineers, requesting their assistance.

Early in March, 1970.—The Speaker received replies from the American Society of Civil Engineers and all but a few of the deans (15 of the 19 deans responded to the Speaker).

March 9, 1970.—The Speaker sent requests to the firms or individuals recommended to undertake the study, requesting their brochures and other information which would show their capabilities to undertake the study; also requesting to be advised whether they had previously been associated with the project, or had any predisposition for or against the extension or restoration work. There were, of course, numerous overlappings of the recommendations of the American Society of Civil Engineers and the various deans of engineering. Several firms recommended, which had previously been associated with the project, were eliminated. Letters went out to 26 firms or individuals, in all.

April 20, 1970.—The Speaker sent letters to the Commission members enclosing a summary report on results of contacts with the American Society of Civil Engineers and the deans of 19 engineering schools, and a digest of information about the 19 firms voicing an interest in the feasibility study in response to the request from the Speaker for brochures. In addition, a digest of information was included from four unsolicited firms.

Contract negotiations

May 25, 1970.—The Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol met for the purpose of selecting a firm to make the feasibility study and cost of restoring the West central front of the Capitol, pursuant to the provisions contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1970. The Commission, after considering guidelines, criteria, and key provisions to be incorporated in a contract, directed the Architect of the Capitol (1) to enter into negotiations with the firm of Praeger-Kavanagh-Waterbury, engineers-architects of New York City, on the basis of such considerations, for undertaking the feasibility study ordered by the Congress, and (2) if thereafter a mutually satisfactory contract could be negotiated, to enter into a contract with that firm, subject to approval of the contract by the Chairman of the Commission.

June 22, 1970.—A draft of the proposed contract, negotiated by the Architect of the Capitol with the Praeger-Kavanagh-Water-

bury firm, was forwarded by the Speaker to the Commission members for their review and comments. Changes suggested by Commission members were incorporated in the final draft of contract.

Contract awarded for feasibility study

July 1, 1970.—The Speaker announced that a contract had been signed with the firm of Praeger-Kavanagh-Waterbury, July 1, 1970, for making the feasibility study required by Public Law 91-145. The total contract cost was \$182,600.

Other expenditures in connection with feasibility study

In addition to the amount of \$182,600 expended for the engineers-architects contract, \$45,779 was expended for exploratory work in and adjacent to the West central portion of the Capitol on the basis of drawings and specifications prepared by the Praeger-Kavanagh-Waterbury firm and performed under their supervision and direction; \$7,722 for compression tests performed on the same basis; \$9,368 for administrative and miscellaneous expenses.

Completion and distribution of engineers-architects report

January 2, 1971.—Upon completion of the feasibility study and report, the Acting Architect of the Capitol transmitted a copy of the Praeger-Kavanagh-Waterbury report, dated January 1971, to the Commission members. The report was also given to Members of Congress requesting it, to the Press, and to various architectural and engineering societies.

Action taken by Commission on engineers-architects report

March 8, 1972.—The Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol met and considered the Praeger-Kavanagh-Waterbury report, and, after establishing to its satisfaction that the conditions specified in Public Law 91-145, relating to restoration, could not be met, directed the Architect of the Capitol to proceed with the preparation of final plans for extending the West central front in accord with Plan 2 heretofore approved by the Commission.

Action of the Senate subsequent to issuance of order by the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol directing the Architect of the Capitol to proceed with preparation of final plans for extending the West Central Front of the Capitol in accordance with Plan 2 heretofore approved by the Commission

Amendment adopted by the Senate limiting use of West Front funds

March 24, 1972.—The Senate Committee on Appropriations added the following amendment to the Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill, 1973, as passed by the House, March 23, 1972.

"Extension of the Capitol"

"Funds available under this appropriation may be used for the preparation of preliminary plans for the extension of the west central front: *Provided, however*, That no funds may be used for the preparation of the final plans or initiation of construction of said project until specifically approved and appropriated therefor by the Congress."

March 28, 1972.—The Senate approved adoption of the amendment, March 28, 1972.

March 28, 1972.—The following amendment offered by Senator Mansfield and Senator Scott during the debate on the Legislative Branch Appropriation Bill, 1973, as a substitute for the Committee amendment, was rejected by the Senate, March 28, 1972, on a roll-call vote of 40 to 35:

"Funds available under this appropriation may be used for the preparation of plans for the extension of the West Central Front: *Provided, however*, That no funds may be used for construction of said project until

specifically approved and appropriated therefor by the Congress."

March 28, 1972.—The Senate passed the Legislative Branch Appropriation Bill, 1973; requested a conference with the House, and appointed the Senate conferees.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

Since September 29, 1969, the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol has consisted of the following members:

The Speaker of the House of Representatives, Chairman;

The President of the Senate;
The Majority Leader of the Senate;
The Majority Leader of the House;
The Minority Leader of the Senate;
The Minority Leader of the House; and
The Architect of the Capitol.

The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Majority Leader of the House were added to the Commission membership by Public Law 91-77, approved September 29, 1969, which increased the Commission membership from five to seven members. Prior to September 29, 1969, the membership consisted of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate, the Minority Leader of the Senate, the Minority Leader of the House, and the Architect of the Capitol.

I am sure most of you have seen displayed in the Speaker's lobby this morning the drawings of the Capitol as it appeared in 1829 and the changes and the additions that have been made to it down to what it would look like with the extension of the west central front. There is also a breakdown model that you can look at.

This project originated under the original basic statute of Public Law 242 of the 84th Congress approved August 5, 1955, which authorized the extension, reconstruction, and replacement of the central portion of the Capitol and created a joint congressional commission, the Commission for the Extension of the United States Capitol, and directed the Architect of the Capitol to carry out the project.

The act was amended in 1963 (Public Law 88-248) to provide for an engineering study of the conditions of the west central front. This study was received in 1964. Contrary to what you have been hearing from some of the opponents, there have been very lengthy hearings on whether the west front should be restored, renovated, or extended. The Commission unanimously agreed that the Architect of the Capitol should be authorized and directed to submit a request for funds for the preparation of preliminary plans with an estimated cost for the extension in marble of the west central front.

An amount of \$300,000 was appropriated in the supplemental appropriation of 1966 for the preliminary plans, cost estimate, and a model. In 1970 we appropriated \$2,275,000 for the west central front, and legislation governing the use of such funds was provided in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1970. This act provided not to exceed \$250,000 should be used for a study of the feasibility and the cost of restoring the west central front, and pending the receipt of that report no further work toward extension was to be carried on.

The whole argument is whether or not the question of restoration or extension has really been studied. Well, it certainly has been studied, and there was a study

not as to whether it was possible to restore the west central front but whether it was feasible. We have had many engineers make this study. We have had several, and each time, if it did not agree with the opponents of extension, they would demand additional study and we would delay the project each time. That has been going on now since 1965.

However, the Commission for the Extension of the United States Capitol after receiving the engineers' reports—and mind you this Commission that some of our colleagues try to low rate—and especially in the other body—the membership of this Commission is made up of our distinguished Speaker, the majority leader and the minority leader of the House, the Vice President of the United States, the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, and the Architect of the Capitol. So I think it is a really blue-ribbon Commission.

Contrary to what has been alleged they have seriously studied this matter and considered it from all angles and unanimously voted to accept extension in accordance with plan 2.

At this point in the RECORD I will insert a copy of the Commission's resolution of March 8, 1972.

The resolution follows:

COMMISSION FOR EXTENSION OF THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL

MARCH 8, 1972.

Whereas Public Law 91-145, approved December 12, 1969, provides:

EXTENSION OF THE CAPITOL

For an additional amount for "Extension of the Capitol", \$2,275,000, to be expended under the direction of the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol as authorized by law: *Provided*, That such portion of the foregoing appropriation as may be necessary shall be used for emergency shoring and repairs of, and related work on, the west central front of the Capitol: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$250,000 of the foregoing appropriation shall be used for the employment of independent nongovernmental engineering and other necessary services for studying and reporting (within six months after the date of the employment contract) on the feasibility and cost of restoring such west central front under such terms and conditions as the Commission may determine: *Provided, however*, That pending the completion and consideration of such study and report, no further work toward extension of such west central front shall be carried on: *Provided further*, That after submission of such study and report and consideration thereof by the Commission, the Commission shall direct the preparation of final plans for extending such west central front in accord with Plan 2 (which said Commission has approved), unless such restoration study report establishes to the satisfaction of the Commission:

(1) That through restoration, such west central front can, without undue hazard to safety of the structure and persons, be made safe, sound, durable, and beautiful for the foreseeable future;

(2) That restoration can be accomplished with no more vacation of west central front space in the building proper (excluding the terrace structure) than would be required by the proposed extension Plan 2;

(3) That the method or methods of accomplishing restoration can be so described or specified as to form the basis for performance of the restoration work by competitive, lump sum, fixed price construction bid or bids;

(4) That the cost of restoration would not exceed \$15,000,000; and

(5) That the time schedule for accomplishing the restoration work will not exceed that heretofore projected for accomplishing the Plan 2 extension work: *Provided further*, That after consideration of the restoration study report, if the Commission concludes that all five of the conditions hereinbefore specified are met, the Commission shall then make recommendations to the Congress on the question of whether to extend or restore the west central front of the Capitol.

Whereas, the restoration feasibility and cost study and report of Praeger-Kavanagh-Waterbury, Consulting Engineers-Architects, made pursuant to Public Law 91-145, was considered by the Commission at its meeting of March 8, 1972, in Room EF-100 of the Capitol; and

Whereas, the Commission established to its satisfaction that all five of the conditions specified in Public Law 91-145, relating to restoration, cannot be met: Now, therefore, be it resolved,

That the Architect of the Capitol is hereby directed to proceed with the preparation of final plans for extending the west central front in accord with Plan 2 heretofore approved by the Commission.

CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the House of
Representatives, Chairman.
HALE BOGGS,
Majority Leader of the House.
GERALD R. FORD,
Minority Leader of the House.
SPIRO T. AGNEW,
President of the Senate.
MIKE MANSFIELD,
Majority Leader of the Senate.
HUGH SCOTT,
Minority Leader of the Senate.
GEORGE M. WHITE,
Architect of the Capitol.

Mr. STRATTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. A brief one.

Mr. STRATTON. Will the gentleman from Texas not agree that since the voluminous Praeger report to the House commission in 1969, at a cost of \$200,000, examined some of these questions in detail, and which demolished all of the arguments that had been advanced in 1969—since that report was submitted in December 1970, there has never been debate or discussion on this subject in the House?

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

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree with the gentleman because the gentleman has had some motions up before the House that have been defeated two or three times. The report that the gentleman referred to was furnished to every Member of the Congress.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield any more of this time. I will try to see that the gentleman has time.

Incidentally, the gentleman put out a letter to all colleagues that was very misleading, and I hope I have time to go over it in detail, because I know the gentleman is very much opposed to any extension of the west front, and I am sure he will use any argument he can to thwart such an extension. But when the gentleman tries to say that it is going to cost over \$300 per square foot, the gentleman's arithmetic is wrong. And when

the gentleman tries to point out that the west wall is historic, well, that wall was painted, and will have to be repainted, whatever you do to it, because it will not match the rest of the building. If you think we should try to get restoration of that wall for \$15 million, let me say that you cannot get any engineering firm or construction firm to give you any kind of a bid except a cost-plus bid, because they do not know what they are going to get into if we should decide to restore it, and then when they get through restoring it there probably would not be a third of the original wall left, and still it would have to be painted again.

Furthermore, it is estimated by some that it will cost close to \$30 million for the so-called restoration, and when that is done we will get no more space. Do we need space? Let me show you. I have had a few pictures made of the rotunda. You can step out there now and you will see the same thing occurring—your constituents and mine waiting in line, trying to see our Nation's Capitol. And this is just a portion—and a small portion—of the people who actually visit this Capitol, because all of them do not take the guided tours.

Statistics provided by the Capitol Guide Service show that 1,063,088 people took a guided tour during 1971. Through June 18 of this year 582,987 people have taken tours. There is an increase of 10 to 20 percent each month over the corresponding month last year. During the peak tourist season—April through August—the daily average Monday through Saturday is 5,000 to 7,000. These figures relate only to people taking tours. There are estimates that 30,000 to 40,000 visitors are in the building daily, probably more than visited the Capitol in an entire year a hundred years ago. During the peak tourist season many people do not take tours due to the long wait under adverse conditions. The rotunda itself can accommodate between 600 and 700 people lined up awaiting tours. During April and May the line usually backs up onto the east portico and contains 1,000 or more people. Make-do measures have been instituted to help control the crowds such as the addition of ropes around the rotunda and police help in maintaining the lines, but during extremely heavy periods the line frequently becomes too tightly packed resulting in sickness as well as creating a safety hazard.

I want to point out one thing in this picture (indicating) a lady bending over her small boy. Do you know what that boy is saying? He is saying, "Mama, I have got to go to the bathroom," and she is saying, "Sonny, we have been here for 40 minutes waiting in line, and we are almost up to the front of the line, and if we leave now we will not be able to make the tour." What is that boy going to do? Is she going to let him run out into the bushes some place?

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

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, on that point, if we extend the west front of the Capitol on the basis of that argument I predict that it will be the most

expensive bathroom in the history of human experience.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I will tell the gentleman from Indiana that I do not know about his constituents, but I know that mine, when they come to the National Capitol, they expect to find some comfort, and not an outhouse or a bathroom that is three blocks away.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield any further.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I do not blame the gentleman.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Of course not.

Mr. Speaker, here is another picture that shows trash out in front of the Capitol, and the reason that this trash is stacked up there is because there is no other place to put it.

You will probably find some answer to that.

If any of you have tried to take your constituents to the dining room for lunch, you know that unless you get in there a few minutes before 12 o'clock, you will have to wait 40 minutes for a table and your constituents wonder if this is the best way you can treat them.

Now the Senator, of course, says that they do not need any more space in the Capitol. But there are only 100 Senators and there are 435 Members of the House. The Senate has fewer committees. Sure, they have all the space they need.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment in order that the planning of the extension can proceed in an orderly manner, as directed by the Commission pursuant to the 1969 legislation. The Senate amendment abrogates the specific provisions of the 1969 act. At such time as the plans are drawn and a request is made for construction funds hearings will be conducted by the appropriations subcommittees of both bodies and the House and Senate will have an opportunity to vote on the issue.

The Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASEY) has gone into the real details of this conference report. The only thing that I think will be in any controversy this afternoon is the question of the west front of the Capitol.

I want to indicate here that I favor the extension of the west front of the Capitol, and I think it would be a tragedy if we did not go ahead with this project.

Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate further that I have absolute confidence in the Building Commission. I think they have done an excellent job in the years that they have been in existence.

We had a great deal of controversy, as those of you here will recall, over the extension of the east front of the Capitol.

The east front of the Capitol, I think, is proving out to be one of the wisest moves that we have made. And I think we will be able to say the same thing when the west front extension is completed.

I want to emphasize again what the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee said. You go out through this Capitol and walk over to the Senate wing. I think it is a disgrace to see what happens in the rotunda of the Capitol where our constituents are herded in there, and as the gentleman said, youngsters are there with no toilet facilities for them, and no facilities for some of our elderly people to sit down for a minute after they walk across the Capitol Grounds and into the Capitol.

I do not think that this is the way to treat our constituents when they visit the Nation's Capitol. They deserve better than that.

This is a growing country and, as I think it will be pointed out in debate this afternoon, our Capitol has been an evolving building. It is something that has grown with the country and I think we should not stop that growth at this time.

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENNIS. I would just like to point out to my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan, that I am no expert on this. But when you go over to England, for instance, and you see Westminster Hall which was built in 1066 or shortly thereafter and the Tower of London and places like that, they do not tear them down and remodel them so that people can have restrooms or greater access. They keep because they are the heritage of that country. That is what bothers me—what bothers me is the approach to our Capitol that the gentleman takes.

Mr. CEDERBERG. That does not bother me a bit. We keep Mount Vernon the way it is and we keep many other places the way they are as historical landmarks. But, the Capitol of the United States is a functional building for the Government of the United States.

Mr. DENNIS. Yes, but the Parliament and Westminster Hall is a functional building, too.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Yes, they are.

But, if you have ever been in the Parliament, I do not know how they could extend it, but I would be willing to bet that they would like to extend it if they could.

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Is not the west wall front the sole remaining visible evidence, apart from the little pieces that you see as you walk through the corridors—the sole remaining evidence of the original building, of the Capitol?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I really cannot answer that.

Mr. YATES. There was testimony before the subcommittee on that and their answer to that is "yes."

Mr. CEDERBERG. That could be, but it does not impress me a bit because I think the fact that it is the sole thing left is an indication that over the years those in the past have decided that this Capitol had to evolve with the growth of the Nation.

Mr. YATES. Why should we not retain the architectural masterpieces of the past?

Mr. CEDERBERG. The gentleman can have his opinion. I think if there is a need there, the need ought to be met.

Another thing about the cost, as the gentleman from Texas said, you cannot get any fixed bid on the restructuring of the west wall of the Capitol and you do not know how much it is going to cost—whether it will be \$15 or \$40 million-plus?

You do not get an extra square foot.

What you are going to do with the west front of the Capitol is that we will have additional space and we can make it better for our constituents who come here and better for those who work here in the Capitol and serve their country and the people they represent.

As I said, we have had these same arguments about the east front of the Capitol, but I think that is gone now and we recognize and the gentleman from Illinois recognizes that the east front of the Capitol is one of the wisest decisions that was made. I think it was. I think they have done a masterful job. For us to stop progress right now would, I believe, be a tragic mistake.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is correct—I agree with him on the east front and I accept your argument. But those who originally opposed the construction of the east front have come around to believe it was a wise step. At this point I now oppose the extension of the west front and rightfully so because it is a link with the past.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The Association of Architects will in my opinion after this is done, agree that it was the wise thing to do. They have a right to change their minds. I do not see anything in the argument there.

If I were on the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol, one thing I think could be done, if we extend the west front of the Capitol, is to have an auditorium.

You go to Williamsburg, and you are started out on the tour by seeing a beautiful movie of Williamsburg. Then you can go on the tour.

I think we can give our people an opportunity to come in, relax a bit, get in the mood for seeing the Capitol, and then go through this great building with a greater idea of history and the background of this building.

Mr. YATES. Was not there a restoration rather than an extension of the Williamsburg building?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Well, of course, there was a restoration of the buildings. That is exactly right.

Mr. YATES. Yes, but you are not restoring this wall. What you are doing is moving the whole wall 44 feet to the west.

Mr. CEDERBERG. If you want to abandon this building and not have it function as a Capitol, then I say, yes, restore it. Williamsburg is no longer functioning except as a restored monument. That is another story. This is not a restored monument. This is a growing institution. This Capitol grows as the country grows. It evolves as the country grows. We can discuss it all we

wish, but I just would like to say that as far as I personally am concerned, as our Nation grows, we need to have the Capitol grow along with it.

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

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

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I think we all ought to realize that what we are talking about is not construction to meet a need for just next year or the next few years, but we are talking about improvements that will last for many, many years.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I think history will indicate there has been a necessity; as the country has grown, the Capitol has grown. I think that is sensible and wise.

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

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

Mr. YATES. One of the most famous parts of the Capitol is the so-called Olmsted balustrade, perhaps the outstanding architectural contribution of this world famous architect, Frederick Law Olmsted. Under the proposed extension that balustrade will be destroyed, totally destroyed. One of the great architectural beauties of the world will be destroyed. That is one reason why I changed my mind from 1969 when I stood in the well of the House and said that based upon the testimony that was adduced in our subcommittee—and I was a member of the subcommittee at that time—I wanted restoration, but the experts told us it could not be done. And based upon that testimony, I voted and spoke for extension. Since that time we have had the Praeger report, the studied, careful conclusion of a great architect that it can be restored. Based upon that report, I have changed my mind. If restoration is possible I will now vote for restoration of that beautiful west front.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I respect the gentleman's opinion. I just happen to disagree with it.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield, please?

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

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I am for extending the west front. I would like to remind all of those people who would like things as they used to be that such a Member of Congress once came before the Appropriations Committee, when the late and beloved Mike Kirwan was on that committee. This person was speaking about maintaining Mount Vernon and wanted to buy some parkland across the way. At that time Mr. Kirwan said to the other Congressman:

If you want things to be exactly as they were when George Washington was here, then I suggest that we take up that road out to Mount Vernon and let you really know how George Washington had it.

The last time he covered that road was in the mud on a rainy night on horseback, and we could all go back to how it used to be by just taking up that road.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I thank my colleague from Michigan.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. What is the estimated cost of the extension of the west front?

Mr. CEDERBERG. About \$60 million, I believe.

Mr. YATES. It was that 2 years ago.

Mr. CEDERBERG. All right, put the escalator in. The same escalator, incidentally, would go in for the restoration; we are talking about the same comparable figure.

Mr. GROSS. That \$60 million would be an interest-bearing debt; would it not?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Sure, it would be an interest-bearing debt, just like subsidies to the Iowa farmers and many others.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to respond to that.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Does the gentleman wish me to yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I wonder if there had not been some subsidizing of the farmer what your food costs would have been.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am not against subsidizing the farmer.

Mr. GROSS. What are you talking about, then?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I just said it is part of the debt.

I did not say I was against it. I voted for the farm bills, because I recognized the importance of them, as I do recognize the importance of the extension of the west front.

Mr. GROSS. The bankers, automobile manufacturers, and a host of other industries and businesses are subsidized, are they not?

Mr. CEDERBERG. So let us subsidize our constituents who come to the Capitol. It is not bad to subsidize our constituents and give them an opportunity to go through this building in comfort.

Mr. GROSS. Extension of the west front of the Capitol is not a necessity of life as is food and wearing apparel.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I agree.

Mr. GROSS. So let us put first things first.

Mr. CEDERBERG. That is what we are doing. That is why we have delayed this for so long.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan consumed 12 minutes.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Roush).

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Legislative Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations handling this matter. I am in disagreement with the majority of the members of my subcommittee.

At this particular moment, I would like to address myself to this matter of the need for additional space. It seems to me there is a great deal of space in this Capitol Building, which, is first, not used, and, second, is misused. I, for one, think it is a desecration of this monument in which we conduct the Nation's business to have barbershops in one of the main corridors of this building. I think it is a desecration to have restaurants in this building. If I had my way, that space would be better used and could be used

to meet some of the needs we have insofar as our congressional requirements are concerned.

But let us talk for just a moment about the need that my chairman has spoken of. I refer to the concern for the needs of our visitors. I was under the impression that the reason we chose Union Station as the National Capital Visitors' Center was to relieve us of some of the problems we have here. A few moments ago I spoke with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY) who very graciously gave me some figures and information concerning that proposal.

First of all, it will be under construction within a matter of 2 or 3 weeks. It should be completed within 18 to 24 months. It will have eating facilities, a restaurant, and a cafeteria. There will be two large theaters and one small theater. The two large theaters can accommodate 500 people every 15 minutes. There is going to be constructed an \$11 million parking area which will accommodate 2,000 cars, 200 tourist buses, and arrangements will be made to transport people back and forth from that center, which is not too far away, to the Capitol Building.

I think this is a proper plan for the accommodation of those people who want to visit the National Capital.

I do not want to walk just in the paths of my predecessors. There are changes needed in this building. These changes can be accomplished as we restore it. There are changes needed inside this building to better accommodate the people who work here, and the people who use it, and the people who visit it, but I, for one, cannot accept the arguments which have been advanced here today in favor of extending the west front of the Capitol.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, as I told the House a few moments ago, in 1969, I stood in this well with diagrams of the west front to sustain my arguments, and urged the House to support the extension of the west front of the Capitol rather than restoration. I told the House at that time our subcommittee had taken voluminous testimony by experts who had been selected by the Architect of the Capitol to advise us on what action should be taken. Based upon that testimony, which was to the effect that the condition of the west front was so hazardous that the Architect of the Capitol was afraid that the vibrations caused by planes flying over the Capitol might cause the collapse of the west front, I voted for the extension of the Capitol. I told the House that I favored restoration, but I saw no alternative. Something had to be done. The wall was deteriorating. The Senate then, as today, was adamant in insisting upon the restoration of the west wall rather than extension.

Because of the adamant position taken by the Senate the conference bogged down as this one has. Finally, the conferees agreed upon a study to be made of the feasibility of the restoration of the west front; \$200,000 was appropriated for that study.

One of the most famous architectural firms in the country was selected for that study. At that time I recommended to Speaker McCormack, who was the head of the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol, that he address a letter to 40 of the leading architectural schools of the country, to the deans of the schools of engineering and architecture, asking for their help and their recommendation as to the best engineering firm to carry out this study. It had to be the best because the Capitol, to my mind, is the Nation's most important building. It stands as the symbol of this Nation's traditions and ideals. All Americans revere the Capitol. Rightfully, they insist that the Congress take all steps necessary for its preservation for the ages.

Acting upon the recommendation of the deans he had received, Speaker McCormack, with the consent of the Commission, approved the Praeger-Cavanagh-Waterbury firm of New York City.

The Praeger firm conducted the study and concluded that restoration of the wall was possible.

Thus, the issue has been narrowed.

The question which is now presented to the House is not whether the extension is necessary to preserve the safety of the Capitol or of the west front but rather, do we favor an extension of the west front or a restoration of the west front? Both of them are feasible. Which alternative shall we take?

One of them will cost \$60-plus million, based upon figures submitted to the committee 2 years ago. Restoration will cost \$15-plus million, based upon the testimony submitted 2 years ago.

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

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. It is correct, though, is it not, that we cannot get any fixed bids on restoration?

Mr. YATES. I am saying that one of the conditions of the study given to the Praeger firm was to determine whether the wall could be restored for \$15 million. The Praeger report stated that it could be restored for \$15 million.

The Praeger report did say that in all probability it would be better to have a cost-plus contract.

I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The gentleman agrees we cannot say exactly what the cost would be under that procedure.

Mr. YATES. But we cannot say what the cost would be under the extension, either. We do know that the Rayburn Building had an initial projected cost of \$60 million, it wound up costing over \$100 million. I suspect the same thing will happen if the extension of the west front is approved.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Is it not true that we could be spending, say, \$20 or \$30 million—

Mr. YATES. It is possible.

Mr. CEDERBERG. And getting no additional space?

Mr. YATES. Space for what? The issue we face is whether or not we retain our link to the architectural glories of the past or whether we destroy a beautiful front part which has been standing since 1800.

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Is it not true if that decision is made to restore, and we get absolutely no additional space involved at all, for a number of dollars—taking our choice as to whatever it might be, for we do not know what it will turn out to be—we will doom forever the possibility of extending the west front of the Capitol, because in all probability it could never be done again, regardless of the needs of the Capitol?

Mr. YATES. I would say the gentleman is correct. If the reasoning upon which I and the others who support my position is sustained, which is to keep that west front of the Capitol intact for posterity, so that it continues the thread with the past, I would say "yes." I favor that. Unfortunately, today too many great architectural buildings of the past are being destroyed to make way for so-called progress that is not in effect progress. The old Stock Exchange Building in Chicago, one of the great examples of the work of the distinguished architect Norris Sullivan was demolished recently to make way for a new skyscraper.

Yes, we need toilets for the public, but we can find space for new rooms that are now not used for other purposes, we can do without the additional office space in the Capitol in order to retain the link with our heritage.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I guess I am a part of a "small, vocal minority," as one Member of this House referred to it this morning, that has been opposing the extension of the west front for 6 years because I felt it was unnecessary and because I felt it was too costly and because I felt it would be destructive of an important part of our architectural heritage.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROUSH) have made some very good points here. Time is limited, and I would like to concentrate my attention on just a couple of things.

First of all, the basic issue here is whether the rank-and-file Members of this Congress are going themselves to make the decision on this costly project or whether it is going to be made by a handful of Members however eminent and however senior they may be.

I thought this was the year in Congress on both sides of the aisle when we were reforming our procedures so that we would not be doing things on the say-so of one or two men but we would do it on the decision of the House and the Senate themselves.

That is all that is really involved in this conference report. That is what the Senate amendment says. It says that we do not go ahead with this extension, whether it is good or bad, without a vote of the Members of the House and the Senate. If Congress wants to go ahead with the extension we can go ahead and build it; but under the Senate amend-

ment we are not going to build it by sneaking it through the back way.

If we accept the Senate amendment, which I think is eminently reasonable and eminently sensible and eminently in accord with the times both in the modern Democratic Party and in the Republican Party, then we can go home tomorrow, because we will have full agreement on this legislative appropriation conference report.

The gentleman from Texas said we have discussed this issue a lot of times, and we have; but the last time we discussed it, as the gentleman from Illinois has already said, was back in 1969. At that time the argument for extending the west front was that the Capitol Building was going to fall down. If a helicopter came too close, we were told, the Capitol would crash around us. As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Illinois and other members of the committee were eloquent in their testimony on this point.

But with the help of the Senate we got an opportunity to put that assertion by our former Architect of the Capitol to a searching examination by the most reputable firm of structural engineers in the country, the Praeger firm of New York City. The Praeger report, at a cost of \$200,000 or almost a quarter of a million dollars, was the result. This study group made their survey, and came back and said, "Baloney. It is not true. You can restore the west front and do it for about \$15 million compared to about \$60 million or \$70 million for this elaborate extension."

Since that time we in this House have not had an opportunity to discuss the subject, we have not had an opportunity to examine it and we have not had any discussion by the Commission for Extension of the Capitol that anybody knew about.

So the question today simply is whether we are going to let this small group of eminent leaders, including the Speaker of the House and the majority and minority leaders and the majority and minority leaders on the other side of the Capitol, make the decision for us or whether we are going to make it ourselves.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. STRATTON. I decline to yield because I have a very limited amount of time, and I have been working on this matter for 6 years to get a chance to present the case fully to the House.

So that is the basic question before us. Actually it will not be presented to us as part of the conference report. The conference report will come up first, and I have no objection to it. The first vote will include those items that are in agreement between the House and the Senate and you can vote for them, as far as I am concerned. Then we will take up the amendments in disagreement, and this west front issue is the only substantial amendment in disagreement, as I understand it. The managers on the part of the House will move to insist on our disagreement to Senate amendment No. 36. If that motion carries, then we go back and hassle it out for a few more months, and our legislative pay and all of the other things in the bill

will have to be continued by a continuing resolution.

I am going to move that we recede and concur in the Senate amendment. That amendment says simply that if we are going to make changes in our Capitol in a \$70 million boondoggle project, as I believe it to be, on top of a \$40 million visitors center already authorized at Union Station, then at least we ought to have one little vote in this House and the other one on what we propose to do.

The main reason why I am against this extension is the cost. The cost is not simply an appalling \$70 million, and, as the gentleman from Illinois has said, it is also likely to escalate, but let me show you just how enormous that cost figure is.

A Holiday Inn motel can be built for \$15 a square foot. If you want a fancy house in Spring Valley, it is \$30 a square foot. The Rayburn Building, the most expensive building in history, was roughly \$50 a square foot, and the new FBI building will set a new high at \$68 a square foot. But this extension will be—believe it or not—\$368 a square foot, or five and a half times the cost of the FBI building; and I just do not think we want that.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL).

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I believe I can say that no one loves our Capitol more than I do. It might also be true that I have read more about it and studied it and considered it and analyzed some of the things that have happened here throughout our history, than most of the other Members of the Congress have. And in some small way I have tried to help the Members understand and the people of our country understand somewhat better the history of this great Nation, and especially the history of this institution that you and I are a part of, the legislative branch.

Mr. Speaker, I am strongly for the committee's position, and I hope we sustain them, and the Commission. I want to get on with this building, and I say to you that what we are doing here is just emulating what has happened many years before, and there were those who said at that time, "Let us keep the link with the past." I say to you then what would the Capitol look like without its dome? You see, this is the second dome. If you are worried about a link with the past, that is going to be the link with the past, not the west wall.

I was against the east front extension, and I was against the west front extension, but I have changed my mind, based upon some pretty thorough studies, I think. People are worried about the cost. Now, no one here can say that if we just rebuild that west wall that it will cost only \$30 million. There is no guarantee of that. No contractor is prepared to make such an offer, and our report shows this, or is interested in such a contract except on a cost-plus basis. I believe that if you have done any extensive probing so as to understand these reports, that you would all agree.

A few days ago one of our colleagues sent a letter that had a lot of mistakes in it, and I responded to that, and that

should be in everyone's hands today. Time does not permit me going into that extensively, but just let me comment on some parts of it.

Our colleague, in the letter he sent to each of us, used the emotional word "destroy" in describing what he deems to be the result of such an extension. But rather than destroy, Mr. Speaker, I have a deep conviction that the design will be enhanced by being a reproduction almost exactly for the most part, altered slightly in the portico, in order to strengthen the composition and the visual support of the dome, a concept that was envisioned as far back as 1860 by Thomas Walter, the designer of the dome and the House and Senate wings. And many of the Members then opposed, just like there was opposition to putting in electric lights, because people at that time said, "What is the matter with gas, it is good enough."

Also we changed the cooling system. The cooling system we now have works very efficiently, but it is not the first one; the other system of cooling was through those little silos that you see out here on the west side of the Capitol where they pulled the air through, and then underground, and pumped it into this room to cool it.

Well, we have changed.

Now the beautiful Olmsted terraces will not be destroyed but rather will be altered in the center portion and, as can be seen from the model in Statuary Hall, it shows the extension throughout substantially improved as a result.

Our colleague discussed, but neglected to point out that the true cost of the extension is only the differential between the cost of restoration and the additional cost of the extension.

For \$30 million we could get an old wall and no space—for \$60 million—and you might not get that for \$30 million. If you take that out, you are going to have at the end of 20 or 30 years to do it again.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I do not have much time, but I yield to the gentleman briefly.

Mr. GROSS. Does this extension contemplate a new dining room or dining rooms?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. The details of that plan have to be worked on and finally agreed on. Every Member of the House has had and will have a chance to go to the Commission and they have not finally decided on it.

Mr. GROSS. I understand previous speakers to say that this will provide for additional and sumptuous dining room facilities.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. That may be—if that is what the House should decide, but it has not yet been decided for sure.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know or is there anyone present in the House Chamber who knows, what the deficit was in the operation of the Senate dining room this past year, as well as the House dining room?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes, I am on the committee that deals with this and the committee that does something about it under the leadership of Mr. HAYS. But the investment of \$60 million may

prevent another restoration. I confidently believe that.

As I said earlier, I opposed the extension of both the east and west fronts. But continued research and study convinces me beyond question of the advisability and desirability of the extensions.

With this much needed extension, we could then accommodate with dignity and pride the millions of visitors who come to their capital.

This building, my friends, is visited by more people than any other capital in this world.

The holy place in this Capitol is the reception center, the rotunda. If this extension is granted, you are going to have some auditoriums that will take up to 500 people at a time and hopefully they will be screened there when we get our electronics installed and there may be a screen in your office where you can sit at your desk and talk to your students who come here.

Then there will be some place for the relief of the poor elderly citizens who have to park beyond the Library and walk up 47 steps and for whom there is no really adequate place to sit down and be comfortable and who have to wait to take their turn to make a tour of the Capitol.

My friends, we would be doing our country a disservice if we do not support the committee report.

I am against the Senate's position. The people who have convictions about this do not want to listen much. I have been over there and I have made myself available, but I do believe that if we will insist on our own position which we have taken repeatedly, the Senate will back down and accept our position. They will be glad of it just like those who opposed the east front are now glad that that was done and it is gone and done. That will be the case when, and if, we have this extension.

Today we are considering the conference report, including a rider added in the Senate, on the legislative appropriations bill. Senate amendment No. 36 has been correctly and strongly opposed by the House managers. If the House recedes from the position of the House managers, it will stop the preparation of final plans for the excellent and well designed extension of the west front of this "Temple of Liberty" that is the Capitol.

You have recently received a letter sent to you by one of our colleagues giving his views on why you should vote with the Senate managers and against the House on this vital issue. It is appropriate to comment on his statements in order to furnish you with some facts so that you may make an informed decision.

Contrary to our colleague's statement, the Commission, representing the leadership of both parties in both the House and the Senate, did not order construction to begin, but rather, in accordance with the 1969 legislation, ordered final contract plans to be prepared. There is no funding and no intention to engage in actual construction of anything until construction funds are later requested after the preparation of final contract plans.

He states:

Plans for this project have long since been completed. . . . this \$2 million will be used for preliminary digging, demolition, etc.

The truth is that only preliminary plans are completed, and paid for with funds appropriated in 1965, after which those plans were sent to all Members of Congress in 1967. Final plans have not been prepared; the \$2 million was appropriated in 1970 and is still held for this purpose. Digging, demolition, or other site work cannot be and will not be done with these funds.

Our colleague states only a portion of the amendment, the entire text of which is as follows:

Funds available under this appropriation may be used for the preparation of preliminary plans for the extension of the west central front: *Provided, however,* That no funds may be used for the preparation of the final plans or initiation of construction of said project until specifically approved and appropriated therefor by Congress.

Please note the trap in the language of the amendment: Funds may be used only for preliminary plans, which are indeed already completed, and no funds may be used for final plans, which is the purpose for which the funds were originally appropriated in 1970. Actually, initiation of construction cannot proceed in any event until additional funds are requested and appropriated therefore.

This is obviously one more move on the part of a small but vocal minority of the Congress to delay, impede, and subvert the project in the hope that ultimately they can defeat the will of the previously expressed majority of the House to provide space from the expenditure of public funds rather than to spend approximately \$30 million for the cosmetic treatment of a badly deteriorated old stone wall comprising only 20 percent of the exterior perimeter of the Capitol and painted white since 1820 in order to completely hide, cover, and inadequately preserve the brown, soft sandstone.

We were told in 1969, not as our colleague states, that it was "impossible to repair the Capitol," but rather that to strengthen the wall by an extension was the most feasible and most certain engineering solution.

Contrary, also, to our colleague's statement, the Praeger engineering firm was hired, pursuant to the law, to determine the feasibility of restoration, and specifically to determine whether five conditions established by the Congress itself, could be met. The body of the report, contrary to its stated conclusions, left grave doubts regarding the possibility of meeting two of the five conditions, namely, that the work could be accomplished for a maximum of \$15 million and a contract let on the basis of a fixed, lump sum bid. None of three nationally reputable contractors would agree to bid on that basis and with that cost limitation because of the excessive quantity of unknown conditions within the wall.

Contrary again to our colleague's statements, neither the Commission nor the Appropriations Committee ignored the report and, further, neither they nor anyone else "ordered construction on the extension to begin at once." Our colleague knows the latter is impossible

under the legislative purpose for which the funds were appropriated. Further, the Commission had before it not only the engineering report, but also the 1969 hearings, floor debate, reports, the preliminary plans and estimate of cost, and numerous other documents bearing on the entire west front question.

The Commission did not lightly draw its conclusions. Our Architect, who is held in the highest of professional esteem by both the architectural and engineering professions, had the courage to change his position and to support the extension after being better informed through a year's study and after numerous interviews with responsible, internationally renowned architects and engineers, including Mr. Praeger who wrote the engineering report.

Our colleague uses the emotional word "destroy" in describing what he deems to be the result of the extension. Rather than "destroy", I have deep convictions that the design will be enhanced by being reproduced exactly for the most part, and altered slightly at the portico in order to strengthen the composition in visual support of the dome, a concept envisioned as far back as 1860 by Thomas U. Walter, the designer of the dome and the House and Senate wings.

The beautiful Olmsted terraces will not be destroyed, but rather will be altered in the center portion only, and as can be seen from the model in Statuary Hall, which shows the extension, they will be substantially improved by the result.

Our colleague discusses costs, but neglects to point out that the true cost of extension is only the differential between the cost of restoration and the additional cost of extension. For \$30 million we would get an old wall and no space; for \$60 million we get 270,000 gross square feet of additional space. The differential of \$30 million yields a cost of only \$111.30 per square foot. In any case, it is inappropriate to compare the cost of a unique and monumental building of classical design with that of office buildings and cheap motels.

Our colleague infers that the project has not been debated, when he knows full well that the House has already considered and voted on this project after full debate on the floor and after defeating his previous proposal in 1969. He now asks us to support a Senate amendment which traps us by permitting the preliminary plans to proceed, when, as we all know, the preliminary plans were completed and delivered to us 5 years ago.

The Senate amendment will completely stop the extension. I urge your support for the position that the House has already taken; to proceed with final contract plans for the long studied and well designed extension. To uphold the position of the House is to give the citizens substantive results for the expenditure of public funds, rather than to sink upward of \$30 million into a thicket of uncertainty in an attempt to patch up a deteriorated wall.

I once opposed the extension of both the east and west fronts, but continued research and study convinced me beyond question of the advisability and desir-

ability of the extensions. With this much needed extension, we could then accommodate with dignity and pride the millions of visitors that come to their Capitol with attractive and adequate reception facilities which would enable us to remove this type of activity from the rotunda and allow it to become, as it should be, the "holy ground" of the Capitol and high point of their visit.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT).

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I believe that our love for our heritage requires the preservation of this wall that we are talking of either destroying or covering up. It dates from the era of the powdered wig and the knee breeches of our Revolutionary period, not the much later Civil War period of the great dome. Washington and Jefferson knew this wall, and it is all of the exterior wall that they ever saw that still exists.

I think it is an icon of the past that we should preserve if we can. I think most of us agree that we should, if we can. And we can—and at a financial saving.

I think most of us would also agree that we should not spend money where lesser money would get us the same or more results. I believe the Visitors Center will get us more results for our constituents than we can have here and that Center project is already underway. But if it would be felt that we should have additional visitors facilities in the Capitol Building, then there is a vast acreage of empty or subutilized space in the basement of this building—a very substandard utilization at present. I think anybody who has been in the basement of this building realizes that that is so. With modern conveniences and air conditioning and a lot of things of that type, that existing basement area could be utilized for everything that is contemplated for this new extension, and at a much cheaper cost.

The most important point I would like to make, and which I have not heard discussed very much here, is the question of utility. Just building this building on the front of this building is not going to make this building we have more useful—but rather less useful—for the purposes for which it was designed, and which history would indicate that it should be used for in the future. That is not as a visitor center, but rather as a legislative chamber or a group of legislative chambers where laws can be made.

If you bring to this structure this new auditorium and these new cafeterias and these other facilities to the degree that is being suggested for this new area, you will find our present legislative facilities are going to be severely cramped, when presented with the millions of people who will come to this building as a restaurant facility and as an auditorium facility and as a civic center facility. You will then rue this day in the destruction this plan will work upon the legislative processes.

Look at the Chambers right here and now, and how small they are. Everything is going to be cramped with the millions who will come to this building for its

restaurant and other tourist facilities. Every room here is going to be cramped. There are a lot of suggestions for this building, but this one will diminish our heritage, cost more money than available alternatives would cost and will crowd the building to the detriment of its governmental purposes. It will create a crowded museum and civic center of what should be preserved as a functioning legislative tool.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I should just like to make one comment. We are talking about an issue that has been before us for years—whether to expand or restore the west front. In this regard I now refer to the comments just made by the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON), in which he suggests to the House that a small group of people are going to sneak—and I use his word "sneak" something over on the House. Personally I resent this, and I think it is a very improper and incorrect way to refer to the distinguished gentlemen who have had this matter referred to them to make recommendations to this Congress.

I should also remind those who have some fear about something being "sneaked over" on them that there will not be a dime spent for either restoration or extension—and I hope it is extension—unless a line item appropriation comes before this House and the Senate, when you can vote it up or down.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. O'KONSKI).

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing a lot about secrecy in Government cost overruns and what not. I have been trying to get some information. I cannot seem to get it from anybody. Last year, for example, in this appropriation bill for the legislative body there was \$450,000 that was a cost overrun in the restaurant of the other body, and after we made a thorough investigation of it, we found out that there was an additional \$500,000 cost overrun in the restaurant of the other body, making the total a \$900,000 loss in the restaurant of the other body. That amounts to \$9,000 a year to feed one Member of the other body. I have been trying to get the information over here from members of the committee, and I went over to the headquarters over here.

Is there anybody here who can give me the information on what the cost overrun is of the restaurant in the other body? How much money is there in this bill to feed the Members of the other body? Does it run to \$9,000 a year for each Member like it did last year? Is it more? Is it less? If it costs us \$900,000 a year to feed 100 Members of the other body, over a period of 30 years that would build the west front that we are talking about here. Is there anybody here who can give me the information on what the cost overrun of the restaurant in the other body is, the amount of money involved in this bill? Is there anybody who can give me that information?

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

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. I cannot give the gentleman that information, but I can say that if we are going to put three or four more restaurants in the Capitol, then we are going to have a lot more overruns because of the fact that these House restaurants are only one-meal restaurants. They are not going to be a paying proposition.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Cost overruns and secrecy—here you have it at its very height.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL).

Mr. RANDALL. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me some time.

At the outset let me say I favor restoration but not extension of the west front of the Capitol.

In the debate so far most of the emphasis has been on the need for more facilities for our constituents who visit the Capitol. It is argued that there should be more restaurant space. It is also argued there should be an auditorium to show a film of the Capitol prior to a tour. Then there was great emphasis placed upon the need for more comfort stations or toilet facilities.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there may be a need for more toilets in the Capitol but that does not mean we must spend either the \$15 million figure or the higher figure of \$60 million to achieve the objective of more toilet facilities. Let us install what we need but do not put the reason for the extension on the basis of need for a few more washrooms.

In consideration of the argument for more restaurant space and a place to show a movie to tourists and constituents before they tour the Capitol I was under the impression the reason we spent money on the old Union Station was to convert it into a Visitors Center. We have or will spend several million—perhaps as much as \$40 million on the old station and I understand there is a place down there to show films of places of interest to our constituents. If it should be argued the Visitors Center is too far away from the Capitol then let us build some kind of tracked shuttle cars to the Capitol. We could even put in a little subway for less than the \$60 million cost of extension of the west front of the Capitol.

Then if the imagined need for extension of the west front is to have more room for restaurants, let us not forget there is one across the street in the old Congressional Hotel which is equipped with a good kitchen and ready for use. This is owned by the Government and could be put into service immediately without any additional expense.

If the Congressional Hotel does not give enough dining room space maybe we could use some of the eating facilities in the third library, which we did not need, we could then at least make it useful as a place to eat even if it were not needed as a library.

Mr. Speaker, of course, the talk about more dining room space, more toilets and a movie auditorium is not the real issue involved. The real basic issue is whether

or not this Congress is willing to start down an uncertain road toward a huge extension of the west front, adding as much as 270,000 square feet in a multi-story structure and costing an estimated amount of \$60 million when we have no way to know that it may run as much as \$100 million.

Whether the figures that have been mentioned during the debate are accurate I do not know but one speaker pointed out that the cost to build a Holiday Inn is about \$15 a square foot; to build a house in one of the finer residential sections of the city of Washington would be about \$30 a square foot; the Rayburn Building cost about \$50 a square foot; the new FBI building will run as much as \$68 a square foot. But my colleagues, the best estimate that we have at the present time is that the extension of the west front of the Capitol may cost as much as \$360 a square foot. Honestly, I do not see how we can justify such a cost at this time whatever the alleged advantages may be.

Because one opposes extension does not mean that he opposes restoration. We do want to restore the west Capitol, make it safe and be sure it will remain solid and strong throughout the years to come. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that we might be able to take down the unsightly wooden supports which, in my opinion, were put there as a sort of propaganda measure by the preceding Architect of the Capitol in order to promote the west front extension.

A while back fears were generated that the vibrations produced by jet planes flying overhead would cause the west front to collapse. We know now that that kind of argument was just hogwash. The reason this is so is that the west side of the Capitol suffered quite a substantial blast, from a pretty good sized bomb that blew out several walls and corridors very near to where these wooden supports were placed. Yet this blast in the late winter of 1971 did not cause the west side of the Capitol to collapse.

The Praeger report estimated the cost of restoration at \$15 million, and while it made many recommendations, there were five principal recommendations to the effect that there should be no extension of the west central front unless five conditions were established to the satisfaction of the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol. The important point of the Praeger report as I understand it is that in spite of some of the cracks and surface flaws, these do not impair the ability of the west front to continue to support the loads imposed upon it.

Equally important is the fact that the Praeger commission pointed out that the restoration could be accomplished without vacation of any of the Capitol space, whereas the extension plan would require vacating such space.

The other body has taken the lead to oppose this extension. Our side of Congress should act to recede from our former position and concur in the Senate amendment, which in this instance happens to be Senate Amendment No. 36. While the basic issue is between the choice of restoration and extension, an-

other very important issue is whether or not this work is important enough to be settled by a vote of both Houses of the Congress rather than by the wishes of a handful of Members no matter how senior, that make up the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol.

This matter has been under vigorous debate for the past 6 years.

The report of the Commission has now proved to be completely false. The arguments advanced for the work on the west side in 1966 were that the Capitol was in imminent danger of collapse. We were told then that the Capitol could only be saved by an extension including 4 acres more of space. We were told it was impossible to repair the Capitol or prevent its collapse in any other way. But the Praeger report completely demolished all these arguments. The report said the Capitol was not in danger of collapse. The report concluded it could be restored much more satisfactorily than by extension and it would cost less than \$15 million.

Mr. Speaker, whatever parliamentary situation might develop, let us all stand firm against covering up the last remaining visible portion of the original historical Capitol building built in 1800. The Capitol is more than the seat of government, and more than a national monument. It is a great heritage of our Nation. We should not lose the great work of William Thornton, Benjamin Latrobe, or Frederick Law Olmsted. Once extension begins there would be no opportunity for restoration. We should not let ourselves be led into the alteration of the west facade. Every Member of this body should vote to preserve our great heritage rather than to vote to create another Federal office building. Let us preserve the magnificent design of the west front. To do otherwise is to desecrate our great heritage.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard the discussion, and in my opinion this will be a vote as to whether or not we will extend or try to restore the west central front. When we talk about restoring, again, is it just to keep the building in its present shape? Because, if it is, the sacred sandstone will not be there through restoration. We will have some new sandstone in the wall and a new coat of paint.

There has been a discussion as to whether or not we need additional space. Mr. Speaker, I think all the Members need to do is to look around and note what they see. There are four basic committees with rights to meet while the House is in session. One is the Rules Committee, which has been crowded, for years, and they tried to enlarge their space and had to push someone out of their room in order to get more office space. They still do not have enough room. They have to operate close to the Floor. We have the House Administration, Appropriations, and Ways and Means Committees which are also involved, and all are crowded. We should look around and see how little space is available for the official reporters of

debate in their office. They are crowded together.

We need more rooms as we grow. There is no question about it.

The Tally Clerk and Journal Clerk are as crowded as the reporters. The Parliamentarian has one little room and, frankly, he has moved in on part of the Speaker's quarters. That is a little ridiculous.

As to the public, on one day, June 20 of this year, there were 26,219 visitors in the Capitol. Only 7,260 took the tour. We have talked about the Visitors' Center, everyone is not going to that Visitors' Center. The visitors are going to come here, and they want to see the Capitol in the limited time they may have. Restoration will not solve all these problems. It may alleviate some, but it will not solve the problems.

We have had a study of the increase in the number of visitors to the Capitol. As a comparison, we have had an average of anywhere from 10 to 28 percent increase per month this year over last year. There was only one drop, which was in February, and no doubt that was due to the weather. Last month we had a 20-percent increase. There were 120,222 visitors in June of 1971. On just half the month of June this year, we have had 93,914 visitors. We badly need adequate space to handle these visitors. The rotunda is crowded and cluttered. As I said earlier, these are not adequate facilities for our visitors.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired. Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

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

Mr. STRATTON. 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 382, nays 8, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 239]

YEAS—382

Abourezk	Bergland	Byrne, Pa.
Abzug	Bevill	Byrnes, Wis.
Adams	Biaggi	Byron
Addabbo	Biester	Cabell
Alexander	Bingham	Camp
Anderson,	Blackburn	Carey, N.Y.
Calif.	Blatnik	Carlson
Anderson, Ill.	Boland	Carney
Andrews, Ala.	Boiling	Carter
Andrews,	Bow	Casey, Tex.
N. Dak.	Brademas	Cederberg
Annunzio	Brasco	Celler
Archer	Bray	Chamberlain
Arends	Brinkley	Chappell
Ashbrook	Brooks	Clancy
Ashley	Brotzman	Clark
Aspin	Brown, Mich.	Clausen,
Aspinall	Brown, Ohio	Don H.
Badillo	Broyhill, N.C.	Clawson, Del.
Baker	Broyhill, Va.	Cleveland
Barrett	Buchanan	Collier
Begich	Burke, Mass.	Collins, Ill.
Belcher	Burlison, Tex.	Collins, Tex.
Bell	Burlison, Mo.	Conable
Bennett	Burton	Conover

Conte
Conyers
Corman
Cotter
Coughlin
Crane
Culver
Curlin
Daniel, Va.
Daniels, N.J.
Danielson
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Dellums
Denholm
Dennis
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Downing
Drinan
Dulski
Duncan
du Pont
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Ellberg
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Flood
Flowers
Flynt
Foley
Forsythe
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Frenzel
Frey
Fuqua
Gallianakis
Garmatz
Gaydos
Gettys
Gialmo
Gibbons
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grasso
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Haley
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammer-
schmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Harrington
Harvey
Hastings
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Heinz
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks, Mass.
Hicks, Wash.
Hills
Hogan
Hollifield
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jacobs

Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Keating
Kee
Keith
Kemp
King
Kluczynski
Koch
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Landrum
Leggett
Lennon
Lent
Link
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lujan
McClary
McClure
McCollister
McGuiloch
McFall
McEwen
McKee
McKay
McKevitt
McKinney
McMillan
Macdonald,
Mass.
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Mallory
Mann
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathis, Ga.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Mazzoli
Meeds
Melcher
Metcalfe
Michel
Mikva
Miller, Calif.
Mills, Ark.
Mills, Md.
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mitchell
Mizell
Mollohan
Monagan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morgan
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
O'Neill
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Pettis
Peyser
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Podell
Poff
Powell
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Fryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Rallsback
Randall
Rangel
Rarick
Rees

Reid
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Robison, N.Y.
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Roncallo
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rousselot
Roy
Roybal
Runnels
Ruppe
Ruth
Ryan
St Germain
Sandman
Sarbanes
Satterfield
Saylor
Scherle
Scheuer
Schwengel
Scott
Sebellius
Seiberling
Shipley
Shoup
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Stanton
J. William
Stanton
James V.
Steed
Steele
Steiger, Ariz.
Stephens
Stokes
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Symington
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Terry
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Veysey
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Wampler
Ware
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
Charles H.
Winn
Wolf
Wright
Wyatt
Wylder
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Young, Fla.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—8

Gross
Hall
Landgrebe

Latta
Miller, Ohio
O'Konski

Schmitz
Steiger, Wis.

NOT VOTING—42

Abbitt
Abernethy
Anderson,
Tenn.
Baring
Betts
Blanton
Boggs
Broomfield
Burke, Fla.
Caffery
Chisholm
Clay
Colmer
Davis, S.C.

Dent
Dowdy
Dwyer
Erlenborn
Esch
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford,
William D.
Fraser
Fulton
Gallagher
Hagan
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Hébert

Jones, Ala.
Karth
McCloskey
McCormack
McDade
Mich.
Mosher
Moss
Pepper
Pirnie
Schneebell
Teague, Tex.
Thone
Vander Jagt

So the conference report was agreed to.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Pirnie.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Moss with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Schneebell.
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Betts.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Caffery with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Davis of South Carolina with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Clay with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Abbott with Mr. Thone.
Mr. McCormack with Mr. McDade.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Hagan.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as Senate amendments Nos. 1 through 29 relate solely to housekeeping operations of the other body in which, by practice, the House concurs without intervention, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments Nos. 1 through 29 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments Nos. 1 through 29 are as follows:

(1) SENATE

(2) COMPENSATION AND MILEAGE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT AND SENATORS AND EXPENSE ALLOWANCES OF THE VICE PRESIDENT AND LEADERS OF THE SENATE

(3) COMPENSATION AND MILEAGE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT AND SENATORS

For compensation and mileage of the Vice President and Senators of the United States, \$4,778,340.

(4) EXPENSE ALLOWANCES OF THE VICE PRESIDENT AND MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS

For expense allowance of the Vice President, \$10,000; Majority Leader of the Senate, \$3,000; and Minority Leader of the Senate, \$3,000; in all, \$16,000.

(5) SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

For compensation of officers, employees, clerks to Senators, and others as authorized by law, including agency contributions and longevity compensation as authorized, which shall be paid from this appropriation without regard to the below limitations, as follows:

(6) OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

For clerical assistance to the Vice President, \$430,200.

(7) OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

For office of the President pro tempore, \$54,130: Provided, That effective July 1, 1972, the Comptroller may appoint and fix the compensation of an auditor at not to exceed \$18,130 per annum in lieu of a secretary at not to exceed \$15,281 per annum.

(8) OFFICES OF THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS

For offices of the Majority and Minority Leaders, \$206,165.

(9) OFFICES OF THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY WHIPS

For offices of the Majority and Minority Whips, \$104,640.

(10) OFFICE OF THE CHAPLAIN

For office of the Chaplain, \$18,650.

(11) OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For office of the Secretary, \$2,244,230, including \$99,974 required for the purpose specified and authorized by section 74b of title 2, United States Code: Provided, That effective July 1, 1972, the Secretary may appoint and fix the compensation of a third assistant parliamentarian at not to exceed \$19,684 per annum, and a messenger at not to exceed \$9,583 per annum.

(12) COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

For professional and clerical assistance to standing committees and the Select Committee on Small Business, \$7,696,705.

(13) CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

For clerical assistance to the Conference of the Majority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, \$153,070.

For clerical assistance to the Conference of the Minority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, \$153,070.

(14) ADMINISTRATIVE AND CLERICAL ASSISTANTS TO SENATORS

For administrative and clerical assistants to Senators, \$34,264,925.

(15) OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

For office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, \$8,633,250.

(16) OFFICES OF THE SECRETARIES FOR THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY

For offices of the Secretary for the Majority and the Secretary for the Minority, \$248,120.

(17) OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL OF THE SENATE

For salaries and expenses of the office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, \$473,810.

(18) CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

(19) SENATE POLICY COMMITTEES

For salaries and expenses of the Majority Policy Committee and the Minority Policy Committee, \$309,770 for each such Committee; in all, \$619,540.

(20) AUTOMOBILES AND MAINTENANCE

For purchase, lease, exchange, maintenance, and operation of vehicles, one for the Vice President, one for the President pro tempore, one for the Majority Leader, one for the Minority Leader, one for the Majority Whip, one for the Minority Whip, for carrying the mails, and for official use of the

offices of the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, \$36,000.

(21) INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

For expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate, or conducted pursuant to section 134(a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, including \$511,460 for the Committee on Appropriations, to be available also for the purposes mentioned in Senate Resolution Numbered 193, agreed to October 14, 1943, \$11,848,545.

(22) FOLDING DOCUMENTS

For the employment of personnel for folding speeches and pamphlets at a gross rate of not exceeding \$3.34 per hour per person, \$74,475.

(23) MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

For miscellaneous items, \$6,532,150.

(24) POSTAGE STAMPS

For postage stamps for the Offices of the Secretaries for the Majority and Minority, \$320; and for air mail and special delivery stamps for the Office of the Secretary, \$610; Office of the Sergeant at Arms, \$240; Comptroller, \$100; Senators and the President of the Senate, as authorized by law, \$137,355; in all, \$138,625.

(25) STATIONERY (REVOLVING FUND)

For stationery for Senators and the President of the Senate \$385,800; and for stationery for committees and officers of the Senate, \$17,200; in all \$403,000.

(26) ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The second sentence of section 4 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint Resolution transferring the management of the Senate Restaurants to the Architect of the Capitol, and for other purposes", approved July 6, 1961, as amended (40 U.S.C. 174-4), is amended (1) by striking out "1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "1973", and (2) by striking out "specifically for such restaurants as a" and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "which shall be part of a".

(28) Effective July 1, 1972, the last paragraph under the heading "Administrative Provisions" in the appropriations for the Senate under the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1971 (2 U.S.C. 46d-5), is repealed.

(29) For the purpose of carrying out his duties under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, the Secretary of the Senate is authorized, from and after July 1, 1972, (1) to procure technical support services, (2) to procure the temporary or intermittent services of individual technicians, experts, or consultants, or organizations thereof, in the same manner and under the same conditions, to the extent applicable, as a standing committee of the Senate may procure such services under section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency, and (4) to incur official travel expenses. Payments to carry out the provisions of this paragraph shall be made from funds included in the appropriation "Miscellaneous Items" under the heading "Contingent Expenses of the Senate" upon vouchers approved by the Secretary of the Senate. All sums received by the Secretary under authority of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CASEY OF TEXAS

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CASEY of Texas moves that the House

recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 through 29, inclusive, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 33: On page 21, line 18, strike out:

"For necessary expenditures for the Capitol Building and electrical substations of the Senate and House Office Buildings, under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol, including improvements, maintenance, repair, equipment, supplies, material, fuel, oil, waste, and appurtenances; furnishings and office equipment; special and protective clothing for workmen; uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901, 5902); personal and other services; cleaning and repairing works of art, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; purchase or exchange, maintenance and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; purchase of necessary reference books and periodicals; for expenses of attendance, when specifically authorized by the Architect of the Capitol, at meetings or conventions in connection with subjects related to work under the Architect of the Capitol, \$2,852,900, of which \$50,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That there is hereby authorized to be established and maintained in an amount not to exceed \$100, a petty cash fund for small purchases necessary for care and operation of the buildings and office administration, which shall be reimbursed by vouchers properly chargeable to this and successor appropriations."

And insert:

"For necessary expenditures for the Capitol Building and electrical substations of the Senate and House Office Buildings, under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol, including improvements, maintenance, repair, equipment, supplies, material, fuel, oil, waste, and appurtenances; furnishings and office equipment; special and protective clothing for workmen; uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902); personal and other services; cleaning and repairing works of art without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; purchase or exchange, maintenance and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; purchase of necessary reference books and periodicals; for expenses of attendance, when specifically authorized by the Architect of the Capitol, at meetings or conventions in connection with subjects related to work under the Architect of the Capitol, \$4,411,000, of which \$1,521,000 shall remain available until June 30 1974 to enable the Architect of the Capitol under the direction of the Commission on Art and Antiquities of the United States Senate established by S. Res. 382, 90th Congress, agreed to October 1, 1968, to make such expenditures as may be necessary, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to restore the Old Senate Chamber on the principal floor of the Capitol and the Old Supreme Court Chamber on the ground floor of the Capitol substantially to the condition in which these chambers existed when last occupied in 1859 and 1860, respectively, by the United States Senate and the United States Supreme Court, including expenditures for procurement, restoration, and repair of furniture and furnishings for these chambers: *Provided*, That there is hereby authorized to be established and maintained, in an amount not to exceed \$100, a petty cash fund for small purchases necessary for care and operation of the buildings and office administration, which shall be reimbursed

by vouchers properly chargeable to this and successor appropriations."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CASEY OF TEXAS

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CASEY of Texas moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "For necessary expenditures for the Capitol Building and electrical substations of the Senate and House Office Buildings, under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol, including improvements, maintenance, repair, equipment, supplies, material, fuel, oil, waste, and appurtenances; furnishings and office equipment; special and protective clothing for workmen; uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902); personal and other services; cleaning and repairing works of art and procurement of fabric and installation of same on the wall panels in the galleries of the Senate Chamber, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; purchase or exchange, maintenance and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; purchase of necessary reference books and periodicals; for expenses of attendance, when specifically authorized by the Architect of the Capitol, at meetings or convention in connection with subjects related to work under the Architect of the Capitol, \$4,411,000, of which \$1,521,000 shall remain available until June 30, 1974, to enable the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Commission on Art and Antiquities of the United States Senate established by S. Res. 382, 90th Congress, agreed to October 1, 1968, and a similar group as may be appointed by the Speaker of the House, to make such expenditures as may be necessary, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to restore the Old Senate Chamber on the principal floor of the Capitol and the Old Supreme Court Chamber on the ground floor of the Capitol substantially to the condition in which these chambers existed when last occupied in 1859 and 1860, respectively, by the United States Senate and the United States Supreme Court, including expenditures for procurement, restoration, and repair of furniture and furnishings for these chambers: *Provided*, That there is hereby authorized to be established and maintained, in an amount not to exceed \$100, a petty cash fund for small purchases necessary for care and operation of the buildings and office administration, which shall be reimbursed by vouchers properly chargeable to this and successor appropriations."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 34: On page 24, line 1, insert:

The sum of \$74,000 of the \$470,000 made available until expended under the heading "Senate Office Buildings" in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1968, is hereby rescinded.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CASEY OF TEXAS

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CASEY of Texas moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In

lieu of the first sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "\$34,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 36: On page 24, line 5, insert:

The unobligated balances on June 30, 1972, in the following appropriation accounts, now available until expended, shall cease to be available for obligation on June 30, 1973:

Senate Office Buildings (excluding the \$74,000 rescinded); Extension of Additional Senate Office Building Site; Structural and Mechanical Care, Library Buildings and Grounds; John W. McCormack Residential Page School.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CASEY OF TEXAS

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CASEY of Texas moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of \$74,000 named in said amendment, insert the following: "\$34,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 36:

Page 24, line 20, insert:

EXTENSION OF THE CAPITOL

Funds available under this appropriation may be used for the preparation of preliminary plans for the extension of the west central front: *Provided, however*, That no funds may be used for the preparation of the final plans or initiation of construction of said project until specifically approved and appropriated therefor by the Congress.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CASEY OF TEXAS

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CASEY of Texas moves that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY
MR. STRATTON

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STRATTON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 36 and concur therein.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I request a division of the question.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STRATTON. Is the request for a division of the question presumably to recede on one part and concur on the other part? Is this subject to a vote or something?

The SPEAKER. All of the motion is subject to a vote. The question is on the matter of receding from disagreement.

Mr. STRATTON. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. If a Member is in favor of accepting the Senate amendment, then he would oppose the motion to divide on the vote. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER. This is not a question of voting on the division but a question of voting on the motion to recede.

Mr. STRATTON. A further parliamentary inquiry. My understanding is that if the motion to divide succeeds and passes, then it is possible parliamentarily to offer an amendment to the Senate amendment rather than to accept the Senate amendment. Is that not correct?

The SPEAKER. If the motion to recede from disagreement is adopted, then a motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment is in order.

Mr. STRATTON. Then another further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. If we want to accept the Senate amendment and conclude the conference, the way to do that is to vote down the motion to divide this particular question. Is that not true?

The SPEAKER. There is no question of division involved.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am confused. My original question was whether the proposal to divide the question into two parts was subject to a vote.

The SPEAKER. Division of a question is a right which any Member of the House enjoys.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. At what point is it in order for the gentleman from New York to offer his motion to recede and concur with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The motion is pending. The gentleman from Texas asked for a division.

Mr. YATES. Is it in order at this point for the gentleman from New York to offer his motion to recede and concur?

The SPEAKER. That motion is pending. The question is shall the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR.
CASEY OF TEXAS

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CASEY of Texas moves that the House concur in the amendment of the Senate numbered 36 with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

EXTENSION OF THE CAPITOL

No funds available under this appropriation shall be used to initiate construction of said project; for any preparation of the building site or the surrounding area for construction; or for any vacation of the building, until specifically appropriated for by the Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 1 hour.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR.
STRATTON

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion. I move that the motion of the gentleman from Texas be laid upon the table.

The SPEAKER. That would carry the whole conference to the table.

Does the gentleman from New York insist upon his motion?

Mr. STRATTON. I do, Mr. Speaker. I move to lay on the table the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASEY).

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. STRATTON. 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. The Chair will count. One hundred seventy-nine Members are present, not a quorum.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 186, nays 206, not voting, 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 240]

YEAS—186

Abourezk	Fuqua	Nichols
Abzug	Gettys	O'Konski
Adams	Goodling	Pelly
Addabbo	Grasso	Peyser
Alexander	Gross	Pike
Anderson, Calif.	Grover	Poff
Archer	Gubser	Preyer, N.C.
Ashbrook	Gude	Price, Tex.
Aspin	Haley	Pryor, Ark.
Badillo	Hall	Quile
Bell	Hamilton	Rallsback
Bennett	Hammer-	Randall
Bergland	schmidt	Rarick
Bieber	Hanley	Rees
Blackburn	Hanna	Reld
Brasco	Hansen, Idaho	Reuss
Bray	Hansen, Wash.	Robinson, Va.
Brotzman	Harrington	Rodino
Brown, Mich.	Hastings	Roe
Broyhill, N.C.	Hathaway	Rogers
Burke, Mass.	Hechler, W. Va.	Roncallo
Burton	Heckler, Mass.	Rosenthal
Byron	Heinz	Roush
Camp	Helstoski	Runnels
Carey, N.Y.	Hicks, Mass.	Ruppe
Celler	Hicks, Wash.	Ryan
Chappell	Hillis	Sarbanes
Clancy	Howard	Satterfield
Clewson, Del.	Hunt	Scherle
Cleveland	Hutchinson	Scheuer
Collier	Ichord	Schmitz
Collins, Tex.	Jacobs	Shipley
Conable	Jarman	Shoup
Conover	Jones, N.C.	Smith, Calif.
Conte	Keating	Spence
Conyers	Keith	Stanton
Corman	Kemp	J. William
Cotter	King	Steiger, Ariz.
Coughlin	Koch	Steiger, Wis.
Crane	Kuykendall	Stokes
Culver	Kyl	Stratton
Daniel, Va.	Kyros	Stuckey
Delaney	Landgrebe	Teague, Calif.
Dellums	Latta	Terry
Denholm	Lloyd	Thompson, N.J.
Dennis	Long, La.	Thone
Derwinski	Lujan	Tierman
Devine	McClure	Udall
Diggs	McCollister	Vanik
Donohue	McCulloch	Veysey
Dorn	McKevitt	Vigorito
Dow	McKinney	Waggonner
Drinan	McMillan	Waldie
Dulski	Macdonald, Mass.	Wampler
Duncan	Mailliard	Whalen
Dwyer	Mann	Whitehurst
Edwards, Calif.	Mathias, Calif.	Wildnall
Findley	Mayne	Wylie
Fish	Mazzoli	Yates
Flowers	Miller, Ohio	Young, Fla.
Frelinghuysen	Mitchell	Zion
Frey	Montgomery	Zwack
	Nedzi	

NAYS—206

Anderson, Ill.	Barrett	Bow
Andrews, Ala.	Begich	Brademas
Andrews, N. Dak.	Belcher	Brinkley
Annuzio	Bevill	Brooks
Arends	Blagel	Brown, Ohio
Ashley	Bingham	Broyhill, Va.
Aspinall	Blatnik	Buchanan
Baker	Boland	Burleson, Tex.
	Bolling	Burlison, Mo.

Byrne, Pa.	Hull	Quillen
Byrnes, Wis.	Hungate	Rangel
Cabell	Johnson, Calif.	Rhodes
Carlson	Johnson, Pa.	Riegle
Carney	Jonas	Roberts
Carter	Jones, Ala.	Robison, N.Y.
Casey, Tex.	Jones, Tenn.	Rooney, N.Y.
Cederberg	Kastenmeier	Rooney, Pa.
Chamberlain	Kazen	Rostenkowski
Clark	Kee	Rousselot
Clausen,	Kluczynski	Roy
Don H.	Landrum	Roybal
Collins, Ill.	Leggett	Ruth
Colmer	Lennon	St Germain
Curlin	Lent	Sandman
Daniels, N.J.	Link	Saylor
Danielson	Long, Md.	Schwengel
Davis, Ga.	McClory	Scott
Davis, Wis.	McCormack	Sebelius
de la Garza	McEwen	Seiberling
Dellenback	McFall	Shriver
Dickinson	McKay	Sikes
Dingell	Madden	Sisk
Downing	Mahon	Skubitz
du Pont	Mallory	Slack
Eckhardt	Mathis, Ga.	Smith, Iowa
Edmondson	Matsunaga	Smith, N.Y.
Edwards, Ala.	Meeds	Snyder
Ellberg	Melcher	Staggers
Eshleman	Metcalfe	Stanton
Evans, Colo.	Michel	James V.
Evins, Tenn.	Mikva	Steed
Fascell	Miller, Calif.	Steele
Flood	Mills, Ark.	Stephens
Flynt	Mills, Md.	Stubblefield
Foley	Minish	Sullivan
Forsythe	Mink	Symington
Fountain	Minshall	Talcott
Frenzel	Mizell	Taylor
Gallfianakis	Mollohan	Thompson, Ga.
Garmatz	Monagan	Thompson, Wis.
Gaydos	Morgan	Ullman
Gialmo	Murphy, Ill.	Van Deerlin
Gibbons	Murphy, N.Y.	Vander Jagt
Goldwater	Myers	Ware
Gonzalez	Natcher	Whalley
Gray	Nelsen	White
Green, Oreg.	Nix	Whitten
Green, Pa.	Obey	Williams
Griffin	O'Hara	Wilson, Bob
Griffiths	O'Neill	Wilson,
Halpern	Patman	Charles H.
Harsha	Patten	Winn
Harvey	Perkins	Wolff
Hawkins	Pettis	Wright
Hays	Pickle	Wyatt
Henderson	Poage	Wylder
Hogan	Podell	Wyman
Hollifield	Price, Ill.	Yatron
Horton	Pucinski	Young, Tex.
Hosmer	Purcell	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—40

Abbutt	Dowdy	McDonald,
Abernethy	Erlenborn	Mich.
Anderson,	Esch	Martin
Tenn.	Ford, Gerald R.	Moorhead
Baring	Ford,	Mosher
Betts	William D.	Moss
Blanton	Fraser	Passman
Boggs	Fulton	Pepper
Broomfield	Gallagher	Pirnie
Burke, Fla.	Hagan	Powell
Caffery	Hébert	Schneebell
Chisholm	Karth	Springer
Clay	McCloskey	Teague, Tex.
Davis, S.C.	McDade	Wiggins
Dent		

So the motion to table was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Abbutt for, with Mr. Pepper against.
 Mr. Baring for, with Mr. Hébert against.
 Mr. Clay for, with Mr. Boggs against.
 Mrs. Chisholm for, with Mr. Fulton against.
 Mr. Betts for, with Mr. Dent against.
 Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Gerald R. Ford against.
 Mr. Burke of Florida for, with Mr. Pirnie against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Broomfield.
 Mr. Karth with Mr. Erlenborn.
 Mr. Moorhead with Mr. McDade.
 Mr. Davis of South Carolina with Mr. Esch.
 Mr. Blanton with Mr. McCloskey.

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Martin.
 Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Schneebell.
 Mr. Moss with Mr. Mosher.
 Mr. Passman with Mr. Powell.
 Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
 Mr. Fraser with Mr. Springer.
 Mr. Caffery with Mr. Wiggins.
 Mr. Hogan with Mr. Dowdy.

Messrs. ASHLEY, ULLMAN, LONG of Maryland, MADDEN, BRADEMANS, LEGGETT, BINGHAM, FRENZEL, and BOLAND changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DOW and Mr. GROVER changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASEY) is recognized for 1 hour.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary inquiry is. How much time do we have under this particular motion?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas has 1 hour of time on the motion.

Mr. STRATTON. If the gentleman from Texas were to move the previous question, that would cut off debate; would it not?

The SPEAKER. If it were carried, it would.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, if the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas does not carry; what is the parliamentary situation then?

The SPEAKER. The next vote would be on the motion of the gentleman from New York to concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. STRATTON. That is the motion to concur in the Senate amendment?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. STRATTON. I hope we will have an opportunity at least to discuss this before we move to the vote.

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

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Would the gentleman from Texas tell the House the difference between the position taken by the gentleman, as stated in the amendment which was read to the House, and the Senate amendment?

As I understand the difference, your amendment provides for the Congress being able to vote upon the provision of funds only for construction or building.

In the Senate case, no action can be taken on either plans or construction.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. No. If the gentleman will let me proceed, I will try to tell you the difference and just what I am trying to accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, where we are is that the gentleman from New York is trying to persuade the House to accept the language placed in our bill by the Senate.

Mind you, there were \$2 million appropriated—not in this bill but in a prior

bill—for plans, as and when the commission decided whether there was going to be a restoration or an extension.

The commission decided it was more feasible, that we would get more for the money, and that we needed the space, so they voted unanimously for the extension.

The \$2 million that has been appropriated is not for construction; it is for plans. Those who are opposed to any extension—and the chairman of the subcommittee in the other body is definitely wholly opposed, and has used some pretty ridiculous language, in my opinion, with reference to the commission and other Members of the House in public print and on TV. So he put this amendment in the bill. Read it carefully:

Funds available under this appropriation may be used for the preparation of preliminary plans for the extension of the west central front: *Provided*, however, that no funds may be used for the preparation of the final plans or initiation of construction of said project until specifically approved and appropriated therefor by the Congress.

The gentleman from New York in his circular letter that he sent to you—you will read it—states that we have plans, and we do have some preliminary plans. All we wish to do is to go ahead with the final plans so that you Members can look at them, and there will be plans that you can get some bids on, or at least some good estimates on. You cannot estimate on preliminary plans. Then you can determine whether or not you wish to appropriate the money for the extension.

The gentleman from New York and the gentleman in the other body have been saying that we are trying to sneak something over on them, that we are going to get out here and start digging holes, and start vacating the west central front, and start tearing some of it down, and then come in and say, "Well, we have got this far. You have got to go ahead."

To make sure that you know that all we wish to do is to get the plans, I offered this motion to concur with an amendment, and I took practically the same language that was proposed by the Senate, with the exception I would delete this limitation to preliminary plans, for we already have them. My amendment simply states in lieu of this language:

No funds available under this appropriation shall be used to initiate construction of said project for the preparation of the building site or the surrounding area for construction, or for any vacation of the building until specifically appropriated for by the Congress.

If that does not protect you from anyone, regardless of who they are, who wishes to sneak out at night and start digging holes and tearing down the building, I do not know what will.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The Senate language says this:

Funds under this appropriation may be used for the preparation of preliminary plans for the extension of the West Central Front.

That money is now available. The Senate language goes further and says:

Provided, however, That no funds may be used for the preparation of the final plans or initiation of construction of said project until specifically approved and appropriated therefor by the Congress.

There are extra words in the Senate provision, and those words are "of the final plans." Those words are missing from the gentleman's amendment; is that not correct?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. That is right. I am not trying to kid you a bit. I want them to go ahead with the final plans so we can see just what they are going to put in there, what the space requirements will be and what it is going to cost. The gentleman from New York estimates \$70 million. We got an estimate of \$60 million. You will not know until you get specific plans—the type of construction, the material that is going to be used—and then you can have construction firms give you an estimate or a firm bid.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. In other words, if a Member were to favor restoration, he would vote against the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Of course not, if he is like you and like the gentleman from New York and does not want to extend and does not want any more space, but wants to leave it with a painted wall so it does not match the rest of the building—surely, go right ahead. The whole issue is whether or not you want to prepare this building for the next 100 years instead of letting it sit here with a painted wall.

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

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I am not so concerned about the viewpoint of the other body. I, as a Member of the House, am more concerned about what the House thinks. The House has been accused of trickery and gimmickry, a most improper accusation. It is up to Members of the House to make up our own minds as to what should be done about the west front.

The gentleman from Texas is proposing that we do nothing more than make the plans and then we look at the plans to see if we want to go forward.

Mr. Speaker, I support the gentleman's position.

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

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana, a member of my committee.

Mr. ROUSH. Of course, I would agree with the chairman of the full committee that I do not want to be a part of any chicanery nor do I intend to be.

There is another question and that is whether we are going to let the Senate lead us or whether we, in this House, will express our own will on this matter.

I would ask the gentleman in the well with regard to his amendment whether there are any funds in this bill which re-

late to the construction or extension of the west front of the Capitol Building?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. There are none in this bill.

Mr. ROUSH. That being the case, I cannot understand the gentleman's amendment. He states:

No funds available under this appropriation shall be used to initiate . . .

It would seem to me that the purpose of this statement is to avoid a direct confrontation on this issue and that the amendment, as proposed by the Senate, is, indeed, different. It is different in this regard. The preliminary statement does refer to funds available under this appropriation, but it continues on to say:

Provided, however, that no funds may be used for the preparation of final plans or initiation of construction of said project until specifically approved and appropriated therefor by the Congress.

It is this language which makes the Senate amendment so very different than the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

It seems to me it is on that issue now that this House should be voting and not on the amendment that the gentleman offers, which is my opinion, I say this respectfully, because the gentleman knows I have a high regard for him, means nothing, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I will say to my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, that we have some carryover funds, \$2 million, that were originally appropriated for the purpose which could have been used, frankly, possibly for construction under the 1970 appropriation.

The reason I am excited is because the limitation that was placed over here on the Senate side applies to these funds. It allows the use of these funds for preliminary plans which we already have, and it provides that these funds that are available could not be used for preparation of final plans. The decision has been made. If we do not agree that we should even have final plans to look at before we appropriate money for actual construction—and that is the gentleman's position. I know—go right ahead. I respectfully disagree with the gentleman, or I would not be in this well.

Mr. ROUSH. If the chairman will yield further, would the gentleman agree that his amendment does nothing to preclude the use of the \$2 million, and that his amendment applies to limitation of the funds in this appropriation bill only?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. It is the same language in the Senate amendment.

Mr. ROUSH. I respectfully disagree.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. It is amendment No. 36.

Mr. ROUSH. However, if the gentleman goes on to the proviso clause, it makes no reference to this appropriation, and it says, "No funds shall be used" and it specifies the purposes for which they shall not be used.

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

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the amendment is headed, "Extension of the Capitol." It says, "No funds available under

this appropriation"—and this appropriation is a continuing appropriation, available without fiscal year limitation:

No funds available under this appropriation shall be used to initiate construction of said project; for any preparation of the building site or the surrounding area for construction; or for any vacation of the building, until specifically appropriated for by the Congress.

We should vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Texas whether we are for or against extension of the west front. We need better plans which will enable us to make an informed judgment, and voting for the gentleman's amendment does not commit one to be for the construction of the west front extension project.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. That is absolutely right. The distinguished chairman of the full committee is absolutely right. If anyone votes for this, it does not mean he is bound to vote for construction funds after he sees the final plans and knows what they involve.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I believe it is important to understand what we went through in the conference, and what we went through prior to the conference, in previous years.

Certainly no one on this subcommittee, or in the House that I know of, wants to take a position of trying to trick somebody or to hide something or to sneak something through. I am sorry this has been raised. It was raised in the other body, and raised in our conference, and I am sorry for it.

I am in favor of the extension of the west front, but I do not want that done until every person in this House has an opportunity to see the final plans, upon which good estimates can be based as to cost.

I believe that everybody who is here talking today, when we make the final decision about the extension or the renovation of the west front, ought to have as much knowledge and information as he can have. That is what we are asking to do.

One of the most difficult things in this conference committee which came up was the question of preliminary plans. That is what is involved in the question of the Senate language.

We told the people from the other body that there were preliminary plans, and that there had been preliminary plans for some time; and, frankly, they were amazed. They did not believe preliminary plans existed. We asked them to recess with us and to go down to look at the plans, and finally they did.

It is my understanding they now do concede we have preliminary plans, but they are just preliminary. Nobody is asking the House or the Senate to go ahead and start construction in this institution.

We want all Members to be advised as well as possible, and Members cannot make a proper decision until they can have final plans to see what the cost estimates are. Then they will clearly

come before the Members in an authorization or construction appropriation in the future.

I hope the Members will support the committee.

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

Mr. CASEY of Texas. If the gentleman does not mind, I will give him some time.

Mr. STRATTON. If the gentleman will give me some time, I would appreciate it.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. The gentleman initiated this, and I believe he is entitled to some time.

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

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. As a member of the subcommittee, I want to concur in the statements made by the gentleman from Colorado. I believe he stated this question very effectively.

Unless there be any doubt among any of the Members here that any of this money is going to be spent for construction, we want to assure the Members, as members of the subcommittee, that is not going to happen.

It is specifically stated here that this money, as the chairman of the subcommittee said, is for the final plans. We have to have some final plans before we know what we are going to do. We will have to come back to ask for the appropriation, and Members can take a look at that before they make up their minds.

The distinguished Speaker of the House is the chairman of this commission, and I am confident he will see that the Members have some assurance on this matter.

Clearly we are not trying to do anything here at all except in the future to give the Members of this House an opportunity to make a more intelligent decision before we go ahead with the final decision on the construction of the west front, which I happen to favor.

I believe that is a wholly reasonable position, and one which we should be able to sustain. I hope the position of the chairman of this subcommittee will be sustained.

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

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. How much of the \$2 million originally appropriated for plans is now available?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Well, the \$2 million, the full amount, is available. There was some additional money which was used for the study.

Mr. LANDRUM. Under the language proposed by the other body to be carried in this bill, that \$2 million or whatever part of it is still available could not be spent to develop any final plans under that language; is that true?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. That is true, or I would not be standing in this well.

Mr. LANDRUM. But the money is already appropriated.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. The money is already appropriated.

Mr. LANDRUM. As the gentleman from Colorado so clearly stated, no de-

cision can be made by this body or the other body until final plans are available. Is that right?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I am in favor of the extension now, but when they come up with the final plans I might not be if the space is not utilized as I think it should be.

Mr. LANDRUM. And the money is already appropriated to develop the final plans. Is that right?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. That is right. And those opposed to extension do not want you to do anything.

Mr. LANDRUM. And the commission voted unanimously to have plans developed?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. That is right.

Mr. LANDRUM. And I assume the commission is proposing the plans be submitted to the Congress.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. They will have to be if we will get the money for construction unless the Speaker and the commission, as some seem to intimate, are going to go out in the dark of the night with a shovel to start it up. That is all I can think of.

Mr. LANDRUM. Will the gentleman tell me if I am correct that the commission is made up of the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the majority leader, and the minority leader of the House of Representatives, the Vice President of the United States, and the majority and minority leaders of the other body?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. And the Architect of the Capitol.

Mr. LANDRUM. Yes; and the Architect of the Capitol.

And a unanimous decision by that group is to develop final plans under money already appropriated?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Yes, sir.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman said those of us who opposed extension just want to do nothing. May I say respectfully that those of us opposed to the extension nevertheless favor restoration of the west front. We believe something must be done but it should be restoration, not extension.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Oh, no, I did not want to leave that impression that the gentleman has.

Mr. MAYNE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MAYNE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman has repeated the assurance to us now that no construction will proceed and in that he was joined by the gentleman from Michigan, but I have heard no such assurance as to any demolition proceeding. I would like to have such assurance from the gentleman at this time.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. If you read the amendment, it says:

No funds available under this appropriation shall be used to initiate construction of said project; for any preparation of the building site or the surrounding area for construction; or for any vacation of the building, until specifically appropriated for by the Congress.

Mr. MAYNE. Then, do we have the gentleman's assurance there will be no demolition without this body having a further opportunity to vote on the entire issue?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. You have the assurance from me, as I say, unless the distinguished Speaker on a dark night goes out with a shovel and starts in.

Mr. MAYNE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank my distinguished colleague from Texas for yielding. I would like to ask a question.

Under your amendment would the final plans for the extension of the west front of the Capitol be prepared?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Would the west front be what?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Under your amendment would the final plans be prepared for an extension of the west front?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. That is right.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would like to suggest this, then, to the Members of this House. We have just recently hired a new Architect of the Capitol, Mr. George M. White, a registered architect and a member of the American Institute of Architects, with an excellent reputation throughout this country. After carefully studying the report I found certain ambiguities and certain things in the report which in my opinion did not support the conclusions of the treasurer's report. Therefore, I wrote to the Architect of the Capitol, Mr. George White, and asked him for his opinion. He sent me back these documents which I hold in my hand and in which he takes a very strong position on the extension of the west front as opposed to the reconstruction or restoration of the present west front. I would suggest every Member of this House get a copy of these documents and read them, because if we are hiring a professional man, a registered architect, to be our adviser, we certainly should heed his advice.

I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I would like to inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has consumed 21 minutes.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may use to the Speaker of the House.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the House today is called upon once again to affirm the action it has previously taken and provide funds for the preparation of final plans for the extension of the west front of the Capitol Building. The House has previously acted on this matter and acted affirmatively.

Mr. Speaker, I, like my predecessors, Speaker Rayburn and Speaker McCormack, have supported, and I do support the extension of the west front of the Capitol. That view is shared by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Boggs) the majority leader, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) the minority leader, both of whom are absent today but both of whom

have been strong and vocal advocates of extension. We believe it vitally important that the House confirm its previous position on extension of the west front. We believe it vitally important that the House not give in on this issue. I hope the House today will support the Committee on Appropriations and the House leadership.

As chairman of the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol, I want to take a few moments today to attempt to clarify and correct some of the apparent misconceptions which exist concerning the proposed west front extension.

First, there seems to be some suggestion that the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol has acted unfairly, clandestinely—in some kind of extralegal fashion—in directing the Architect of the Capitol, under its authority as set out in Public Law 91-145, to proceed with the preparation of final plans for extending the west central front. That action of the Commission was agreed to by all seven members of the Commission after consideration of the restoration study which was made in accordance with the terms of the 1969 legislation and after consideration of the professional judgments of the Architect of the Capitol, who is one of the outstanding members of his profession. Public Law 91-145, the Legislative Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1970, provided \$2 million for the preparation of final plans for the extension of the west front and was approved by the House of Representatives after full floor debate and after extensive hearings by the Committee on Appropriations. In conference the two Houses agreed that the funds appropriated for preparation of the final plans would not be obligated unless the restoration study was undertaken and five enumerated conditions were met.

The restoration study was prepared and submitted in January 1971. Several times during 1971 the new Architect of the Capitol and I discussed the need for the Commission to review the restoration report. I advised the Architect that the Commission would want his candid and well-considered advice and his professional judgment on the restoration study and the overall question of the west central front. He indicated he was making an intensive study of the entire question so that he would be in a position to offer his professional judgment and recommendations at the appropriate time.

Early in March 1972 he informed me that Members of the other body had inquired when the Commission was going to meet and render a decision and that he felt ready to provide us with his recommendations and professional judgment. I arranged a meeting of the Commission as quickly as possible and all members were present at the meeting on March 8, 1972.

At that time the Architect of the Capitol testified that in his judgment and from the information he had obtained from some of the most reputable general contractors in the country that there was no way two of the conditions specified in Public Law 91-145 could be met: First, that the cost of restoration would

not exceed \$15 million; and second, that the method of accomplishing restoration can be so described and specified as to form the basis for performance of the restoration work by lump-sum, competitive, fixed-price construction bid or bids.

Further, the Commission had before it for consideration what was in the best interest of the building, the Congress, and the people of the country, especially in view of the need for additional space in the Capitol of which I have first-hand knowledge and of which many of you are also aware. After considering the testimony, the report, asking questions, examining the model and drawings of the proposed west front, the Commission voted unanimously and without exception in favor of proceeding with the final extension plans in accordance with the 1969 legislation.

I believe this demonstrates amply that the Commission did not act hurriedly or in some sinister and conspiratorial fashion on this matter. It has been suggested that the Commission is attempting to thwart the will of Congress and is attempting to deface a national monument. This is, of course, patently false and to give credence to such a notion is simply to ignore the facts.

There is ample justification for the extension of the west front. We badly need space for our legislative operations on the House side of the Capitol. The crowded conditions which exist now for the use of the House and for the public are deplorable. Certain committees have a need to have meeting rooms in close proximity to the legislative Chamber. Joint committees, commissions, and conference committees require an increased capacity in the physical requirements for meeting rooms and require a place to meet in close proximity to both legislative Chambers.

This building is a national shrine. It is also very much a working building which must serve the needs of the Congress of the United States, the people who work in this building, and the American people. The Capitol has been altered many times as the needs of Congress have changed and there is no reason why our present-day needs should not be met by the proposed extension.

As our legislative responsibilities daily increase, it seems to me unthinkable that we should penalize ourselves and the country by not extending the west front. I hope the House will vote overwhelmingly in support of the motion offered by the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASEY), and to reaffirm its position on construction of the west front of the Capitol and allow the preparation of final plans for the proposed extension.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I know one thing that influenced the last vote was the belief that the cost of extension would be over \$300 a square foot. I would say comparing cost of construction of a work of art, which the extension of the west central front would be, with the cost of construction of a Holiday Inn or of a home out here on Massachusetts Avenue is a little ridiculous. The same would be true in comparing it even with the FBI building—because if we extend it, we want it to conform to and enhance the

looks of this Capitol and not detract or downgrade its appearance.

If you look at the renderings of the west front as extended that is in the Speaker's Lobby you will see how attractive it would be. We have a model in Statuary Hall which includes the extension and many people do not realize that is the way it is proposed to look after the extension.

The highest estimates of cost of the overall project that we have—building costs and all—is \$222 a square foot.

When you just take the usable space without the area surrounding that has to be taken care of—the figure is \$172 a square foot.

So bear that in mind. Frankly, not a dime is going to be spent for construction until you get a chance to look at the final plans and then you can decide if you actually want to spend the money.

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

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENNIS. Although the gentleman assures us that no funds will be paid for construction, nevertheless insofar as his amendment is concerned it deals only with funds available under this appropriation and in no wise touches the \$2 million on hand. Therefore, I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that his amendment will not prevent the use of that \$2 million for construction.

I am asking you if that is not true?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. We discussed this matter a while ago. I shared the view that this was a carryover fund. The chairman of the full committee assured everyone that it is a continuing situation.

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

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Is the gentleman from Indiana saying that he does not take the Speaker at his word?

Mr. DENNIS. If the gentleman will yield to me, I said no such thing. But I am saying—when you have an amendment which deals only with funds available under this appropriation and it does not touch the \$2 million you have already available, it is not saying anything about construction.

Whereas, the Senate amendment says very plainly that no funds shall be used for construction. As my friend from Indiana (Mr. ROUSH) pointed out, that is the difference.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. The amendment does not say that.

It says that the funds available under this appropriation and the appropriation is a continuing year-to-year thing.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman giving me 5 minutes out of an hour.

This has been the history of this question in the past. One side has been presented and we are fighting the establishment, I suppose, although a few mo-

ments ago, I notice—we came within 20 votes of winning on the last vote, and that was a confused parliamentary situation, to say the least.

I do hope the gentleman will yield me just a few more minutes to try to present the other side because there has been a good deal of confusion and a good deal of glossing over what the real issue is.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that Members are getting restless and they want to vote.

But I think the fair thing is to try to see the other side. I apologize for the somewhat confusing parliamentary situation that we were in on the last vote. But we are told in this body to bring our amendments to the other side and we are told to discuss them with the parliamentarian, but somehow when things get tight they spring these fancy parliamentary moves on you at the last minute. I think perhaps if we had had a vote on the real issue, we would have gotten a majority; and I think we are going to have an opportunity on this next vote to determine how this House stands on the real issue.

Now the real question, I think, as I posed it earlier is not what the Congress did back in 1954 and 1955 in setting up an elite body to make these decisions for us, but in today's world, whether this House and the Senate can vote to extend—or not to extend. With all due respect to the Speaker—and I have been one of his staunchest supporters in and out and on some of the tough issues in particular—I have battled on this question against previous speakers. But something is wrong today in a body where when someone wants to increase the pay of a district judge in the District of Columbia, the House and Senate have to vote upon the issue, but when the extension of the Capitol comes up, that issue can be decided by five men and one architect who voices the individual opinion that he does not think a \$200,000 report filed by a most prestigious structural engineering firm in the country means anything; and so on the say-so of one man, who is not an engineer, and also happens to be on the payroll, and whose view was the opposite before he went on that payroll, we throw the technical report away and do just what was wanted to be done originally anyway. Something is wrong in that kind of procedure.

Now, the gentleman from Texas says all we are going to do if his amendment passes is spend \$2 million for final plans. But why should we spend \$2 million for extension plans if we do not want to extend the Capitol? This is what the basic question is. Let us decide, first of all, whether we are going to extend the Capitol, and then we can go into the final plans. But not the other way around.

The statement has been made, "Well, we have already decided that. We cast a vote back in 1955. And we had another vote back in 1969". Ah, but the 1969 vote was taken before we had this Praeger report before us which I put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the day before yesterday, and which is available to you, and which said that all the arguments used

by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGLER) and others in support of the extension the last time were fallacious, and the building was not going to fall down, and we could restore it much more cheaply.

So why do we not decide here in this body today whether we wish to extend or whether we wish to restore? Let us have the vote on that. I do not want to have to vote on having to lay on the table any more than anybody else does; but we seem to be running into a lot of parliamentary maneuvering here today to avoid the question of whether we are going to recede and concur in the Senate amendment or not.

Here is what the gentleman's amendment from Texas would do:

No funds available under this appropriation shall be used—

Et cetera, et cetera. But as the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS) made clear just a moment ago, there are no funds in this appropriation. The real question is, what do we do with the \$2 million that is already in the kitty? Why should we spend it for extension? We all know what extension is going to look like. We do not need any more plans. But why should we spend money for plans for a project that is going to cost \$368 a square foot if we decide that we do not want that kind of project. So let us take that vote.

Why are the managers on the part of the House so worried about this? Why is the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, so anxious to spend \$70 million of the taxpayers' money when we can do the job that needs to be done for only \$15 million?

I wish to complete my point, and then I shall be glad to yield. What worries me is that we could wake up some day to be confronted with a fait accompli.

We have had statements here this afternoon that nothing is going to be done, that there is not going to be any vacation of any office space; there are not going to be any drillings. But, as a matter of fact, I have researched the background of the Rayburn Building, and I remember a Member of the Congress rising in 1955 to try to oppose construction of the Rayburn Building. He was told he was out of order that he spoke too soon. Then 3 years later when he tried to object to it, they ruled that his motion had come too late. That is what I am afraid will happen on this west front matter if we do not accept the modest, innocuous Senate language.

What is so wrong a simple vote—unless of course you look at the close vote we had a moment ago. If the vote occurs on the real issue maybe the votes might be on our side for once rather than on the other side.

If we need toilets, if we need restaurants, if we need movie theaters, we can build them much more cheaply elsewhere, and we have already got a \$40 million investment down the street in the Union Station's new National Visitors Center.

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

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. The gentleman from Texas has indicated that under his amendment we would have a choice. Am I correct in saying that that choice will not be between restoration and extension because the final plans will be formulated only for an extension?

Mr. STRATTON. That is correct.

Mr. GUBSER. So the choice will be for extension or nothing at all?

Mr. STRATTON. That is correct. There will not be any choice. All you will be confronted with under the gentleman's amendment is a request for appropriations.

Let us get this clear. The Senate language is absolutely clear. It states—and this was discussed at the time the Senate debated the question—

No funds may be used for the preparation of the final plans or initiation of construction of said project until specifically approved and appropriated therefor by the Congress.

That "No funds" does not mean the funds in this bill. It means the \$2 million that is sitting around in the kitty.

If we are so anxious to help the taxpayers, let us have a vote and decide which way we want to go. If we do not want to go the route of extension, it would be an utter waste of the taxpayers' money to spend \$2 million for final plans.

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

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER).

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I have heard this afternoon that this extension is necessary to meet the needs of Congress. I am very concerned that the needs of the Congress be met for all kinds of space, staff, services and facilities we do not have now. Does the gentleman in the well know of any professional survey that has ever been done to determine exactly what are the office space, staff, services facilities and equipment needs of the Members of Congress? Has there ever been a survey done by a qualified management consultant?

Mr. STRATTON. You are right. There has been no such survey. Efforts have often been made to get such a survey done. But they have always been blocked. As the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROUSH) has pointed out, we have a great deal of unused space still in the Capitol, and we might have enough even to provide the rest facilities that have been previously alluded to.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield. If we are opposed to the extension, we vote this down?

Mr. STRATTON. That is correct.

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

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I yield the gentleman from Ohio such time as he may consume.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas. We have been through this many times. We have heard the same arguments time and time again. I recall when we passed the original authorization. What is being attempted today by the action of those opposed to

this bill is to repeal existing legislation. Congress passed this legislation, and it was by a rollcall vote, in which we authorized that this be done. What we are being asked to do today is something that should not be done, and that is in an appropriation bill, a conference report, we are being asked to repeal existing law. What we are actually doing here to the existing law is writing in a limitation that none of the funds shall be used for construction or for preparing the site—nothing but plans.

Let us follow the laws which the Congress has passed. Are we going to expect every Congress that comes in here to change the existing law each year? We have done it several times. The law is on the books now. All we are asking for is that we now vote for this amendment so we can have final plans, so we can come to the Congress.

Unfortunately, I will not be here to come to the Members, but I will be hoping that, when we have the final plans, the Members will finally conclude to build the west front. I am for it, I admit that; I have great confidence in this Building Commission and the distinguished Speaker and the distinguished minority leader and others and those in the other body who have given careful consideration to this. Under existing law, the law which the Congress has passed, they are acting. Why do we repeal that law today? Why do we do anything today which shows we may not have confidence in the leaderships we set up in the existing law?

So I am pleading with the Members of the House to adopt this amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas. We are not going to disturb a brick or a single thing in this building. We are only going to proceed in an orderly manner, an orderly fashion, to find out whether or not this should be done. Then we will have a chance to say "Yes" or "No" when the appropriation bill comes in. If the Members should say "No," then the action can be taken to amend the laws to provide for the restoration. But, under the existing law, this is a proper amendment. This ought to be passed on. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I will take just a moment to dwell on two very important points. Members have heard me say a number of times on the House floor that I was against the east front and west front. I have changed my mind based on the study, and I have said that before, and I will not say it again. But there have been some Members, some people almost accusing the Commission of trying to hide something, and not being in line with the desires of the Members of the House. I say to the Members, even when I was almost viciously against both the east front and the west front, I never failed to get the complete cooperation of the members of the Commission to get the information I wanted.

Never have I seen them turn a deaf ear to a suggestion or to a question. So I want to underscore that there is reason to have faith in this Commission, a statutory group the Speaker and others already have spoken of.

There is one other thing. People have spoken of the Architect. We have an Architect who is an architect now. He was once vice president of the AIA. He was vice president when he was selected to be the Architect of the Capitol.

He was against extension, but he promised the President he would come here with an open mind and that he would look at the proposition. He has studied it in depth. He has changed his mind.

This is one of the great architects of the world, not only of the United States. We are fortunate to have George White as Architect. He has a strong feeling for history.

I appeal to the Members to support this amendment, because it will be money well spent; \$30 million will have to be spent for restoration, if that is the route we go, and then we would have to do it again in 20 or 30 years.

I believe the thing to do is extend it now. I hope you will vote for the amendment.

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

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statements which have heretofore been made by previous speakers I would like to discuss at length the matter before us.

In 1969, amid cries of alarm that the west front was disintegrating, Congress commissioned a private study to determine the feasibility of restoring the west front so that the findings could be utilized by the Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol. It was agreed that restoration would not be the route taken if five specific points, which have been listed too often to require further enumeration here, could not be met. The feasibility report, performed by the prestigious firm of Praeger-Kavanagh-Waterbury of New York City, was submitted to Congress in 1971. It concluded that all five conditions necessary to restoration could be met. It languished with the Commission until March 8 of this year when Congress was suddenly informed that the Praeger-Kavanagh-Waterbury findings were apparently inaccurate and that extension would go forth.

There has been no official comment from the Commission yet as to why it found the Praeger report erroneous. We receive some clue as to what occurred during deliberation on restoration from the Senate debate held on the legislative branch appropriation on March 28 of this year, however. Senator MANSFIELD's comments, beginning on page 10551 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, indicated that the Commission simply accepted the word of the current Architect of the Capitol that requirement No. 1 of those five requirements possibly could not be met, that requirements Nos.

2 and 5 were accurately assessed in the Praeger report, and that requirements Nos. 3 and 4 could not, in his opinion be accomplished. In short, it appears that the Commission members simply acquiesced to the opinion of Mr. White, ignoring the findings of not only one, but two, skilled professional groups. A handful of men who are neither architects nor engineers decided to overthrow the findings of one expert group whom we paid—namely, Praeger-Kavanagh-Waterbury—and another whom we did not—the Task Force of the American Institute of Architects—which both found that restoration plans could meet those five congressionally imposed requirements. If this arbitrary decision was to be the end result, can someone please explain why we appropriated \$225,000 to have the Praeger study made in the first place? I certainly cannot, and I doubt that my constituents could.

As we approach the denouement of this issue, I should like to remind my colleagues in the House of a rather disturbing editorial which appeared in last Monday's Washington Post. It was entitled "It's Up to the Senate To Save the West Front." Why the Senate? Are we so indecisive here in the House that we must abdicate our own responsibilities and let another body decide the outcome? I think not. Whichever side one upholds, it seems only reasonable that the extension ordered in March should not go ahead, as Senate Amendment No. 36 provides, until the project has been approved and appropriated by Congress. In a body that customarily spends 1 day a week scrapping over expenditures for roads and the like in the District of Columbia, it hardly seems appropriate that we should not at least hold a vote on whether to obscure the last visible portion of the original U.S. Capitol Building.

Perhaps, before we reach a conclusion on this, we should consider the design for that original Capitol Building. The design by Dr. William Thornton which was submitted in 1792, "captivated the eyes and judgment of all," stated then Secretary of State Thomas Jefferson. Washington said of it:

Grandeur, Simplicity and Convenience appear to be so well combined in this plan . . . that I have no doubt of its meeting with approbation from you.

Should the proposed extension of the west front be granted, not only would the original west wall be changed, but we would also sacrifice the graceful terracing by Frederick L. Olmsted, America's greatest landscape architect, who designed the terraces in 1874. The first extension of the west front plan actually was submitted a year later, in 1875, and was rejected, according to one critic, because it would be wrong "to extend the central portion of the old building thus—spending money to diminish the apparent magnitude and grandeur of this noble building." A more recent article opposing extension contended:

William Thornton's softly elegant sandstone facade is the only visible link to the Capitol's beginning in the early years of the Republic. It is the last remnant of an architecture that was at once inspired by and expressive of the Jeffersonian concept of civilization.

Grandeur, nobility, simplicity, and soft elegance—these words, used seldom with accuracy, have all been fittingly utilized to describe the west front of the Capitol. Are we now, without so much as a vote to appropriate funds in this Chamber, to envelope that same facade in phony Roman imperial kitsch?

In addition to my objection to the proposed architectural form that extension would take, I must take issue with the argument that we need additional space in the Capitol itself—space for offices, tourist facilities, and the like. Of course visitors coming to see their Capitol should be accommodated, but the fact that a new Visitors' Center is being built at Union Station appears to have gone unnoticed by proponents of extension. As to the other "needs," which seems a handy euphemism for "conveniences," we have only to turn to the task force report, written by the American Institute of Architects, for an evaluation:

The Task Force observed, that the present space usage in the Capitol is crowded, misused, or underused; that many functions now located in the Capitol have questionable need of being there; and some functions are duplicated.

Anyone looking at a map of the Capitol interior can easily validate that comment. We house an airline ticket office here, a duplication of facilities located in the office buildings, the Democratic senatorial campaign photo room, which could easily be located elsewhere, a Clerk's storeroom on the House side, and a barber shop. Even if a Member is insistent on having short hair today, fashion notwithstanding, is it too much to ask that he walk—or ride—to one of the office buildings for a haircut? I can highly recommend walking myself; on Saturday I plan to start a walk across my district which will involve 135 miles and 8 days. I really do not feel that expecting someone to walk from the Capitol across the street is an unreasonable demand.

There is no reason why necessary functions should not preempt expendable functions in the Capitol. If we truly require office space in this building, we can always move some of the above mentioned unnecessary facilities to make room for it.

Lastly, if one is on the Appropriations Committee, one does, or should, become acutely conscious of the cost of things. One of the congressional stipulations for restoration was that it not cost more than \$15 million. The Praeger-Kavanagh-Waterbury report presented two possible restoration plans, one costing \$13,700,000, and the other costing \$14,500,000. Even with an allowance for inflationary cost increases, either of those figures is preferable to the proposed extension cost of between \$60 and \$70 million. It could be that we have become numb here and experience no pain when appropriating such huge amounts, but I can assure you that my constituents, who foot the bill, can still feel a pinch. I refuse to go back to them and try to defend a vote for office space which will cost \$368 per square foot. Information

like that is all we need to turn the current taxpayers' revolt in this country into a taxpayers' revolution.

We must now confront this issue of whether we will preserve the original west front of the Capitol, or whether we will simply limp away from the issue sans a vote. I do not wish to relive history, but I do respect it; and I believe we should not hide this remaining portion of our original Capitol. Those of us who argue for historical preservation of the Thornton Capitol design are not trying to make the Capitol a reliquary for the past. Architecture should provide a setting for life, not for still life. We, too, want the Capitol to be a viable, bustling, alive, and responsive place. But it has been amply shown that modern needs can well be met without this costly extension.

Irrespective of one's own position on this issue, we should at least agree to put the question to a vote. The Capitol does not belong to the few; it belongs to the many, and there is no legislative reason why the House of Representatives should permit its fate to be determined by the few. When the Capitol building was planned, the Founders of our Republic had the foresight and good sense to hold a contest to obtain the design. Are we now, 180 years later, ready to destroy that last original facade without a contest at all?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming (Mr. RONCALIO).

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to make a speech or to take the time of the Members, but I do want to bring a few things to the attention of all of us. I have long opposed more office building for Federal agencies downtown. I think the same should apply to Capitol Hill.

If ever we are going to put an end to the proliferation of congressional committees, so severely criticized by the people of this Nation, now is the time.

If ever we are going to put a stop to the proliferation of Government office buildings in the District of Columbia, which is going to make the life of the lawmaker here ever more miserable, now is the time.

If ever there is going to be an end to the bureaucratic maze that is the District of Columbia, with its effect on traffic, on the stench of its air and the impossibility of life around here, now is the time.

Someone mentioned earlier that we should prepare a site for adequate legislative needs for 100 years from now. We had better be giving thought to an alternate site for the U.S. Capitol itself—to move the Capitol away from here. I do not care whether it is to Mr. EVANS' Colorado, or to Mr. MELCHER's Montana, or somewhere in between, but—get an alternative away from the District of Columbia if you want a real Capitol for a hundred years from now.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, a short time

ago an article appeared in the Washington Post under the title of "Why Destroy a National Masterpiece?" The article was devoted to the Capitol extension plan.

In the course of the article this was said:

The Commission on the Extension of the Capitol seems to have forgotten the reason why Walter Bulfinch and Olmstead insisted on windowless platforms to enhance the monumental effect of the west side of the Capitol. The commission's plan is to embellish the terrace with 36 tall square windows to give the occupants of four private dining rooms, two restaurants, and some hideaway offices a sweeping view down the Mall towards the Washington Monument. It is hard to see these windows in the model of the extended Capitol which is on display in Statuary Hall. But they will glitter in the western sun and, lighted up at night, will make the west front of the U.S. Capitol look like a five story wedding cake, nearly twice the height as the east front.

There are other ways of solving the practical problems of what to do with seven-million tourists, where to place truck docks, and how to meet the demand for office space. There is no reason to destroy a national architectural masterpiece for a questionable expediency.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is the question we are voting on: do we want to destroy a national masterpiece? Let us not commit this act of desecration. Vote against the Casey amendment.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, of course, I could take the time to read the Evening Star editorial in support of our position for extension, but I will not. I believe the Members are all intelligent enough to make up their own minds. They know what the question is.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASEY).

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. Speaker, is it in order for me to ask that we have tellers with clerks to record this vote?

The SPEAKER. It is in order.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask that we have the vote by tellers with clerks.

The SPEAKER. It would be necessary first to withdraw the demand for yeas and nays.

TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my demand that the vote be taken by the call of the yeas and nays, and demand that this vote be taken by tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Speaker appointed as tellers Messrs. CASEY of Texas, STRATTON, CEDERBERG, and YATES.

The House divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 181, noes 197, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 241]
[Recorded Teller Vote]

AYES—181

Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Aspinall
Baker
Barrett
Begich
Belcher
Bergland
Bevill
Biaggi
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brinkley
Brooks
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burlison, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Carlson
Carney
Casey, Tex.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clausen,
Don H.
Colmer
Curlin
Danielson
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Dickinson
Dingell
Downing
Duncan
du Pont
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Ellberg
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Forsythe
Fountain
Frenzel
Garmatz

Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Griffiths
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey
Hays
Heckler, Mass.
Henderson
Hogan
Hollifield
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones
Jones, Tenn.
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kluczynski
Kuykendall
Landrum
Link
Long, Md.
McClary
McCormack
McCulloch
McEwen
McFall
McKay
Madden
Mahon
Mallory
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathis, Ga.
Matsunaga
Melcher
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Mills, Ark.
Mills, Md.
Minish
Minshall
Mizell
Monagan
Morgan
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nix
O'Hara
O'Konski
O'Neill
Passman
Patman

Patten
Pettis
Pickle
Poage
Podell
Price, Ill.
Pucinski
Purcell
Quillen
Rhodes
Riegle
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Robinson, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Rousselot
Ruth
Sandman
Saylor
Schwengel
Scott
Sebellius
Seibering
Shoup
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Springer
Staggers
Stanton
J. William
Stanton
James V.
Steed
Steele
Stephens
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, Wis.
Vigorito
Ware
Whalley
White
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
Charles H.
Wright
Wyatt
Wyman
Young, Tex.
Zablocki

NOES—197

Abourezk
Abzug
Adams
Addabbo
Alexander
Anderson,
Calif.
Archer
Ashbrook
Ashley
Aspin
Badillo
Bell
Bennett
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Brademas
Brasco
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Broyhill, N.C.
Burke, Mass.
Burton
Byron
Camp
Carter
Chappell
Clancy
Clawson, Del.
Cleveland
Collier
Collins, Ill.
Collins, Tex.
Conable
Conover
Conte

Conyers
Corman
Cotter
Coughlin
Crane
Culver
Daniel, Va.
Daniels, N.J.
Delaney
Dellums
Denholm
Dennis
Derwinski
Devine
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Drinan
Edwards, Calif.
Findley
Fish
Flowers
Frelinghuysen
Frey
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gaydos
Gettys
Gialmo
Goodling
Grasso
Green, Pa.
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Haley

Hamilton
Hammer-
schmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Harrington
Hastings
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hechler, W. Va.
Heinz
Helstoski
Hicks, Mass.
Hicks, Wash.
Hillis
Howard
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jacobs
Jarman
Jones, N.C.
Keating
Keith
Kemp
King
Koch
Kyl
Kyros
Landgrebe
Latta
Leggett
Lloyd
Long, La.
Lujan

McClure
McCollister
McKevitt
McKinney
McMillan
Maconald,
Mass.
Mailliard
Mann
Mayne
Mazzoli
Meeds
Metcalfe
Mikva
Miller, Ohio
Mink
Mitchell
Montgomery
Moorhead
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Obey
Pelly
Perkins
Peyser
Pike
Poff
Powell
Preyer, N.C.

Price, Tex.
Quie
Rallsback
Randall
Rangel
Rarick
Rees
Reid
Reuss
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Roncalio
Rosenthal
Roush
Roy
Roybal
Runnels
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
Sarbanes
Satterfield
Scherle
Schauer
Schmitz
Shipley
Smith, Calif.
Spence
Steiger, Ariz.

Steiger, Wis.
Stokes
Stuckey
Symington
Teague, Calif.
Terry
Thompson, N.J.
Thone
Tiernan
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Veysey
Waggonner
Waldie
Wampler
Whalen
Whitehurst
Widnall
Winn
Wolff
Wyllie
Yates
Yatron
Young, Fla.
Zion
Zwack

NOT VOTING—54

Abbutt
Abernethy
Anderson,
Tenn.
Baring
Betts
Blanton
Boggs
Bray
Broomfield
Burke, Fla.
Caffery
Carey, N.Y.
Celler
Chisholm
Clark
Clay
Davis, S.C.
Dellenback

Dent
Diggs
Dowdy
Dulski
Erlenborn
Esch
Fisher
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford,
William D.
Fraser
Fulton
Gallagher
Goldwater
Hagan
Halpern
Hébert
Jones, Ala.
Karth

Kee
Lennon
Lent
McCloskey
McDade
McDonald,
Mich.
Mollohan
Mosher
Moss
Pepper
Pirnie
Pryor, Ark.
Rooney, N.Y.
Schneebeli
Stratton
Teague, Tex.
Wiggins
Wydler

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, one Member voted two ballots.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the tellers and the clerks are to please make certain and to see to it that Members do not put in more than one ballot.

Tellers and clerks must make sure of the Members' ballots.

Mr. STRATTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So the preferential motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

The preferential motion was agreed to. The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 37: Page 25, after line 12, insert:

SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS

For maintenance, miscellaneous items and supplies, including furniture, furnishings, and equipment, and for labor and material incident thereto, and repairs thereof; for purchase of waterproof wearing apparel, and for personal and other services; including eight attendants at a gross annual rate of \$7,695 for the period January 9, 1972 to June 30, 1972 and whose salary rates shall be fixed on and after July 1, 1972 by the Architect of the Capitol without regard to Chapter 51 and Subchapters III and IV of Chapter 53 of Title 5, United States Code and shall thereafter be adjusted in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 5307; for the care and operation of the Senate Office Buildings; including the subway and subway transportation systems connecting the Senate Office Buildings with the Capitol; uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by law (5

U.S.C. 5901-5902), prevention and eradication of insect and other pests without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes as amended; to be expended under the control and supervision of the Architect of the Capitol; in all, \$4,932,200.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CASEY OF TEXAS

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CASEY of Texas moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 38: Page 26, after line 7, insert:

SENATE GARAGE

For maintenance, repairs, alterations, personal and other services, and all other necessary expenses, \$89,100.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CASEY OF TEXAS

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CASEY of Texas moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 41: Page 34, line 21, strike out:

Hereafter, appropriations for authorized printing and binding for the Congress shall not be available under the authority of the Act of July 30, 1947, (1 U.S.C. 211) for the printing, publication, and distribution of more than two copies of new editions of the Code of Laws of the United States and of the Code of the District of Columbia for each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CASEY OF TEXAS

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CASEY of Texas moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment, insert the following:

"Hereafter, appropriations for authorized printing and binding for the Congress shall not be available under the authority of the Act of July 30, 1947 (1 U.S.C. 211) for the printing, publication, and distribution of more than two copies of new editions of the Code of Laws of the United States and of the Code of the District of Columbia for each Member of the House of Representatives."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to, and that I be permitted to include a tabulation summarizing the action as well as certain extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 13188, COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION, 1973

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H.R. 13188) to authorize appropriations for the procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments, and to authorize the average annual active duty personnel strength for the Coast Guard.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 26, 1972.)

Mr. GARMATZ (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement of the managers be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, this bill H.R. 13188, is to authorize appropriations for the procurement of vessels, aircraft, and the construction of shore and offshore installations and to authorize the average annual active duty personnel strength for the Coast Guard. This bill passed the House on April 11, 1972, and passed the Senate on June 1, 1972.

The committee of conference agreed with the Senate amendment to add \$670,000 to the House \$81,070,000 for vessels. The purpose of this addition was to provide funds to abate pollution from vessels. Your conferees did not specify any particular waters for this sewage abatement equipment, but stated it should be installed in vessels where pollution problems are most acute, such as inland lakes and rivers.

The committee of conference agreed that \$3 million should be added to the House passed \$15,100,000 for procurement of aircraft. The purpose of this \$3 million was for the procurement of a long-range, search-and-rescue helicopter, which your conferees stated should be located at whatever site is most useful to protect human life.

The committee of conference agreed to the Senate amendment adding \$390,000 to the \$1,600,000 set out in the House passed bill to complete the project at Cheboygan, Mich., for the rebuilding of the moorings of the cutter *Mackinaw*.

The committee of conference agreed to increase the average active duty personnel strength of the Coast Guard from 39,074 in the House-passed bill to 39,449,

as set by the Senate. This increase in personnel was for the manning of two cutters recalled from the Reserve Fleet and to provide essential services for Coast Guard operations at Kodiak, Alaska, necessitated by the closing of the naval station at Kodiak. In order to conform to the recent action of Congress stating authorized personnel ceilings in terms of the end of year fiscal year figures, your conferees agreed to authorize an end of year personnel strength of 39,541, which does not reflect an increase over the ceiling set by the Senate, but sets the figure in a manner compatible with the method adopted by the Armed Services Committees of the two Houses.

At the request of the Coast Guard, the Senate added an amendment authorizing the extension of the authority of the Coast Guard to lease housing for military personnel now scheduled to expire on June 30, 1972. The committee of conference granted the Coast Guard permanent authority to lease housing for military personnel subject to the filing of an annual report to the Congress as to the utilization of the authority during the preceding calendar year.

The total cost of this legislation in the House passed version of the bill was \$154,320,000. The Senate passed version—and the conference figure—is for a total of \$158,380,000, for a difference of \$4,060,000 between the House and Senate versions.

This concludes my explanation of the action of the conferees and I respectfully ask that the conference report be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I would defer to the ranking minority member of our committee for his comments on this bill.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has explained the conference report. I rise in support of what he has said.

It is well recognized in the Congress that the Coast Guard is in dire need of more modern ships and more aircraft to meet its ever-expanding responsibilities.

There was, therefore, no objection to the decision of the other body to increase the authorization by \$3 million for acquisition of an additional long-range search-and-rescue helicopter. We were concerned, however, over the effort to restrict use of this helicopter for service at Cordova, Alaska. There is undoubtedly a great need for an expanded search and rescue capability in that area, however, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries felt it would be an unwise precedent to dictate operational policy to the Coast Guard. The conference report, therefore, stresses that this additional helicopter should be employed wherever the need is greatest from the standpoint of saving lives.

The same is true of the additional funds for vessel pollution control abatement. It is recognized that all Coast Guard vessels must be brought into conformity with the President's directive regarding the dumping of sewerage by public vessels of the United States. Nevertheless, it was considered unwise to impose a condition that these addi-

tional funds be used exclusively to abate pollution from vessels stationed on the Great Lakes. Therefore, the report of the conference committee makes it clear that these funds are to be employed where the environmental problems are most acute.

Mr. Speaker, the remaining amendments simply reflect revised cost estimates and the need to extend the authority of the Coast Guard to lease housing for personnel and their dependents in the many high cost metropolitan areas where Coast Guard facilities are located. I urge my colleagues to support the action of the conference committee.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 8140, PORTS AND WATERWAYS SAFETY ACT OF 1972

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H.R. 8140) to promote the safety of ports, harbors, waterfront areas, and navigable waters of the United States.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 26, 1972.)

Mr. GARMATZ (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement of the managers be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the managers on the part of the House on the conference with the Senate on H.R. 8140, the Ports and Waterways Safety Act of 1972, I am pleased to report that we were able to

resolve our differences with the Senate in conference on this very important port and harbor safety legislation.

There were a number of technical, clarifying or conforming changes made by the Senate to which the House either receded or receded with amendment. Conversely, the Senate receded in order to conform to other action agreed upon by the committee of conference.

The House began work on this critical port and harbor safety legislation in 1970. The House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee held 10 days of hearings in that year on the initial bill, H.R. 17830. As a result of numerous proposals and suggestions made at the hearings, this bill was redrafted and introduced as the present H.R. 8140. Our committee held 10 days of hearings in 1971 on H.R. 8140 and it passed the House on October 19, 1971.

This measure provides the Coast Guard with authority to establish control over port structure and port safety and over vessel traffic in certain hazardous circumstances and areas.

The genesis of this type of legislation was the tremendous increase in vessel size and the increase in variety and amounts of hazardous cargoes carried on these vessels, as well as the number of serious spills and incidents which occurred. Some examples of these incidents were the vexing spills in the Baltimore area of the Chesapeake Bay 2 years ago, the incidents when the U.S.S. *Yancy* knocked three different portions of the Chesapeake Bay Bridge Tunnel complex in 1970, and the tragic collision which occurred in January 1971 in San Francisco Bay involving the tankers, *Arizona Standard* and the *Oregon Standard*. This collision resulted in a spillage of half a million gallons of oil into the waters of the San Francisco Bay area and was convincing proof that the time was indeed at hand for the passage of H.R. 8140.

The Senate amendment to the House-passed H.R. 8140 inserted new material, designated as title I, amending the Tank Vessel Act (46 U.S.C. 391a) to authorize the Secretary, in consultation with other agencies or departments to establish standards for the design, construction, maintenance, repairs, and operation of vessels carrying certain cargoes in bulk in order to protect the marine environment. The purpose of the Senate amendment was to provide a systems approach to protection of the marine environment: improve traffic controls and improve vessel design, construction, and operation.

The committee of conference agreed that the Senate amendment would be a useful complement to the basic vessel traffic control purpose of H.R. 8140. In accepting the Senate amendment, the committee of conference agreed that the legislation should carry the House title, "Ports and Waterways Safety Act of 1972," and that the basic element of the legislation; namely, the House passed-vessel traffic control and port safety provisions should come first as title I, and the Senate amendment, providing for vessel construction and design standards,

and so forth, should come second as title II.

In accepting the Senate amendment, the committee of conference also agreed to certain revisions, most of which were technical, clarifying or conforming in nature. I would like to take just a minute to comment briefly on several of the more significant points agreed to by the conferees.

First. The conferees agreed to exclude from the provisions of the Senate, vessels carrying dry cargoes in bulk. This revision was made at the urging of the Coast Guard, which noted that the Environmental Protection Agency has not yet designated hazardous polluting substances under section 12(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. The Coast Guard also expressed concern that this might include such substances as sugar, cement, grain, and coal, which carriers would then come within the traditional marine inspection envelope as well as the standards set up by the Senate amendment. Such an extension of Coast Guard responsibilities would be beyond the present personnel resources and facilities of the Coast Guard. As revised, the bill would apply to vessels engaged in the bulk carriage of liquid cargoes which are inflammable or combustible, oil in any form, or hazardous polluting liquids.

Second. The conferees agreed to a deferral of an additional year to January 1, 1976, for the latest date by which initial standards for the design and construction of vessels will be applied to vessels in foreign trade including vessels of foreign registry, in the absence of internationally adopted standards. This amendment was urged by the Coast Guard because an international conference on the subject of preventing pollution from vessels is scheduled for late 1973, and your conferees agreed that an additional maximum delay of 2 years to allow development of international standards before unilateral imposition of standards would not be unreasonable.

Third. The Senate amendment provides that the Secretary shall begin publication as soon as practicable of proposed regulations setting forth minimum standards for vessel design and construction. This was interpreted to mean that the Secretary was required to unilaterally impose on foreign vessels all previously published proposed standards unless nearly identical standards were adopted internationally in each and every topic area. The Coast Guard and the House Members believe that the Secretary of the Department of Transportation should have more flexibility with respect to the unilateral imposition of standards on foreign vessels. Thus, the committee of conference adopted language making it clear that the Secretary has flexibility not to impose a particular standard if he deems it inappropriate.

All the outstanding differences with the Senate have been resolved on behalf of the managers on the part of the House, I recommend most strongly that this conference report be accepted by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY), the ranking member of the committee who has been most interested in the ports and waterways safety legislation, and who has been most cooperative in working with us on this conference report.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure to bring to the House for consideration the conference report on the Ports and Waterways Safety Act of 1972.

This legislation is the product of many months of hearings before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and before the Commerce Committee of the other body. The legislation, has as its genesis, the President's message on oil pollution in May 1970. Following the introduction of this legislation in the 91st Congress, the most serious pollution incident in American history occurred, the collision of two oil tankers under the Golden Gate Bridge in the San Francisco Bay. The hearings in the 91st Congress and the experiences gained from the San Francisco Bay collision led to the introduction of a much improved bill in this Congress. The gentleman from California (Mr. MAILLIARD) was especially interested in this situation.

Title I of the conference bill is virtually identical to the legislation passed by the House on October 18, 1971. Title II to the Tank Vessel Act which were added to the House-passed legislation in the other body. In essence, title I of the bill deals with the movement of all ships in our navigable waters and title II concerns itself with the construction, loading and discharging of tankers and tank barges, transporting liquids in bulk, principally petroleum but also any substance which is inflammable, combustible, or designated as a hazardous polluting substance under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Title II of the bill will give the Secretary of Transportation expanded authority to establish minimum safety standards for such ships, both in the realm of traditional maritime safety and with respect to environmental protection. In setting these standards, the Secretary of Transportation is directed to begin publication, as soon as practicable, of proposed rules and regulations setting forth minimum standards of design, construction, alteration, and repair of vessels for the purpose of protecting the marine environment. These rules and regulations may cover such criteria as improved vessel maneuvering and stopping ability, reduction of cargo loss following collision or grounding, and reduction of pollution as a result of normal vessel operations, such as the disposal of ballast water in tankers and procedures for loading and discharging the cargo. The authority to establish such environmentally oriented rules and regulations is in addition to the expanded authority vested in the Secretary with respect to maritime safety. The legislation is predicated upon our hope that the international maritime community will act promptly to adopt comprehensive and meaningful regulations for the protection of the marine environ-

ment comparable to those which the Secretary is directed to promulgate. The Secretary's draft rules and regulations for environmental safety will become effective not earlier than January 1, 1974, unless the Secretary shall earlier establish rules and regulations consonant with international convention or treaty. Should the international community fail to adopt meaningful tank vessel regulations, the Secretary's rules and regulations will become effective not later than January 1, 1976. The international maritime community has approximately 3½ years from now in which to act. If it fails to act, the United States will move unilaterally to regulate the design of tankers entering our waters regardless of flag.

The principal amendment agreed to in conference with regard to title II of the legislation involved the question of partial action by the international maritime community. The legislation as passed in the other body appeared to require the Secretary of Transportation to impose upon foreign-flag tankers whichever draft rules and regulations had not been covered at the international level. For example, if the Secretary had determined in his draft rules and regulations that tankers of a given size must be able to stop within a given distance as well as have a certain horsepower and the international community agreed only to a stopping distance requirement, it would appear that the Secretary would have to unilaterally impose on foreign-flag tankers a horsepower requirement. As agreed to by the conference committee, however, the Secretary will have discretion in determining, following action at the international level, whether additional criteria should be imposed unilaterally by the United States.

It is recognized that international agreement with respect to tanker vessel construction and operating characteristic is preferable to unilateral action by the United States and other countries. At the present time, the vast preponderance of oil is transported in foreign-flag ships. It is appropriate that the international community be given an opportunity to meet the grave challenge posed by the ever-increasing size and number of tankers plying the world's oceans.

Should the maritime nations of the world, acting through the appropriate United Nations organs, fail to meet this challenge, however, it is expected that the Secretary of Transportation will weigh most carefully the vital need to protect our environment from pollution and will not hesitate to impose additional requirements upon ships entering our waters regardless of the hue and cry raised by foreign nations and foreign tanker owners who may have failed to meet their responsibility. The Secretary of Transportation has sought this discretion in the unilateral imposition of regulations. We have agreed to give him that discretion, but with it is imposed the duty to place the protection of our environment above all other considerations.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the enactment of this important legislation will enable the

Coast Guard to establish the necessary traffic control systems and tanker regulations needed to insure that the movement of oil between Alaska and the west coast of the United States will be accomplished without damage to the marine environment of the United States or of our neighbor, Canada. A great many ships will be needed to transport the oil of the Alaskan North Slope. The ships to be constructed for this trade will be built to the highest safety standards. The traffic control systems at the port of loading, along the route, and at the discharging point on the west coast will be the most sophisticated and will be strictly imposed. This is far-reaching legislation, a long step forward in our efforts to preserve our inland and coastal waters from the hazards of pollution and loss of life and property. I urge all of my colleagues to support the action of the conference committee.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MAILLIARD).

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in urging support of the conference report.

Although I was not a conferee, I was an author of the basic House bill and participated actively in the formulation of that bill.

Hearings were held in my home city of San Francisco, where there was great interest because of the environmental consequences of a larger oil spill caused by a clearly avoidable collision between two tankers in heavy fog in the Golden Gate.

While I do not suppose any legislation can guarantee against accidents, this bill should minimize the risk in the future.

Our subcommittee worked on this for several years, and at last I am pleased we can bring to you a well conceived piece of legislation to meet a serious threat to the environment as well as to life and property.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN).

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report particularly because I am vitally concerned about the oil spills which continually despoil our beaches.

I spend a great deal of my leisure time at the ocean. Walking on the beach and beachcombing are among my favorite forms of relaxation. During the past 6 months I have on two occasions written to the Environmental Protection Agency to protest oil despoliation on the beach at Ocean City, Md. On the most recent occasion, a few weeks ago, I found a gull saturated with oil amidst the oil on the beach.

The beach at Ocean City, Md., is one of the most beautiful in the world and it disturbs me greatly to see the beach so stained because of the carelessness or willful disregard for the environment by ship operators.

The bill before us recognizes this problem. It not only promotes safety, but it also attempts to protect the navigable waters from environmental harm primarily by authorizing the Secretary of

Transportation to establish vessel traffic services, systems and controls and minimum safety standards for structures. The Secretary would be authorized to establish standards for the design, construction, maintenance repair and operation of vessels carrying certain cargoes in bulk in order to protect the marine environment.

The legislation before us not only includes a civil penalty of \$10,000 for violation of the provisions, but it also includes criminal penalties of not less than \$5,000 nor more than \$50,000 or 5 years imprisonment or both. Hopefully, this will help prevent oil spills.

I urge adoption of the conference report.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman from Iowa desire me to yield to him?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, Mr. Speaker. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARMATZ. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I have only a couple of quick questions.

Are all of the amendments germane to the bill?

Mr. GARMATZ. Yes, they are.

Mr. GROSS. Is this the bill that provides for the raising of a certain number of bridges to provide more clearance for vessels operated by yachtsmen and others?

Mr. GARMATZ. No, it is not, not in this conference report dealing with the Ports and Waterways Safety Act of 1972.

Mr. GROSS. So that the Members of Congress as well as others owning pleasure boats can go through bridges without lowering their radio antennas or lowering their canopies?

Mr. GARMATZ. No, this does not relate to that at all.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with the statement of Chairman GARMATZ concerning H.R. 8140, the Ports and Waterways Safety Act of 1972.

I would like the Members to know that I introduced the first legislation in this port and waterway safety area back in February 1970. This early bill of mine resulted from the dangerous incident in January 1970, when the U.S.S. *Yancy*, a Navy munitions vessel, broke loose from her moorings in high winds and knocked out three portions of the Chesapeake Bay Bridge-Tunnel complex.

The Coast Guard Subcommittee of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee held a hearing on this incident in connection with the legislation now before us and even before that I became convinced of the necessity of this type of legislation.

I cannot tell you how pleased I am that we are on the verge of enacting this type of legislation and I am convinced that vessel traffic control in certain circumstances and control of the construction and design of vessels is now absolutely essential for marine safety in our congested waters.

I urge the enactment of this very important marine safety legislation.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, in recent years society has become more complex, populations have increased dramatically, demands have become more persistent and expectations have gone higher. In these times of rapid change and fast transportation, the thread of consistency is maintained by the unchanging sea and the continuous hazards which she presents. Equally persistent, although not always so successful, are the efforts of the navigator to overcome the harshness of the sea and the hazards of navigation. As a result of the extensive requirement for the goods of commerce borne over the oceans and through the ports of the world, and the recently awakened universal awareness of the environment and its degradation, technology has leaped forward to provide the wherewithal and the hardware to move the enormous quantity of goods from place to place and to satisfy the tremendous energy requirements of civilization while trying to maintain a reasonable balance with minimum effect on the environment.

The impact of the growth of commerce, coupled with the restrictions of various harbors, provides an interface with the marine environment which causes an important conflict. The best solution for a conflict of this type, short of the abolition of commerce, is the establishment of an effective marine traffic system that will accomplish the greatest good with the least possible disruption of existing conditions and customs. Added to this systems protection of the marine environment is the regulation of construction, design, et cetera, of tankers.

H.R. 8140, the bill now before us, provides for the establishment, maintenance and operation of these marine traffic systems in our port and waterway areas, as well as control of tank vessel design and construction. It is important to note that these marine traffic systems will not be universally imposed all over in all our port and waterway areas. Instead, they will be established in certain selected areas which past statistics prove are hazardous due to heavy traffic flow and/or hazardous condition or circumstances.

I urge the Members to support this important legislation which imposes a systems control over the marine environment.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 14734, FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1972

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 14734) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and for the U.S. Information Agency, 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 15, 1972).

Mr. MORGAN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with, inasmuch as it has been printed in the Record for quite a few days, and I am sure that every Member is familiar with it.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am reporting today to the House on the outcome of the successful conference with the other body on H.R. 14734. Members will recall that that measure, dealing with authorizations for the next fiscal year for the Department of State and the U.S. Information Agency, carried authorizations amounting to \$848,603,000. In separate measures this House also authorized \$88,027,000 for the Peace Corps for fiscal year 1973 and \$22,000,000 for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for the next 2 fiscal years. Together the authorizations in the three House bills total \$958,630,000.

The Senate struck out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and substituted a Senate amendment that included the three House bills as well as a number of other items relating to the broad area of foreign affairs.

Let me say at the outset that there was one unusual feature about the conference with the other body. It was one of the few instances in my long experience where both bodies included identical sums in their version of the same bill. Thus we bring back to the House an authorization bill with the same amounts that the House has previously voted.

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment included \$85,000,000 for Israel to assist in the resettlement in that country of Jewish refugees from the Soviet Union. The only difference in the two versions was in the form—neither in the amount nor the purpose. The House had added it to the State Department authorization for migration and refugee assistance; the Senate made it a separate item. The managers on the part of the House accepted the Senate version.

In all there were 27 differences between the House and Senate versions. The House conferees accepted some Senate proposals to realign the principal officers in the Department of State.

Specifically we agreed to a change in the title of the No. 2 man from Under Secretary of State to Deputy Secretary of State. We agreed that the principal economic officer in the Department should be on a level with the principal political officer. The House conferees would not accept, however, an amendment that would have split the Western Hemisphere into two separate bureaus, each headed by an Assistant Secretary of State. However well intentioned the amendment was, it had the effect of downgrading Canada by putting a number of the smaller Central American countries in the same bureau and, at the same time, dividing Latin America when the effort in that area has been to promote regionalism.

The Senate amendment included a lengthy and complicated section on grievance procedures for Foreign Service personnel. Government employees in all agencies have grievances just as do employees in private employment. The issue is not to suppress the grievances or to pretend they do not exist. Rather it is to work out procedures that are fair both to the individual and to the employer. Without prejudging the merits of the Senate proposal, the House conferees simply felt that they did not have enough information to make an informed judgment on so detailed a proposal. One of the House conferees was the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) who is chairman of the Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations. He is particularly interested in this matter and has already scheduled hearings. For these reasons the House conferees insisted that the amendment be deleted.

One other contentious proposal by the Senate was for the creation of a Study Commission relating to foreign policy—something of a little Hoover Commission. Anyone with the slightest knowledge about foreign affairs is aware that many agencies of our Government are in the foreign policy business. Most of us are agreed that there should be better coordination among them. The question is whether the Commission approach is the way to explore the dimensions of the problem and to devise remedies. I know that the real work will be done by the staff that the Commission selects. In accepting the Senate amendment the House conferees insisted upon the inclusion of a terminal date; namely, July 30, 1974. I think it accurate to say that the House conferees were not as enthusiastic about this amendment as were the Senate conferees. We can only hope that it serves the purpose for which it was created. On a more positive note, the House will be pleased to know that in this bill we did abolish a commission—the Peace Corps National Advisory Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I have touched on the more significant differences between the two Houses. On balance, I think we have brought back to the House a bill that can be supported by this body. I urge that the conference report be adopted.

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

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for yielding.

Will the gentleman refresh my memory—did we have this language in the House bill concerning a study commission relating to foreign policy?

Mr. MORGAN. No, this was an effort by two members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and they were very adamant in their position. The House found it necessary to accept this provision. It was not in the House bill.

Mr. GROSS. This was not in the House bill at all?

Mr. MORGAN. No, it was not in the House bill at all—this was a Senate amendment.

Mr. GROSS. And this provides for a staff for this commission which can be paid up to \$145 a day and, apparently, an unlimited number of supergrades; is that correct?

Mr. MORGAN. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And the House conferees acceded to this?

Mr. MORGAN. The House conferees acceded very reluctantly.

This amendment caused me considerable concern. I am very doubtful about this commission.

It was a most difficult conference and we had to give on some matters.

We held out on this one but finally accepted it after they agreed to a termination date.

Mr. GROSS. As to the Peace Corps, I thought the House bill carried some \$77 million for that. Am I mistaken?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir, you are mistaken. It carried the same amount.

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

Mr. MORGAN. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I would just like to say in defense of the chairman that this commission is something, as he said, we were all very reluctant to accept, but I would point out to the gentleman from Ohio the Senate added a great deal of language to this bill involving 27 different issues, and the House got them to recede on 16 of the issues, I believe, and we accepted 11. We think the ones we got them to recede on were perhaps more important than the others. We had to compromise on something, and this is one of the things we reluctantly compromised on.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, the chairman has explained the problems in this conference report. I rise in support of this report on the conference with the Senate to resolve differences in the authorizing legislation for the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the Peace Corps.

I am pleased to report that your conferees were generally successful in protecting the House position.

We had a vigorous discussion of the Senate language establishing a grievance procedure for foreign service personnel. While I agree that a grievance procedure should be established, I am pleased that

the Senate conferees agreed to let us handle the legislation in a more orderly manner. Our subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations began hearings this week and will continue them on July 18, following the recess.

However, I am not pleased with the necessity of our acceptance of the Senate proposal for a Study Commission relating to foreign policy. We did succeed in improving the Senate language, but I find little merit in the proposal. It is not at all clear to me what useful purpose this Commission is supposed to serve.

This is the first time funds have had to be specifically authorized for the Department of State and USIA as required by a provision of last year's Foreign Assistance Act. The authorization for State Department includes funds for administration of foreign affairs, international organizations and conferences, educational exchanges, and migration and refugee assistance. These amounts total \$648,354,000, of which \$85 million is to assist in the resettlement of Soviet Jewish refugees in Israel.

The USIA authorization amounts to \$200,249,000 for fiscal year 1973. Of this amount, \$194 million is for salaries and expenses, including the funding of various media programs. The remaining funds are largely for international exhibitions.

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency would receive an authorization in the amount of \$22 million for the 2 fiscal years, 1973 and 1974. The recent SALT agreement is, I believe, ample evidence of the value of ACDA's work.

The Peace Corps authorization is for \$88,027,000, the amount agreed to by both the House and the Senate.

I urge approval of this conference report, in spite of my reservations concerning the creation of another commission whose function is of dubious value in my judgment.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM).

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in support of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report. I believe the conferees have done a fine job under the circumstances.

I am, of course, gratified that adoption of this conference report will represent final action by the Congress in approving the \$85 million of aid to Israel to help with the resettlement of the Jewish refugees from the Soviet Union which I proposed, along with Congressman HALPERN and many cosponsors in H.R. 13022 on February 8, 1972.

I sincerely hope that the Appropriations Committee will act promptly to provide the funds required to carry out this authorization.

Mr. MAILLIARD. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, as a conferee on this conference report, I rise to support it, but I do so with some

reluctance. My reservations about the report have to do with the proposed study commission relating to foreign policy. I might point out that one House conferee did not sign the conference report at all—Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. I do not wish to speak for him, but I know he, too, has serious reservations about the wisdom of authorizing a commission of this kind. I would like to suggest that the Appropriations Committee take a very close look at what is proposed, take a close look at what a commission of this kind would get into, and how much it would cost.

The chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee said that none of the House conferees is very happy with the proposal, and the gentleman from California said that at least the commission will die in 1974. My view is that we should really not allow it to be born. The very broad mandate which it is given has to me the earmarks of a fishing expedition. It takes the form of a little Hoover commission with 12 members, eight of whom are to be appointed by the legislative branch of the Government.

Take a look at the language regarding what should be its duties. I refer to the language on pages 9 and 10. It begins at the bottom of page 9:

It says: "The Commission shall study and investigate." I am not sure what that means. Is to study something else than to investigate? It goes on: "the organization, methods of operation, and powers of all departments, agencies, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the United States Government participating in the formulation and implementation of United States foreign policy." It goes on to say the Commission "shall make recommendations which the Commission considers appropriate to provide improved governmental processes and programs"—I am not sure what that means.

The specific recommendations have to do with "the reorganization of the departments, agencies, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch participating in foreign policy matters. I suppose anyone who has taken a look at the broad field of the executive branch of the Government would recognize that shifts in responsibility might be made. The President has suggested certain shifts and consolidations within the executive branch, but in the field of foreign policy I would suppose there is not going to be any major restructuring of any Government departments or agencies.

We are supposed to authorize this Commission to make recommendations with respect to "more effective arrangements between the executive branch and Congress, which will better enable each to carry out its Constitutional responsibilities." Well, Mr. Speaker, I know that there are Members of the other body which have a kind of persecution complex with respect to the executive branch in the field of foreign policy. It may be they want some kind of instrumentality to help define what the relationships should be between the executive branch and the legislative branch in this

area, but I would think this search for "more effective arrangements" is going to be a difficult responsibility.

What are we aiming at? What kind of more effective arrangements between the executive branch and the Congress could a commission suggest that we legislators might not think of if we do not think the relationships are good?

They are also supposed to make recommendations for "improved procedures among departments—to provide improved coordination"—I suppose it was just an accident that they speak of improved procedures to provide improved coordination. No one doubts there is need for coordination in the field of foreign policy within the executive branch. Indeed, this conference report pinpoints a major responsibility in the Department of State by designating a new position of Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. In the field of foreign economic policy, there is unquestionably need for additional coordination and control with respect to the foreign policy questions, but I doubt very much whether any commission is going to throw much light on what should be the proper relationships between the various agencies of our Government.

The responsibilities in subparagraphs (4) and (5) on page 10, include "the abolition of services, activities, and functions not necessary to the efficient conduct of foreign policy"—that could point in any direction or in no direction. What activities of the Federal Government in the field of foreign policy are not necessary to its efficient conduct? I suppose there must be some. The Senate must have had something in mind, or the sponsors of this proposal must have had something in mind, in making this suggestion.

In sum, what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that we need to be careful about a proposal of this kind, because the field is so big, because the responsibilities of both the executive and legislative branches of our Government are so intermixed that a commission with the best of intentions might muddy the waters.

And if a commission were to do a thorough job, they would require, I would suppose, very extensive staff assistance. They certainly would be free to issue subpoenas, which an individual Commission member might invoke, against any agency of the executive branch, and they could demand access to all records. I am not sure whether the objective is about the intelligence activities of the Government, or whether we are talking about the information activities of the Government, or whether we are talking about the economic activities of the Government, or whether we are talking about the diplomatic activities of the Government. In any event, it is a huge field, and one where I doubt very much we need as sweeping and far-reaching a commission as this, at least on paper, would suggest.

I might say as a footnote to all this, that it was something like 24 years ago that I was a humble staff member of a foreign policy task force of the first Hoover Commission. I found myself in that position exploring, among other things, the relationships between the in-

telligence activities of the CIA and the State Department.

However, I would suppose that by this time these relationships have become pretty well defined. The various responsibilities are pretty well known and pretty well regulated.

I doubt whether this kind of far-reaching exploration of one aspect of the executive branch's responsibility is a wise move.

It is for that reason I have such severe reservations about the proposed Commission. Nonetheless I did sign the conference report, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the passage of this legislation by the House insures the continuation of a program begun years ago and which has proven its worth. In the beginning, the concept of the Peace Corps received a cynical and unbelieving analysis by substantially the same people who approve it today.

But it was—and still is—one of the most noble and inspiring ventures advanced by the Congress and the country. Even the countervailing force of the war involvement in Vietnam as a necessarily negative force to this type of effort has not fatally flowed it.

On the contrary, it has been an ever-present reminder to bewildered foreigners that America is still idealistic and venturesome and capable of great moral purpose.

Yes, the Peace Corps remains the one great product of a great American, John Kennedy; and, in truth, is his greatest memorial.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

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

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

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 314, nays 77, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 242]

YEAS—314

Abourezk
Abzug
Adams
Addabbo
Alexander
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arendt
Ashley
Aspin
Aspinall
Badillo
Barrett
Begich
Belcher
Bennett

Bergland
Bevill
Biaggi
Biestler
Bingham
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Brinkley
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Mass.

Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Carey, N.Y.
Carlson
Carney
Casey, Tex.
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chappell
Clancy
Clark
Clausen,
Don H.
Cleveland
Collier
Collins, Ill.
Conable

Conte
Conyers
Corman
Cotter
Coughlin
Culver
Daniel, Va.
Daniels, N.J.
Danielson
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Dellums
Derwinski
Dickinson
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Downing
Drinan
Dulski
du Pont
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Elberg
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Flood
Flowers
Foley
Forsythe
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Frenzel
Frey
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Garmatz
Gaydos
Gialmo
Gibbons
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grasso
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammer-schmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harrington
Harvey
Hastings
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Heinz
Helstoski
Hicks, Mass.
Hicks, Wash.
Hillis
Hogan
Hollifield
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hungate

Hunt
Jacobs
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Kazen
Keating
Kee
Keith
Kemp
Kluczynski
Koch
Kuykendall
Kyros
Latta
Leggett
Lent
Link
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McClary
McClure
McCormack
McEwen
McFall
McKay
McKevitt
McKinney
Macdonald, Mass.
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Mallory
Mann
Mathias, Calif.
Matunaga
Mayne
Mazzoli
Meeds
Melcher
Metcalfe
Mikva
Mills, Ark.
Minish
Mink
Mitchell
Mizell
Mollohan
Monagan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morgan
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
O'Neill
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Peyser
Pickle
Pike
Podell
Poff
Freyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Rallsback
Randall
Rangel
Rees
Reid
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Robison, N.Y.

NAYS—77

Andrews, Ala.
Archer
Ashbrook
Baker
Blackburn
Burleson, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Byron
Camp
Carter
Clawson, Del.
Collins, Tex.
Colmer
Conover
Crane

Curlin
Davis, Ga.
Denholm
Dennis
Devine
Dorn
Duncan
Edwards, Calif.
Flynt
Gettys
Griffin
Gross
Haley
Hall
Harsha

Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Roncallo
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roy
Roybal
Ruppe
Ruth
Ryan
St Germain
Sandman
Sarbanes
Satterfield
Scherle
Schueer
Schwengel
Scott
Seiberling
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Stanton, J. William
Stanton, James V.
Steed
Steele
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Symington
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Terry
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thone
Tiernan
Udall
Ullman
Van Derlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Veysey
Vigorito
Waldie
Wampler
Ware
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Wildnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wolf
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Young, Fla.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

McCulloch
McMillan
Martin
Mathis, Ga.
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Mills, Md.
Minshall
Nichols
O'Konski
Passman

Pettis
Poage
Powell
Price, Tex.
Quillen
Rarick
Roussellot
Runnels
Saylor
Schmitz
Sebelius

Shoup
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Steiger, Ariz.
Stephens
Thomson, Wis.
Waggoner
Whitten
Wylie

NOT VOTING—41

Abbitt
Abernethy
Anderson,
Tenn.
Baring
Bell
Betts
Blanton
Boggs
Bray
Broomfield
Burke, Fla.
Caffery
Chisholm
Clay

Davis, S.C.
Dent
Diggs
Dowdy
Erlenborn
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford,
William D.
Fraser
Fulton
Gallagher
Hagan
Hébert
Jonas
Karth

Lennon
McCloskey
McDade
McDonald,
Mich.
Miller, Calif.
Mosher
Moss
Pepper
Pirnie
Pryor, Ark.
Schneebell
Stokes
Wiggins

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. Karth with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Dent with Mr. McDade.
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Betts.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Clay.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Stokes.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Pirnie.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
Mr. Davis of South Carolina with Mr. Schneebell.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Caffery with Mr. Hagan.

Messrs. CRANE, MARTIN, KING, and MILLS of Maryland changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on the conference report just adopted.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1893, GOLDEN EAGLE PASSPORT PROGRAM

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1893) to restore the golden eagle program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, provide for an annual camping permit, and for other purposes, 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 22, 1972.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the conferees on the legislation now before the House (S. 1893) met at length to try to develop a meaningful and reasonable admission fee program for our national park and recreation areas. A great effort, both in the conference and informally, was made to find a common ground between the Senate and House versions of the golden eagle bill.

I am sure that I need not remind my colleagues of the history of the Golden Eagle program. In spite of its many problems and shortcomings, it has become relatively popular among those people who frequently visit our Federal outdoor recreation areas. For this reason, although a lapse has developed on two different occasions, the golden eagle passport has been revived.

This year, rather than allowing the program to continue to flounder, the members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee made a major effort to reconstruct it based on past experience. I think that the Members of the House can be proud of the work that has been done, and I believe that the product of the conference committee should give us a relatively permanent and productive program.

Very briefly, I would like to outline the recommendations of the conference committee:

First, the legislation would extend indefinitely the existence of the \$10 annual carload admission permit known as the golden eagle passport.

Second, admission fees would be charged only at designated units of the national park system and at national recreation areas administered by the Forest Service. Admission to outdoor areas administered by the Corps of Engineers, wildlife refuges, and other Federal facilities would be free of charge. For senior citizens, who are generally on fixed incomes, a new element in the program would be established, called the golden age passport. As contemplated by the legislation, persons 62 years of age or older would be entitled to a free annual admission permit so that no admission fees would be collected from these people at any federally operated outdoor recreation area.

Third, all Federal agencies, however, would be expected to review the facilities which they offer to the public. Those which are provided at considerable Federal expense and which specifically benefit an individual or group of individuals are to be subject to a daily recreation use fee. It seemed fair that those who utilize these special facilities should pay more than those who do not. For persons carrying the golden age passport a special concession would be made. They would be entitled to a 50-percent reduction in the daily recreation use fee so that if they use a \$2 campsite, they pay only \$1.

Fourth, in the past, the program has been plagued with a lack of publicity, with a lack of ready access to purchase the annual permit, and with a general public misunderstanding about the use of the proceeds. The legislation recommended by the conference committee attempts to cure some of these maladies by authorizing a portion of the proceeds to be invested in promotion of the program and in its effective enforcement. In addition, the conferees recommend the sale of the golden eagle passports through the post offices—like the present duck stamps—naturally, the postal service is to be reimbursed for the assistance which it provides. Finally, rather than placing the proceeds in the Land and Water Conservation Fund, the recommended legislation provides that they shall be placed in a special account in the Treasury so that they can be reappropriated to the collecting agency for any authorized outdoor recreation purpose.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, the legislation extends the same protection against the unauthorized use of the golden eagle symbol that is afforded other important Federal symbols.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by saying that this conference report represents many hours of patient study and deliberation. We hope that this legislation will resolve the problems that have beset this program since the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act was enacted in 1964. We think that S. 1893 represents a realistic and reasonable course of action and I can recommend its approval to my colleagues in the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my chairman in support of S. 1893, as recommended by the conference committee.

Without repeating what he has told the Members of the House, I want to emphasize that what we have tried to do is to develop a uniform program which recognizes that some agencies, under some circumstances, cannot control access or collect admission fees even though outdoor recreation is a significant objective of the areas which they administer.

Under the terms of the legislation now before the House, no admission fees are to be charged except at designated units of the national park system or designated national recreation areas. Even at these admission fee areas, I want to make it perfectly clear that the conferees expect uniform treatment for all visitors. Unless admission fees can be collected from all visitors—at least during the peak season—then no admission fee should be charged. Personally, I feel—and I believe the consensus of the conferees was—that no admission fees should be charged except at manned entrance gates where the visitor is met, provided with information, and where the fees can be explained, if necessary.

Once a person is admitted to an area—even if there is no charge—he should be entitled to use any facilities which all visitors might reasonably be expected to use, without any special recreation use charge. For example, a person should not be expected to pay for the use of trails, a visitor center, or a picnic table because

most visitors who go to the area expect to use these facilities. On the other hand, it is contemplated that a special recreation use fee should be paid on a daily basis for the exclusive use of a developed campsite. It is not contemplated that any charge would be made for backwoods camping.

Entrance fees would be charged at designated units of the national park system and at national recreation areas administered by the Secretary of Agriculture. I would place emphasis on the word "national." We have only a few of these areas. Sawtooth National Recreation Area in Idaho and Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area in Oregon were approved by the House this year. It is not intended that the Forest Service be permitted to designate a section of a national forest as a recreation area and then collect entrance fees.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the committee has outlined the most important features of the recommended legislation. I concur in his statement and join him in urging the adoption of this conference report.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report to S. 1893, a bill designed to revive the golden eagle passport program which was allowed to expire on December 31, 1971.

This measure would extend indefinitely the golden eagle passport, a \$10 annual permit for entrance to designated national parks and campsites. In addition, this proposal creates a new golden age passport for citizens aged 62 or over which will allow them free entry into any designated admission fee area in the national park system or designated national recreational area administered by the Forest Service.

The golden age passport would operate in the same manner as the golden eagle passport and, in addition, would entitle the bearer to a 50-percent reduction in special recreation use fees, including camping.

Both of these passports can be obtained at the local post office.

Mr. Speaker, I have long felt that the national park and recreational systems belong to the people—those who have worked long and hard to pay taxes to support these programs.

By requiring a person to pay to gain access to their own lakes and parks, as well as pay taxes which purchased that lake or park, we are subjecting our citizens to double taxation—a policy I do not endorse.

However, I commend the conferees for their conclusion that those who have reached retirement are deserving of a special dividend by establishing a golden age passport.

Most of our retired citizens have a great love of nature and the outdoors. Most have limited financial resources, living on fixed incomes in an era of ever-rising costs.

Mr. Speaker, the golden eagle passport system is an important part of a concerted effort to expand recreational opportunities to all Americans. It is an inexpensive way to see our national treasures, and it has provided a method

by which our citizens can relive our national heritage.

Without this system many families were priced out of our parks and recreational areas. Thus, they were not allowed the enjoyment and the relaxation as can only be provided in the outdoors.

I support this conference report, and I urge my colleagues to act promptly on its passage. Hundreds of thousands of American families are depending on us.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1028 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1028

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move, clause 27(d) (4) of Rule XI to the contrary notwithstanding, that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15587) to provide for a six-month extension of the emergency unemployment compensation program, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, but shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a closed rule providing for 2 hours of general debate, as those who listened to the rule well know. It deals with the extension of the emergency unemployment compensation program. This is the usual way in which matters affecting unemployment compensation are handled.

Unless somebody would like me to yield I propose to yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman's remarks should not be limited to this unemployment compensation bill that is covered by a closed rule. Closed rules are the trademark of the Ways and Means Committee. That committee seems to be sacrosanct. We never get a bill from the Committee on Ways and Means that is not protected by a closed rule.

Is that not correct?

Mr. BOLLING. There have been minor exceptions, and once upon a time not too long ago we made in order a vote on a matter—I think this was a couple of years ago—where we did not give them an entirely closed rule. The gentleman now speaking hopes that in the future there will be occasions where we can have many other situations in which we will not have a closed rule, as we did on one previous occasion, and not have an entirely closed rule on a tax bill some day. And this I have tried, in company with the gentleman from Iowa, to do, but have been unsuccessful so far. Perhaps at some other time we will be successful.

Mr. GROSS. I thought the last time we had an open rule in legislation coming from the Committee on Ways and Means was 15 or 20 years ago.

Mr. BOLLING. I believe, and I would not be able to cite an example—I am informed now by the chief of staff of the Committee on Ways and Means that the coffee bill was taken up under an open rule, and that was relatively recently. However, I am not sure that is entirely responsive to the gentleman's point.

Mr. GROSS. Well, along with the gentleman from Missouri, I am always thankful for real small favors.

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

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri has explained House Resolution 1028. As of today I do not believe we need the first waiver in the rule, rule XI, clause 27(d) (4) because the 3 days have now passed, since the report was filed back on June 21.

The purpose of H.R. 15587 is to extend the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1971 for 6 months, and to pay for the cost by an increase in the Federal unemployment tax.

The Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1971 authorizes the Secretary of Labor to enter into arrangements with any State having at least a 6.5 percent rate of unemployment, by which the State receives Federal funds to pay emergency unemployment compensation to individuals who have exhausted their regular unemployment compensation. This emergency program provides compensation at the same weekly rate paid by the State, for a period equal to one-half of the individual's period of entitlement to regular benefits but not more than 13 weeks.

This bill would extend the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1971 so that new beneficiaries could become eligible for benefits under the program until December 31, 1972, instead of until June 30, 1972, as is provided in the present law.

In order to pay for benefits paid under this program after June 30, 1972, the bill provides a temporary increase in the Federal unemployment tax. Following an administration request, the committee bill increases the Federal unemployment tax from .05 percent to .58 percent for calendar year 1973 only.

The cost of this bill is estimated at \$120,000,000 to \$220,000,000 during fiscal year 1973.

I will say this—if your State does not qualify—all employers of your State will pay this additional increase in unemployment tax to take care of the unemployed people in the other States.

So you may have some problems to face with your employers paying this additional tax. Thus, I say, Mr. Speaker, I am not too enchanted with the bill from the standpoint of transferring the cost to the employer at the present time.

They are paying some pretty heavy taxes as it is right now. However, I urge the adoption of the rule.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. In the interest of clarity, is it not also true that it extends for 6 months the time which unemployed individuals may receive the benefits—and this is in a little bit different context from just extending the life of the act.

Mr. SMITH of California. As I understand it, it is a 6-month extension during which they can apply, and if they qualify, they will get the 13 weeks. So they have the additional months if there is a 6.5 percent unemployment in those States, then the person that has the 26 weeks will have 6 months to qualify to get the 13 weeks.

That is my understanding. I think I am correct.

Mr. HALL. I certainly appreciate the gentleman's yielding. I hope and pray that he is correct.

I am sure that this will be cleared up during the general debate on the bill.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15587) to provide for a 6-month extension of the emergency unemployment compensation program.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 15587, with Mr. ROUSH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BYRNES) will be recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 15587 is a relatively short bill. It would do two things. First, it would extend the life of the emergency unemployment compensation program for 6 months. Second, it would modify the financing of the program beginning July 1, 1972.

The Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1971 (P.L. 92-224) was enacted last December to provide unemployment compensation to persons who have exhausted their regular unemployment compensation and payments under the Federal-State extended unemployment compensation program if payable in their States.

The emergency unemployment compensation program was directed toward meeting the needs of persons whose unemployment was caused primarily by national economic forces. Unemployment had become especially high in certain industries directly related to the national defense and space programs. Cut-backs in these industries resulting from national policies had caused unemployment to spiral not only with respect to persons directly engaged in employment in these industries but in other areas of activity that are supportive of such industries.

The emergency unemployment compensation program, then, was enacted to meet the needs of individuals affected by high unemployment in certain States, but whose situation resulted from national policies, some of which were shaped here in Congress. The program operates only in States having a 6.5 percent "rate of unemployment" as defined in the law. These States enter into agreement with the Secretary of Labor to act as fiscal agents of the Federal Government in paying emergency unemployment compensation to eligible recipients. The program has been in operation in all 19 States that have had the required 6.5 percent rate of unemployment. These States are: Alaska, California, Connecticut, Idaho, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Vermont, Washington, and West Virginia.

Under the emergency unemployment compensation program an individual is paid compensation at the same weekly rate as under the State's program and receives such payment for a period equal to one-half of his period of entitlement to regular compensation but not more than 13 weeks.

The emergency program is about to begin to phase out of existence. Public Law 92-224 provides that no compensation will be payable to an individual who is not eligible to receive at least one payment under the program for a week

ending prior to July 1, 1972. It also provides that if a person starts receiving payments under the program prior to a week ending before June 30, 1972, he may continue to receive payments after July 1, but that no payment may be made for any week ending after September 30, 1972.

H.R. 15587 would delay these termination dates so that new beneficiaries could become eligible for benefits under the program until December 31, 1972—instead of June 30, 1972—and that no benefit payments could be made for weeks ending after March 31, 1973—instead of September 30, 1972.

It is estimated that between 300,000 and 400,000 workers will exhaust their unemployment compensation in the last half of this year and will remain unemployed for some time thereafter. These are the persons that this bill is concerned about. These persons will have no sources of financial assistance available to them other than welfare. The extension of the emergency unemployment compensation program will prevent many of them from having to turn to welfare for further assistance.

Public Law 92-224 directed the Secretary of Labor to make a detailed study of the operation of the program and report his findings and recommendations to the Congress. The Secretary submitted two such reports to the Congress, one in May and the second in the middle of June. The analysis of the Labor Department, as evidenced in these reports, showed clearly that most of the recipients of the emergency program have been workers with substantial labor force attachment. They are mostly men who are regular full time workers rather than secondary workers whose income is not so essential to the support of the family. The Labor Department studies show that seven out of 10 of the recipients have been entitled to maximum duration under the State programs and the national average weekly benefit amount has been \$54.65.

The second change made by the bill is to modify the method of financing the benefits paid under the program beginning with weeks starting after June 30, 1972.

As enacted, the emergency unemployment compensation program is financed by advances from the general funds of the U.S. Treasury to the extended unemployment compensation account of the Unemployment Trust Fund. These advances are to be recovered in the future by withholding from the States that have made payments under the program the distribution of excesses in the Employment Security Administration account which would be distributed to the States.

In order to provide financing for benefits paid under the program for weeks ending after June 30, 1972, the bill provides for a temporary increase in the Federal unemployment tax for calendar year 1973. This method of financing benefits during the period that the program would be extended under the bill was recommended by the administration. More specifically, the administration recommended, and the bill provides, a

1-year temporary increase in the Federal unemployment tax rate of 0.08 percent of covered wages. This would increase the total Federal unemployment tax rate from 3.2 to 3.28 percent and the net Federal tax rate from 0.5 to 0.58 percent.

Questions have been raised concerning the method of financing the program during the period it would be extended by the bill. It is claimed that it is unfair to tax the employers in all of the States to pay benefits to workers in only a few of the States. Those who claim that this method of financing the program is unfair overlook the fact that the program is directed toward alleviating high unemployment which exists in certain localities as a result of forces that are beyond local control. It should be noted in considering these arguments that one-half of the cost of the permanent program of Federal-State extended unemployment compensation is financed in essentially the same manner.

When this program was enacted last December, economic conditions were of serious concern, especially in certain States in which unemployment had been directly affected by retrenchment in national spending programs. The insured unemployment rate in December—when the emergency unemployment compensation program was enacted—was 4.3 percent. It remained above 4 percent until April of 1972 when the rate dipped slightly below 4 to 3.98 percent. The rate would have remained above 4 percent except for the fact that the extended unemployment compensation program ceased operating nationally the first of April. This resulted in many thousands of unemployed workers going off the insured unemployment rolls, thus lowering the insured rate of unemployment.

The total unemployment rate is a more reliable test of unemployment and it has remained constantly at around 6 percent every month this year.

It is everybody's hope that unemployment will decrease in the latter months of the year but there is no way that employment can possibly increase fast enough to prevent many thousands of workers—estimated at 300,000 to 400,000, as I stated earlier—from using up their entitlement to unemployment compensation. This bill is intended to help alleviate the problems of these workers and their families and therefore should be enacted.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to H.R. 15587, a bill extending the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1971 for a 6-month period.

Under the original law, enacted December 29, 1971, a third tier of unemployment compensation benefits was added to existing unemployment insurance programs for a temporary period. I opposed enactment of this legislation, and while the extension before the House is an improvement over the legislation enacted last December, I still think it is inappropriate.

In order to put the issues in context, I should point out that in addition to the basic unemployment compensation program established in each State as a

result of the Federal-State partnership created by the Federal Unemployment Tax Act enacted in the 1930's, we provide a permanent program of extended benefits under legislation that we enacted in 1970. Although formulas vary from State to State, a typical State provides a worker who has sufficient wage credits with a specified basic weekly benefit for up to 26 weeks duration.

The permanent extended benefits program enacted by Congress in 1970 provides that when economic criteria measuring unusually large unemployment on either a national or State basis are applicable, additional benefits are automatically triggered in equal to 50 percent of an individual's basic unemployment compensation benefits. The costs of this extended benefit program are shared on a 50-50 basis with the States and financed by a payroll tax on employers. The enactment of this program represented a culmination of years of effort by the Ways and Means Committee, cooperating with the Labor Department, the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Administrators, and both industry and labor groups, to develop a permanent program to deal with abnormally high unemployment on either a State or national basis in accordance with criteria known in advance, rather than on an ad hoc basis as we did through temporary unemployment extended compensation programs in 1958 and 1961.

The Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1971, which is extended by this bill, provided a third tier of benefits on top of both the basic benefits and the permanent extended benefits that entitled recipients in States with sufficiently high unemployment to up to an additional 13 weeks of unemployment compensation. As the chairman noted before the Rules Committee yesterday, and as I made clear on the floor of the House when we adopted this program, these benefits were financed out of general revenues. The third tier of benefits trigger-in in States whose unemployment compensation rate, including the rate of exhaustions, equals or exceeds 6.5 percent for any week. Once the program triggers in, it is in effect for a minimum of 26 weeks, and remains in effect thereafter until the third week after which unemployment drops below the 6.5-percent figure. The bill before the House would extend this program for 6 months. Under the extension, no new beneficiaries may be qualified for these third-tier benefits after December 31 of this year, and no benefits will be payable after March 31, 1973, in any event.

It is estimated that the cost of this extension will be between \$120 million and \$220 million during fiscal 1973. Whereas the initial program was financed from general revenues, the extension will be financed by an increase in the Federal unemployment tax during calendar 1973, that is expected to yield \$220 million. By providing adequate financing through a payroll tax for these benefits, the bill is an improvement over the initial legislation. One of the principal reasons I strongly objected to the initial legislation was the potential damage done to

the unemployment insurance program through the use of general revenues which undermined the insurance basis of the program. The principle of unemployment insurance payments payable as a matter of right is grounded on the principle of benefits being related to the wages on the basis of which the payroll tax is imposed. The principle of experience rating—varying an employer's tax burden with the unemployment costs incurred—is an essential part of this insurance system. The use of general revenues completely undermined these insurance principles.

Despite this improvement in the bill, I feel that its extension is a mistake. It represents a return to the practice of dealing with abnormal unemployment on an ad hoc basis, as we did in the late 1950's and early 1960's.

Before we have really had any opportunity to carefully review the permanent extended unemployment benefits program we enacted in 1970, we are piling a temporary third-tier program atop both the basic program and the permanent extended benefits program.

Additionally, this third-tier program triggers in solely on the basis of a State trigger. This means that individuals in a State where unemployment is 6.5 percent are entitled to the additional benefits provided by this program, while unemployed individuals in a State with 6.4 percent unemployment are entitled to no benefits under this program. Despite the fact that both of these individuals are unemployed, and that employers in both States are paying the taxes to finance this program, the employee in the State with one-tenth of 1 percent higher unemployment will qualify, while the employee in the other State will not qualify.

Under the program, 19 States have met the trigger criteria entitling employees in those States to an additional period of benefits up to 13 weeks. Some of these States no longer meet the criteria and with improving economic conditions, few additional States can be expected to qualify. This means that employees nationwide will be paying taxes to finance benefits available only in about 19 States.

This program as extended is wholly financed by the Federal Government through the additional tax imposed on employers. Under the basic program, the States pay the benefit cost, and the Federal Government pays the cost of administration. Under the permanent extended benefit program enacted in 1970, the States and the Federal Government share the benefit costs on a 50-50 basis. I believe that history demonstrates that the program has been served best by this method of sharing the costs.

Furthermore, by financing the additional benefits wholly through an increase in the net Federal unemployment tax, the cost of the program will not be subject to experience rating. The practice of experience rating, or varying the tax imposed on employers with their unemployment experience, is a critical component of the unemployment insurance system that has served our people so well for more than one-third of a century.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this bill con-

tinues a temporary program that, when combined with our permanent unemployment compensation programs, provides benefits for up to an entire year. At some point, an individual's continued unemployment becomes sufficiently remote from his previous employment to make any connection between the two tenuous at best. I realize that the program is a temporary one designed—as the President said in signing the initial measure—"to ease the transition of workers adjusting from the wartime to a peacetime economy." But benefit periods this long will in the final analysis undermine the unemployment insurance program by burdening the program with employment problems bearing too remote a connection to previous employment relationships.

The unemployment insurance program is one of the most successful experiments in Federal-State cooperation in our history. It provides economic security to millions of workers, stabilizes our economy in periods of economic downturn, and is based on sound principles of social insurance. We pay too great a price when we threaten the integrity of this program by asking it to assume responsibilities and carry burdens for which it is not designed.

I am certainly sympathetic to the problems of unemployment that this bill is designed to deal with and recognize that shifts in Federal priorities have been a significant contributing factor in many cases. It may well be that a carefully considered Federal response entirely outside of the Federal-State unemployment insurance program would have been desirable. But this is a stopgap program that simply ameliorates the symptoms without dealing with fundamental causes.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the bill before the House. I agree with the President's statement when he signed the initial legislation that the program is a temporary expedient and not the best or soundest method of helping the unemployed, and should not be viewed as a precedent for future legislation.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENNIS. The fact remains, if I understand the gentleman from Wisconsin, if one does not come from one of these 19 States which qualify under this bill, and he votes for the bill, he will be voting a tax on every employer in his State without benefit to any employee in his State. Is that true?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The benefits will not go to the employees who are unemployed in those particular States that have not met the prescribed criteria. But let me hasten to add that I am not suggesting there is no benefit to the Nation in taking care of people even though they are located in a minority of the States. However, the Federal-State extended unemployment compensation program we enacted in 1970 provides a much better approach than this bill.

Mr. DENNIS. That is another question.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I want to agree with my friend from Wisconsin that the Federal-State extended program is much to be preferred over this very temporary program in that respect. We are calling upon the employers of the Nation to pay for the cost of this extension of the program.

But we did call upon the employers of the Nation under the extended benefit program enacted in 1970 to pay for one-half the cost of the benefits paid in any State that could qualify by meeting the State trigger. So the same philosophy is used here that was used there, except this is a tax on all the employers in the United States of 100 percent of the cost whereas it was 50 percent there.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. There are other distinctions between the two programs in addition to the important one the gentleman has mentioned. The gentleman will admit we do have a national trigger in the Federal-State extended benefits program.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Yes, certainly. Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. So under certain circumstances any employee could be eligible for benefits under that system, no matter what States he comes from.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. That is true. Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. This is not the case under this program.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. No, but this is a much higher trigger.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I understand. I do not believe the gentleman and I are in disagreement as to what is the situation here.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. No.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The part that worries and worried me in December is the general concept of again approaching those problems on an ad hoc basis the way we did in the late 1950's and early 1960's. We thought we had taken care of that problem, Mr. Chairman, when you and I joined worked together for a long time, to develop a system to be triggered into existence when we had long and extended high unemployment.

That was the extended benefit program which we worked out in consultation with the Labor Department, with the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Administrators, and enacted into law in 1970.

We have the regular unemployment program and the extended benefits we enacted in 1970. Now we have a third tier which has not been worked out on the same careful basis as the two existing permanent programs. We are reverting to the ad hoc process of the 1950's and 1960's of responding in a crisis atmosphere which we said at the time we thought was wrong. We should have a permanent system, one on which we focus to carefully meet specific problems on an ongoing basis. That is why I quarrel at this time.

But, as I say, I could with good conscience, vote for this extension, because it is the law and it has been in operation for 6 months. We are not going to design

a new program for the next 6 months. Maybe it is appropriate to continue what we have done, but I do not think so.

However, I can see the rationale of an extension, and I am not going to quarrel with anybody about it.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Yes. Sure. Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I think my friend has said this extension is really better than the program we had in the first 6 months, because this extension does cover all of the basic concepts of financing these kinds of benefits rather than doing it as we did in the first 6 months by financing the benefits initially out of the general fund of the Treasury.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I said that in my opening remarks, that it is an improvement.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Yes, you did. And you did point out that the Department of Labor and the administration recommended it.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The administration does approve this with the change in the financing. But again I would say that that does not necessarily change my basic viewpoint.

Mr. DENNIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENNIS. If the gentleman will yield again for one moment, I, too, do not want to seem to oppose the idea of dealing nationally with a national problem, but I concur with what the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin said earlier about the superiority of the Federal-State extended benefits program enacted in 1970. I think I took the same position he did concerning its comparative advantages over what we are doing now.

I remain of the opinion it is asking a good deal of one who comes from a State which does not qualify to vote to impose additional taxes on all the employers in his State to help everyone with no benefits whatsoever returning to anybody in his own State. That is the only point I was making.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I would add here you can very readily have State A with an assured unemployment of 6.4 percent and they would get no benefit and they would not be triggered in. Maybe, though, State B did happen to have that one-tenth of 1 percent higher percentage of unemployment and therefore all of the employees in that State who become unemployed get an additional 13 weeks of benefits. There is that unfairness that exists under this kind of a system.

Mr. DENNIS. If the gentleman will yield further, I agree with the gentleman that there certainly could be and should be a fairer method to take care of this national problem than we have in this particular measure.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MIZELL. I thank the gentleman. I think he has answered the question.

I have, that a person is no less unemployed if he is unemployed whether he qualifies for special benefits or not, and certainly to tax all the employers to solve the unemployment problem in these 19 States, even if the unemployment would be as high as 6 percent within a State, they would not receive any of the benefits although all of the employers in that State will be taxed.

I certainly think it is unfair to require the employers in all States to pay the cost of this program. The unemployed in States which do not have 6½ percent unemployment will not receive any benefits under this limitation.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments and for yielding to me.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to pass the pending bill, H.R. 15587, which would provide a 6-month extension of the emergency unemployment compensation program. This program pays additional unemployment compensation to workers who have exhausted their Federal or extended unemployment compensation. Under it, an unemployed person can receive additional payments equal in amount to those received under the State's program for up to 13 weeks. Under present law, no one may start receiving payments under the program after June 30, 1972.

The bill under consideration would extend the termination date by 6 months and permit persons to apply for benefits until December 31, 1972. The date when the last payments to qualified persons could be made would be changed from September 30, 1972, to March 31, 1973.

The bill would also modify the method of financing payments made after June 30, 1972. This provision was recommended to the Committee on Ways and Means by the administration. The bill provides that benefits paid under the program for weeks ending after June 30, 1972, be charged directly to the extended unemployment account in the Federal unemployment trust fund and that the Federal unemployment tax rate be increased by 0.08 percent of covered wages with respect to wages paid in calendar year 1973. This tax increase would be for 1 year only and would raise the net Federal tax rate from 0.5 percent to 0.58 percent.

The method of financing the program during the extended period as provided in the bill is in effect the same method used to pay the Federal portion of the cost of the permanent Federal-State extended unemployment compensation program. The cost of the extended benefits program is shared 50-50 by the Federal Government and the States and when the program is triggered into operation in individual States, the employers in all States share in financing the Federal portion of the cost of the program in any State.

Mr. Chairman, the temporary program of emergency unemployment compensation was enacted to meet the problems of

high unemployment which are largely the result of national policies and economic forces. Conditions have improved somewhat since that time, but the problems we faced then although not as serious today are still with us. The adoption of this bill will make it possible for between 300,000 and 400,000 workers who experience lengthy periods of unemployment to participate in the emergency unemployment compensation program through the last half of this year.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Chairman, as a sponsor of the bill before us now, H.R. 15587, and as a Representative from Massachusetts, one of the 19 States which receive benefits under the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1971, I strongly urge my colleagues to extend the provisions of this act for 6 additional months.

On December 15, 1971, the House of Representatives approved the emergency unemployment compensation program. On that occasion, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee described it as:

A short-term program designed to assist workers who are the victims of long-term unemployment due to unusual circumstances.

Since then, two facts have become clear: first, that the program has been enormously successful, providing critically needed benefits worth \$270 million to more than 500,000 unemployed individuals, and second, that the "unusual circumstances" which prompted this program—high unemployment rates and an unusually inflexible labor market—are not only still with us but are even more severe today than they were 6 months ago.

We consider today a bill to continue the emergency unemployment compensation program beyond its June 30 expiration date. This bill extends the program for an additional 6-month period and provides a mechanism for financing the estimated \$220 million cost of the extension. The Ways and Means Committee estimates that as many as 400,000 people would receive unemployment benefits in the 6-month period beginning July 1. Those people who have already received benefits in the first 6 months of the program would not qualify for additional benefits during the extension period.

The Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1971 provides 13 weeks of emergency coverage at an average weekly benefit amount of \$55. No compensation is payable to any individual for any week of unemployment ending after June 30, 1972, unless the individual has already qualified for and received compensation for at least 1 week's unemployment. In this latter case, individuals may continue collecting compensation until September 30. Beyond that date, all benefits cease.

This bill extends each of these dates 6 months, so that benefits for those who qualify would be distributed until December 31, 1972, with an absolute cutoff date of March 31, 1973. Funds for the additional 6-month period would be provided by temporarily raising the Federal unemployment tax in 1973 from 0.5

to 0.58 percent, yielding revenues of \$220 million. The "triggering" provision in the present law which limits benefits to those States with an unemployment rate greater than 6.5 percent, is retained in the extension bill. At present, 18 States and Puerto Rico qualify for benefits.

For almost 2 years the Nation's unemployment rate has stubbornly remained above or near the 6-percent level, and in my own State of Massachusetts the statewide unemployment rate is now approaching a staggering 8 percent. Since the introduction of the emergency unemployment compensation program 6 months ago, neither of these rates has fallen and the latter has actually risen. To allow this program to expire now would make cruel jest of the Federal Government's commitment of emergency aid to the unemployed.

Legislation suited to the needs of the long-term unemployed must be a very high priority of this Congress. I urge my colleagues, in Congressman JIM BURKE's words, to "end unemployment instead of ending unemployment benefits" by voting for passage of H.R. 15587.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Chairman, as cosponsor of legislation to extend the termination date of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act for 6 months, I urge speedy House approval of H.R. 15587. The expiration of the present law would result in severe difficulties for many families of unemployed workers in areas of continued high unemployment.

The language of this legislation is simple, but its impact will be significant. The present law allows registration for emergency benefits until June 30, 1972. The language of H.R. 15587 extends this period for 6 months, to December 31, 1972. Under the act, up to 13 extra weeks of emergency unemployment compensation is made available to unemployed persons in States with an unemployment rate over 6.5 percent.

My State of Connecticut has 8.6 percent of its labor force unemployed. In my district, the unemployment rate in Bristol is 16.1 percent; in Torrington, 11 percent; and in New Britain, 10 percent. Each week, more and more unemployed workers are exhausting their regular and extended unemployment compensation benefits. They cannot find jobs. Soon they will have no benefits either. Congress must pass H.R. 15587 and extend the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act for 6 months.

We should be mindful, however, that passage of this legislation will keep alive only one of the two unemployment compensation programs which will expire in some States, including Connecticut. Presently, some 60,000 people in Connecticut are receiving regular unemployment compensation benefits. Yet, the State is no longer eligible for the Federal-State extended benefits under the Employment Security Amendments of 1970. This law contains a "trigger-off" provision which terminates aid to high unemployment States whose unemployment level falls below 120 percent of the average unemployment rate for the past 2 years. Although Connecticut has an unemployment rate of 8.6 percent, it will be de-

prived of these benefits because the rate falls below this arbitrary 120 percent provision. Although thousands of people remain out of work, they will be unable to receive 13 weeks of extended compensation benefits after their regular benefits are exhausted. Therefore, a necessary complement to the legislation we are considering today must be a bill to waive or eliminate the 120 percent "trigger-off" provision. To achieve this end, I have introduced legislation which, hopefully, will receive early consideration by the Congress.

The unemployed in cities and towns across the Nation look now to the Congress for assistance, and the Congress must provide the unemployment benefits desperately needed by our people who are still without jobs.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Extension of the Emergency Employment Act, H.R. 15587, of which I am a cosponsor. This bill will extend the emergency unemployment compensation program for an additional 6 months and will be financed by a slight increase in the Federal unemployment tax.

When the original legislation was considered last year, we were told that it would be a temporary emergency measure, and the administration assured us that the unemployment rate would go down. In fact, the Nixon administration has failed totally to create an economic climate where a man who wants to work can work.

In the past 6 months, unemployment has not decreased. Nationally, 5.9 percent of the labor force cannot find jobs. In New England, the hardest hit region of the country, unemployment has actually risen in the last year, from 7.5 percent in April 1971, to 8.1 percent in April 1972. Clearly, the temporary emergency has assumed long-range proportions, and shows little sign of improving. Many of the long-term unemployed have already exhausted their rights to emergency unemployment compensation. It is estimated that, unless this legislation is passed, 300,000-400,000 additional unemployed persons will be deprived of access to unemployment compensation. We cannot allow this to happen.

We have been told by the administration officials, once again, that this short extension should be adequate and that unemployment will drop in the last half of 1972. Yet last month, unemployment in Massachusetts jumped three-tenths of 1 percent, adding another 6,900 workers to the unemployment roles. Unless this legislation is passed, they will be left without compensation of any kind once their State eligibility expires. There are the workers we must consider in supporting this bill.

In the long run, however, we can correct the situation only by providing the unemployed with jobs. Therefore, I have introduced H.R. 15649, which extends and broadens the Emergency Employment Act of 1971, to provide public service jobs for the unemployed as long as the unemployment rate remains above 4.5 percent, which it undoubtedly will—at least throughout the remainder of the present administration's term in office.

This bill also increases the amount of funding for the program from \$1 billion in fiscal year 1972 to \$2 billion in fiscal year 1973, and doubles to \$500 million the annual amount appropriated for the special employment assistance program for areas such as New England with over 6 percent unemployment.

We need also to pass economic conversion legislation and to find a better means of stabilizing prices.

While legislating jobs should be our primary goal, the legislative process is often too slow, and emergency action is needed right now to assure continued compensation for those workers who have lost their jobs until new work can be provided. Therefore, it is imperative that the House vote the 6-month extension of emergency unemployment compensation, and then get down to the business of passing laws that will allow our workers to get back to work.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15587, which provides a 4- to 6-month extension of the emergency unemployment compensation program.

As a cosponsor of this vitally needed legislation, I want to commend my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE), for his dedication in shepherding this bill so promptly to the House floor. Unless we act quickly, as many as 400,000 people across the Nation, who will exhaust their unemployment benefit rights during July to December of this year, will be deprived of access to emergency compensation.

The State unemployment rate in Massachusetts is hovering near the 8 percent mark. And in my own congressional district, unemployment in some areas ranges as high as 14 percent. I am sure that these unfortunate statistics can be duplicated in many other sections of the country.

Thus it is imperative that we approve this bill and thereby offer some relief to those suffering from the indignity and frustration of being denied the means of earning their own livelihood.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. Extending the life of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act for 6 months, the bill would mean food on the table and clothes on their backs for hundreds of thousands of American families. That statement may sound tainted by melodramatic exaggeration, Mr. Chairman, but it is not. The Ways and Means Committee estimates that 300,000 to 400,000 idled workers, most of their savings accounts already plundered and many of their assets already sold off, will exhaust their conventional unemployment benefits by the end of the year. They will have nowhere to turn but to the welfare system, now so overburdened that it verges on collapse.

The bill before us today—as you know, Mr. Chairman, I was among its earliest sponsors—would maintain until the end of the year the emergency program offering up to 13 weeks in additional unemployment benefits.

For many families, it would make the difference between financial survival and financial ruin.

I am willing to concede, Mr. Chairman, that the economy now shows a few heart-

ening signs of recovery: for one thing, the unemployment rate's dizzying climb upward appears to have been arrested; and, for another, some economic seers think they have divined the coming of a modest "boomlet" sometime later this year. I want to emphasize, however, that millions of Americans are still jobless. The rate of unemployment in the Springfield-Holyoke-Chicopee metropolitan statistical area, largely within my congressional district, stands at a disquieting 9.2 percent.

The unemployed in my district, like most of the unemployed throughout the United States, are not shirking work.

Indeed, they are searching for it with something akin to desperation.

We in the Congress have a responsibility to extend a helping hand to them by enacting the legislation before us today.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 15587, a measure which extends for 6 months the time periods during which unemployed individuals can receive emergency unemployment compensation payable under the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1971.

On June 12 I introduced a bill, H.R. 15436, which called for this 6-month extension, and it is reassuring that the Ways and Means Committee has acted in time to prevent the expiration of this desperately needed program.

I would, however, like to address myself to one particular provision of the 1971 act that has been carried over in the measure currently under consideration. Under section 202(B)(1) of this act, States eligible to participate in this program are those in which "(1) the rate of unemployment—in the State for the period consisting of such week and the immediately preceding 12 weeks equaled or exceeded 6.5 per centum."

I have been informed today by the Department of Labor that New York State's unemployment rate for April was 6.3 percent and for May the figure was 6.1 percent. Therefore, when the unemployment figures for June are released, if it is found that New York State's unemployment rate is again below 6.5 percent, that State will no longer be eligible to participate in the emergency employment program. And yet over 500,000 people are unemployed in New York State and are sorely in need of financial assistance.

The bill I introduced, H.R. 15436, changed the 6.5 percent figure to read "the national average rate of unemployment for such period." The national unemployment rate for April was 5.5 percent and for May 5.1 percent, according to the information I received from the Department of Labor. Therefore, under my bill, New York State would still be eligible to participate in the emergency unemployment program. It is regrettable that this bill has been brought before the House under a closed rule since no amendments were in order, there was no way in which a change in the 6.5 percent figure could be offered on the floor of the House.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the bill is considered as having been read for amendment.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 202(f) of Public Law 92-224 (relating to termination dates for purposes of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1971) is amended—

(1) by striking out "June 30, 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1972";

(2) by striking out "September 30, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 31, 1973"; and

(3) by striking out "July 1, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1973".

Sec. 2. (a) Section 3301 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to rate of Federal unemployment tax) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In the case of wages paid during the calendar year 1973, the rate of such tax shall be 3.28 percent in lieu of 3.2 percent."

(b) Section 6157(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to payment of Federal unemployment tax on quarterly or other time period basis) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In the case of wages paid in any calendar quarter or other period during 1973, the amount of such wages shall be multiplied by 0.58 percent in lieu of 0.5 percent."

(c) Section 905(b)(1) of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In the case of any month after March 1973 and before April 1974, the first sentence of this paragraph shall be applied by substituting 'thirteen fifty-eighths' for 'one-tenth'."

(d) Section 903(b)(3) of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "No reduction shall be made under this subsection in the amount transferable to the account of any State by reason of emergency compensation paid to any individual for a week of unemployment ending after June 30, 1972."

(e) The second sentence of section 204(b) of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1971 is amended to read as follows: "Amounts appropriated as repayable advances and paid to the States under section 203 shall be repaid, without interest (1) in the case of weeks of unemployment ending before July 1, 1972, as provided in section 903(b)(3) of the Social Security Act, and (2) in the case of weeks of unemployment ending after June 30, 1972, as provided in section 905(d) of such Act."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, no amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall not be subject to amendment.

Are there any committee amendments?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. There are no committee amendments, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee raises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROUSH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 15587) to provide for a 6-month extension of the emergency unemployment compensation program, pursuant to House Resolution 1028, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. MIZELL. 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 275, nays 108, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 243]

YEAS—2

Abourezk	Esch	Mallory
Abzug	Eshleman	Mathias, Calif.
Adams	Evans, Colo.	Matsunaga
Addabbo	Evins, Tenn.	Mazzoli
Alexander	Fish	Meeds
Anderson,	Flood	Melcher
Calif.	Foley	Metcalf
Anderson, Ill.	Forsythe	Mikva
Andrews,	Frelinghuysen	Mills, Ark.
N. Dak.	Frenzel	Minish
Annunzio	Garmatz	Mink
Arendts	Gaydos	Minshall
Ashley	Gialmo	Mitchell
Aspin	Goldwater	Mollohan
Aspinall	Gonzalez	Monagan
Badillo	Grasso	Moorhead
Barrett	Gray	Morgan
Begich	Green, Oreg.	Murphy, Ill.
Bennett	Griffiths	Murphy, N.Y.
Bergland	Gubser	Myers
Biaggi	Gude	Natcher
Blester	Halpern	Nedzi
Bingham	Hamilton	Nelsen
Blatnik	Hanley	Nix
Boland	Hanna	Obeys
Bolling	Hansen, Wash.	O'Hara
Brademas	Harrington	O'Konski
Brasco	Harsha	O'Neill
Brooks	Harvey	Passman
Brotzman	Hathaway	Patman
Brown, Mich.	Hawkins	Patten
Brown, Ohio	Hays	Pelly
Burke, Mass.	Heckler, W. Va.	Perkins
Burlison, Mo.	Heckler, Mass.	Pettis
Burton	Heinz	Peyser
Byrne, Pa.	Helstoski	Pickle
Carey, N.Y.	Hicks, Mass.	Podell
Carlson	Hicks, Wash.	Poff
Carney	Hillis	Preyer, N.C.
Casey, Tex.	Hogan	Price, Ill.
Cederberg	Horton	Pryor, Ark.
Celler	Hosmer	Pucinski
Chamberlain	Howard	Quile
Clancy	Hungate	Randall
Clark	Hunt	Rangel
Clausen,	Hutchinson	Rarick
Don H.	Ichord	Rees
Collier	Jacobs	Reld
Collins, Ill.	Johnson, Calif.	Reuss
Conable	Johnson, Pa.	Rhodes
Conte	Kastenmeyer	Riegle
Conyers	Kazen	Roberts
Corman	Keating	Rodino
Cotter	Keith	Roe
Coughlin	Kemp	Roncallo
Culver	Kluczynski	Rooney, N.Y.
Curlin	Koch	Rooney, Pa.
Daniels, N.J.	Kuykendall	Rosenthal
Danielson	Kyl	Rostenkowski
Davis, Ga.	Kyros	Roush
de la Garza	Leggett	Roussellot
Delaney	Lent	Roy
Dellenback	Link	Roybal
Delums	Lloyd	Ruppe
Denholm	Long, La.	Ryan
Derwinski	Long, Md.	St Germain
Dingell	Lujan	Sarbanes
Donohue	McClary	Saylor
Dorn	McCormack	Scheuer
Dow	McEwen	Schwengel
Drinan	McFall	Seiberling
Dulski	McKay	Shipley
du Pont	McKevitt	Shoup
Dwyer	McKinney	Shriver
Eckhardt	Macdonald,	Sikes
Edmondson	Mass.	Sisk
Edwards, Calif.	Madden	Skubitz
Ellberg	Mailliard	Slack

Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Springer
Staggers
Stanton,
J. William
Stanton,
James V.
Steed
Steele
Steiger, Wis.
Stokes
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan

Symington
Talcott
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Wis.
Tiernan
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Veysey
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Wampler
Ware
Whalen

White
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
Charles H.
Wolf
Wright
Wyatt
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zwach

NAYS—108

Andrews, Ala.
Archer
Ashbrook
Baker
Bevill
Blackburn
Bow
Brinkley
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burleson, Tex.
Byrnes, Wis.
Byron
Camp
Carter
Chappell
Clawson, Del.
Cleveland
Collins, Tex.
Colmer
Conover
Crane
Daniel, Va.
Davis, Wis.
Dennis
Devine
Dickinson
Downing
Duncan
Edwards, Ala.
Fascell
Findley
Fisher
Flowers
Flynt
Fountain

Frey
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gettys
Gibbons
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Haley
Hall
Hammer-
schmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Hastings
Henderson
Hull
Jarman
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
King
Landgrebe
Landrum
Latta
McClure
McCollister
Mahon
Mann
Martin
Mathis, Ga.
Mayne
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Mills, Md.
Mizell
Montgomery

Pike
Poage
Powell
Price, Tex.
Purcell
Quillen
Rallsback
Robinson, Va.
Robison, N.Y.
Rogers
Runnels
Ruth
Sandman
Satterfield
Scherle
Schmitz
Scott
Sebelius
Smith, Calif.
Spence
Steiger, Ariz.
Stephens
Stuckey
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Terry
Thompson, Ga.
Thone
Whalley
Whitehurst
Whitten
Winn
Wydler
Young, Fla.
Zion

NOT VOTING—49

Abbutt
Abernethy
Anderson,
Tenn.
Baring
Belcher
Bell
Betts
Blanton
Boggs
Bray
Broomfield
Burke, Fla.
Cabell
Caffery
Chisholm
Clay
Davis, S.C.

Dent
Diggs
Dowdy
Erlenborn
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford,
William D.
Fraser
Fulton
Gallagher
Green, Pa.
Hagan
Hebert
Hollifield
Jonas
Kath
Kee
Lennon

So the bill was passed.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. Karth with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Bell.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Abbutt with Mr. Pirnie.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
Mr. Davis of South Carolina with Mr. Schneebell.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Teague of California.

Mr. Caffery with Mr. Hagan.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Betts.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. McDade.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Miller of California.
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Nicholas.

Messrs. JARMAN, DICKINSON, and FINDLEY changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MYERS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND AND INCLUDE

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that those Members who spoke on the bill just passed be permitted to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 15692, INTEREST RATE ON SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION DISASTER LOANS

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 1030, Rept. No. 92-1194) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. Res. 1030

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move, clause 27(d) (4) of rule XI to the contrary notwithstanding, that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15692) to amend the Small Business Act to reduce the interest rate on Small Business Administration disaster loans, and all points of order against said bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 979, HIGH-SPEED GROUND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (S. 979) to extend the act of September 30, 1965, as amended by the acts of July 24, 1968, and October 13, 1970, relating to high-speed ground transportation, by removing the termination date thereof, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 92-1195)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 979) to extend the Act of September 30, 1965, as amended by the Acts of July 24, 1968, and October 13, 1970, relating to high-speed ground transportation, by removing the termination date thereof, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

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

That (a) the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes", approved September 30, 1965 (49 U.S.C. 1631), is amended by inserting "and door-to-door ground transportation" immediately after "high-speed ground transportation".

(b) The first sentence of section 2 of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1632) is amended to read as follows: "The Secretary is authorized to contract for demonstrations to determine the contributions that high-speed ground transportation and door-to-door ground transportation could make to more efficient, safe, and economical intercity transportation systems."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 8(a) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1638(a)) is amended by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively, and by inserting immediately after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

(2) In awarding contracts in connection with research and development and demonstration projects under this Act, the Secretary shall give priority to proposals which will increase employment in labor areas (as those areas are described by the Secretary of Labor in title 41 of the Code of Federal Regulations)—

"(A) which are experiencing a rate of unemployment of 9 per centum or more of the area's work force, or a rate of unemployment of 150 per centum or more of the federally determined unemployment rate for the entire United States; or

"(B) which have experienced a 1 per centum increase in unemployment, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, of the available work force as a result of the termination or reduction of a federally financed or supported program and such increase in unemployment continues to exist.

Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to require that any contract awarded under this Act must be wholly performed in any one labor area."

(b) Paragraph (3), as so redesignated by

subsection (a) of this section, is amended to read as follows:

"(3) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, the private agencies, institutions, organizations, corporations, and individuals with which the Secretary enters into agreements or contracts to carry out research and development under this Act shall, to the maximum extent practicable, be geographically distributed throughout the United States."

SEC. 3. The first sentence of section 11 of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1641) is amended by striking out "and" and by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: "\$97,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; \$126,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; and \$92,900,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975."

SEC. 4. Section 12 of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1642) is repealed.

SEC. 5. (a) Section 504(a) (3) of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 1234(a) (3)) is amended by striking out "fifteen years after the date thereof" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-five years after the date thereof".

(b) Section 505 of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 1235) is amended by inserting immediately after "renewal or extension of any such guaranty" the following: "for any period of time not exceeding twenty-five years from the date of the original guaranty".

SEC. 6. Part V of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 1231 et seq.) is amended by renumbering section 510 as section 511 and by inserting immediately after section 509 the following new section:

"AUDIT BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL

"SEC. 510. (a) In any case in which—

"(1) there is outstanding any guaranty by the Commission made under this part; or

"(2) the Secretary of the Treasury is required to make any payment as a consequence of any guaranty by the Commission made under this part;

the financial transactions of the common carrier by railroad subject to this Act with respect to which such guaranty was made may be audited by the Comptroller General of the United States under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe. The representatives of the Comptroller General shall have access to all books, accounts, records, reports, files, and other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by such common carrier by railroad pertaining to its financial transactions and necessary to facilitate the audit, and such representatives shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians.

"(b) A report of each such audit shall be made by the Comptroller General to the Congress. The report to the Congress shall contain such comments and information as the Comptroller General may deem necessary to inform the Congress of the financial operations and condition of the common carrier by railroad involved in such audit, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as he may deem advisable. The report shall also show specifically any program, expenditure, or other financial transaction or undertaking observed in the course of the audit, which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, adversely affects the financial operations or condition of the common carrier by railroad involved in such audit or lessens the protection afforded the United States at the time the original guaranty was made. A copy of each report shall be furnished to the Commission at the time it is submitted to the Congress."

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagree-

ment to the amendment of the House to the title of the Senate bill and agree to the same.

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
JOHN JARMAN,
JOHN M. MURPHY,
SAMUEL L. DEVINE,
JAMES HARVEY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
VANCE HARTKE,
FRANK E. MOSS,
J. GLENN BEALL, Jr.,
L. P. WEICKER, Jr.,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 979) to extend the Act of September 30, 1965, as amended by the Acts of July 24, 1968, and October 13, 1970, relating to high-speed ground transportation, by removing the termination date thereof, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

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

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

The differences between the text of the Senate bill, the House amendment thereto, and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below.

DOOR-TO-DOOR GROUND TRANSPORTATION

Senate bill

No provision.

House amendment

The first section of the House amendment amended the first section of existing law (the High Speed Ground Transportation Act) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to undertake research and development in door-to-door ground transportation as well as high-speed ground transportation. This section of the House amendment also amended section 2 of existing law to authorize the Secretary to contract for demonstrations to determine the contributions that door-to-door ground transportation could make to more efficient, safe, and economical intercity transportation systems.

Conference substitute

The conference substitute is the same as the House amendment.

LABOR SURPLUS AMENDMENTS

Senate bill

The Senate bill amended section 8(a) of existing law by adding a new paragraph requiring that the Secretary of Transportation, in "considering proposals or applications for" research and development and demonstration projects, must give "highest priority to those proposals or applications" which will "substantially" increase employment in labor areas with a high unemployment rate. These labor areas are described by the Secretary of Labor in title 41 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Eligible areas would include—

(1) areas experiencing a rate of unemployment of 9 percent or more of the area's work force, or a rate of unemployment of 150 percent or more of the federally determined unemployment rate for the entire United States; or

(2) areas which have experienced a 1 percent increase in unemployment (as determined by the Secretary of Labor) of the available work force as the result of the termination of a federally financed or supported program and such increase in unemployment continues to exist.

The Senate bill also provided that, in the event two or more entities from the same labor area were in competition for assistance, priority must be given to the proposal or application deemed by the Secretary to have the greatest potential impact in reducing the amount of unemployment in such area.

House amendment

Section 2 of the House amendment also amended section 8(a) of existing law by adding a new paragraph requiring that the Secretary, in "awarding contracts for the design or manufacture of equipment, or for the construction of facilities, in connection with" research and development and demonstration projects, must give "consideration to proposed contracts" which will increase employment in labor areas with a high unemployment rate. Eligible areas would be the same as those described under the discussion of the Senate bill above, except that areas which have experienced a 1 percent increase in unemployment as the result of the reduction of a federally financed or supported program as well as the termination of such a program would be eligible. The House amendment also provided that nothing therein should be construed to require that any contract awarded by the Secretary must be wholly performed in any one labor area.

Conference substitute

The conference substitute provides that, in "awarding contracts in connection with" research and development and demonstration projects, the Secretary must give "priority to proposals" which will increase employment in labor areas with a high unemployment rate. Eligible areas are the same as those described in the House amendment. The conference substitute, like the House amendment, also provides that nothing in the new paragraph added to section 8(a) of existing law shall be construed to require that any contract awarded by the Secretary must be wholly performed in any one labor area.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Senate bill

The Senate bill amended section 11 of existing law to eliminate the periodic authorization of appropriations and the specific dollar limitations for each fiscal year.

House amendment

Section 3 of the House amendment amended section 11 of existing law to authorize the appropriation of \$97 million for the fiscal year 1973; \$126 million for the fiscal year 1974; and \$92.2 million for the fiscal year 1975.

Conference substitute

The conference substitute is the same as the House amendment, except that the authorization for fiscal year 1975 is increased from \$92.2 million to \$92.9 million.

EXTENSION OF RAILROAD LOAN GUARANTEES

Senate bill

No provision.

House amendment

Section 5 of the House amendment amended section 504(a) (3) of the Interstate Commerce Act to extend from 15 to 25 years the maximum period for repayment of loans to railroads guaranteed under part V of that Act. This section of the House amendment also provided that any such loan guarantee

could be extended for any period of time not to exceed 25 years from the date of the original guarantee.

Conference substitute

The conference substitute is the same as the House amendment.

The conference committee considered adding a number of "safeguards" or limitations to the amendments to part V of the Interstate Commerce Act similar to some of the limitations imposed by Congress in section 3 of the Emergency Rail Services Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-663). It was argued, however, that the conference committee might not have jurisdiction to entertain such amendments. The conference committee also acknowledged the fact that any changes in part V would, of course, affect existing relationships and that any protection afforded the public and the Government by additional "safeguards" would be minimal. For these reasons the conference substitute added no new limitations. The conference committee, however, is desirous of insuring that Federal assistance is used for the purpose for which it was conceived. Of specific concern is the practice by some carriers of investing in nontransportation ventures while the transportation plant, so very important to the interests of the public, is allowed to deteriorate. This practice is particularly intolerable when engaged in by a carrier while it is enjoying Federal aid. That situation must not occur. The Senate and House Commerce Committees are both vitally concerned about the potential abuse inherent in some financial aid programs. Accordingly, both committees will review various proposals and will take whatever action seems to be appropriate.

AUDIT BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL

Senate bill

No provision.

House amendment

Section 6 of the House amendment added a new section 510 to part V of the Interstate Commerce Act to permit the Comptroller General to audit financial transactions of any railroad with respect to which a guarantee was made under such part. The audit could be made in any case in which the guarantee was still outstanding or any payment was required to be made under such guarantee. Representatives of the Comptroller General were given access to all books and other papers of the railroad necessary to facilitate the audit. The new section 510 also required the Comptroller General to report to the Congress, with respect to each audit, information deemed necessary by him to inform the Congress of the financial operations and condition of the railroad, together with any recommendations he may deem advisable. The report was also required to show any expenditure or other financial transaction which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, adversely affected the financial operations or condition of the railroad or lessened the protection afforded the United States at the time the original guarantee was made. A copy of each such report was required to be furnished to the Interstate Commerce Commission at the same time it was submitted to the Congress.

Conference substitute

The conference substitute is the same as the House amendment.

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,

JOHN JARMAN,

JOHN M. MURPHY,

SAMUEL L. DEVINE,

JAMES HARVEY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,

VANCE HARTKE,

FRANK E. MOSS,

J. GLENN BEALL, Jr.,

L. P. WEICKER, Jr.,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the acting majority leader why we would come in early, and if by so doing he proposes, or with the concurrence of the leadership proposes, that we would not then meet on Friday?

Mr. O'NEILL. No; there is no proposal whatsoever of that type. We expect to meet on Friday. There is legislation pending that will take us through Friday. We do have so much legislation, the agricultural bill which is scheduled for tomorrow, the predatory animal bill and the flood loan bill and other conference reports which will give us a full schedule for 2 days.

Mr. HALL. Just about anything, Mr. Speaker, that we can dredge up in order to force through under pressure of adjournment. Is that what the gentleman is saying?

Mr. O'NEILL. No; I do not mean it in that light whatsoever. I just think we have a full program.

Mr. HALL. Does the distinguished gentleman know, Mr. Speaker, if there are any committees that have witnesses who have been subpoenaed or who have traveled the length of the country—at their own expense, perhaps—in order to be present in the morning?

Mr. O'NEILL. We have talked to many of the chairmen and we have had no complaints.

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

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

Mr. ARENDS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman in a position to advise the House as to what the first item on the program will be tomorrow?

Mr. O'NEILL. The agriculture appropriation bill will be the first item on the agenda.

Mr. ARENDS. I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to point out that the Mining Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has been making a major effort for a number of months to try to report a very important piece of legislation controlling the coal mining industry in the United States and stopping the practice of failing to reclaim lands that are stripped in this country, and we have scheduled an important meeting tomorrow in which it is our hope to report that bill out. It is scheduled for the morning and has been noticed to all Members for the morning. I believe the gentleman's decision to come in early is going to make it impossible to bring that important bill out at the present time.

The SPEAKER. Would the gentleman ask unanimous consent that the committee to which he referred might meet

during general debate tomorrow? The Chair points out that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has permission already under the rules to meet during general debate. Does that solve the problem?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Our problem is getting Members at the meeting to move the bill. It is a serious problem. I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. GUBSER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I noticed that the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, in listing the bills on the program for tomorrow, did not mention the cyclamate bill. Could the gentleman inform the House as to when it is contemplated that that bill will be scheduled?

Mr. O'NEILL. I understand that that is one of the bills contemplated for consideration tomorrow.

Mr. GUBSER. For tomorrow?

Mr. O'NEILL. Yes.

Mr. GUBSER. Would the gentleman be kind enough to repeat the order in which he now contemplates the bills will be considered?

Mr. O'NEILL. I know the first bill that will come up will be the Agriculture Appropriation bill, and that will take quite some time. There will be conference reports and other scheduled bills. The cyclamate bill is scheduled to come up, and the predator bill.

Mr. GUBSER. Would the cyclamate bill be called up before or after the predator bill?

Mr. O'NEILL. That is something I could not answer.

Mr. GUBSER. That remains to be seen. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

SCHOOL TAX EQUALIZATION ACT OF 1972

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the School Tax Equalization Act of 1972—a bill I hope will help solve the school finance riddle posed by recent court decisions holding that States cannot continue to use the present system of local property taxation to finance elementary and secondary education.

Here are the school finance facts that form the backdrop for our riddle:

Of the \$47 billion spent for schools last year, 52 percent was from local taxes, \$24 billion, 41 percent was from State taxes, \$19 billion, and 7 percent was from Federal taxes, \$4 billion.

Of the \$24 billion in local spending for schools, 88 percent, \$21 billion, came from the property tax.

A recent public opinion survey conducted for the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations shows that the property tax is $2\frac{1}{2}$ times more unpopular than the Federal income tax and $3\frac{1}{2}$ times more unpopular than State sales taxes.

The purpose of the bill I am introducing today is to furnish financial assistance to the States to assure that their re-

sources—when supplemented by this Federal assistance—will be adequate to:

Improve and equalize the quality of elementary and secondary education throughout each State; and

Permit a reduction in the use of local property taxes for the purpose of financing elementary and secondary education.

Mr. Speaker, this bill spells out two formulas to achieve its aims and, in so doing, offers significantly more help than existing Federal programs to States that are taxing themselves heavily to meet their own needs.

The first formula advances the principle that the quality of a child's education should not depend on the accident of his birth in one community instead of another. Under this formula, in 1973 each State would receive anywhere from \$47 to \$100 per school-age child, depending on how it compares with other States on three counts: Per capita income, total tax collections as a percentage of personal income, and income taxes as a percentage of total tax collections. These three recognition factors will give greater fiscal relief to States like Delaware, Maryland, New York, Hawaii, Wisconsin, North Carolina, Alaska, Vermont, Minnesota, Oregon, Kentucky, and others whose total tax effort as a percentage of personal income is extremely high. It will also reward States that have progressive tax structures and penalize States that do not.

The second formula encourages States to pick up a larger share of education costs to permit reduction of local school property taxes. Under this formula, each State in 1975 would receive anywhere from \$2 to \$25 per school-age child, depending on how much of the school finance burden it removes from the local property tax.

The bill requires States to file a plan showing that they will distribute these funds in a way that is inversely related to the wealth of the local district—in effect, boosting the assessed valuation that backs each school-age child.

Distributing the funds this way means striving for equity on the premise that parents in the Wisconsin community of Ashland, for example, should not have to tax themselves at twice the rate that applies in well-to-do areas of the State in order to provide the same level of education for their kids.

And it will mean a significant reduction in property taxes in the poorer areas of a State.

When fully operational in 1975, estimates for the School Tax Equalization Act based on currently available data show that Wisconsin and North Carolina would tie for fifth in total grant entitlement per school-age child, ranking behind Delaware, Maryland, New York, and Hawaii—contrasting sharply with other Federal aid programs which place Wisconsin at or near the bottom.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to make these points in further explanation of the School Tax Equalization Act:

This bill differs from others of its kind that tie how much a State would receive to what it is spending now. The trouble with doing it that way is that it builds in a bias in favor of wealthier States that can afford to spend more on education.

This bill also does not make the assumption that is made in some quarters that exact equality in per pupil expenditures, guarantees equal education, because education costs vary in different kinds of communities. Instead, this plan is geared to the economic needs of each school district, and to recognition of tax effort and the fairness of the tax structure a State employs to finance its schools.

This bill incorporates several proposals contained in recent reports by the President's Commission on School Finance, the national education finance project, and other studies of school financing issues: It increases the Federal share of financial support for elementary and secondary schools; it provides an incentive to shift more of the burden for financing education from localities to State governments; it encourages greater reliance on more progressive taxes for the support of public education, thereby reducing the reliance on local property taxes; and it will reduce the inequality in spending among school districts within a State.

This bill by itself is certainly not the whole answer. It needs to be tied to a rewriting next year of special education and other title I programs for the disadvantaged to concentrate them where they are most needed. It also needs to be tied to a loophole-closing, revenue-raising

tax reform measure like that of the gentleman from California (Mr. CORMAN) or the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) to pay for the program.

This legislation was drafted over a period of 6 months and after consultation with a number of experts in the field of education finance—including some at the Brookings Institution, Wisconsin's Department of Public Instruction, and the Urban League—and while I emphasize that none of them has in any way endorsed this proposal, I want to extend them my appreciation for their comments and suggestions. I intend to circulate this proposal as widely as possible for further study and criticism, and will invite other Members of the House to join me in sponsoring it.

Mr. Speaker, here are details of the formulas and amounts involved.

Basic assistance grant—formula No. 1—A State's entitlement equals the adjusted basic assistance amount times the number of children aged 5 to 17 living in the State. The adjusted basic assistance amount is calculated by giving equal weight—one-third—to how a State compares with other States on each of three counts: Per capita income, total tax collections as a percentage of personal income, and income taxes as a percentage of total tax collections.

The basic assistance amount starts at

\$75 in fiscal 1973 and rises \$25 a year until it reaches \$200 in fiscal 1978. Basic assistance grants would total \$3.8 billion in fiscal 1973, \$5.1 billion in 1974, and \$6.3 billion in 1975.

Incentive assistance grant—formula No. 2—A State's entitlement equals the adjusted incentive assistance amount times its school-age population as defined above. The adjusted incentive assistance amount equals the ratio of State revenue made available to public schools—as a percentage of total State and local revenue made available to public schools—to 75 percent. In other words, the incentive assistance amount rises as the local revenue share shrinks to 25 percent of the total State and local revenue made available to public schools.

The incentive assistance amount starts at \$25 in fiscal 1975 and rises by \$25 a year until it reaches \$100 in fiscal 1978. Incentive assistance grants would total \$790.4 million in fiscal 1975.

In fiscal 1975, when the bill was fully operational, basic assistance and incentive grants would total \$7.1 billion.

Finally, I include a set of tables listing the States and their estimated grant entitlements alphabetically, and ranking them according to type of grant and total grants.

The material follows:

TABLE 1.—SCHOOL TAX EQUALIZATION ACT: ESTIMATES OF STATE ENTITLEMENTS¹ (IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER) FISCAL YEARS 1973-75

(In thousands of dollars)

State	Basic assistance grant		Fiscal year 1975		
	Fiscal year 1973	Fiscal year 1974	Basic assistance grant	Incentive grant	Total grant
Alabama	\$69,749	\$92,993	\$116,246	\$23,225	\$139,471
Alaska	7,640	10,187	12,734	2,200	14,934
Arizona	34,462	45,953	57,434	7,573	65,007
Arkansas	38,139	50,851	63,563	9,197	72,760
California	369,345	492,477	615,608	61,541	677,149
Colorado	45,086	60,120	75,149	6,026	81,175
Connecticut	42,588	56,786	70,984	6,105	77,089
Delaware	14,397	19,196	23,994	3,688	27,682
Florida	78,018	104,035	130,051	32,092	162,143
Georgia	96,222	128,292	160,362	23,970	184,332
Hawaii	18,595	24,795	30,992	5,075	36,067
Idaho	16,586	22,116	27,647	2,990	30,637
Illinois	189,041	252,045	315,078	36,214	351,292
Indiana	90,628	120,842	151,069	15,969	167,038
Iowa	52,026	69,363	86,714	6,050	92,774
Kansas	37,440	49,924	62,402	6,100	68,502
Kentucky	73,433	97,919	122,396	17,909	140,305
Louisiana	69,707	92,943	116,168	22,480	138,648
Maine	17,467	23,290	29,110	2,972	32,082
Maryland	103,786	138,391	172,986	16,032	189,018
Massachusetts	122,500	163,338	204,176	10,612	214,788
Michigan	188,258	251,011	313,764	37,530	351,294
Minnesota	94,088	125,447	156,816	19,874	176,690
Mississippi	49,944	66,596	83,241	14,185	97,426
Missouri	77,953	103,929	129,905	15,160	145,065
Montana	16,049	21,399	26,746	1,693	28,439
Nebraska	24,590	32,787	40,987	2,379	43,366
Nevada	\$5,932	\$7,908	\$9,886	\$1,867	\$11,753
New Hampshire	9,535	12,714	15,894	372	16,266
New Jersey	93,600	124,801	156,019	15,707	171,726
New Mexico	23,315	31,086	38,860	7,700	46,560
New York	424,274	565,669	707,109	72,278	779,387
North Carolina	117,213	156,288	195,350	32,925	228,275
North Dakota	12,780	17,040	21,301	1,862	23,163
Ohio	152,225	202,958	253,719	30,361	284,080
Oklahoma	41,851	55,801	69,751	9,746	79,497
Oregon	51,242	68,330	85,407	3,681	89,088
Pennsylvania	226,378	301,867	377,326	49,686	427,012
Rhode Island	14,551	19,401	24,251	3,010	27,261
South Carolina	59,950	79,327	99,918	16,411	116,329
South Dakota	11,225	14,967	18,710	1,079	19,789
Tennessee	62,205	82,334	103,672	17,385	121,057
Texas	144,224	192,298	240,373	52,315	292,688
Utah	26,351	35,133	43,913	5,996	49,909
Vermont	11,083	14,775	18,472	1,360	19,832
Virginia	97,565	130,083	162,601	15,234	177,835
Washington	43,724	58,301	72,887	16,118	89,005
West Virginia	29,889	39,851	49,808	8,369	58,177
Wisconsin	116,789	155,719	194,649	13,012	207,661
Wyoming	5,118	6,824	8,529	1,021	9,550
District of Columbia	13,011	17,350	21,685	4,075	25,760
Total ²	3,831,767	5,109,051	6,386,412	790,421	7,176,833

¹ Estimates based on currently available data for school-age population, per capita income, tax collections and other factors. The actual entitlement for a State could differ from these estimates due to changes over time in 1 or more of the factors affecting the entitlement levels for each State.

² In addition, grants are authorized for Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

TABLE 2.—SCHOOL TAX EQUALIZATION ACT: GRANT ENTITLEMENT PER SCHOOL-AGE CHILD¹ RANKING OF STATES BY GRANT AMOUNT

BASIC GRANT	Fiscal year—		
	1973	1974	1975
1. Maryland	\$100.47	\$133.97	\$167.46
2. New York	98.03	130.70	163.38
3. Wisconsin	97.65	130.20	162.75
4. Delaware	97.28	129.70	162.12
5. Oregon	96.32	128.44	160.54
6. Vermont	94.73	126.29	157.88
7. Hawaii	91.60	122.14	152.67
8. Minnesota	89.95	119.93	149.92
9. North Carolina	\$89.00	\$118.67	\$148.33
10. Massachusetts	87.50	116.67	145.84
11. Kentucky	87.42	116.57	145.71
12. Alaska	86.82	115.77	144.70
13. Utah	84.73	112.97	141.20
14. Idaho	83.77	111.70	139.63
15. South Carolina	83.73	111.63	139.55
16. Montana	82.30	109.74	137.16
17. Virginia	81.85	109.13	136.41
18. Washington, D.C.	79.82	106.44	133.04
19. Mississippi	79.15	105.54	131.92
20. Georgia	79.00	105.33	131.66
21. Pennsylvania	77.82	103.77	129.71
22. Michigan	77.25	103.00	128.75
23. Colorado	\$77.07	\$102.77	\$128.46
24. Arkansas	77.05	102.73	128.41
25. New Mexico	75.70	100.93	126.17
26. Alabama	75.08	100.10	125.13
27. California	74.30	99.07	123.84
28. North Dakota	73.45	97.93	122.42
29. U.S. average	73.31	97.75	122.19
30. Arizona	71.35	95.14	118.91
31. Iowa	70.40	93.86	117.34
32. West Virginia	67.93	90.57	113.20
33. Maine	67.70	90.27	112.83
34. Louisiana	67.35	89.80	112.24
35. Illinois	66.40	88.53	110.67
36. Missouri	66.23	88.30	110.37

Footnote at end of table.

	Fiscal year—		
	1973	1974	1975
36. Kansas	\$65.80	\$87.74	\$109.67
37. Indiana	65.72	87.63	109.55
38. Oklahoma	65.70	87.60	109.50
39. Rhode Island	65.25	87.00	108.75
40. Nebraska	63.87	85.16	106.46
41. Tennessee	62.33	83.10	103.88
42. South Dakota	60.35	80.47	100.59
43. Connecticut	55.67	74.23	92.79
44. Wyoming	54.23	72.33	90.42
45. Ohio	52.32	69.76	87.21
46. New Jersey	50.72	67.63	84.54
47. New Hampshire	49.97	66.63	83.30
48. Washington	48.67	64.90	81.13
49. Florida	48.30	64.40	80.50
50. Texas	47.08	62.76	78.46
51. Nevada			

¹ Estimates based on currently available data for school-age population, per capita income, tax collections, and other factors. Actual grant entitlements for a State could differ from these estimates due to changes over time in one or more of the factors affecting the entitlement levels for each State.

State entitlement under incentive grants—to begin fiscal 1975

[Fiscal year 1975, per pupil]

Alabama	\$25.00
Alaska	25.00
Hawaii	25.00
New Mexico	25.00
North Carolina	25.00
Washington, D.C.	25.00
Delaware	24.92
South Carolina	22.92
Mississippi	22.48
Louisiana	21.72
Kentucky	21.32
Florida	20.02
Georgia	19.68
Utah	19.28
West Virginia	19.02
Minnesota	19.00
Arkansas	18.58
Washington	18.42
Texas	17.52
Tennessee	17.42
Pennsylvania	17.08
New York	16.70
Arizona	15.68
Maryland	15.52
Michigan	15.40
Oklahoma	15.30
U.S. average	15.12
Idaho	15.10
Nevada	14.82
Rhode Island	13.50
Missouri	12.88
Virginia	12.78
Illinois	12.72
California	12.38
Vermont	11.62
Indiana	11.58
Maine	11.52
Wyoming	11.10
Wisconsin	10.88
Ohio	10.82
Kansas	10.72
North Dakota	10.70
Colorado	10.30
New Jersey	8.78
Montana	8.68
Iowa	8.20
Connecticut	7.98
Massachusetts	7.58
Oregon	6.92
Nebraska	6.18
South Dakota	5.80
South Dakota	5.80
New Hampshire	1.98

Total grant to each State under Obey School Tax Equalization Act—basic grant and incentive grant combined

[Fiscal year 1975 per pupil]

Delaware	\$187.04
Maryland	182.98
New York	180.08
Hawaii	177.67
Wisconsin	173.63
North Carolina	173.33

Alaska	\$169.70
Vermont	169.50
Minnesota	168.92
Oregon	167.46
Kentucky	167.03
South Carolina	162.47
Utah	160.48
Washington, D.C.	158.04
Idaho	154.73
Mississippi	154.40
Massachusetts	153.42
Georgia	151.34
New Mexico	151.17
Alabama	150.13
Virginia	149.19
Arkansas	146.99
Pennsylvania	146.79
Montana	145.84
Michigan	144.15
Colorado	138.76

U.S. average 137.31

California	136.22
Arizona	134.59
Louisiana	133.96
North Dakota	133.12
West Virginia	132.22
Iowa	125.54
Oklahoma	124.80
Maine	124.35
Illinois	123.39
Missouri	123.25
Rhode Island	122.25
Tennessee	121.30
Indiana	121.13
Kansas	120.39
Nebraska	112.64
South Dakota	106.39
Wyoming	103.81
Washington	101.72
Ohio	101.24
Florida	101.15
Connecticut	100.77
Texas	98.02
New Jersey	95.99
Nevada	93.28
New Hampshire	86.52

SIDNEY BICENTENNIAL (1772-1972)

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

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, next week as our Nation celebrates its 196th birthday, the thriving village of Sidney in the heartland of New York State will observe the 200th anniversary of its founding in 1772.

The Rev. William Johnston, that omnipresent explorer of upstate New York in the colonial period, discovered this unusually beautiful area near the Susquehanna River in that year in the company of the Indian guide Joseph Brant. Early in 1773, Rev. Johnston settled here with his family, being the first settler in the Susquehanna Valley within the limits of the State.

Just before the War of Revolution a critical meeting took place at Sidney between Gen. Nicholas Herkimer, the Rev. Johnston, and a band of Iroquois. The belligerent attitude of the Indians led Johnston and others sympathetic to the continental cause to leave the area.

During the early years of the revolution the Indian castles just northeast of Sidney were the gathering place for Tories and Indians bent on destruction of frontier patriot settlements. In October 1778 an American force destroyed the Indian villages.

Herkimer, who had tried unsuccessfully to avert raids on the Mohawk Valley by his meeting with the Indian Joseph Brant at the confluence of the Unadilla and Susquehanna Rivers, in 1777 returned northward only to meet his death at the hands of Brant's warriors at the Battle of Oriskany.

After the war many returned to their farms and the local economy flourished with the completion of a road from Sidney to the Hudson River in 1790-91.

Sidney, located 30 miles northeast of Binghamton, was named in honor of the British Admiral Sir Sidney Smith who fought successfully against the French forces in Asia Minor in the late 18th century.

Today, 200 years young, Sidney is a sparkling village of almost 5,000, known throughout the aviation industry for its quality magnetos manufactured there by the Bendix Aviation Co.

As Mayor Charles McCarty, educator Howard Dunbar, industrialist Samuel Nader, and other leading citizens signal the beginning of Sidney's bicentennial July 1, let this House join in a common prayer for the security and future well-being of this typical American village whose contributions to the stability of our democratic system have spanned two centuries.

A REPUBLICAN FINANCIAL EMERGENCY

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, no one likes an emergency—particularly a financial emergency. But I will say that when the Republicans have a financial emergency, it is cause for drastic action.

Such an emergency is now upon us. This week, my distinguished colleague from California, Mr. WILSON, sent a telegram to a number of Republican fat cats in an effort to raise \$750,000 to cover this week's emergency TV film costs for the National Republican Congressional Committee.

Mr. Speaker, \$750,000 is a lot of money for a single week's budget. At least it is a lot of money to a Democrat; \$750,000 is more than the budget of the National Democratic Congressional Committee for the entire year.

No wonder there is cause for an emergency telegram.

To raise this money, the Republicans are asking their friends to give up buying a new suit or a new car this year.

Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to learn that there are some people who can still buy a new car—or even a new suit—after 3½ years of President Nixon's economic policies.

It takes a lot of nerve to send out a telegram like that after you have thrown more than 5 million people out of jobs.

It takes a lot of nerve to ask people to give up buying a new suit this year when millions of others had to give up a new suit last year—and the year before that.

I am inserting the full text of this remarkable telegram into the RECORD. I think my Democrat colleagues will find it amazing and amusing:

TELEGRAM

JUNE 15, 1972.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Washington, D.C.:

Emergency TV film costs referred to in my last letter not yet covered. I am grateful for your past contributions to Congressional Committee but must ask again.

Consider importance of a Republican Congress to your future, your family, your income. Democrats admit planning big tax increase if they win this year.

435 Republican candidates for Congress counting on you, your friends, your neighbors, your associates, your family—for campaign money needed for electing Republican majority. Elections now too close for comfort.

Your contributions work harder here because we provide services at low cost in addition to money for campaigns. Again I ask what can you afford for good government? The cost of a new suit or dress? The cost of a new car? A big win for Republicans this year could mean much more than that to you and yours.

Would prefer asking other than our committed and wonderful old friends to answer these emergency needs for quick cash. You know story. There are no others—forced to depend on you.

Radical liberal organizations are putting all they have behind plan to elect even more liberal Democrat Congress in November. Cannot match that big money but believe can win bare majority in Congress in 1972 even on tight budget.

Will require sacrifice for everyone if we hold our own, more if we are to win. Need at least 20 \$5,000 checks, 100 \$1,000 checks, 200 for \$500, 1,000 at \$100, 2,000 at \$50, 4,000 for \$25, plus balance under \$25—to meet emergency needs budget of \$750,000 I must meet this week. Can I count on you again? Personal regards.

BOB WILSON,

Member of Congress and Chairman, National Republican Congressional Commission, House of Representatives, Box 2837, Washington, D.C.

Address:

FDA ACTS RESPONSIBLY

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

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, the Food and Drug Administration is now proceeding in a most responsible manner in its decision to hold hearings on the animal drug diethylstilbestrol, better known as DES. This is a synthetic hormone used as a feed additive to stimulate more rapid weight gain in cattle and sheep. It also increases the ratio of protein to fat, resulting in more nutritious meat. The problem prompting these hearings is that DES is also a carcinogen. And the Delaney clause of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act forbids the use of a carcinogen if any residue at all is found in a finished food product. In order to eliminate the possibility of DES residue in meat—such residue only occurs in the liver—the Department of Agriculture and the Food and Drug Administration have instituted strict controls, such as the withdrawal of the drug 7 days before the animal is marketed.

Due to findings of some DES residue despite the controls, proposals have been made to ban the use of DES altogether. However, if Americans are to continue to receive a plentiful and nutritious meat supply, it is imperative that every avenue of progress be kept open. The decision by

the FDA to seek a public hearing to fairly consider all pertinent facts and regulatory alternatives is a logical beginning from which to proceed.

The level of residue in tissue in the 39 cases cited this year has been approximately two parts per billion. This evidence is a basis for concern and further action, it is not a basis for public hysteria. One important reason for the increase in the number of specimens of residue-bearing liver is that inspectors are now using much more powerful measuring devices. They are checking at levels which were unheard of when the original law was enacted. In light of these technological improvements, the Delaney clause has become an unreasonable restraint in all areas of nutrition research. I have introduced legislation which will modify and modernize the Delaney amendment. The bill (H.R. 15545) will allow the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to set a tolerance level for a carcinogen if he is convinced by reliable scientific evidence that such amount would not cause cancer in man. I urge support for this legislation and for the FDA in its careful and responsible action on the DES issue.

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

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, this morning the House Judiciary Committee had the privilege of hearing the Honorable Richard J. Daley, mayor of the city of Chicago, testifying on behalf of the Council of Mayors with reference to gun control.

I have asked for permission to insert his statement as a part of the RECORD so that all my colleagues may see it.

At that same hearing a coalition of some 50 or 60 different organizations issued a statement in support of gun control and I insert their statement. I should like to also insert in the RECORD a brilliant article—the first of a series—written by the Chicago Tribune on the very important subject of gun control which confronts the country. The series sets forth the parameters of the problem in an outstanding and objective manner.

The material referred to follows:

TESTIMONY OF MAYOR RICHARD J. DALEY BEFORE THE HOUSE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 28, 1972

I thank the House Judiciary Subcommittee for this opportunity to testify on behalf of the U.S. Conference of Mayors in support of its gun resolution and House Bill 2334 restricting the availability of handguns. I know that there are a number of bills pending before this committee with similar objectives. Certainly I will support any bill which has as its goal the control of handguns.

I strongly support the position of the U.S. Conference of Mayors which urges national legislation against the manufacture, importation, sale and private possession of handguns except for the use by law enforcement personnel, military and sportsmen clubs. As far as I'm concerned the only purpose of a handgun in unauthorized hands is to kill.

I do not feel that it is necessary to present to this committee a long recitation of the violence done by handguns. These statistics have filled the journals of committees for at least the past ten years. Perhaps instead of statistics we should have as witnesses the victims of the handguns . . . the mother of the ten-year old boy killed by a playmate's experiment with a gun . . . the young hus-

band slain in a moment of anger by a neighbor . . . the woman shot in what should have remained a petty dispute.

Nationally, ten thousand persons are murdered yearly by handguns, shotguns and rifles.

I would like to cite some Chicago statistics to indicate how gun misuse relates directly to younger people. For example, in Chicago there was a 613 percent increase in the number of offenders under 21 years of age using firearms to commit homicides. In 1965, thirty-eight youthful offenders were arrested in fire-arm homicides, and in 1970, this number had risen to 271.

During the same period the number of youthful victims in firearm homicides increased from 30 in 1965 to 153 in 1970.

Statistically during this period 45 percent of all homicides involved the use of handguns. In addition 13 percent of the homicides were committed by other firearms.

One of the most serious offenses in our society is armed robbery and here the statistics are frightening. In 1965 there was a total of 8,080 armed robberies in Chicago in which 48 percent were committed with handguns. In 1971, there were 16,000 armed robberies, of which 71 percent were committed with handguns. During this period the number of armed robberies increased 98 percent and the number of armed robberies committed with the use of handguns increased 192 percent.

In Chicago we have had a gun registration ordinance in effect since 1968. We have registered more than 470-thousand guns. We also have removed from circulation more than 34,500 guns. Of these 30-thousand guns were unregistered.

Our registration ordinance has had limited success because it is apparent that people can walk over the city limit line to the suburbs and acquire a gun.

The State of Illinois does not require the registration of guns but does require the licensing of gun owners. It is obvious from these conflicting standards and from the easy accessibility of guns that local legislation is not the answer to the gun problem. National legislation is required to deal with the subject.

I believe that legislation is essential. We must establish specific responsibility for the gun by the owner. He must be held accountable for the gun as well as for any transfer in ownership and for reporting immediately the loss or theft of the gun.

In the face of all the evidence and data that has been presented concerning the death-dealing capabilities of the handgun—why is it that Congress doesn't pass a strong gun control bill?

There are three basic reasons. There is the influence and the lobbying pressure of the National Rifle Association. There is no doubt about the organization being financed by gun manufacturers and dealers in addition to the revenue from membership dues.

The handgun industry is a multi-million dollar business. Perhaps we can reduce the senseless killing and violence if we take the profits out of the gun business.

For example, manufacturers could be required to assume some of the burden of paying for the funeral expenses, the hospital fees, the losses suffered by the victims of violence with handguns.

Obviously this suggestion of imposing a financial penalty on the manufacturer and dealer in guns is no substitute for a strong gun control bill.

Then there is the argument by the NRA that guns don't kill, people do. The answer is that if you removed the gun from the person, the gun couldn't be used. Then there is the argument that people still could kill with knives and other objects. But the gun is a peculiar weapon in that it can be fired from a distance. It can be fired repeatedly. It can be discharged accidentally and kill others than the intended victim.

Another argument of the NRA is that only the law abiding will register their guns or turn them in and the guns will remain in the hands of criminals and others who shouldn't have them. Realistically we should adopt the resolution of the U.S. conference of mayors which would take the guns away from every private person, but in the absence of such legislation, there should be the severest penalty for the person committing a crime with a gun or possessing an unregistered gun.

Another proposal by the Conference of Mayors calls for every effort to be made to educate the American public of the dangers and appalling realities resulting from the private possession of handguns. There is no reason why television shouldn't be obligated to carry commercial warning of the dangers of handguns and the need to control them. This would be fitting since so much of TV entertainment is devoted to violence.

Let me summarize briefly. The handgun makes no positive contribution to our society. It kills—whether by accident or on purpose.

The law-abiding private citizen may fear that he is the only one to be regulated and that the criminal will have the advantage, even though the evidence is overwhelming that guns are dangerous to possess even by honest law-abiding people. I don't believe that so many people would feel as though they had to have a firearm if they knew the criminal would have great difficulty obtaining them.

I think it is time we face up to reality. We must pass effective legislation to control the use of handguns.

The people of this country have been bombarded with propaganda that there is a strong public opinion against gun control legislation. Nearly every poll has shown that this is not true. The majority of people want gun control—want to end the violence in our country—and are looking to the Congress to achieve that goal.

HANDGUN CONTROL COALITION STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

There is ample and tragic proof that the greatest partner in crime in this nation is the handgun. Since 1900, more people have been killed by private citizens using guns than have been killed in all our wars. The United States has a higher homicide rate than any other modern, politically stable nation in the world, with over 10,000 murders each year. Most of these 10,000 killers used handguns. In the last ten years, 560 policemen have been killed in the line of duty. Three quarters of their killers used handguns.

The villain in the hideous parade of death and crime in our nation is clearly the handgun. Yet the United States, alone among civilized nations, makes handguns readily available to all who want them.

Easily concealed and easily disposed of, handguns primarily are designed for killing and maiming human beings. They are not "sporting" weapons and restrictions on handguns would not limit the rights of those who use long guns for legitimate sporting purposes.

Handgun control must be the highest priority crime control goal of our federal government. We urge the Congress of the United States to respond to the vast majority of Americans who want effective control of firearms. No other piece of legislation, no change in our laws, no amount of resources for law enforcement could have a greater impact or crime.

The members of the Handgun Control Coalition call upon Congress to enact strong handgun control legislation immediately.

Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL-CIO; Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America,

AFL-CIO; American Baptist Convention—Division of Social Concern; American Civil Liberties Union; American Federation of Teachers; Americans for Democratic Action; Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith; Hyman Bookbinder, Washington Representative; The American Jewish Committee*; B'nai B'rith Women; Business and Professional Women's League, Inc. of Washington, D.C.; Church of the Brethren—Brethren Service Commission; Common Cause; Friends Committee on National Legislation; The Honorable Roman A. Gribbs, Mayor of Detroit; Hadassah, The Women's Zionist Organization of America, Inc.; National Council of Jewish Women; National Council of Negro Women, Inc.; National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, Inc.; C. Edward Singer, Director of Washington Office, National Board of YMCA's*; Southern Christian Leadership Conference; Union of American Hebrew Congregations; United Automobile Workers of America; United Presbyterian Church, Department of Church and Society; The United States Conference of Mayors; William J. vanden Heuvel, Chairman, New York City Board of Corrections*; Washington Research Project Action Council; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; Jerry Wurf, President, American Federation of State, County or Municipal Employees*.

[From the Chicago Tribune]

THIRTY MURDERS A DAY: FIREARMS TO SLAY 10,000 THIS YEAR

Gerald Carlisle tried to win the hand but lost his life.

The 30-year-old South Sider was playing poker at 6438 S. Drexel Blvd. He and another player began quarreling over who had won a pot.

Carlisle pulled a .32 caliber revolver he carried for his protection and fired a shot into the floor.

REACHES FOR CHANGE

"Be cool, man. Take the money," someone said.

Carlisle reached for the pile of change. It was the last thing he would ever do. The other player opened fire with a .38 caliber handgun, killing Carlisle and another man, Joseph Guster, 52.

The murder of the two men did not make the newspapers because 30 gun homicides occur every day in America.

Ten thousand persons are murdered yearly in the United States with handguns, shotguns, and rifles. For every American killed in Viet Nam since 1970 (two were killed by gunfire in this country).

Unlike those who died in war, most of the victims of this manmade plague did not die for a cause, or even a good reason.

A few died just because someone felt like killing and had a gun.

MOST SHOT IN QUARRELS

Others were slain defending their homes or shops against criminals, but the majority—7,000 out of the 10,000—were shot down in domestic spats, tavern brawls, or in disputes over a card game. Squabbles that might have ended at worst with a broken jaw ended in death for these people.

Like Carlisle, they lost their arguments to the murderous logic of the gun. That is why his death and Guster's are as important as they are commonplace.

They are flesh-and-blood examples of what gun control experts try to say with statistics: The vast number and the availability of guns, combined with the ease of their use, are escalating fights into murders and making murderers out of people who might otherwise never deliberately break the law.

* Organization listed for identification purposes only.

NEVER BEFORE IN TROUBLE

According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the vast majority of gun killers are people who have never been in trouble before, ordinary people who pull a trigger in a moment of anger.

But this slaughter is producing more than the loss of life. Each death leaves a legacy of tragedy and pain that lives on in the families of the victims.

Although the families of the victims knew better than anyone else the agony caused by the firearms plague, not one of them has been invited to the gun control hearings which the House Judiciary Committee will begin Tuesday in Washington.

"NOT A SOAP OPERA"

Ben Zelinko, staff aide to Rep. Emanuel Celler [D., N.Y.], committee chairman, explained why:

"Congressional hearings are not a soap opera. Their testimony would be useful in mobilizing public opinion, but it would not be important for legislative background."

Nor will the committee hear testimony from even one of America's walking wounded—the tens of thousands who have been scarred or crippled by gunfire.

Instead, it will listen to the same type of witnesses who have appeared at all the gun control hearings held in the last five years—senators, congressmen, mayors, governors, police chiefs, administration officials, and spokesmen for the National Rifle Association.

The committee will probably hear the oft-repeated fact that there are 30 to 115 million firearms in the nation, 24 million of which are handguns, and that handguns account for about 80 per cent of all firearms murders.

It will not hear 10-year-old Pamela Banks tell them that she is too terrified to sleep without the light on. That fear is the emotional wound left by the .22 caliber handgun bullet that struck her in the head three months ago.

The committee, which is holding hearings in response to the shooting and resulting paralysis of Alabama Gov. George Wallace, may also hear that in 1970 there were 9,960 murders, 130,000 robberies, and 80,000 aggravated assaults committed with firearms.

But it will not hear Peter Pannos, 14, tell about the night of April 21, when a .38 caliber slug struck him in the spine, paralyzing him.

HAVE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

The committee will probably hear the N.R.A. argue, as it has in the past, that Americans have a constitutional right to keep and bear arms.

But Mrs. Katherine Malone, a resident of the Cabrini-Green Homes housing projects, will not be there to describe how street gangs exercise that right by walking around her neighborhood with pistols dangling from their belts and carbines slung from their shoulders.

The Task Force interviewed numerous victims of gun crimes and their families. Pamela Banks, Mrs. Malone and Peter Pannos are three of them. If they could be at Tuesday's hearings, this would be their testimony:

The door leading to the Banks' family apartment at 1724 W. 66th St. is flanked by the names of two rival street gangs painted on the wall. Those proclamations symbolize the dilemma of the family. The Banks are the noncombatants in the urban warfare waged with guns nightly in their neighborhood. On the night of March 17 the war found them.

TAKES TARGET PRACTICE

Pamela and her mother, Mary, 29, were walking the family dog. Nearby, a group of gang members decided to start practicing with their .22 caliber revolvers.

Had they lived in the country they might have shot at a rabbit or squirrel. But this was the city and the nearest moving animal was Pamela's dog, Uno. Mrs. Banks remembers it this way:

"I heard firecracker sounds and then I saw Pamela drop to the sidewalk. There were four or five teen-agers standing near her and Uno was running in circles with blood all over him. I ran toward Pamela screaming, 'Oh my God, my baby's hurt.' I thought she was dead."

A bullet lodged behind Pamela's right eye. She lay in the hospital for 33 days mumbling over and over, "No. No. Don't shoot my dog. Don't shoot Uno." Police theorized she was shot while trying to protect the dog from youths who had tortured the animal that summer by driving nails into its back and paws.

SHOOTING LEAVES MARK

Pamela survived the shooting without permanent injury, but the incident has left its mark on the entire family.

"We're always on edge," said Mrs. Banks. "Pamela can't sleep without a light on and she's afraid to sleep alone. I'm afraid myself. When I drive home I get out of the car and I run into the building."

Now Uno growls at every stranger when Pamela's father, John, walks him. "He'll charge at someone and I'll think 'Is that the one who did it?'"

The family also has strong views on gun control.

"It has to happen to one of your family before you really understand what these guns and shootings are all about," said John Banks. "I think the only thing they can do is stop manufacturing these small handguns and just make revolvers for the police and military. I don't think the police need small caliber guns, so why make them?"

GIVES ONE ANSWER

Ribert Meltzer, president of Criterion Die and Machine Co., a New York City firm that makes 100,000 .22 caliber handguns a year, provided at least one answer to that question:

"Because it's a profitable business," he told a Task Force reporter.

Regardless of caliber, handgun manufacturing is profitable. An estimated 2.5 million handguns are produced each year, with annual sales exceeding \$50 million.

Peter Pannos is one of the byproducts of that business.

Peter made the error of standing in front of a store at Evergreen Street and Washenaw Avenue when the Latin Kings chose to terrorize their arch-rivals, the Latin Disciples.

BRASS KNUCKLES POSSE

Like all modern street gangs, the Kings do not use brass knuckles or chains. The availability of guns has allowed them to equip themselves with the firepower of a small army.

Peter knew about the gang rivalry, just as he knew that he was in Disciple territory and that the figure across the street was dressed in the uniform of the Kings—black coat, snap-brim hat, and maroon sweater.

He wasn't afraid because, being of Greek descent, the Puerto Rican gangs never bothered him. Then he heard the youth shout "Kings run it!" As he turned toward the sound the figure raised a revolver and Peter saw an orange flash.

"I guess he thought I was a Disciple," Peter said from his bed in Walther Memorial Hospital. "I heard the shot and felt a burning pain in my stomach because blood was bubbling out of my mouth. I tried to get back in the store. Then my legs crumpled and I was hanging onto the door handle with my hands."

"LEGS WOULDN'T MOVE"

"I shouted to the owner to let me in, but he was scared and locked the door on me. That's when I felt real tired like and rolled over on my back. I couldn't feel anything in my legs. My legs wouldn't move."

Peter's legs will never move. Neither will his hips, nor any part of his body below his chest. The bullet struck him in the mouth, then drilled thru the lower part of his head to lodge in his upper spine. He shifts himself in bed by grasping a trapeze-like bar that hangs above him.

Peter firmly believes he will walk again and continue training to be an auto mechanic. He clings to that illusion as tightly as he clings to the reality of that bar.

However, after a costly but unsuccessful operation to restore use of his limbs, doctors say Peter will be lucky if he lives. The paralysis could creep into his lungs and bring on a fatal case of pneumonia.

PARENTS USE SAVINGS

His parents have emptied their savings for the \$5,000 operation and are applying to public aid to pay for treatments at a rehabilitation center.

Mrs. Malone has become so accustomed to the daily shootings in her neighborhood that she now regards them in the way that farmers regard blizzards and droughts. She feels there is little she can do about them.

There is a bullet hole in her living room window, a reminder of the day three months ago when the Dictators shot at her son. The bullet narrowly missed striking her daughter, Linda, 13, in the head.

There is another bullet hole in her bedroom window, put there by some youths who were taking target practice one night.

FALLS OUT OF BED

"I was in bed and I'll never forget it," she recalls. "I fell right out of bed and stayed there the rest of the night. I have a high bed and lots of nights I sleep on the floor."

Firearms are so much a part of life in the projects, she said, "that kids walk around with them hanging out of their pockets. They have brand new carbines they're walking around with. I saw a 16-year-old kid walking upstairs with one like he's supposed to be carrying it. . . . It would be the best thing that could happen if they could get the guns out of their hands."

With 20,000 gun control laws now on the books, how and why do guns get in the hands of the wrong people? In its investigation, Task Force reporters sought to answer this and other questions about the gun crisis. This is what they found:

The most prevalent means by which illegal firearms are obtained is thru home burglaries. As more people buy guns to protect themselves, more and more criminals become armed by stealing those guns.

SECURITY IS LAX

By a conservative estimate, the number of stolen guns in the nation is 500,000. Yet federal security regulations for the storage and transportation of firearms are so lax that amateur burglars can obtain guns with ease from shipments and sporting good stores.

A black market in firearms continues to flourish despite all the gun control laws. Gun-runners daily join with unscrupulous dealers to ship contraband weapons across state lines. To demonstrate this technique, two reporters lived the lives of interstate gun-runners in Florida, Virginia, and Iowa.

Another source is the pilferage of weapons parts from firearms manufacturers. A New York City firm lost enough parts in one year to make 10,000 handguns. The Task Force found how these stolen parts were assembled by gun "bootleggers," then sold on the streets of the Bronx and Harlem.

The nation's courts show an appallingly low conviction rate for persons charged with

gun law violations. Statistics gathered from Chicago, Washington, and New York show that only about one of every eight defendants serves even a single day in jail.

Current laws are so fragmented and lacking in uniformity that weak laws in one jurisdiction often subvert strong laws in neighboring jurisdictions. For example, New York and Chicago, which have tough gun registration laws, are flooded with unregistered guns purchased in suburban areas with less stringent controls.

Contrary to popular myth, the manufacturing of the cheap handguns called Saturday Night Specials, is not a cottage industry, but big business. At least two such manufacturers are subsidiaries of prestigious firms.

RETIREMENT OF GEORGE ROBINSON

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, we have had many wonderful people working for the Members of the House of Representatives since I have been a Member. These people generally serve from day to day without receiving too much credit for their loyal and able service. One such individual is George Robinson, a good personal friend of mine and one who has the record of serving the longest, as far as I know, here on Capitol Hill from Colorado. He has served us for 26 years first as a clerk in the Document Room and for the last 20 years as Doorkeeper in this Chamber.

I have known George Robinson for the past 34 years—8 years of which while he was serving in the Governor's office in Colorado where he served as clerk and messenger and at which time I was serving as a State senator. Since 1947, he has been here in Washington with us of the House of Representatives.

I wish to commend George for the fine service that he has performed since I have known him, and I wish to also commend his fine wife, Ethel, for being such a wonderful helpmate to him and, in turn, a very helpful partner to us in keeping George ready for his service to us.

The Robinsons have certainly earned their retirement and I wish for them continued happiness and needed rest as they return to their home State of Colorado.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, retirement is claiming another valuable employee of the House. George Robinson is leaving after many years of service both in the Documents Room and as a doorkeeper.

George Robinson's Colorado ties go back to the beginning of this century when his father brought him to Cripple Creek. He served in the Armed Forces during World War I and after the war he served on the Denver to Chicago Zephyr. During that time he made both

Denver and Chicago his home and he also became the friend of the Honorable William Dawson, who later served in the House.

In 1939, the Honorable Ralph Carr was elected Governor of Colorado. George Robinson was asked by Governor Carr to be his personal messenger. He served Governor Carr for 4 years and stayed on with Governor Vivien for another 4 years.

In 1947, the Honorable Bill Hill of Colorado, brought George Robinson back to Washington and put him to work in the Documents Room. In 1949, the Honorable John Carroll saw to it that George Robinson stayed with the House. Later, the Honorable Byron Rogers of Colorado helped Mr. Robinson move to present position as a doorkeeper.

I salute George Robinson for his many years of service to the House and the State of Colorado. I wish him well and hope that his retirement years are happy and fulfilling.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Colorado for his comments.

I yield now to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BROTZMAN).

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Colorado yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in tribute to Mr. George Robinson, a distinguished citizen of the State of Colorado and one of those dedicated persons who makes serving in the House of Representatives such a great pleasure.

Altogether, George Robinson has been a faithful servant of government for 47 years at local, State, and Federal levels. For 13 years he served the city of Chicago. Then he spent 8 years in Colorado where he ably assisted two of the State's Governors: Ralph Carr and John Vivian. Then, 26 years ago he came to Washington with one of my predecessors from the Second District of Colorado, Congressman William S. Hill. Serving first for 6 years in the documents room, he later became one of our doorkeepers, a position he has occupied for the past 20 years.

Mrs. Brotzman and I join in wishing Mr. Robinson and his wife, Ethel, all possible happiness in their well deserved retirement. We in the House will miss his helpfulness and cheerful attitude. It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the Robinsons will be returning to Colorado, and this pleases me considerably since it will enable me to stay in touch with them. I trust that we will continue to receive the benefit of his counsel in the future and that he will occasionally visit the Chamber he has served so well for the past 26 years.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. McKEVITT).

Mr. McKEVITT. I thank the chairman. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is losing one of its most devoted and best known employees with the retirement of George L. Robinson, who has served this body as a doorkeeper for the past 20 years and prior to that, 6 years as a clerk in the House document room. That adds up to more than a quarter of

a century of outstanding service to the House of Representatives. He also served in the Governor's Office of the State of Colorado before embarking upon his career in Washington. The hallmark of his service has been excellence and as his wife Ethel remarked: "The House has been his life."

However, I must admit that while Mr. Robinson's retirement will be a loss to the House, the city and County of Denver will gain. As has already been noted, Mr. and Mrs. Robinson plan to return to their home in Denver, the city I am privileged to represent. I look forward to seeing the Robinsons in Denver and I want to be the first to welcome them back home.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, an able member of my own committee, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL).

Mr. KYL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have very mixed feelings at this moment when we recognize George Robinson and his efforts and the fact that he is leaving us.

Oh, yes, he has performed his duties with great distinction and with dignity. He has been a good servant.

But I am sorry to see him go, because more than being an employee of the House he is a close personal friend.

So, on the one hand, I cannot be happy at this moment, knowing that I am not going to be able to see this good friend in our daily duties here in the House; but, on the other hand, it is true that George and his wife have earned an opportunity to do all those things they have postponed for all these years.

I know all of us join in wishing them great happiness and great satisfaction in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in expressing my regret at the retirement of George Robinson from this body. Although he certainly has most richly deserved what I am sure will be many happy years of retirement, I do want to say it has meant a great deal to me to come in that door each day, and many times each day, and always be pleasantly and kindly greeted by George Robinson. He has earned the respect of each Member of this House, and I believe each Member holds him in high respect.

I have always felt he had good judgment. The only question of his judgment now comes from the fact that he is returning to Colorado, rather than going to Florida for his retirement, but we hope that he will remedy that and bring his good wife, Ethel, to see us some time in Florida.

I wish him well and Godspeed.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN).

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I fully understand the feelings of my colleagues who are pleased that George and Ethel

Robinson are returning to Colorado, but I have had the privilege of representing the area where George has been residing in his non-legal residence while he has been working here at the Capitol, and I will sorely miss him as a friend and as a man who was constantly keeping me abreast of things that were going on in his area in my constituency.

When I came here in the 91st Congress as a green freshman George Robinson kind of took me under his wing and was very solicitous to insure that I made the votes and to make sure that he alerted me when my name was about to come up on the roll.

In this and so many other ways he has been a real and cherished friend. I will miss him very much and wish him and his lovely wife, Ethel, all the happiness in the years ahead that it is possible and in the richly deserved retirement that he embarks upon.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON).

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is typical of the gentleman in the well of the House, our beloved colleague, WAYNE ASPINALL, that he has taken this time to salute the contribution to the House of Representatives of George Robinson. The chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs knows that a committee is often no better than its staff workers, and he knows the great House of Representatives is strengthened and constantly carried along in its course by staff people who have a love for the House in their hearts and a dedication to service and to seeing a good job done here in the House of Representatives and who are absolutely indispensable to the job getting done.

Mr. Speaker, Colorado has sent many great Congressmen and great Senators to the Halls of the Congress. They have also sent fine people to work with us in a staff capacity. George has been a fine representative of the great State of Colorado, and he will indeed be missed by many, many people who have known him and treasured his contribution for many years.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank my colleague.

I now yield to my friend and colleague and my own Congressman from the State of Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am just real distressed to hear that George is retiring because I think that the House and each of us will be diminished by not seeing him on a daily basis here serving not only this body that he has loved and served for so long but each of us who have enjoyed his company and his pleasant smile and personality during our service here, in my own case a service which does not begin to match George's service in point of time.

Mr. Speaker, I will say Ohio has some claim on George because he has relatives in our community, and in a way I am glad he is going back to Colorado, because that means he will have a reason to come back to Washington. He can

then stop through on his way in the Seventh District of Ohio and visit with us and some of his relatives in that community.

One thing ought to be said about him. Not only does he love this House and has served it well, but he has trained it up in some ways, because there are many other people who serve this body who had the benefit of his experience. George is a pretty good guide for the other doormen and other people who have responsibilities on the staff of the House, and perhaps for some of us who are Members he has been a guide and an adviser from time to time to our benefit. I know that is true in my own case, and I am sure all of the other Members of the House who have become acquainted with George over the years feel much the same way.

George, we will miss you very much, but we will look forward to your return from time to time to keep an eye on us and keep us on the straight and narrow.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to our industrious and good friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado for taking this time to permit all of us to say a few words in behalf of this friend, George Robinson.

He has been an efficient and hard-working employee, and with it all he has been kindly and courteous, and certainly a fine gentleman at all times. Things will not be quite the same with George Robinson gone from the Chamber of the House of Representatives.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank my colleague, and I now yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Keith).

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my other colleagues in the Congress in paying tribute to George Robinson. I have elected not to run for reelection, and I was looking forward to coming back to visit the House of Representatives, and finding permanency in the staff, and without George Robinson being here it will be hard to do so, because I would be looking for his kindly "hello" and his warm welcome which he has always done in the past.

I hope that on his way back to Colorado he will come by way of Cape Cod and enjoy its lovely climate and its wonderful people, and to let them share in his personality that has warmed us here in the Congress, and for which we are so very grateful.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank the gentleman very much.

I now yield to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Myers).

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions that all of us come here today to remember and to thank George Robinson for his many years of faithful service to this Nation. I know that 6 years ago when I came here as a freshman that it was frightening to come here into this august body, but one of the early people who caught me by the hand, and from whom I learned something about the traditions of the House

and the proper way to function here, was George Robinson.

It has always been a great pleasure to come here to the door and receive that friendly "hello" from a good guy like George. He and his wife Ethel have stopped in Indiana at our home as they have traveled on their way to Colorado, and I hope they will continue to make our Indiana home their half-way home on their way to Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, I think something should be said in addition about George and his wife Ethel, and that is that they have a very fine family. For instance, I know that they have a granddaughter who is going to be touring Europe during the next couple of months as a concert violinist, and I know how proud they are at the accomplishments of their very fine granddaughter. They have had some tragedies in their lives, but these have not diminished George and Ethel in their dedication to make America a better place in which to live.

So I speak selfishly, Mr. Speaker, as I say that I am sorry that day has come, the day that George Robinson will not be here to say "hello," but my wife, Carol, and I want to wish Ethel and George many, many years of happiness, and hope that they can now see the rest of America that they have not seen already, and I hope that they will always continue to make Washington and Indiana their homes away from home.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank my colleague.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, our good friend Mr. George Robinson is retiring after 20 years' service as Doorkeeper and 6 years as a clerk to the House. He and his wife, Ethel, are returning to Colorado for their retirement. I have never had the privilege of meeting Mrs. Robinson. However, in knowing George, I know that she must be a very great lady.

I have known George Robinson since I came to the House in 1958. He was helpful to me as a new Member. He has been helpful to scores of new Members since.

Mr. Robinson is one of those men who combine the qualities of modesty with a deep capacity for understanding the House of Representatives and what it is and what it stands for. I consider these qualities as premium qualities in those associated with this body.

When I think of George Robinson and Members of the House and staff members whom I admire, I think of a short poem by Edward Everett Hale, who wrote:

I am only one
But still I am one.
I cannot do everything,
But still I can do something;
And because I cannot do everything
I will not refuse to do the something that
I can do.

The career of George Robinson in his service to the House of Representatives and in his rapport with the Members of the House over a period of 26 years has lived the spirit of Hale's poem. Those Members who are successful here have that same spirit.

The U.S. House of Representatives as well as the State of Colorado can be proud to claim George Robinson as their

own. We wish him and his wife, Ethel, well.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that George Robinson is retiring after 26 years of Government service. I have known George during a considerable portion of this time and in my judgment he has been a dedicated and efficient public servant. In his post as a doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, he has always been available to the Members and most helpful to them in arranging contacts with their constituents and other callers at the floor of the House.

He is a kind person and a courteous gentleman, and I wish him many years of health and happiness in his well-deserved retirement.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I have not had the privilege of knowing George Robinson for as long as many of our colleagues, but for the 4 years I have been in Congress he has been a good friend and a real help to me. Soon after my arrival in Washington, I learned that George was born in Dover, Okla., located in my Sixth District. In fact, Mrs. Elijah A. Allison, George's sister, is still a constituent of mine, living in Hennessey. These strong Oklahoma ties led to the beginning of a deep friendship which I trust will last far beyond George's retirement on June 30.

After 26 years of service to the Congress as Clerk and Doorkeeper, George has every right to want some rest and relaxation. Though I was one of the many Members who urged him to stay—he will be nearly impossible to replace—I want to take this opportunity to wish him and his wife all the happiness and contentment they so richly deserve.

I can only hope that the Robinsons will make it a point to visit Oklahoma often so that we can continue our rewarding friendship.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may revise and extend their remarks concerning the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Roush). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

CONGRESS FAILS TO DEAL PROPERLY WITH THE DEBT CEILING BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the House meekly accepted another debt ceiling bill without dealing with some fundamental questions.

First, the 435 Members of this body—who were duly elected and who represent approximately 500,000 persons each—were forced to either vote this bill up or down under a closed or gag rule which allowed no amendments. Unfortunately, an effort to open the bill for

amendments failed on a 207 to 180 vote. Thus, the Members of the House were precluded from representing their constituents on this key issue.

Secondly, the closed rule, of course, once again prevented the House from dealing with tax reform. This is highly regrettable. The people are demanding tax reform now and they are not in favor of it being put off to some future date. In any event, the individual Members of this House should have a right to propose tax reforms whenever they feel they are necessary and this should not be the decision solely of the members of a single committee.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, the House continues to deal with these debt ceiling measures without taking a hard look at what constitutes the so-called "debt." Much of this debt is a fake. Much of this debt is simply a device to allow the Federal Reserve System to operate outside of the normal strictures of a democratic government.

In fact, \$70 billion of the current debt is fiction. It represents bonds in the portfolio of the Federal Open Market Committee of the New York Federal Reserve Bank. These are bonds that have been paid for once with the credit of the United States. They are not a debt—they have been paid for. It is regrettable that the Ways and Means Committee failed to deal with this question in the current debt ceiling legislation and it is my hope that they will give the House the full information—and the proper remedies—before the question comes up again in October.

The Federal Reserve, of course, draws interest from the U.S. Treasury on these bonds and these interest payments finance nearly all of the Federal Reserve's far-flung operation. Through this device, the Federal Reserve System does not have to come to Congress for appropriations and its funds are not audited by the GAO. By maintaining this fiction of calling a bond that has been paid for a "debt," the Congress allows the Federal Reserve to operate footloose and fancy-free using public moneys for whatever they might desire.

The Federal Reserve is drawing almost \$4 billion annually off of these bonds. Four billion dollars of tax money paid by the Treasury to the Federal Reserve. The Federal Reserve uses this money for whatever it pleases—with no check whatsoever—and then returns the surplus to the Treasury.

Imagine this Congress—and the appropriations committees—allowing any other agency of the Federal Government to operate in this manner. All of us can well visualize the hue and cry that would erupt if some one suggested that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Labor—or any other agency—was given a blank check and told to spend whatever they desired on whatever programs they wanted and just return the loose change to the Treasury.

If we allowed the other agencies of the Federal Government to operate as the Federal Reserve does, there simply would be no reason for appropriations committees—or perhaps for the Congress itself.

This is an absurd situation and it is one on which the press and the Congress continually turn their backs. It is one of the things that no one really wants to talk about—to discuss in the press—because it is so fundamental to the operation of our system of government and the people's right to control basic economic and monetary policy.

In an age which demands honesty and at a time when politicians everywhere are being sharply criticized for the fiscal confusion surrounding our Federal Government, it is regrettable that the Federal Reserve is allowed to maintain—and draw interest on—Government securities which have been paid for by the money and credit of the United States. This is fiscal fiction of the first order.

Mr. Speaker, these securities are paid for with other obligations of the U.S. Government—namely, Federal Reserve notes. In some cases, of course, this is in the form of credit which can be drawn down in Federal Reserve notes. In other words, we are exchanging one obligation of the Federal Government for another obligation of the Federal Government. Without question, one of the obligations ought to be canceled.

In reality, Mr. Speaker, many of these bonds are actually paid for several times. The Open Market Committee buys and sells Government securities and it is possible for a bond to be purchased in the open market—with the money or credit of the United States—resold the next day, and again repurchased by the Federal Reserve's open market operations. In some cases, the same bond has undoubtedly been paid for three or four times.

Only a complete top-to-bottom audit by the GAO would really reveal what is happening to all of these bonds in the Federal Open Market Committee's portfolio. We ought to order such an audit without delay.

Mr. Speaker, the bond holdings of the Federal Reserve's Open Market Committee have been increasing tremendously through the years and, in the foreseeable future, this portfolio will exceed the present national debt of \$400 billion. In 1915, the Federal Reserve banks held only \$16 million of U.S. Government securities. Today, they hold \$70 billion and the figure is growing rapidly every month.

Mr. Speaker, I want to place in the record a table showing the holdings of U.S. Government securities in the Open Market Committee's portfolio from 1915 to 1972.

[In millions]	
Year	Year-end holdings
1915	\$16
1916	55
1917	122
1918	239
1919	300
1920	287
1921	234
1922	436
1923	134
1924	540
1925	375
1926	315
1927	617
1928	228
1929	511
1930	729
1931	817

[In millions]

Year	Year-end holdings
1932	1,855
1933	2,437
1934	2,430
1935	2,431
1936	2,430
1937	2,564
1938	2,564
1939	2,484
1940	2,184
1941	2,254
1942	6,189
1943	11,543
1944	18,846
1945	24,262
1946	23,350
1947	22,559
1948	23,333
1949	18,885
1950	20,778
1951	23,801
1952	24,697
1953	25,916
1954	24,932
1955	24,785
1956	24,915
1957	24,238
1958	26,347
1959	26,648
1960	27,384
1961	28,881
1962	30,820
1963	33,593
1964	37,044
1965	40,768
1966	44,282
1967	49,112
1968	52,937
1969	57,154
1970	62,142
1971	69,000
1972 (to date)	70,000

This present system is absurd. This device deludes the American public. This enables the Federal Reserve to be what the Congress never intended—an agency free of control and supervision—free to thumb its nose at the Congress, at the executive branch, and the American people.

It does the Congress no credit to allow these absurdities to continue.

This fiction is maintained because the Federal Reserve has developed into a super-agency with a super-powerful lobby behind it. The banking community—and its big business allies—want the Federal Reserve System to be free to serve the banking interests full-time without worrying about any public strictures which the Congress might insist upon. This feeling has intensified since the Federal Reserve has gained new power over the economy through the administration of the Bank Holding Company Act.

The Federal Reserve will always be able to serve the interests of the banking and big business community first so long as the Congress continues to allow the system its own independent source of funds by maintaining the fiction of these paid-up bonds.

Without these bonds, the Federal Reserve System would be like any other agency of the Federal Government. It would have no independent source of money and it would be required to come to the Congress and to undergo annual appropriations processes just like any other agency.

Faced with this appropriations proc-

ess, the Federal Reserve System would be much more careful about its decisions, much less likely to meet the demands of the big banking and big business community and hopefully more inclined to pay attention to the public interest.

More important, the Congress would be able to use the appropriations process to insist that the intent of Congress was met in the administration of banking and monetary statutes.

This Congress, of course, has the power to accomplish this great public purpose and to remove the over-powering banking domination of Federal Reserve policies and administration.

Let me review the situation as it stands today. The Federal Reserve has about \$70 billion of bonds residing in the portfolio of the Federal Open Market Committee in the New York Federal Reserve Bank. These are all bonds which have been paid for by the credit of the United States. There is no dispute over this fact. Federal Reserve official after Federal Reserve official has conceded this in hearing after hearing before various committees of the Congress. The maintenance of this system—in the face of unrefuted testimony—simply means that the Congress is perpetuating a myth and is a party to an effort to delude the American public about the public debt and the operations of the Federal Reserve.

The Federal Reserve is drawing about \$4 billion annually in interest on these bonds. This interest is paid by the U.S. Treasury and the money comes from funds of the American taxpayers. The Federal Reserve uses this money as a huge slush fund for whatever it desires and the Appropriations Committee has no authority to either review or to control these expenditures in any manner. The funds are not audited by the General Accounting Office, and the Federal Reserve has engaged in a well-financed and emotional campaign to lock the GAO out of the entire Federal Reserve System.

So the debt ceiling that the House considered here yesterday was composed of at least \$70 billion of outright fiction. These bonds should be retired, subtracted from the debt, and if this were done, there would be no need for the consideration of the legislation now before you.

This could be done without any harm to either our fiscal or monetary system and I hope this committee will not fall prey to the emotional outcries of those who will be simply attempting to preserve their empire at the Federal Reserve. If the Federal Reserve thinks it needs these bonds for "fiscal bookkeeping" purposes, then it should agree that these bonds—which have been paid for by the credit of the United States be noninterest bearing. By making them noninterest bearing, the Federal Reserve could continue to maintain its bookkeeping fiction, but it could no longer draw the \$4 billion in interest from the Treasury Department each year.

Mr. Speaker, this situation is so absurd that many people just cannot believe that the Congress would allow this to continue. The absurdity of the situation is one of the protections that the Federal Reserve System has. The average

person simply cannot believe that the Congress would allow the Treasury to pay interest on bonds which have been paid for by the credit of the United States.

So to clear up the question of whether these bonds have been paid for, I want to quote from a hearing record before the Banking and Currency Committee on July 6, 1965, when the then Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, William McChesney Martin, was asked about this situation:

Mr. MARTIN. The bonds were paid for in the normal course of business.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. MARTIN. And that is the only time they were paid for.

Mr. PATMAN. Just like we pay debt with checks and credit.

Mr. MARTIN. Exactly.

Mr. PATMAN. In the normal course of business, they were paid for once. You will admit that, will you not? They were paid for once and that's all?

Mr. MARTIN. They were paid for once and that's all.

Mr. PATMAN. That's right.

This is very clear. Surely the Congress does not need any more evidence that these bonds should be cancelled and the Treasury relieved of its obligation to pay interest.

Mr. Speaker, of course I interrogated Chairman Martin on many other occasions and received very similar replies. On December 10, 1965, I questioned Mr. Martin when he appeared before the Joint Economic Committee. The amount of bonds in the portfolio was much less at this time, but the same principle applies. I quote from these hearings:

Mr. PATMAN. And every one of those notes that you trade for those bonds of the Government says on its face that it is an obligation of the United States Government?

Mr. MARTIN. That is correct.

Mr. PATMAN. And that is what makes it good.

Mr. MARTIN. That is right.

Mr. PATMAN. Now then, whenever you take that Government obligation from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and you trade it for \$24 billion worth of bonds which you have, and you have those bonds now, you draw interest on these bonds, do you not?

Mr. MARTIN. We do.

Mr. PATMAN. About \$600 million a year; and, although you traded one Government obligation for it, you keep the bonds and you do not cancel them. They pay interest, and you use that \$600 million in any way that is allowed by law, for administrative purposes in the operation of the Reserve banks. And then, of course, after all the deductions have been made, why, you pay 90% of the remainder into the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. MARTIN. That is correct.

There have been many other officials of the Federal Reserve who, like Mr. Martin, concede that these bonds have been paid for. I well remember a discussion—again before the Joint Economic Committee—that I had in 1956 with Robert G. Rouse, manager of the Federal Reserve System's Open Market Account, and I quote:

Mr. PATMAN. But the truth is, all the bonds that you have—and you have about \$25 billion worth of bonds, do you not?

Mr. ROUSE. Something less than that; yes, sir.

Mr. PATMAN. Every one of those bonds have

been bought, not on the resources of the Federal Reserve banks, but on the credit of the Nation by exchanging Federal Reserve notes for them, have they not?

Mr. ROUSE. Yes; they are bought by the—out of Federal Reserve funds.

Mr. PATMAN. No; you are mistaken there, are you not? You do not say that they are bought with Federal Reserve funds. The money is created by those bonds. Do you not understand that?

Mr. ROUSE. It is created—yes, indirectly.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, directly. In other words, if you buy bonds, you must pay for them, and those \$24 billion worth of bonds were paid for, but not by Federal Reserve bank funds; they were paid for by Federal Reserve notes.

Mr. Speaker, others through the years have questioned the Federal Reserve about these bonds. For example, Senator Paul Douglas, in February 1952, had the following colloquy with Mr. Martin on this point:

Senator DOUGLAS. When the Open Market Committee buys Government bonds, how are these bonds paid for?

Mr. MARTIN. They are paid for by a check, by deposit.

Senator DOUGLAS. You mean that the banks, the Federal Reserve banks, create credit—

Mr. MARTIN. That is right, sir.

Senator DOUGLAS (continuing). With which they buy Government bonds from private parties.

Mr. MARTIN. That is right, sir.

Senator DOUGLAS. What happens to these checks which the Federal (Reserve System) draws from a created credit account? What happens to those checks?

Mr. MARTIN. They go into the reserve account.

Senator DOUGLAS. Yes; that is the second step. What is the first step? They are given to the holders of securities; is that true?

Mr. MARTIN. That is right.

Senator DOUGLAS. When they are deposited in the Federal Reserve System, how are they set up as a credit?

Mr. MARTIN. To the reserve account of the bank, of the depositing bank.

Senator DOUGLAS. Does this increase the lending capacity of the banks?

Mr. MARTIN. Under our present fractional reserve system by about a 6-to-1 ratio.

These quotes should establish for anyone that the bonds have been paid for and that there is every reason for the Congress to require that they be canceled and subtracted from the debt.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress is going to have to deal with some of these tough subjects despite the lobbyists who demand that the status quo be maintained. There is much change going on in this country and the Congress is deluding itself if it thinks it can avoid these developments.

All of us know that it is not in keeping with the democratic process to allow any committee of the Congress to handle its legislation under closed rules. This is completely foreign to our system of Government and it is something which clearly demeans the Members of the House who meekly accept a removal of their powers. Our constituents send us here to represent them on every bill and we can only do that when we have the right to amend legislation, particularly measures as far-reaching as those which emanate from the Ways and Means Committee.

A great many of us on this floor are committed to tax reform and yet our hands are tied by the fact that the Ways and Means Committee is allowed to bring all of its measures to the floor under a closed rule. Many of us have promised our constituents prompt action on tax reform but we cannot offer amendments to Ways and Means bills to carry out our pledges.

This greatly reduces the rights—the powers granted our people by the U.S. Constitution. This is a serious matter which far transcends party lines and philosophical positions. It goes right to the heart of our system of government and it is something which the U.S. House of Representatives better take a long and hard look at before all the people discover what these gag rules mean to them.

A PROPOSAL FOR CREATION OF A COUNCIL ON ENERGY POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH), is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to just very briefly say in prefacing these remarks that I have been thrilled by the previous special order given by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL), and to say that I am so delighted that we had the opportunity to pay tribute to George Robinson, who has been such a good friend and servant to you and to all our colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, in 1971, President Nixon suggested the formation of a Department of Natural Resources, a Cabinet-level department that, among other things, would be responsible for keeping the President informed as to the adequacy of the Nation's energy resources.

The demand for energy is increasing at an unprecedented rate.

If we have no energy policy between now and the time such a department comes into being, this country could—and possibly will—be in the midst of a catastrophic "energy crisis."

Some members of the Federal Government have already said that we have such a crisis. We are, in fact, already on the fringe and the worst is yet to come.

During the past weeks and months, there have been numerous hearings and discussions of the problem. In the past month alone, energy was the subject of a cover story in *Time* magazine and of extensive articles in *Newsweek* and *U.S. News & World Report*. Newspaper articles daily tell us what might happen if we ignore the problem and go on to quote Cabinet members and agency heads who predict what might happen and what can be done to anticipate such a crisis.

Many of the committees of the House and Senate have held hearings on various aspects of the energy problem. Their reports, while illuminating, have not yet enabled the Congress or the country to develop policies or programs to cope with the conditions which they foresee.

The time has come to find a way to see in perspective the problems highlighted by these studies and investigations. We must have an independent,

prestigious policymaking agency which can interpret the implications of this crisis which is almost upon us. It must be able to forecast what will develop—how our society will develop—if our present course is pursued. This agency must be able to advise us on alternative courses of action. Only in this way can we deal with the economical, ecological, and sociological consequences that will lie ahead of us and other nations of the world.

The present piecemeal approach to the problem is leaving the private sector uncertain as to what its role should be. Why should a company spend large sums of money on research and development if the Government backs R. & D. in another area?

Accordingly Mr. VAN DEERLIN of California, my colleague on the Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Communication and Power, and 42 other of our colleagues in this House, today join in asking for the creation of a Council on Energy Policy. Our committee and other committees of the Congress concerned with the energy problem need such an agency's advice and counseling—we need to know the facts.

Initially, Mr. VAN DEERLIN and I had planned to submit our proposal for the creation of a council as an amendment to the powerplant siting bill pending before the Commerce Committee. Along with other subcommittee members, BROWN of Ohio and FREY of Florida, we shall still submit that proposal when the committee takes the bill up. We are, however, realistic enough to know that there is a possibility that other members of the committee might argue that because there were no hearings on the amendment, there is—at this moment—insufficient evidence of the need for such a council. We are filing this legislation this afternoon in order to touch all bases.

I stated earlier that those of us on committees need the facts. To be sure, we get the facts now—from more than five dozen agencies and departments dealing with energy matters. This fragmentation is not giving us the leadership we need. The creation of a coordinated energy policy in one central location would give us that leadership; would have all the facts and would be better able to keep the Congress aware of the energy situation than is presently the case.

The agencies themselves need some direction so that they do not tend to cancel out one another's policies and decisions.

The President, too, needs to have one agency to look to for answers to questions on energy and energy policy.

The public, it seems, is ahead of the Congress in realizing the problem confronting us. The Ford Foundation has undertaken an energy policy study headed by Dr. David Freeman—former head of the energy policy staff of the White House Office of Science and Technology. The study will last 15 months and has a budget of \$2 million. The Chase Manhattan Bank has announced within the past few days that it will publish a special report on the energy crisis in layman's language. Chase also said that—

For the most part, government has reacted to the energy shortage by recommending larger doses of the same kind of medicine that made the patient ill in the first place. . . .

In addition, the Columbia Gas Co. which serves Maryland and Delaware is issuing pamphlets on the energy crisis and how homeowners can effectively cut down their energy consumption. Consolidated Edison of New York has bought radio and television time to make the public aware of the growing shortage of energy fuels and how to conserve electricity and energy.

Pennsylvania and New York are two of the most recent States to add their names to the list of States that are trying to create statewide energy policies.

It is time that we in the Congress take action. We must plan now for the kind of America we want in the future.

On June 21, I spoke on the energy crisis and the need for congressional action. My statement and a copy of the bill we are submitting today, is on page 21920 of the RECORD.

As our constituents become more aware of what might happen, they will hold us responsible. When their lights go out, when their gasoline is rationed, when their food spoils because of lack of refrigeration, it is we who will have to answer. With a Council on Energy Policy we will have one responsible, informed agency to which we can go for the answers to the questions that are being posed today in the public's mind. Together with the executive branch and this Council, the Congress will be better able to establish policy and make plans that will assure the best for our citizens—in energy matters, in foreign and domestic policy matters, in social matters—in the years to come.

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

Mr. KEITH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAZZOLI. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to join the gentleman in his remarks and point out that I am glad to be a signator of the bill to which the gentleman refers with respect to the energy crisis in this country. I congratulate the gentleman on taking the leadership in this area because it is the subject of much debate. It is the subject of a great deal of newspaper attention, and I believe there is a great deal of misinformation which perhaps this panel, this group can overcome in the effort to find an answer to this very serious problem of energy crisis. I thank the gentleman for taking this interest.

Mr. KEITH. I appreciate the gentleman's observations and his support of the legislation.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted at the strong showing of bipartisan support for our legislation to establish a National Council on Energy Policy. Upwards of 40 colleagues have joined in cosponsoring the bill, an indication of the widespread concern over the lack of planning that has always characterized the way we use our precious—and rapidly diminishing energy resources.

Full credit for this initial wide acceptance of our proposal must go to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH). From his vantage point as the ranking minority member of our subcommittee on communications and power, Mr. KEITH has developed considerable expertise on the allocation of our energy resources. On numerous occasions, Mr. KEITH has warned of the dangers implicit in our present heedless course, and now his efforts are beginning to bear fruit.

There are two main reasons for offering the legislation at this time.

First, in this fashion we hope to sharpen the focus of public attention on the energy crisis. The views of 40-plus House Members as expressed in their cosponsorship of this measure will, in themselves, carry great weight in shaping public response.

Second, the introduction of the bill ties in with the plans of Mr. KEITH and myself to offer this proposal as an amendment when consideration of related powerplant siting legislation is resumed by the Commerce Committee. We believe the amendment may be rejected—on grounds that the committee's recent hearings on the powerplant matter did not develop sufficient information about the energy council concept.

If this proves to be the case, our bill would obviously be an ideal vehicle for additional hearings to obtain precisely this intelligence.

As Mr. KEITH has explained, the council of three Presidential appointees would be responsible for recommending both short-term policies and long-range plans for using and conserving our energy resources.

The council would not assume powers of existing agencies, but instead be purely advisory, like the Council of Economic Advisors. It would, however, attempt to provide badly needed guidance for the 65 executive agencies now involved in energy matters. With each of these agencies having only a relatively small piece of the action, none obviously is in a very good position to show us where we have been and where we are headed in this critical area.

While I have not devoted anywhere near the amount of study to this problem that Mr. KEITH has, some evidence of the looming crisis has become quite obvious to me. If anyone is complacent, he need only look at the ominously growing rate of power blackouts and brownouts in various sections of the country, or at the highly publicized shortages of key fuels, like natural gas. During the past 3 years in my home county of San Diego, rates charged to the 350,000 residential users of natural gas have climbed nearly 20 percent, about par for the Nation during this period.

Gas producers and pipeline operators complain that for one reason or another they are unable to develop new supplies of their product. The time is here for an appropriate planning authority to take action, to assure that all public and private needs for this as well as other primary fuels can be met for the foreseeable future.

Mr. KEITH has pointed out, and I

agree, that within the next decade the United States may have to depend on foreign imports for half or more of its fuel needs. Clearly, if such a time is coming, we'd better start preparing for it now, for the possibility that our energy policy—now practically nonexistent—might of necessity become a central concern of our foreign policy. Looking further ahead, what could we do if a suddenly hostile nation decided to cut off our supply of a precious fuel? Could we find a substitute?

Mr. Speaker, the proposed council on energy policy might not have all the answers, but whatever direction it was able to provide would be a distinct improvement over our present groping in the darkness.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is no longer news that our Nation is facing an energy crisis. We are rapidly using up our traditional hydrocarbon sources of energy, and have already developed our prime economic hydroelectric sites. It is clear that we are going to have to make some difficult decisions in the future as we cope with limited energy sources and, at the same time, implement policies which will protect and improve our natural environment.

There is a wide spectrum of choices available for dealing with the energy crisis. We must immediately proceed down a number of parallel roads in order to develop policies and programs to assure adequate energy supplies in the future. The issues involved in stimulating exploration for domestic energy resources, increased importation of oil and liquefied natural gas, powerplant siting, and the control of sulfur oxide emissions from central power stations are just a few of the short term policy decisions which we must address. There are other decisions which we must also make in the very near future regarding energy research and development priorities and funding levels. I think it is clear that in the long run the decisions we make now on supporting energy research and development will be most important.

Realizing the importance of energy research and development, Chairman GEORGE MILLER, of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, last summer established an energy task force within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, which I have the privilege to chair. This task force is headed by the only scientist in the Congress, MIKE MCCORMACK, of the State of Washington. He and his colleagues on the task force have done an outstanding job of developing and analyzing the energy research and development issues. On April of this year, the full subcommittee conducted extensive hearings on the subject of energy research and development. These hearings brought out for public discussion numerous proposals which are worthy of further consideration. These proposals were not only scientific and technological in nature, but included important policy options for coping with the tremendous managerial challenges that adequate support of energy-related research and development inevitably entails. They also

took cognizance of the international questions posed by the crisis.

Based on their studies and the subcommittee hearings, Congressman MCCORMACK's task force is currently working on a report which will hopefully be issued in the early fall. I am looking forward to this report, and I believe that it will provide substantive guidance for the important decisions necessary to assure adequate energy research and development between now and the end of this century.

I believe the proposal of Congressman KEITH and Congressman VAN DEERLIN is an important one. It addresses the question of how our Nation, and the Federal Government in particular, must go about the process of managing and coordinating energy policies, including research and development policies. Their proposal deserves the careful consideration of the Congress, and could make an important contribution to the current debate centered around the energy crisis.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

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

There was no objection.

LAURENCE WALRATH WAS OUTSTANDING ICC COMMISSIONER

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

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, a great career of public service is ending.

Laurence K. Walrath is retiring as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission after 16 years of service that will set a mark of excellence for all who come behind.

I came to know Commissioner Walrath because he is from Florida—his home is in my district—and I mention with pride that he is the first Floridian ever appointed an ICC Commissioner.

That would be one thing, but the reason I rise to pay tribute to him in the Congress today is because of the way he has served. Larry Walrath is a man who was never too busy to take the time to listen, to attempt to work continually to see that the public has been served.

President Richard M. Nixon, in accepting his resignation, had this to say:

After having given sixteen years of dedicated service to the Commission, your desire to devote more time to your family and personal affairs is fully understandable. As you return to private life, however, I want you to know that you carry with you the deep appreciation of all our fellow citizens for the skillful manner in which you have carried out your challenging responsibilities.

It is a pleasure to have this opportunity to express to you my gratitude for your important contributions to our nation, and my very best wishes for health and happiness in the years ahead.

Commissioner Walrath took the oath of office as an Interstate Commerce Commissioner on March 29, 1956, to succeed the late Commissioner Kelso Elliott for a term expiring December 31, 1956. He was reappointed for a term expiring December 31, 1963, and took the oath of office on February 21, 1957. In March 1964, he was again renominated by President Johnson for a term expiring December 31, 1970, and reappointed by President Nixon in 1971. March 29, 1972, marked the end of 16 years as a member of the ICC.

Commissioner Walrath was born in Meadville, Pa., August 16, 1909. He attended Emory University Academy, Oxford, Ga., and graduated from the University of Florida with the degrees of A.B. in 1931 and J.D.—including LL.B.—in 1934 with high honors.

He was admitted to the Florida bar in 1934, and has been admitted to practice before the United States Supreme Court, the ICC, and numerous other Government agencies and courts. At the time of his appointment to the Commission, he was the senior active partner of Knight, Walrath, Kincaid and Young, a law firm in Jacksonville, Fla.

During World War II he voluntarily entered the service in February 1942 as a lieutenant (j.g.) in the Navy, served in the Atlantic and Mediterranean areas, and was released from active duty as a lieutenant commander in 1945.

Commissioner Walrath was a member and past president of the Jacksonville Bar Association, a lecturer for the Florida Bar Association, and a member of the American Bar Association and of the ICC Practitioners Association.

He has been active in many civic organizations including Boy Scouts of America, the American Red Cross, the Salvation Army, and the Chamber of Commerce. He is a member of the University of Florida Alumni Association, Phi Delta Phi, Phi Kappa Phi, Pi Kappa Phi, and the American Legion, and is a 32d Degree Mason, and Shriner.

He is married to the former Mildred Hoff. There are four children, Jean Camille—Mrs. E. K. Goethe—Laurence Kaye, Jr., Timothy Glass, and Shelby Ann—Mrs. Joseph F. Shad, Jr. The Commissioner and Mrs. Walrath have 10 grandchildren.

He resides at 4201 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., but has maintained his legal residence at Keystone Heights, Clay County, Fla. After June 30, 1972, he will be a permanent resident of Florida at 1026 Shore Acres Drive, Leesburg, Fla.

Commissioner Walrath is a Democrat and, as I mentioned, is the first member of the Commission appointed from the State of Florida. He has been reappointed by Presidents Eisenhower, Johnson and Nixon and is leaving the Commission voluntarily after more than 16 years' service.

While a member of the Commission, he has served on all of its divisions, was chairman of division 1 in 1961, vice chairman of the Commission in 1962, chairman in 1963, and chairman of division 2—Rates and Practices—from 1967 until May 15, 1972, when he voluntarily

stepped down to assist his successor to that office take over prior to his leaving the ICC officially as of June 30, 1972.

As Larry Walrath returns to Florida for a well deserved retirement, he leaves behind a host of friends and admirers. He richly deserves all of the tributes which have been paid him.

He was a Government official who set a standard for excellence.

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, through retirement our country is losing a great public servant, Laurence K. Walrath, Commissioner of the Interstate Commerce Commission. His career with the Commission has been impeccable. He has executed his duties with dignity and precision and has been a great help to the Congress and the distinguished Presidents he has served. We are certainly losing a very capable and devoted individual.

Mr. Walrath accepted his duties as Commissioner March 29, 1956, under President Eisenhower and has been reappointed to that position by the three succeeding Presidents. He was admitted to the Florida bar in 1934, has been admitted to practice before the U.S. Supreme Court, ICC and various other Government agencies and courts. He served in the Navy during World War II and achieved the rank of lieutenant commander. He has been active in such civic organizations as the Boy Scouts of America, the American Red Cross, the Salvation Army and the chamber of commerce. He is also a member of the American Legion, and is a 32d Degree Mason and Shriner. He also has the honor of being the first Floridian appointed to the Interstate Commerce Commission. He has served in all divisions of the Commission and is now voluntarily retiring after 16 years of outstanding service to the Commission. We wish him and his wife our very best in their new residence in Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of personal loss that I take note of the retirement of Laurence Walrath from his post as Commissioner of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

As the first member of the Commission ever to be appointed from the State of Florida, those of us who have known and respected him are especially proud that he calls the Sunshine State his home. Now that he has made his decision to retire, we are pleased that he will return to Florida to spend his retirement years.

Laurence Walrath first took the oath of office on March 29, 1956 to fill an unexpired term created by the death of Commissioner Kelso Elliott. Presidents Eisenhower, Johnson and Nixon each had confidence in Laurence and depended on him to fulfill the duties to which they assigned him with honor and dignity. He at no time failed them or their trust.

At the time of his first appointment, Laurence Walrath was a senior partner in a Jacksonville law firm, having graduated from the University of Florida Law School in 1934.

During World War II, he served with distinction as an officer of the U.S. Navy and was released from active duty in

1945 with the rank of lieutenant commander.

Throughout his career in the law and later as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, he has had at his side his lovely wife Mildred. Their four children, Jeane, Laurence Jr., Timothy, and Shelby Ann have been a constant source of pride to Mr. and Mrs. Walrath and all who know them.

Now, after having served for 16 years in his responsible position on the Commission, he will leave, with his voluntary retirement, a void which will be difficult to fill.

While a member of the Commission he served as chairman of division 1, vice chairman of the Commission, as chairman in 1963, and as chairman of division 2 from 1967 until this year, when he stepped down to assist his successor in taking over that office.

Those of us who have had the privilege of knowing Laurence Walrath during his service in Washington will miss him, not only as a friend, but as a stalwart figure on the Interstate Commerce Commission. Although we recognize he has given fully of himself on the Commission and deserves this respite, we are sorry to see him go.

As he takes up his life with his family in Leesburg, Fla., we wish him well and we know for certain that his days will be filled in the future, as they have in the past, with love of his country and dedication to the service of his fellow men.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, a respected Interstate Commerce Commissioner is retiring from his office as of June 30. Laurence K. Walrath, after 16 years of dedicated and productive service to his country, has decided to step down.

Commissioner Walrath has brought great honor to his home State as the first Floridian appointed to the Interstate Commerce Commission. His work was so outstanding that he has been reappointed by Presidents Eisenhower, Johnson, and Nixon.

Since taking the oath of office on March 29, 1956, the Commissioner has done his utmost to serve his country. He has served on every division within the Interstate Commerce Commission and did an outstanding job at each one. His excellence was recognized and he served as chairman of division I in 1961 and as chairman of division II from 1967 until May 15, 1972 when he voluntarily stepped down to assist his successor before he officially left the Commission.

Because of his vast overall knowledge of the Interstate Commerce Commission system, Commissioner Walrath served as chairman in 1961 and as vice chairman in 1962. He is considered to be one of the finest leaders and administrators who has ever served on the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Besides being involved in the monumental task of Government work, Commissioner Walrath has found time for many other activities. He is past president of the Jacksonville Bar Association and is active in the chamber of commerce. He is also active in the Boy Scouts of America, the American Red

Cross, and the Salvation Army. There has never been a time of need in any organization that Commissioner Walrath did not respond.

It has been my pleasure to know this personable and able gentleman, and we, in Florida, are honored that such a distinguished citizen as Commissioner Walrath has made our State his home.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to wish Commissioner Laurence K. Walrath and his wife, Mildred, the most enjoyable of retirements and to thank him again for his outstanding public service.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, Laurence Walrath, who is retiring from the Interstate Commerce Commission, is a prime example of dedicated public service. He has been Chairman of that important governmental agency; and throughout his 16 years of service on that body has served with excellence in his ability and spirit of public service.

I have known Laurence Walrath intimately for most of our lives. He graduated from the University of Florida Law School in the same graduating class as I did, that of 1934. He served as chancellor of the honor court at the university at the same time I was serving as his counterpart as president of the student body. We both practiced law in Jacksonville, and he headed the Jacksonville Bar Association during a part of that time.

He has been active both in Florida and in Washington in numerous civic endeavors, and he served his country well in the armed services during World War II. Truly he has made a magnificent contribution to humanity in every place he has lived. I am sure we are all grateful to him for his great contributions to our country and wish him every happiness as he retires to his beloved Florida.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I join with my colleague, Congressman Fuqua, to advise the Members that Laurence K. Walrath, a Commissioner of the Interstate Commerce Commission, has announced his retirement after 16 years of outstanding service to his country.

Laurence Walrath whom I have had the pleasure of knowing for a number of years has contributed significantly to the Interstate Commerce Commission. I have enjoyed a warm relationship with Larry. He was appointed by President Eisenhower, and reappointed by Presidents Johnson and Nixon after an impressive record of distinguished service to the Commission.

Commissioner Walrath has been a member and past president of the Jacksonville, Fla., Bar Association, a member of the American Bar Association and of the ICC Practitioners Associations. He has been active in many other civic organizations.

I regret that Commissioner Walrath has decided to retire from the position of Commissioner of the Interstate Commerce Commission, but I am certainly pleased that he has decided to return to the State of Florida. I join with my colleagues in saluting Laurence Walrath for his distinguished government service. I extend my best wishes to his wife Mildred and their four children.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, as the

ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have had the privilege of knowing Laurence Walrath during his 16 years as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Originally appointed to the Commission by President Eisenhower, Mr. Walrath was reappointed by Presidents Johnson and Nixon, which in itself is evidence of the high confidence these chief executives had in Commissioner Walrath's ability and devotion to duty.

I thank our colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Fuqua) for allowing me to join in this tribute to Commissioner Walrath. I understand that he is going back to the beautiful State of Florida and I wish both him and Mrs. Walrath much health and happiness in the years ahead.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join my colleagues from Florida in honoring the Honorable Laurence K. Walrath on his retirement after more than 16 years as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Commissioner Walrath is a personal friend of long standing who has served his State, his region, and his country well on a regulatory agency of vital importance to the economic health of all of us.

He was admitted to the Florida bar in 1934, the year I first sought election to the Congress. Our careers diverged, as I entered the Senate in 1937, and he pursued the legal calling for which we both were trained. At the time of his appointment to the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1956, he was the senior active partner of Knight, Walrath, Kincaid & Young, a distinguished law firm in Jacksonville, Fla.

His acceptance of the challenge of the ICC brought him to Washington, where his ability and dedication to duty won him successive reappointments by Presidents Eisenhower, Johnson, and Nixon.

I am pleased to extend my personal congratulations on his distinguished performance in the service of his country and to extend my best wishes for his health and happiness in the years ahead.

COMPILATION OF LEGISLATION INTRODUCED OR COSPONSORED BY HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, so that my constituents will have a clearer idea of my views and my approach to the issues of the day, I am inserting a compilation of legislation I have introduced during the 1st session of the 92d Congress.

I previously inserted into the RECORD a compilation of all the votes I have cast since coming to Congress. Combined, these give my constituents an opportunity to learn where I stand on issues.

I insert the compilation of my bills in the RECORD at this point.

LIST OF BILLS INTRODUCED OR COSPONSORED BY THE HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN (92d CONGRESS THROUGH FIRST SESSION 92d CONGRESS) (ACTION INDICATED)

H.R. 10. Promotes fair competition among prime contractors and subcontractors and

prevents bid peddling on public works contracts by requiring persons submitting bids on those contracts to specify certain subcontractors who will assist in carrying them out. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 113. Provides certain medical and surgical services to officers and members of the fire department of the District of Columbia and of police forces in the District of Columbia retired under the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act for total disabilities. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia.

See H.R. 8794—Public Law 92-12, approved 8/26/71.

See H.R. 2600—Pocket vetoed 8/17/71.

H.R. 817. Establishes a national catastrophic illness insurance program under which the Federal Government, acting in cooperation with State insurance authorities and the private insurance industry, will reinsure and otherwise encourage the issuances of private health insurance policies which make adequate health protection available to all Americans at a reasonable cost.

(Hogan & others)

Referred to Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 851. Extends to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 918. Provides in certain cases for an exchange of credits between the old-age survivors, and disability insurance system and the civil service retirement system so as to enable individuals who have some coverage under both systems to obtain maximum benefits based on their combined service. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1343. Provides for the awarding of a Medal of Honor for Policemen and a Medal of Honor for Firemen. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1344. Amends the Public Health Service Act so as to add to such act a new title dealing especially with kidney disease and kidney-related diseases. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1345. Makes it unlawful to injure, intimidate, or interfere with any fireman performing his duties during the course of any riot. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1346. Strengthens the penalty provision applicable to a Federal felony committed with a firearm. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1347. Provides a code of ethics for Federal judges, including Supreme Court Justices, by amending Chapter 11 of Title 18, U.S. Code. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1348. Prohibits the dissemination through interstate commerce or the mails of materials harmful to persons under the age of 16 years, and restricts the exhibition of movies or other presentations harmful to such persons. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1349. Amends Section 341 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to require the Attorney General to furnish a certificate of citizenship to a person holding certification of birth issued by the Secretary of States. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1350. Strengthens and clarifies the law prohibiting the introduction, or manufacture for introduction, of switchblade knives into interstate commerce. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1351. Amends Section 8331 of Title 5,

United States Code, relating to civil service retirement. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1352. Amends Title 39, U.S. Code, to provide additional free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges for certain members of the U.S. armed forces. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

See H.R. 3808—Passed House Oct. 4, 1971.

H.R. 1353. Provides that any unmarried person who maintains his or her own home shall be entitled to be taxed at the rate provided for the head of a household. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1354. Modifies the provisions relating to taxes on wagering to insure the constitutional rights of taxpayers; and facilitates the collection of such taxes. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1355. Authorizes voluntary withholding of Maryland and Virginia income taxes in the case of officers and employees of the Architect of the Capitol. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1356. Amends Title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2480. Permits the acceptance of checks and nonpostal money orders in payment for postal charges and services; authorizes the Postmaster General to relieve postmasters and accountable officers for losses incurred by postal personnel when accepting checks for nonpostal money orders in full compliance with postal regulations; and provides penalties for presenting bad checks and bad nonpostal money orders in payment for postal charges and services. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2481. Provides an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the government. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2586. Provides that the entire cost of certain minimum health benefits for employees and their families shall be paid by the United States. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2878. For the relief of Giuseppe Cavallo. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2879. For the relief of Fermina Marinan. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3119. Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Lincoln Home National Historic Site in the State of Illinois. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

See H.R. 9798 (S. 489)—PL 92-127, approved 8/18/71.

H.R. 3305. Amends the Act of August 27, 1952, (commonly known as the Fishermen's Protective Act) to conserve and protect Atlantic salmon of North American origin. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Merchant Marine & Fisheries.

See H.R. 3304—PL 92-219, approved 12/23/71.

H.R. 3553. Authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to transfer surplus Liberty ships to States for use in marine life conservation programs. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Merchant Marine & Fisheries.

H.R. 3559. Prohibits the mailing of un-

solicited samples of cigarettes. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Post Office & Civil Service.

H.R. 3679. Assists in the efficient production of the needed volume of good housing at lower cost through the elimination of restrictions on the use of advanced technology. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3808. Same as H.R. 1352.

Passed House 10/4/71.

H.R. 4133. Same as H.R. 817.

H.R. 4215. Authorizes the National Science Foundation to conduct research, educational, and assistance programs to prepare the country for conversion from defense to civilian, socially oriented research and development activities. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Science & Astronautics.

H.R. 4257. Provides that an abortion in facilities of the uniformed services may be performed only in accordance with the requirements of the law of the State in which the abortion is performed. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4268. Amends Title II of the Social Security Act to provide a ten-percent across-the-board increase in benefits thereunder, with a minimum primary benefit of \$100, and to increase to \$2,400 a year the amount of outside earnings a beneficiary may have without loss of benefits. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4299. For the relief of Antonio Ciancio. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4963. Provides for medical and hospital care through a system of voluntary health insurance including protection against the catastrophic expenses of illness, financed in whole for low-income groups through issuance of certificates, and in part for all other persons through allowance of tax credits; and resources, health manpower and facilities. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5050. Regulates the discharge of waste in territorial and international waters. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Merchant Marine & Fisheries.

H.R. 5082. Provides that the first \$3,000 of an individual's civil service retirement annuity (or other Federal retirement annuity) shall be exempt from income tax. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5408. Amends the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5665. For the relief of Benjamin Nery Bueno. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5684. Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to protect, manage, and control free-roaming horses and burros on public lands. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

See H.R. 10015.

H.R. 6238. Authorizes the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to lease airspace above and below freeway rights-of-way within the District of Columbia. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 6652. Encourages States to establish abandoned automobile removal programs and provides for tax incentives for automobile scrap processing. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6808. Requires the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe regulation requiring certain modes of public transportation in interstate commerce to reserve some seating capacity for passengers who do not smoke. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Interstate & Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6955. Provides for more effective inspection of imported meat and meat products to prevent the importation of diseased, contaminated, or otherwise unwholesome meat and meat products. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 7060. Includes 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. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Post Office & Civil Service.

Reported in House 2/17/72; H. Rept. 92-840.

H.R. 7399. Amends Chapter 73 of Title 10, U.S. Code to establish a survivor benefit plan. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Armed Services. See H.R. 10670—Passed House 10/21/71.

H.R. 7400. Equalizes the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 7401. Exempts citizens of the United States who are 65 years of age or over from paying entrance or admission fees for certain recreational areas. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7402. Provides a penalty for unlawful assault upon policemen, firemen, and other law enforcement personnel. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7403. Amends the age and service requirements for immediate retirement under subchapter III of Chapter 83 of Title 5, U.S. Code, and for other purposes. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7404. Authorizes the construction of a low diversion structure or dam on the Potomac River, Maryland. (Hogan & other)

Referred to Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 7408. Extends benefits to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7821. Amends Section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to prohibit foreign assistance from being provided to foreign countries which do not act to prevent narcotic drugs from unlawfully entering the United States. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Foreign Affairs.

See H.R. 9910—Failed of passage 10/29/71.

See S. 2819—PL 92-226, approved 2/7/72.

See S. 2820—Passed House amended, 11/18/71.

Senate agreed to a conference 11/18/71.

H.R. 7836. Allows a deduction for expenses incurred by a taxpayer in making repairs and improvements to his residence, and allows the owner of rental housing to amortize at an accelerated rate the cost of rehabilitating or restoring such housing. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7884. Excludes from the mails as a special category of non-mailable matter certain material offered for sale to minors; and improves the protection of the right of privacy by defining obscene mail matter. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Post Office & Civil Service.

H.R. 7939. Facilitates direct communication between officers and employees of the U.S. Postal Service and Members of Congress. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Post Office & Civil Service.

H.R. 7964. Liberalizes eligibility for cost-of-living increases in civil service retirement annuities. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Post Office & Civil Service. Laid on table 5/17/71. S. 1681, amended, passed in lieu—Passed Senate 5/14/71; Passed House amended—5/17/71. Senate asked for a conference 4/4/72.

H.R. 8397. Creates a National Agricultural Bargaining Board; provides standards for the qualification of associations of producers; and defines the mutual obligation of handlers and associations of producers to negotiate regarding agricultural products. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 8485. Authorizes the District of Columbia to enter into the interstate agreement on qualification of educational personnel. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 8530. Provides for overtime pay without limitation for officers and members of the Metropolitan police force of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park police force, and the Executive Protective Service in those cases of serious civil disturbance. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 8531. Authorizes the District of Columbia to enter into a compact with a State with respect to cooperative efforts and mutual assistance in the prevention of crime. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on District of Columbia.

H.R. 8560. Establishes under the Secretary of Agriculture a 5-year research program seeking to control the gypsy moth. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 8703. Provides for an equitable procedure for establishing congressional districts. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8794. Provides for the payment of the cost of medical, surgical, hospital, or related health care services provided certain retired, disabled officers and members of the Metropolitan Police Force of the District of Columbia, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police Force, the Executive Protective Service, and the U.S. Secret Service. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia.

Public Law 92-121, approved 8/16/71.

H.R. 8805. Excludes from the mails as a special category of nonmailable matter certain material offered for sale to minors; and improves the protection of the right of privacy by defining obscene mail matter. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Post Office & Civil Service.

Passed House 7/7/71.

H.R. 9139. Provides benefits to survivors of police officers killed in the line of duty. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9164. Provides an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for pre-vailing rate employees of the government. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Post Office & Civil Service.

See H.R. 9092—Passed House 7/28/71.

H.R. 9190. Requires a study of the north branch of the Potomac River Basin by the Secretary of the Army. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 9207. Establishes a comprehensive treatment and rehabilitation program for narcotic drug users in the armed forces. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Armed Services.

See H.R. 12846—Reported in House 4/17/72; H. Rept. 92-992.

H.R. 9208. Provides new penalties for the use, possession, sale, or transfer of a narcotic drug, marihuana, or a depressant or stimulant substance for members of the armed services. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9209. Provides new procedures for the civil commitment of drug dependent persons and expands the scope of the provisions of Titles 18 and 28 of the U.S. Code relating to the treatment of drug dependent persons in criminal proceedings. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9210. Provides for the care and treatment of drug dependent former servicemen in Veterans' Administration facilities. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

See H.R. 9265—Passed House 7/19/71.

H.R. 9426. Makes it unlawful in the District of Columbia to intentionally promote or facilitate illegal drug trafficking by possession, sale, or distribution, of certain paraphernalia, and further to make it unlawful for a person to possess an instrument or device for the purpose of unlawfully using a controlled substance himself. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 9483. Provides additional funds for highway safety programs by authorizing appropriations for such programs in an amount equal to 40 percent of the revenue collected from Federal taxes relating to alcohol. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 9541. Provides a system for the redress of law enforcement officers' grievances and establishes a law enforcement officers' bill of rights in each of the several States. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9620. Increases the contribution of the Federal Government to the costs of employees' health benefits insurance. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Post Office & Civil Service.

See H.R. 12202—Passed House 4/27/72.

H.R. 9778. Provides overtime pay for intermittent and part-time General Schedule employees who work in excess of 40 hours in a workweek. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Post Office & Civil Service.

See H.R. 8689—PL 92-194, approved 12/15/71.

H.R. 9785. Transfers the Coast Guard to the Department of Defense. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Merchant Marine & Fisheries.

H.R. 9907. Improves the civil service retirement benefits of employees engaged in the enforcement of the criminal laws of the United States. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Post Office & Civil Service.

H.R. 9908. Provides for the reclassification of positions of deputy U.S. marshal. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Post Office & Civil Service.

H.R. 9939. For the relief of Donald T. Pidgeon. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9940. For the relief of Henry P. Seufert. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10013. Increases personal exemptions after 1973 by an amount based on annual variations in the Consumer Price Index. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10015. Requires the protection, management, and control of wild free-roaming horses and burros on public lands. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

See S. 1116—PL 92-195, approved 12/15/71.

See H.R. 5684.

H.R. 10109. Amends the Act of March 3, 1899, commonly referred to as the Refuse Act, relating to the issuance of certain permits. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 10126. Prohibits common carriers in

interstate commerce from charging elderly people more than half fare for their transportation during nonpeak periods of travel. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10144. For the relief of William E. Parish. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10194. Advances by 1 year the standard deduction provisions of the Tax Reform Act of 1969. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10406. Provides a tax credit for homeowners, apartment owners, small businessmen, and car owners who purchase and install certified pollution control devices. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10453. Provides for involuntary civil commitment of narcotic addicts charged with a crime; authorizes grants for certain training programs; establishes training programs for judicial officers; and provides for research and development into causes of and cures for narcotic addiction. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10485. Provides penalties for distribution of heroin by certain persons, and provides for pretrial detention of such persons. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10502. Provides for expanded protection of public officials and foreign officials. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10637. For the relief of James R. Dean. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10695. Strengthens interstate reporting and interstate services for parents of runaway children; provides for the development of a comprehensive program for the transient youth population for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of temporary housing and psychiatric, medical, and other counseling services for transient youth. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10881. Relates to comparability adjustments in pay rates of the Federal statutory pay systems based on the 1971 Bureau of Labor Statistics survey. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Reported in House 9/30/71; H. Rept. 92-538.

H.R. 11014. Facilitates fund pursuant of criminals in the District of Columbia. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 11015. Establishes orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11132. Provides tutorial and related instructional services for homebound children through the employment of college students, particularly veterans and other students who themselves are handicapped. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 11255. Amends the age and service requirements for immediate retirement under Subchapter III of Chapter 83 of Title 5, U.S. Code. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11842. Relates to comparability adjustments in pay rates of Federal employees. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

See H.R. 10881.

H.R. 11877. Amends the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969 (83 Stat. 320) to provide for Federal guarantees of obligations

issued by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority; and authorizes an increased contribution by the District of Columbia. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 11906. Amends the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, to establish a National Marine Mineral Resources Trust. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 11957. Allows a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 12020. Amends the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to require that environmental impact statements be included in agency reports on bills and resolutions being considered by the Congress. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 12145. Provides benefits to survivors of law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12191. Excludes the personal records of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia from public records. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 12202. Increases the contribution of the Federal Government to the costs of health benefits. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Passed House 4/27/72.

See H.R. 9620.

H.R. 12348. Authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to designate areas of the oceans, coastal, and other waters, as far seaward as the outer edge of the Continental Shelf, for the purpose of preserving or restoring the ecological, esthetics, recreation, resource and scientific values of and related to such areas. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine & Fisheries.

H.J. Res. 5. Establishes a Joint Committee on the Environment. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Rules.

See H.J. Res. 3 (S.J. Res. 17).

Passed House 7/20/71.

S.J. Res. 17—Passed Senate 3/16/71.

H.J. Res. 22. Authorizes the President to designate the period beginning March 21, 1971, as National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.
See H.J. Res. 16 (S.J. Res. 10)—P.L. 92-6, approved 3/19/71.

H.J. Res. 106. Constitutional Amendment—Provides for representation of the District of Columbia. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 107. Grants the consent of the Congress for the States of Virginia and Maryland and the District of Columbia to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the establishment and authority of a Washington Metropolitan Airport Authority. (Hogan & other)

Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.J. Res. 268. Constitutional Amendment—Provides the offering of prayer in public buildings. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.
See H.J. Res. 191—Failed of passage 11/8/71.

H.J. Res. 280. Designates the 3d week of April of each year as Earth Week. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 685. Creates a select joint committee to conduct an investigation and study

into methods of significantly simplifying Federal income tax return forms. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Rules.

H.J. Res. 810. Authorizes the President to proclaim the period September 12, 1971, through September 20, 1971, as Myasthenia Gravis Week. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 919. Grants the consent of Congress to certain boundary agreements between the States of Maryland and Virginia. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 933. Designates the first week in February of each year as National Salesmen's Week. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 981. Constitutional Amendment—Relates to participation in silent prayer or meditation in public schools. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 1010. Establishes a Joint Committee on Aging. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 362. Same as H. Con. Res. 352.

H. Con. Res. 385. Expresses the sense of Congress that the Holy Crown of St. Stephen should remain in the safekeeping of the U.S. Government until Hungary once again functions as a constitutional government established by the Hungarian people through free choice. (Hogan & others)

Referred to Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 407. Expresses congressional recognition of a declaration of general and special rights of the mentally retarded. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. Con. Res. 446. Expresses the sense of Congress with respect to placing before the United Nations General Assembly the issue of the dual right of all persons to emigrate from and also return to one's country. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 454. Urges review of the United Nations Charter. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 476. Same as H. Con. Res. 385.

H. Con. Res. 490. Relieves the suppression of Soviet Jewry. (Sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Foreign Affairs.

See H. Con. Res. 471—Passed House 4/17/72.

H. Con. Res. 27. Calls for a national commitment to cure and control cancer within this decade. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

See S. 1828 (H.R. 11302)—PL 92-218, approved 12/23/71.

H. Con. Res. 113. Calls for the humane treatment and release of American prisoners of war held by North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Foreign Affairs.

See H. Con. Res. 374—Passed House 10/4/71.

H. Con. Res. 128. Expresses the sense of Congress with respect to the continued operation of Public Health Service facilities. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. Con. Res. 221. Requests the President of the United States to take affirmative action to persuade the Soviet Union to revise its official policies concerning the rights of Soviet Jewry. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 254. Requests the President of the United States of America to take immediate and determined steps to encourage and persuade the Soviet Union to permit persons of the Jewish faith who express the desire to emigrate to a country of their choice. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 352. Relates to control of the

production and traffic of illegal drugs. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 353. Expresses the sense of Congress with respect to the withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Foreign Affairs.

See S. J. Res. 155—In Senate ordered placed on calendar Sept. 17, 1971.

H. Res. 63. Amends the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on the Environment. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 140. Same as H. Res. 63.

H. Res. 222. Provides for free Federal telecommunications system service to patients in veterans' hospitals. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. Res. 501. Provides for equitable and effective minority staffing on House standing committees. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 567. Calls upon the Voice of America to broadcast in the Yiddish language to Soviet Jewry. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 596. Disapproves the alternative plan, dated August 31, 1971, for pay adjustments for Federal employees under statutory pay systems. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Failed of passage 10/4/71.

H. Res. 665. Calls for the shipment of Phantom F-4 aircraft in Israel in order to maintain the arms balance in the Middle East. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 724. Amends the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that the report accompanying each bill or resolution contain an analysis and evaluation of the environmental impact of the bill or resolution. (Co-sponsored)

Referred to Committee on Rules.

THE EDUCATION FOR ALL HANDICAPPED CHILDREN ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today, for myself and 13 other Members of the House of Representatives, a bill to increase dramatically this Nation's commitment to our handicapped children.

The sponsors of this bill believe that the Education for All Handicapped Children Act will substantially improve the opportunity for handicapped children to grow into independent, contributing members of our society.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many people will be shocked to learn that only 40 percent of the 7 million handicapped children in America are now receiving the special educational services they so desperately need.

A reliable authority, however, the Council for Exceptional Children, has documented in the book, "State Law and Education of Handicapped Children," published earlier this year, the extent of this problem in our society, and the response of our schools to it.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD, at this point, a summary table of the findings of the Council for Exceptional Children on the number of children with various disabilities, and the extent to which traditional educational structures are serving these children.

TABLE 1.—HANDICAPPED CHILDREN BY DISABILITY RECEIVING AN EDUCATION

	TMR	EMR	HH	D	SI	VI	ED	C	OHI	MH
Estimated number of handicapped children.....	191,063	1,147,803	260,981	45,681	2,145,647	64,718	749,441	183,802	1,089,147	35,838
Number of handicapped children being educated.....	109,175	594,646	44,430	20,771	1,122,232	22,718	99,400	63,450	165,589	9,242
Percent of handicapped children being educated.....	57	52	17	45	52	35	13	35	2	26

KEY TO SYMBOLS

TMR—Trainable mentally retarded.
 EMR—Educable mentally retarded.
 HH—Hard of hearing.
 D—Deaf.
 SI—Speech impaired.

VI—Visually impaired.
 ED—Seriously emotionally disturbed.
 OHI—Other health impaired (includes learning disabled).
 MH—Multiply handicapped.

I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that the estimated number of handicapped children totals over 5.9 million, and does not include another estimated 1 million preschool handicapped children.

Mr. Speaker, I think we must all ask ourselves how this shockingly inadequate treatment of children with special needs has come to be accepted.

In large measure, I believe that the answer to the question lies in the historical development of public education in this country.

As we know, three-quarters of a century ago, the right of every child to an adequate education was such a radical proposal that many fought its implementation.

When that right came to be accepted, many State statutes provided specifically for the education of all children physically and intellectually capable of benefiting from it.

As the report of the Council for Exceptional Children tells us: In some States such statutes still determine whether or not a handicapped child receives any form of education, not to mention the special services such children so urgently need.

Mr. Speaker, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act is addressed to many of these concerns.

The act is based on the fact that a key reason many States have not provided better services for their handicapped children is the financial condition of their elementary and secondary schools. To help States meet this financial burden the act authorizes the Federal Government to pay State governments at least 75 percent of the extra cost involved in educating a handicapped child.

Under the act, in order for a State to participate, it must:

Establish an advisory committee on the education of the handicapped which will be representative of the individuals and groups involved in this endeavor—educators, administrators, handicapped individuals, and parents of handicapped children;

Submit a State plan for the education of the handicapped to the Commissioner on Education;

Apply uniform criteria to determine the number of handicapped children to be served.

Mr. Speaker, Members of the House are well aware of the distressing statistic that there are today 21 million handicapped adults in the United States. It is generally accepted that two-thirds of these handicapped adults could become more self-sufficient through remunerative employment if they had had the necessary education and training, and if job opportunities were available for them.

It is to the credit of Congress that, in recognition of this problem, Democrats and Republicans have, for over 50 years, given overwhelming support to the vocational rehabilitation program.

The sponsors of the bill I am today introducing believe that Congress will again respond to the pressing needs to insure that rather than seeing 7 million children added to the number of handicapped adults not fulfilling their potential, as many of these children as possible become productive members of our society.

Passage of this bill, needless to say, will be received gratefully not only by the children, but also by their parents.

In the long run, Mr. Speaker, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act will benefit not only individuals—both in terms of productivity and self-esteem—but our entire society as well.

Mr. Speaker, as I conclude these remarks about the purpose of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, I recall the words of President Franklin D. Roosevelt during his second inaugural address:

The test of progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have too much, it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.

Mr. Speaker, for too long our handicapped children have had too little.

Let us act now to correct that inequity.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. MURPHY ON THE INTRODUCTION OF "THE BILL OF RIGHTS FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED"

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

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, at my request, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare recently sent a special team of investigators to Staten Island to see, hear, and smell the conditions at Willowbrook State School, the world's largest mental institution.

Willowbrook, like many understaffed and underfinanced repositories for our Nation's mentally retarded, has over the past years, displayed the best and the worst that typify such an anomaly in our society.

The best at Willowbrook is represented by a small, dedicated, hardworking staff. I personally know Dr. Jack Hammond, the director of the school. He has fought valiantly since 1964 to make conditions better for his tragic wards.

The worst at Willowbrook is repre-

sented by the lack of treatment, the oppressive overcrowding, and the depression that results when an already hopeless situation becomes more hopeless with each passing day.

As a result of the HEW site visit which was attended by myself and several other Members of Congress, we have formulated a bill which will begin to eliminate conditions epitomized by Willowbrook, but which exist for the bulk of the 200,000 mentally retarded persons who are in residential treatment centers on any given day in the United States.

This is a substantial bipartisan effort to relieve the heartbreak of America's mentally retarded.

One of the major reasons for the conditions that face the Willowbrooks of America is the financial squeeze that faces such institutions. Willowbrook alone had 900 unfilled staff positions because of the State's financial inability to fill the vacancies. This means that in the sections housing the most severely retarded, instead of the standard staff-patient ratio of 1 to 4, the ratio was one staff to 20 patients. It will also take more money to relieve overcrowding and to remove certain patients to other treatment centers.

Some States do not even have facilities to handle exceptional children. In others, conditions are more deplorable than Willowbrook though on a smaller scale. And, in most States, there is a crying need to improve the quality of both treatment personnel and available programs.

The beginning solutions for these problems are contained in the legislation I introduce today which I have called, "A bill of rights for the mentally retarded."

The bill will:

Authorize \$45 million over the next 3 years for the States to develop comprehensive plans for establishing and upgrading residential facilities for the mentally retarded.

Authorize \$45 million over the next 3 years to improve services provided by existing facilities for the mentally retarded.

Authorize such sums as are necessary to assist nonprofit organizations to develop community living situations for the mentally retarded as alternatives to the gloomy prison-like institutions that exist in many parts of the country.

Authorize necessary moneys—in the form of grants—to meet expenses necessary to raise the standards of the Nation's Willowbrooks which are set forth in this legislation and which are considered necessary to provide humane and effective treatment for our Nation's mentally retarded.

The heart of the bill is contained in

part "C" which establishes high standards for residential facilities for the mentally retarded. Any State seeking funds under this law must comply with these standards in order to qualify for assistance under the act.

For too long in America our institutions for exceptional children have remained in dark recesses separated from the rest of the community by high walls—or distances—or both.

Mental retardation still has the vestiges of rejection by the community that formerly surrounded institutions for the insane. As a result, those afflicted still suffer from an attitude of "out of sight, out of mind." This in turn has caused a lack of attention and support for the institutions which are charged with caring for these most unfortunate of our Nation's retarded and handicapped.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is an attempt to shed light where there is now darkness, and to bring to our Nation's retarded the sunlight of hope for a future free from the intolerable conditions which are exemplified by the worst of Willowbrook.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the House and the Senate in introducing today the Bill of Rights for the Mentally Retarded.

The handicapped have long been one of our most neglected minorities. Their needs have been placed on the bottom of our list of priorities. Moneys allocated to programs beneficial to them have, as a rule, been ridiculously low. In most instances our society has denied, either through deliberate choice or more often through sheer indifference, their innate right to develop their full potentials. Until lately for the handicapped without independent wealth or extraordinary luck only two avenues in life were available: "the leading of a useful life"—in their case normally an euphemism for shunting them into jobs and positions completely unrelated to their potentials and inclinations, or a caretaker program of "warehousing" whereby we spirited disabled human beings, handicapped physically or mentally, out of sight and out of mind.

It would be extremely easy for me to compile, from personal knowledge, a long list of examples of our society's callous disregard of the human dignity and the human potential of our handicapped citizens. Nowhere, however, is this disregard more evident than in our treatment of the mentally disabled and the mentally retarded.

It took horrifying press accounts of the inhuman warehousing of human beings in institutions for the mentally retarded to rouse this Nation to the need for action. It took the horror of Willowbrook, which I visited as a member of the congressional investigating team, to spark legislation designed to correct the conditions under which the mentally disabled members of our society are forced to exist.

The bill being introduced today is a very necessary piece of legislation. More—it is a pioneering piece of legislation. I have already expressed my strong support of its intentions to its Senate

sponsors and intend to give the measure my full support in the House.

But although necessary and well-drawn, the measure is by no means perfect. I am particularly concerned, for instance, that provisions be made for the incorporation into its structure of an ombudsman service on behalf of patients in institutions for the mentally retarded. Although the bill would make attorneys available to the patients, I am very much concerned about those individuals who are not aware of their rights and consequently would not make active use of the legal aid provided. Family members and guardians at times, either because of lack of information or lack of time, also fail to aggressively seek the safeguarding of the rights of persons on such institutions. Review authority in this bill appears to be vested largely in the institutional staff. For all these reasons, I believe it would be extremely helpful to have persons, knowledgeable and outside the institutions' framework, act on behalf of the patients. The number of ombudsmen would have to vary, the precise structure for their involvement carefully examined. But their incorporation into the program is, in my estimation, essential.

I would also like to see explored the possibility of making use of the concepts of Prevlab somewhere along the line. I believe that much good would come from the unstructured social activity that this concept engenders. As a matter of fact, it is my understanding that Maryland State institutions are presently actively exploring the possibility of incorporating this program into their institutional activities.

Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly Members of both bodies will have much to contribute to the measure. I am certain, also, that testimony presented in the course of hearings on this legislation will point the way to a real reform of our institutions for the mentally retarded. For these reasons I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will see fit to support this bill and help to shape it for speedy passage.

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

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation entitled a "Bill of Rights for the Mentally Retarded." This legislation is identical to legislation being introduced in the other body by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS. It is the result of a Federal inspection of Willowbrook State School, Staten Island, N.Y., in which I participated following last spring's exposé of conditions in that institution.

For the benefit of my colleagues I would like to present a short summary of this important legislation, which I believe, if enacted, will provide a coherent, planned program for this Nation's treatment of its mentally handicapped persons.

For too long our efforts have been fragmented and piecemeal with the sufferers being the handicapped. Passage of this legislation will move us out of the Dark Ages treatment of the present, into the humane light of the 20th century.

The summary follows:

SUMMARY—BILL OF RIGHTS FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED

1. Congressional findings regarding the mentally retarded in the United States and concerned with such matters as:

(a) the numbers of mentally retarded currently living in residential facilities for the retarded;

(b) the prime purpose and basic obligation of residential services;

(c) the need for residential facilities to be humane and safe, to provide basic human needs, and to be located in the community served and provide normal contacts within the community life; and

(d) the necessity for both an upgrading of existing facilities for the retarded, and the establishment of new, small, homelike units integrated into community living situations.

2. Authorizes \$15 million a year for fiscal year 1973 and the next two succeeding fiscal years to help the States conduct comprehensive surveys and analyses of the cost of bringing existing residential facilities into compliance with the standards established under this Act, to review existing State plans and develop strategies to fulfill the overall stated purposes of the Act, and to study administrative relationships, including the involvement of public and private sources in programs and services for the mentally retarded, with recommendations for improvement.

3. Authorizes \$15 million a year for fiscal year 1973 and the next two succeeding fiscal years to assist the States in improving the services provided by existing residential facilities for the mentally retarded. These grants will not exceed \$300,000 per institution and will cover costs of administering and operating demonstration facilities and training programs.

4. Authorizes such sums as may be necessary to assist non-profit institutions to develop, improve, extend or expand community resources and community living situations for the mentally retarded as alternative programs of care for the mentally retarded other than living in residential facilities for the mentally retarded. Priority is given to those applicants whose proposals the Secretary determines are of special significance because they demonstrate new or relatively effective or efficient methods of delivery of services to the mentally retarded.

5. Authorizes such sums as are necessary in grants to assist the States in meeting direct and indirect expenses for bringing residential facilities into conformance with the standards established under this Act. Priority in awarding these grants will be given to those applicants whose facilities are in the greatest need of assistance. A State desiring to receive a grant must submit a plan:

(a) setting forth a schedule for compliance with the established standards for each facility;

(b) designating how placement in residential facilities will be minimized through alternative regional and community programs and services;

(c) assuring reasonable State financial participation in the cost of carrying out the plan;

(d) setting forth a schedule of costs to achieve compliance with the standards.

6. Five years after the enactment of this Act, no residential facility that does not comply to the standards established by this Act will be eligible to receive any direct or indirect payments under any Federal law on behalf of an individual resident and such funds which any individual would otherwise be entitled to have paid on his behalf to any vendor of residential services, public or private, shall be reserved for him and administered by the Social Security Administration in the same manner as benefits under Title II of the Social Security Act would

be administered on his behalf were he entitled to same.

7. Authorizes an extension of time for grantees and other residential facilities for the retarded to meet the established standards if appropriations for grants do not meet authorizations.

8. Establishes a fifteen-member National Advisory Council on Standards for Residential Facilities for the Mentally Retarded. Members will be appointed from representatives of professional and voluntary organizations concerned with the mentally retarded, consumers of services from residential facilities for the retarded, and leaders in the fields of service to the mentally retarded. A majority of the membership will represent the interests of consumers of services. The Council will advise the Secretary on regulations implementing standards, will study and evaluate such standards to determine their effectiveness, and will recommend any changes or improvements in the standards.

9. The major proportion of the 200 page bill is contained in Part C, which is entitled "Standards for Residential Facilities for the Mentally Retarded" and which consists of a comprehensive and detailed description of the standards a residential facility for the mentally retarded must comply with in order to qualify for assistance under this Act, and eventually, for assistance and funds under any Federal program. This part is divided into eight chapters and each chapter is broken down into subchapters. The chapters are:

Chapter I—Administrative Policies and Practices.

Chapter II—Resident Living.

Chapter III—Professional and Special Programs and Services.

Chapter IV—Records.

Chapter V—Research.

Chapter VI—Safety and Sanitation.

Chapter VII—Administration Support Services.

Chapter VIII—Definitions.

COMMENTS ON "BILL OF RIGHTS FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED"

National Association for Retarded Children: "The proposed bill addresses itself to one of the really critical issues facing states in serving the needs of the mentally retarded today. I am in complete agreement with the philosophy expressed in this proposed legislation."

Accreditation Council of Facilities for the Mentally Retarded: "The Accreditation Council wholeheartedly supports the Senator's objective of improving the services provided mentally retarded persons."

New York State Association for Retarded Children: "I think the concept of the bill is superb."

Association for Children with Retarded Mental Development: "We have examined the Bill in its entirety and find it to be an outstanding document covering every aspect of the need for continuity of care and concern of the rights of the mentally retarded."

Federation of Parents' Organizations for the New York State Mental Institutions: "This bill is the best one I've ever seen. I hope I can be of some help in seeing that it becomes the law of the land."

Citizens Action Committee for the Handicapped: "If this Bill could become a reality, it would usher in a 'new world' for the retarded. It includes everything those of us who have been fighting for change and for a restructuring of existing systems of service, would have included were we to write our own 'Bill of Rights'."

AFL-CIO: "... the bill represents a major step forward toward the goal of fully protecting the rights of millions of handicapped citizens of whom the mentally retarded are the most vulnerable."

New York State Department of Mental Hygiene: "I am very much in accord with the

intent of Senator Javits' Bill of Rights for the Mentally Retarded, and with its excellent provisions for providing better services for our retarded citizens."

United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc.: "The 'Bill of Rights for the Mentally Retarded', which you sent me, would be a lasting landmark in the restoration of full citizenship for the mentally retarded of our country."

Illinois Department of Mental Health: "As a superintendent of a 2,700 bed facility serving the mentally retarded of all ages and all handicapping conditions, may I state that this is the most exciting, promising, encouraging and all-encompassing proposal that has ever been made."

The Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., Foundation: "I have read your bill on the Bill of Rights for the Mentally Retarded and am very impressed. Congratulations for working so quickly and with such expertise in such a sad and difficult area."

Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals: "Your strong and sincere interest in the welfare of the mentally retarded is well demonstrated by your conception of this legislative proposal. All of us on the staff, as well as the members of the Accreditation Council for Facilities for the Mentally Retarded and the Board of Commissioners of the Joint Commission, support your objective wholeheartedly."

Association for the Help of Retarded Children: "I would like to assure you of my complete support of this fine legislation."

ROONEY OF PENNSYLVANIA PROPOSES FEDERAL TAX CREDIT FOR NONPUBLIC SCHOOL TUITION

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

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the need for legislation to alleviate the dual problems of rising educational costs and the financial crises being faced by educational institutions, caused me to introduce a bill to provide a Federal income tax credit to parents for up to half the tuition they pay for the education of their children in private non-profit elementary and secondary schools. The bill has an upper limit of \$500 per child, and applies to amounts paid for tuition only.

The bill would reduce the credit for taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes of over \$20,000, from which personal exemptions have been taken, by \$1 of credit for every \$20 of excess income, thus preserving the principle of ability to pay.

A number of bills have been introduced in Congress which would make reductions in the credit to taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes over \$25,000, but, the formula I have devised will have a greater benefit on low- and middle-income taxpayers, and will phase out more quickly as income and ability to pay increase, and will provide a smaller overall revenue loss to the Government.

The parents of children attending non-public schools are both paying taxes for support of the public schools and paying tuition to send their children to private schools. Approximately 2 million families are paying some \$1.4 billion in tuition, and this is but one of the many expenses involved in private education. The bill will take no money away from the public schools, but will relieve the

pressure on these schools by enabling more parents to send their children to private schools, and will save the public schools from the burden they would face if forced to take over the education of 5 million children.

I should also point out that declining enrollments in both private and parochial schools are a clear indication of the financial crisis they are facing. Without some sort of assistance, the American educational tradition of pluralism and freedom of choice are gravely threatened. At the same time, a system of tax credits avoids any conflict with our traditional principle of separation of church and state as guaranteed by the first amendment, since there will be no connection between the Government and any religious institution.

I hope the President's announcement Monday that he will support a system of tax credits will provide the extra impetus necessary for early consideration of these proposals. Prompt action to strengthen our Nation's educational system must be among our highest priorities.

THE NEED TO REFREEZE MEAT PRICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, along with 32 cosponsors, legislation which would refreeze meat prices for 45 days at April 1, 1971, retail levels. It would also require the President to submit to Congress a plan which will insure for the future: first, an adequate meat supply for U.S. consumers and thereby reasonable meat prices and, second, a fair rate of return on invested capital to farmers, food processors, and retailers.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that it is no longer in the public interest to entrust to the Nixon administration the sole responsibility for combating inflationary meat prices. Congress can no longer stand idly by while the Secretary of Agriculture cheerleads for higher and higher prices and calls concerned consumers "cheap food advocates." We can no longer sit idly by while the Price Commission and Cost of Living Council play politics with the food dollars of millions of urban consumers.

Quite frankly, I took this rather far-reaching and, I know, controversial step, only after it became clear that lesser action would not be effective against the present food price emergency. Beef prices are about 8 percent higher today than they were 1 year ago and are up an average of 10 percent since April. Pork prices are up 15 percent over last year at this time. Unfortunately, there is no letup in sight. Even the chief economist of the Department of Agriculture acknowledges that there will be a slower rate of increase in beef production between 1970-80 than between 1960-70, even though demand is rising rapidly.

These figures and every other market indicator—including projections by supermarket chainstores—demonstrate

that it is going to be a long hot summer for millions of financially pressed urban consumers unless the Federal Government acts immediately to hold down meat prices. The administration's only response to date has been to suspend meat import quotas for the balance of the year. This decision is too little and too late to be of any value in moderating retail meat prices today and for the foreseeable future. Even if the President worked for repeal of the Meat Import Quota Act so that foreign suppliers could plan ahead, only the price of hamburgers and hot dogs would be affected—a highly desirable result but only a partial answer to the food price problem.

Mr. Speaker, not very many weeks ago, I spent a full day touring supermarkets in my district and talking to shoppers. For a majority of those with whom I talked, food prices are of an importance beyond any other issue. If Government fails to act decisively now, consumers will react in a way that will make the supermarket boycotts of 1966 look tame by comparison.

My legislation is not antifarmer. I have the greatest respect for America's family farmers and in fact they along with consumers have been victimized by the "feast or famine" food supply situation which has been brought about by USDA's gross failure to insure an adequate meat supply.

In the final analysis, enactment of my legislation will benefit consumers and farmers. I urge the support of my colleagues in securing its passage.

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD DURRELL STONE

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the Members to some very pleasant ceremonies held in Massachusetts on June 14 honoring the world famous architect Edward Durrell Stone. Mr. Stone, who is a native of Arkansas, received a plaque presented by Gov. Francis Sargent at a ceremony held in the Governor's office. Later in the day, at ceremonies in the office of Boston's Mayor Kevin White, the mayor presented him with a book and a citation attesting to his monumental work in architecture. In a highly unusual event, later in the afternoon Mr. Stone was cited by the Massachusetts Legislature for his outstanding achievements and world reknown as an architect. He was given the signal honor of being allowed to address the members who gave him a standing ovation.

In his remarks, Mr. Stone said it was a "sentimental return" for him because he had spent 8 years in Massachusetts while a student at Harvard and MIT.

Edward Durrell Stone is noted for achievements in 15 countries of the world as well as for his contributions in America. The citation read by House Speaker David Bartley listed many of his outstanding works with special reference to his design of the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

I thought my colleagues and also the people of America should know of the high honors paid by Massachusetts to Edward Durrell Stone. He is the only man within my memory who in 1 day was awarded honors by the Governor of Massachusetts, the mayor of Boston, and the Great and General Court of Massachusetts.

Mr. Stone was escorted by Samuel Ostrow, president of Massachusetts Management Corp. and by Robert De Simone, former city greeter of Boston.

DR. IRVIN H. TRINCHER

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, we were saddened and distressed to learn of the sudden and untimely passing of my close personal friend, Dr. Irvin H. Trincher, director of the Veterans' Administration hospital in Columbia, S.C. Our Nation has lost an outstanding member of the medical profession and a devoted public servant who rendered dedicated service to our veterans, to all those associated with them and to our country.

A distinguished surgeon, Dr. Trincher became associated with the Veterans' Administration in 1958, as chief of the surgical and orthopedic section of the Atlanta VA regional office. Subsequently he served in various important capacities in the VA hospitals in Dublin, Ga., New Orleans, La., and Houston, Tex. Before coming to the Columbia VA hospital in 1970 as its Director, he was Director of the Butler, Pa., VA hospital.

Dr. Trincher served on active duty with the Navy during World War II and was a captain in the Naval Reserve. He was an active member of veterans organizations. As a veteran himself, he was particularly able to understand and appreciate the needs of the thousands of veterans that he served so well.

Dr. Trincher was greatly loved and respected by the people of his community and our State. Veterans and service organizations join his many friends in attesting to his outstanding character, leadership, and understanding as he strived to offer the best possible medical service to those in our VA hospitals. He was a man of great capabilities and seemingly unlimited compassion.

Any tribute to Dr. Trincher is necessarily also a tribute to all the great and dedicated men and women who serve in the Veterans' Administration. His quietly devoted service typifies the service of those, too often unacknowledged and unsung, who do so much for our Nation and its veterans. We are grateful to all of them. Among these dedicated men and women, Dr. Trincher served us all with honor and distinction. Mrs. Dorn joins with me in extending deepest sympathy to Mrs. Trincher, their lovely family and to Dr. Trincher's many friends and associates.

LEEWAY INVESTMENTS

(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, I want to bring to the attention of our colleagues the commendable action of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in establishing a new and constructive policy called "leeway investments." The effect of this policy—when formally approved by the FDIC's board—will be to encourage State-chartered banks—not members of the Federal Reserve System—to invest in corporations who are engaged in providing capital to minority business enterprises, or whose objectives are primarily civic oriented and seem socially desirable to a bank's board of directors.

According to the FDIC:

Such a situation might arise with respect to debt securities associated with community rehabilitation or development corporations which lack the qualitative elements of investment grade securities, but are regarded as tolerable risks to depository financial institutions on a restricted and controlled basis.

In the past, the FDIC, and other bank regulatory agencies, have criticized any securities not of an investment grade. These criticisms are subsequently reported to the bank's board of directors, thus inhibiting socially desirable capital investments by banks in worthy enterprises or causes. Under the new system the investments would be identified as "leeway" and they would not be subject to criticism by FDIC examiners.

By establishing this new policy the FDIC is following the direction in which our country has been moving within the past decade. These new socially oriented practices should go far toward assisting corporations interested in helping minority enterprises and others in need of this financial assistance.

EIGHTY-EIGHT MILLION DOLLARS FOR NEW YORK CITY SUBWAYS

(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, New York City has just received approximately \$88 million from the Federal Government to improve the city's transit system. The grant came in two parcels: \$63 million for the purchase of 320 new air-conditioned subway cars and \$25 million to start the Second Avenue subway in Manhattan. These are the first significant grants made to New York City since the urban mass transportation program was revised in 1970 to provide long term assistance for the large construction projects, like the Second Avenue subway, that must be undertaken if our transportation crisis is to be met.

Today millions of New Yorkers are forced to ride in overcrowded, dirty, hot subways and are threatened by breakdowns costing time and too often personal injury. With the \$23 million Federal grant, the Metropolitan Transit Authority plans to start construction on the Second Avenue subway this fall; running along the East Side of Manhattan, this new subway line is essential to relieve

the present overcrowding on the Lexington Avenue line.

For too long this country has neglected the needs of public transportation. While we have spent over \$60 billion in Federal funds for highways, we have allocated less than \$2 billion for mass transit. As a consequence, during the past 20 years, public transportation has suffered a vicious cycle of service deterioration and passenger loss. Now we are at the point that many systems are burdened by growing deficits and equipment that is obsolete and often barely operable.

Some advocate higher fares to eliminate operating deficits; but, I believe that a requisite of public transportation is that the fare be reasonable. The time has come to recognize that the farebox alone cannot meet all operating expenses and that Federal help must be forthcoming. Federal assistance would go a long way in placing transit systems on a sound financial basis and in stabilizing transit fares at a reasonable level.

On February 23, I introduced H.R. 13362, now cosponsored by 84 Members of the House, to provide \$400 million annually in Federal operating assistance for public and private transit systems. Presently, the House Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member, is working on the "Housing and Urban Development Act of 1972." Included in this bill is the \$400 million annual mass transit operating subsidy program I have proposed. In addition, the committee bill has added almost \$3 billion to the mass transit construction program, providing for a total of \$6 billion to be committed to mass transit construction and modernization projects before the end of 1975.

If enacted, this stepped-up transit program will be very important in equipping public transportation to meet the mobility demands of an increasingly urban society. Let us make the 1970's a decade in which we do for public transportation what we did for space exploration in the 1960's and highways in the 1950's.

THE NEED FOR A REALISTIC PEACE BETWEEN INDIA AND PAKISTAN

(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, long-awaited discussions are now in progress between President Bhutto of Pakistan and Prime Minister Gandhi of India. The talks in search of peace came after long delays. All of them apparently on the part of India and after repeated efforts on the part of President Bhutto to begin negotiations and to establish a better understanding and durable peace with India.

It is well to recall that President Bhutto released Shaikh Nuguber Rahman unconditionally and allowed him to return to Dacca as proof of his desire for a new chapter of peace and good will in the history of the subcontinent. Subsequently, President Bhutto has sought summit level talks with Rahman as well as with Mrs. Gandhi but preconditions were demanded by both. It appears clear enough

that the Government and people of Pakistan sincerely seek to achieve an honorable and just settlement of the Indo-Pakistan problems and the new problems created by establishment of an independent government in Bangladesh. Pakistan's economic condition requires this. India has assumed the role of conqueror. Bangladesh is under the protective wing of India. Neither seems interested in a settlement of the manifold problems between the principals.

It rests with India to give a demonstration of her peaceful intentions toward her smaller neighbor. It was India's direct military intervention that led to the dismemberment of Pakistan in December 1971. Since Pakistan's defeat in the east and the separation of East Pakistan, Pakistan clearly poses no threat to India. India has a very advanced defense capability of its own with 38 factories which manufacture war materials including Mig's, helicopters, Vijayanti tanks, and armored vehicles.

India also signed a defense treaty with the Soviet Union on August 9, 1971, and she continues to receive massive military aid from Moscow. Pakistan, in contrast, has no defense production capability of its own. Much of Pakistan's armament system was geared to supplies from the United States. However, since 1965, U.S. military assistance to Pakistan has been cut off. In 1967 sale of spare parts was permitted but since last year there has been almost a total ban on any military supplies from the United States. As a result, Pakistan is in an extremely vulnerable defense position. Obviously the 60 million people of West Pakistan with very limited armaments can never be a threat to 600 million in India with a large war machine.

One item of major concern is the fact that India holds 93,000 Pakistani prisoners of war which include soldiers, civil servants and civilians—men, women, and children. India also controls large tracts of Pakistan territory occupied along the western front in Sind, Punjab, and across the United Nations cease-fire line in Kashmir. The bulk of India's forces are poised on Pakistan's frontiers. In fact, since the fall of Dacca, three additional Indian divisions were brought to the western front to supplement the 13 Indian divisions already poised in the sector.

Pakistan wants peace with India—an honorable peace and a negotiated peace. But Pakistan rejects a dictated peace. The atmosphere for peace can be greatly improved if India honors her commitments under the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and repatriate the prisoners of war, she has been holding since the cessation of hostilities.

Article 118 of the Third Geneva Convention of 1949 states unequivocally:

Prisoners of War shall be released and repatriated without delay after the cessation of active hostilities. In the absence of stipulations to the above effect in any agreement concluded between the Parties to the conflict with a view to the cessation of hostilities, or failing any such agreement, each of the Detaining Powers shall itself establish and execute without delay a plan of repatriation in conformity with the principle laid down in the foregoing paragraph.

In either case, the measures adopted shall be brought to the knowledge of the Prisoners of War.

This article imposes an obligation on all signatories to return prisoners of war immediately on cessation of hostilities. Both India and Pakistan are signatories to the Geneva Conventions of 1949. The hostilities came to an end in December 1971 after the fall of Dacca and the U.N. Security Council Resolution No. 307(71) dated December 21, 1971, clearly noted that "a cease-fire and a cessation of hostilities prevails." This left no doubt that the conditions for the return of POW's had been fulfilled. The resolution also specifically called for "observance of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and to apply in full their provisions as regards the protection of wounded and sick prisoners of war and civilian population."

Nearly 5 months have passed and India has given no indication of her willingness to release the prisoners of war. Out of more than 93,000 prisoners, about 20,000 are civilians, including women and children. There is no excuse for detaining them. Unfortunately, some Indian leaders have made statements which indicate that they are detaining the POW's as hostages to extract political advantage or dictate a settlement of their own choice. Holding human life to ransom in violation of Geneva conventions does not augur well for the future. Thus, it is important that the prisoners are repatriated and that there be a mutual withdrawal of troops of the two countries. Pakistan is ready. The President of Pakistan, on April 21, even offered to repatriate Indian prisoners of war unilaterally, if India asked for them, but there was no response from India.

The President of Pakistan feels that India and Pakistan must move to solve all their problems step by step. Repatriation of prisoners of war and mutual withdrawal of troops from each other's countries could be followed by restoration of communication, travel facilities, restoration of diplomatic relations, and the reopening of trade between the two countries. Then in the improved atmosphere, the most serious problems like the Kashmir dispute, which has remained unresolved for 25 years, could also be tackled and solved.

Pakistan also has made it clear that a sensible relationship is desired with Bangladesh. Since the release of Shaikh Mujibur Rahman other gestures toward normalization have been made by the President of Pakistan. He has offered rice to help the people in Bangladesh which were facing a food crisis, despite the fact that Pakistan also is in serious economic plight. Bengali army personnel and civil servants were offered to cope with problems of setting a new nation in motion which confront Bangladesh. There has been no encouraging response to these gestures nor has Rahman indicated an interest in a meeting with Bhutto in an effort to settle the issues between the countries.

The Dacca authorities are complicating the situation by threatening to hold trials of several thousand Bengali and non-Bengali civilians on charges of alleged collaboration with Pakistan authorities.

They are also talking of trials of Pakistan Army personnel for alleged war crimes.

It should be very clear that this is a time for each of the nations involved to look ahead rather than backward. There should be a negotiated settlement of all differences that exist with speedy repatriation of prisoners of war and withdrawal of troops from each other's territory. A new and peaceful chapter in the history of South Asia is a very big need.

I feel that it is well to include at this point excerpts from the President of Pakistan's statements on peaceful settlement in the South Asian subcontinent. These follow:

On January 3, 1972, the President of Pakistan declared that he was willing to meet Mrs. Gandhi for talks on outstanding Indo-Pakistan disputes on the basis of justice and fairplay, adding that if the offer was accepted, he would be willing to go to Delhi even tomorrow.

The President also said that Pakistan had no aggressive designs on India. "If the Indian Government and its people want to live a peaceful and honorable life, we also want to do the same." He said "let us work towards the betterment of the lot of the common people in both the countries."

In February in an interview given to Mr. Ivan McIntire which was broadcast by the BBC on February 18, 1972, the President said "now after this war the fundamental disputes are still to be settled if not by confrontation, by conciliation and by negotiations. An imposed peace will simply not work." In reply to question about the recognition of "Bangladesh", the President said "I think you may have noted that while I have shown my anxiety and my willingness to hold negotiations with Shaikh Mujibur Rahman on the one hand and with the Government of India on another and until we hold these discussions I do not think it would be fair to us to ask us of our final position."

On March 5, in a broadcast to the nation, the President said "I hope soon we will be able to embark on negotiations with India and in due course I will also meet with Shaikh Mujibur Rahman. I am looking forward to these negotiations. I can assure that they would be animated by a sincere desire to live in peace, to bring an end to hostility, to turn from the path of conflict and conflagration to the path of cooperation; cooperation with honor of course, the kind of cooperation which can make both countries, can make all of us in the sub-continent, bring about tranquillity in a message of contentment and satisfaction. On our part, we will make every effort to arrive at such a *modus vivendi*."

The President further said "I hope animated by the same consideration India too seeks cooperation and prepares the climate of conducive negotiations by releasing all our prisoners of war and detaching them from the main burden of negotiations."

On April 15, President Bhutto in a long speech to the National Assembly again repeated the same desire for peace with India. He declared "we want to live in peace with India. We want Shaikh Mujibur Rahman to overcome his problems and his difficulties for we ardently believe that the people of the whole sub-continent deserve a better future other than the constant friction and conflict that has marked their past. Our people, both theirs and ours, are too poor to live in a state of permanent hostility. We want to direct all our energies from wars of destruction to wars of poverty, illiteracy and hunger. We shall go on trying to resolve our differences and shall always remain ready

to seize any reasonable opportunity to realize this supreme objective."

On April 21, President Bhutto even offered to repatriate Indian prisoners of war without any pre-conditions and he said "it is my proposal that even if the Indian Government does not want to release our POWs, I am prepared to go ahead unilaterally. If the Indian Prime Minister makes a request for the return of her POWs, I am prepared to send them to Hussainiwalla and Wagha border tomorrow. If our sisters, our mothers and our brothers have to undergo more sufferings on this account, there is no alternative but I do not want the kiths and kins of Indian POWs to suffer the same agony. I do not wish to be cruel to them since it is against the principles of justice."

On April 26, in an interview given to the representative of the German magazine "Der Spiegel" he answered several questions on the problems of the sub-continent. When asked whether India or Pakistan would try something in Kashmir because the two armies were stationed along the Kashmir border, the President stated "No, no, we are not going to try something. You can print that and you can take it from me that we are not going to do something silly like that and under no circumstances we would take any adventurous steps of that nature."

On May 7, the President declared at a Rawalpindi press conference "we seek a durable peace. We will reject one that is imposed."

Showing full awareness of the situation the President said "there are certain inherent implications stemming out of a lost war, otherwise why there should be so many prisoners of war in India." He, however, added "we want peace with honor and if this desire is shared by India we will find the peace that has eluded us for generations."

Regarding the forthcoming summit negotiations, the President said "we can neither be optimistic nor pessimistic. I can only say now that we will approach the meeting with an open mind. We would have to accept certain realities but we can never accept dictated terms."

RECOGNITION

In an interview broadcast by ABC on Sunday, May 14, the President said "if the people of East Pakistan really want to sever their connections from us permanently then it is a question of principle. That the people want to part from us altogether for all times to come, and we cannot deny what they want. There is a principle involved, but we have to first find out if that is the correct position and we can't find out, being a thousand miles away and having had no dialogue or communication with them. So that is why we must first meet their leaders and come to an objective assessment."

NOTE: President Bhutto has said that he must meet Shaikh Mujibur Rahman before recognizing "Bangladesh". He has even gone so far as to indicate his "intent to recognize" before meeting Shaikh Mujibur Rahman.

He released Shaikh Mujibur Rahman unconditionally and let him go to Dacca. Shaikh Mujibur Rahman should not really impose pre-conditions for meeting him.

TRIALS FOR SO-CALLED WAR CRIMINALS

During the same interview President Bhutto said it is a most serious matter. It is not serious just because it is the right thing to do but because we believe there is no analogy between "Nuremberg" and the situation here on the sub-continent as to what happened. I don't go into all the legal aspects of it, but strictly from the practical point of view, it will just muck up the atmosphere.

You know our people are sensitive; Bengalis are sensitive and these trials that go on and all sorts of things will be said, the press will play it up.

I am afraid that it will take us to the point "of no return."

The President also made an offer to try and punish those who are guilty in Pakistan. He said "how could a token trial or any form of trial satisfy? It won't satisfy us because a principle is involved. These people, they were defending their national territory and integrity and unity. They might have committed excesses and we are not ballooning those excesses, we are prepared to try some of them here under ordinary law so I don't understand how we can compromise on such questions."

ENERGY—A DIMINISHING CAPITAL RESOURCE

(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, the Pensacola Area Chamber of Commerce in my congressional district was honored on June 8 by the presence of Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover as the principal speaker. America takes great pride in the contributions of Admiral Rickover. I have personal knowledge of his great work. I know that he has been in the forefront in all the efforts to assure a nuclear capability for America's Navy and that his work has been a major factor in giving our country a defense capability which cannot be pinpointed and destroyed in any first-strike effort by an enemy. America is indeed indebted to Admiral Rickover and it was with great pride that I welcomed him to my district. His speech provides an important dissertation on the serious state of the future of energy as a resource in the United States.

I take pleasure in submitting Admiral Rickover's speech for reprinting in the RECORD.

ENERGY—A DIMINISHING CAPITAL RESOURCE (By Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover)

In recent months a great deal of attention has been focused on the rapidly developing shortage of energy resources in this country. This is a matter that has been of deepest concern to me for many years. In 1957, I delivered a speech, "Energy Resources and our Future" which became a chapter in my book *Education and Freedom*, published in 1959. I can think of no public issue confronting us today that will touch the lives of our children and grandchildren—if not ourselves—more closely than the ability of the U.S. to command the energy resources that are needed to sustain our economy.

There can be no effective national resources policy unless the American people acquire a clear understanding of our resources position. They do not have a realistic picture of our position today. How can it be otherwise when every time a new fossil fuel deposit is discovered, a flood of optimistic statements fills the air, and the press deprecates the severity of the energy crisis against which disinterested experts have warned?

I vividly remember the exaggerated claims made eight years ago when new energy resources were discovered in and around the North Sea. The pattern of world politics, it was predicted, could alter; the consequences, once the find was exploited, would be staggering. Europe would become wholly independent of the Near East; Russia would no longer obtain foreign currency to buy wheat and machinery by selling her oil at marked-down prices.

The production of oil in the North Sea has now begun and intensified efforts have been made to find additional deposits in offshore areas of Europe. Yet the latest projections in-

dicade that the production from the North Sea area is expected to reach only one million barrels per day by 1975, and perhaps three million in 1980—a small percentage of the 24 million barrels Europe is expected to need by then.

Most of the studies of the past 25 years projecting future energy needs have consistently underestimated the consumption needs of Europe and Japan. Certainly, no one foresaw that by 1980 Europe's demand would equal our own of 24 million barrels per day, and Japan's would be ten million barrels—almost half as much again.

There is a saying that the British Empire was acquired in a fit of absentmindedness. One might say this, too, of the shift in the 1940's from an economy still based largely on renewable resources, to one depending almost entirely on nonrenewable resources. In 1850—to give an example of the magnitude of this shift—fossil fuels supplied 5% of the world's energy; men and animals 94%. By 1950 the percentages had reversed themselves, 93% coming from coal, oil and natural gas, 1% from water power, and only 6% from the labor of men and animals. By 1970, the energy required to give the U.S. a gross national product of just over a trillion dollars was derived 95.9% from fossil fuels; 3.8% from water power and 3/10th of 1% from nuclear power.

Through nearly all his history on earth, man has lived almost entirely on renewable resources. These left him energy poor but fairly secure in the little he had. We are energy rich today but find ourselves in the unenviable position of the prodigal son who lives luxuriously on his inheritance but after a brief moment of glory is left with nothing to his name.

The shift has come about so suddenly that it is difficult for most Americans to change their outlook. Yet change it we must and quickly, for we are faced with the fact that while it took 600 millennia to create the earth's deposits of fossil fuels, we are using them up in a time span measured by decades. Half the coal ever mined has been taken out of the ground in the last three decades or so; oil production did not begin until 1900, but more than half the world's production has occurred in the last 15 years. The Fossil Fuel Age may well prove to have been one of the briefest major epochs in man's long history on earth.

We did not deliberately choose to build our economy on the uncertain foundation of resources that are finite and must therefore run out unless we devise complex technological alternatives. When we discovered how to unlock Nature's treasure trove of fossil fuels we lost all the instincts for carefully husbanding Nature's bounty that we acquired during millennia of living frugally off renewable energy sources. Prudence would have dictated that we regard this as a one-time windfall, and not go on a wild spending spree before we had some assurance of finding man-made alternatives once the treasure had all been dug out. Instead, we took the continuance of fossil fuel energy for granted and did not exert ourselves sufficiently to prepare for the time when it will be gone.

Psychologically, most people have difficulty grasping that the earth is finite, and that therefore any part of it taken out and destroyed by usage—as are fossil fuels and uranium—diminishes by that amount what is left. The experts moreover have added to the confusion. Too many of them treat energy reserves not as the finite capital they are, but as something that can be increased by exploration and better technological utilization. To be sure, exploration is needed to find energy deposits, just as technological advance was needed for man to make use of these deposits. But it should be made clear in any public statement that the cause of our energy crisis is neither lack of exploration nor lack of technical research,

but simply the fact that consumption proceeds at geometric progressions and supply is finite. Assertions that our resources are ample and we need merely to put more effort into exploring and improving our technical utilization of these resources blurs the real problem: fixed assets, limitless consumption demands.

I blame many of the experts, too, for failing to make clear to the public that Nature is impervious to human demands, to assertions that we have a "right" to live in the style to which we have become accustomed since the Fossil Fuel Age began some 30 years ago. There are no "rights" that government or anyone else can enforce against Nature. I blame many of the experts, too, for serving the public such absurd bromides as that the population explosion does not require us to change our family habits since surplus people can be settled on other planets in the solar system, or, lately, that we shall mine the moon for scarce resources. These are pipe dreams that should not be peddled, for they prolong the time when the public will be ready to take stock of the consequences of current profligacy and accept the necessity of taking steps appropriate to the reality of our situation.

The magnitude of the rise in consumption during the last few decades is also not easy for the public to visualize. Most people are not familiar with geometric progressions. This, I believe, is why the nature of the population explosion—evident to demographers years ago—remained incomprehensible to the general public for such a long time. Indeed, it is difficult to understand that a change in the normal family pattern from two to three children—given today's low death rates—should account for our own recent growth figures. Energy needs have doubled since 1950, and are projected to double again by 1985 and to triple by the end of the century. Even today, in spite of our brownouts, economists and other experts take great pride in our rising consumption pattern; indeed, they measure our success as a Nation not by our intellectual, artistic, or humanistic record but by per capita consumption of telephones, refrigerators, cars, etc. We still seem to pride ourselves on consuming one-third of the world's resources, even though we make up but 6% of the world's population.

To sum up, what needs to be generally understood is that Nature is completely unconcerned with man, his needs, or his desires. We are in a period of painful adjustment to a world which we can neither escape from nor control.

Too many overly sanguine statements have been made about the prospects of replacing fossil fuel energy with man-made alternatives and natural minerals with man-made substitutes. * * * How well is it known that to produce the aluminum in a medium-sized cooker requires 72 kilowatt hours of electricity? Nuclear power is a man-made alternative, but unless practical fusion power (using deuterium) is developed—which it is not yet—even nuclear power has a finite capacity, depending as it does on finite uranium resources.

There are other potential sources of energy not now being effectively used. Hydro power could be increased somewhat, though not much in the industrial nations—more so in the underdeveloped part of the world. Power could be derived from the wind, the earth's thermal energy, tidal energy, electrostatic energy, gravitational energy, and solar energy. Many difficult problems would have to be solved before these sources could be effectively used. Whether or not these problems will be solved only time will tell. However, it should be recognized that some of these sources have but limited power output capability. For example, the energy available in lightning strokes, if it could be directly used to produce electrical power, would provide

only .01% of the current requirements for electricity in the United States. If all of the volcanic heat of the earth could be captured, it would provide only one-tenth of the world's energy needs. Potential tidal energy sources are of the same magnitude as the volcanic heat sources.

As for solar energy on which many pin their hopes, the drawback here is its enormous cost.

A realistic assessment of our energy resources position would stress the fact that it is not important exactly when our fossil fuels give out. We may find better ways to extract oil and gas from coal, tar sands, shale; we may discover more resources than we know of at present on the Continental Shelf surrounding our country or elsewhere in the sea. What is important is to comprehend that some day the fossil fuels will be gone; that renewable energy sources are unlikely to provide more than a small percentage of our needs; that even atomic energy, since it requires uranium, is finite; and that we cannot be certain that some man-made alternative as yet undeveloped will arrive in time—or ever—to supply our energy needs. We share this situation with all the industrial nations; in fact, we are better off than the rest of them. We still have very large coal deposits, most of them do not. Something like 70% of the world's oil reserves are in the Middle East, which will make access to these reserves the biggest international problem before long.

Russia, it would seem, has a keener awareness of the fact that access to energy resources is becoming the primary national interest for all industrial countries. Compare her policy of courting the Arab oil countries with our policy of continuing to export enriched uranium for the sake of improving our balance of payments position. Russia's new naval strength in the Mediterranean poses a very real threat that she might succeed in controlling the Middle East and its oil.

Pressures are exerted on the government to cut down armament expenditures and use the money to solve domestic problems. The Navy is thought of as merely an instrument to wage war—entirely adequate if it is strong enough to act as a preventive force against nuclear aggression. But for the United States, which is a continental island, the Navy's function, besides acting as a primary means to deter nuclear war, is to prevent forcible interference with the flow of international trade to and from our shores. For this purpose, it must at least be the equal of any other navy.

No sensible person can look at war as anything but a disaster to be avoided if at all possible. But if a truly vital national interest were jeopardized, I believe most nations would still fight to protect it, provided always there were any chance at all that they could win. I believe that most of those who totally reject all war are influenced by the fact that for hundreds of years, European wars have been fought, not to preserve vital national interests, but for religious, dynastic and imperial objectives—objectives which are rejected today by the free peoples of the world. Our own wars during the 19th century—with Britain, Mexico and Spain—were also fought for objectives we would no longer seek to obtain by force. But history would indicate that any major industrial power, faced with exhaustion of its energy supplies and feeling itself strong enough to win would, I think, risk war to keep its economy functioning.

Curiously enough, the wars we may not be able to avoid in future are likely to be the kind of major wars fought in antiquity. Homer sang of the Judgment of Paris, the abduction of the beautiful Helen, and the thousand ships that were launched to destroy Troy and bring Helen back to her husband. But historians are well aware that the

underlying motivation of the Greek attack on Troy was economic. Troy stood athwart the trade routes between Greece and the Black Sea and was thus able to keep vital imports from reaching Greece, and lucrative exports from reaching their Black Sea destinations. To control these routes was of overwhelming importance to the Greek economy. Hence the Trojan War—the most cataclysmic event of the Maccenean epoch.

Or take the Punic Wars. Disregarding the eloquent rhetoric of Cato and the noble sentiments voiced by other Roman apologists, historians agree that the real cause of the war was Rome's determination to break Carthage's hegemony over Spain and the rich grain producing regions of North Africa. Unhampered grain imports were as vital a national interest to Republican Rome as adequate energy supplies are to today's industrial Nations.

I bring up this point only to emphasize the importance of facing the truth about the energy crisis and taking steps to insure that our Nation has the means to protect its sources of energy. All experts agree that in a few years we will be importing half our oil—importing 12 to 18 million barrels a day. If we do not have a Navy adequate to insure the safety of our oil sources and the means of transportation, we could risk our industrial capability.

The need to conserve energy resources in this country is clear, but how can it be done? Specifically, I would suggest the following:

a. The American people should recognize the vital importance of the energy resources we now possess. Action should be taken at once to discontinue exporting these resources. For example, providing uranium enrichment services to foreign countries should be prohibited. Ten thousand kw hours of electricity are required to enrich to 3% one kilogram of uranium as presently used in water cooled reactors. In other words, if the U.S. provides enrichment services for a large foreign water cooled reactor this requires 600 million kw hours of electrical energy. This means that we are exporting about 2,000 million kw hours of our energy resources for each reactor core we export. In return, we receive money.

b. Obviously, population expansion is an important consideration in the growth of demand for energy. While I recognize it is an unpopular subject, serious consideration must be given to eliminating tax deductions for dependent children beyond some set number, perhaps three. Possibly a tax penalty should be added for any children in a family after the first four.

c. The price structure used by utilities is so structured as to encourage the use of energy. The cost per unit of energy decreases as the quantity used increases. This creates exactly the wrong incentive; it encourages energy consumption rather than its conservation. A minimum level of use should be established. Any energy use above the minimum should be more expensive, and an upper ceiling of allowable use should be established for commercial and noncommercial uses.

d. Inefficient uses of energy should be discouraged. Take space heating by electricity. The maximum total system efficiency for electrical heating is less than 50%, but there is no theoretical limit on system efficiency for obtaining heat directly from the combustion of fuel. Hence, the use of electricity for heating should not be permitted unless the situation uniquely requires it.

Artificial lighting uses about 6% of the country's total energy, or about 24% of its electricity. The efficiency of converting electricity to light is about 4%. This indicates the incentive to utilize natural light whenever possible.

Furthermore, great effort should be made to utilize the waste heat generated from

energy conversion plants. We cannot afford to continue throwing away 60% or more of our energy resources when converting them to electricity. I recognize that the present siting requirements for nuclear power plants are inconsistent with this suggestion, but some intermediate storage media should be developed—to use like a battery—so as not to waste this heat.

e. Motor fuel represents the other large consumer of energy in the United States. The demand for high-powered, heavy cars represents not only a waste in the energy required to propel the vehicle but also a waste in our nonrenewable mineral resources for their construction and maintenance. I suggest that automobiles be taxed by weight and engine displacement and that upper limits be placed on allowable limits for them.

f. Action should be taken to prohibit the deduction for tax purposes of any expense incurred by utilities as a result of their efforts to expand their market. Also such costs should not be passed on to the consumer, but should come from profits; this would include advertising and other promotional expenses, such as installation allowances, etc. The growth of energy requirements in this country is far too great already; it needs no artificial encouragement.

Another important consideration is that protection must be provided against the development of unnecessary energy converters. The profit a utility is allowed is related to its capital investment. This provides an incentive for a utility to expand its capital base in order to obtain higher profits. It also means there is an incentive to expand its market, whether or not there is a real need.

g. Other large nonproductive uses of energy such as air conditioning must also be controlled. These controls should seek to minimize use and also to achieve greater efficiency. Taxes relating to energy consumption would achieve this goal. For fairness, an upper limit of allowable energy should also be established; otherwise only the poor will feel the effects of such a control.

h. Unpopular as this will be, other controls are also necessary: prohibit air conditioning except where required for industrial or medical purposes. Currently about 16% of the increase in electrical generating capacity is used to meet air conditioning requirements. High excise taxes should be placed on luxuries which require high energy inputs either to manufacture or use. For example, the second car, clothes driers, etc.

The purpose of the proposed actions is to gain time to find practical solutions for the overall energy problem. The minor inconveniences and necessary changes in our habits these would entail pale into insignificance compared to the distress, dislocations and general misery that would follow a rapid loss of our major energy resources. The brownouts we are told to expect in the near future will give us but a faint inkling of what such a loss would mean.

The fact that living off energy capital has lasted for so short a time should make it not too difficult to adjust ourselves to the realities of the supply and demand situation. After all, life in America was very pleasant before we had automobiles, jet planes and electrified homes.

What I said in my 1957 speech still seems to me to sum up correctly where we stand:

"High energy consumption has always been a prerequisite of political power. The tendency is for political power to be concentrated in an ever smaller number of countries. Ultimately, the nation which controls the largest energy resources will become dominant. If we give thought to the problem of energy resources, if we act wisely and in time to conserve what we have and prepare well for necessary future changes, we shall insure this dominant position for our own country."

STORMY TIMES FOR DEMOCRATS

(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, the Democratic Party nationwide is confronted with some of the most difficult decisions in the party's long and constructive history. Confusion within the party has been compounded in recent weeks. It appears that a new proposal for party structure is to be submitted to the convention in Miami. There are efforts to mold the Democratic Party into a liberal party in the hands of a narrow ideological elite. A National Democratic Party composed of card-carrying members would take over the party structure. Party officials and life long Democrats could be disregarded in the new organization. If approved this could revolutionize the party's public posture and it could be ruinous to success in November. It would almost certainly result in a serious split within the party.

Some have stated that a decided swing to the left by the Democrats could be the long-anticipated prelude to a new division of the American party structure into liberal and conservative camps. The unexpected strength developed by Senator McGOVERN would encourage this. However, the Republicans tried the same thing with a strongly conservative program under Senator GOLDWATER and were soundly defeated. Their defeat led to a restructuring of the Republican Party along broader lines and to the election of President Nixon 4 years later. There are few who think Senator McGOVERN could win if nominated. If he should fail to be elected it is likely that the Democratic Party will return to its long-standing image as a party of broad appeal in keeping with the traditions of Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman. This does not solve the party's current problems and there are many.

Regretfully, the Democratic Party in 1972 has missed a golden opportunity. With a majority in both Senate and House, the party has failed to pass its own welfare reform, tax reform, and antibusing laws. These are among the items of greatest interest to most people. A mass of legislation has been enacted by the Democratic Congress, but most of it does not carry the political sex appeal of these principle issues. The President is not likely to overlook the opportunity to expose these shortcomings.

Democrats have a particular talent for killing each other off. Party infighting does not help the Nation or the Democratic Party. The writing of a platform may expose more weaknesses than the party can overcome regardless of candidate, and George Wallace and others are attempting to produce a party platform which is more acceptable to the American public than the one now proposed. Yet, efforts to start pulling responsible party factions together may have come too late to be effective. One thing is certain, the Democratic Party has serious problems ahead for November. America wants responsible programs and responsible candidates which it can confidently

support for a better tomorrow. Let us hope it is not too late to repair the damage within the Democratic Party. America needs a strong Democratic Party under sound leadership.

AN OLD-FASHIONED PATRIOT SPEAKS OUT

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the Missouri National Guard Association, the non-military forum of over 1,700 active officers, retired officers, active and retired enlisted men of the Missouri National Guard recently held its silver anniversary conference in St. Louis, Mo. At that ceremony Col. Oliver M. Husmann, president of the association for 1971-72, and a prominent St. Louis businessman, gave his report to the members.

The conference warmly received this old-fashioned patriot who spoke out for his organization, to always defend the country. From one who has served his Nation, speaking before those who also shouldered the task of defense, Colonel Husmann eloquently and concisely stated his dedication to the United States, and its traditional spirit of patriotic maintenance of freedom, plus efforts for peace.

I recommend these words of Colonel Husmann to this Congress as an example of the strong devotion to our country that still persists today:

REMARKS BY COL. OLIVER M. HUSMANN

Webster defines a Patriot as "one who loves his country and zealously guards its welfare; especially a defender of popular liberty." This is the kind of patriot I was taught to admire and emulate. The kind who has fought for his country throughout its history. The kind who admits the imperfections of government, but loves his country even more in spite of them.

Today we have a new kind of patriot. The draft dodgers who skulks into Canada, Sweden, or any other country that will grant them asylum. Those who trample and spit upon the Flag. Those who bomb and burn our public buildings and academic institutions. Those who condemn our involvement in Viet Nam and publicly esteem our enemies. Those who question every word uttered by our leaders, but willingly accept as the whole truth any and all charges levied against us by our enemies.

There are many in this country who find favor with this new type of patriot. We find these 'sob sisters' amongst our clergy, among our so-called intellectuals and even amongst our leaders in the Congress and the Senate. They say we should not have become involved in Viet Nam and now because we are so involved, the new type of patriot must be permitted to vent his frustrations as he desires.

The National Guard is made up of men. Men from many walks of life. Men in different stages of maturity. Men of different social antecedents. Men of various religious beliefs. Men with different political convictions. These qualities and characteristics which each individual possesses, must be nurtured, moulded and fused with those of the next man until, as an entity, we can move forward in a concentrated effort toward a common goal. We must resolve to do everything in our power to again convince the people of our country that Webster's definition of a patriot is and always will be correct.

There are too many in this country who have forgotten that the two ideologies—Democracy and Communism—cannot live side by side except by artful truces and so-called cold wars, neither of which can nurture a real, lasting peace. The tentacles of Communism creep insidiously wherever they gain a foothold. Our land, our way of life, our freedom and our liberty, as we know them, are the prizes Communism strives to take from us. Guardsmen must be constantly prepared to fight this threat. We must not permit ourselves to become the weak link in the defense of this great nation.

There is a greater need for the existence of the Guard today than ever before. We must let our fellow citizens know that the enemy wants us to be careless, lazy and uninspired in the desire to defend our country. That he looks upon us with utter contempt when we say we are tired of war. We must make the public realize that America needs its men—soldiers and citizens alike—to work continuously to improve our defensive posture while there is still time. If we wish to maintain for our children the liberty, freedom and safety which we enjoy, we must be prepared to defend these truths to the death. Consider for a moment what life would be like without these privileges we accept so matter-of-factly.

One thing is certain; we have the organization to build such a defense. We have the know-how and the money in this country to develop such a defense. Most important of all, we have US, the National Guard. We can discourage aggression now. All we have to do is feel the urgency, to realize the practicability of being prepared, and to work—work as men dedicated to the principle that the freedom we enjoy shall not perish.

Our silver anniversary is an opportune time to rededicate ourselves to the task at hand, to filling our ranks with true patriots, to teaching, to absorbing lessons learned, to building a defense capable of filling the needs of our people, our community and our country.

Guardsmen have taken such dedicated stands many times in history; always in the cause of freedom and liberty. Our citizen-soldiers, our National Guard, is older than the Nation itself. Dedicated men of the early colonies organized units and trained to defend their settlements long before the Declaration of Independence. Many of our present-day Guard units trace their history directly to these early groups of citizen-soldiers.

We need to review the heritage willed us by those who early stood in the defense of our country. We need to relive the struggles of the past, to see in our minds eye and feel in our hearts the valiant stand they took so this nation might be free. We need to think of those who stood with Washington at Brandywine and Germantown. We need to be reminded of the Guardsmen, militiamen, minutemen, call them what you will, who bled at Bunker Hill. We need to trace their footprints that marked with blood the snows of Valley Forge. We must bend our backs and grasp with freezing fingers the frosted oars with Washington as he crosses the icy Delaware. We must lay siege with him to the heights of Yorktown. We must strive with those who followed Lee, Sherman and Grant. We must feel the fury of the charge at San Juan. We must share with them the blood and sweat of the Philippines and the Mexican Border. Let us follow "Black-Jack" Pershing through the holocaust of WWI. Eisenhower, MacArthur and Patton through the war to end all wars. Let us relive with them Argonne, Chateau-Thierry, Corregidor, Normandy and MIG Alley. Finally Korea and Viet Nam. For the first time in history American fighting men find themselves in the unusual position of fighting a battle they cannot win, a war they are not supposed to win. A classic study in frustration.

Is Freedom, Democracy and the American way of life, which was bought at such a tremendous price to be lost to the most deadly enemy that has ever threatened free men? Has the sacrifice they made, been made in vain? Can we not continue the fight, can we not as citizen-soldiers bolster the defenses, man them effectively and surely, against any and all attacks of an enemy? Can we not show a love for our country? A love that surmounts all fears, all weaknesses and dedicates men to preserve with their lives the land they love?

I am not asking that we dedicate ourselves to becoming a nation of warmongers. No, I ask that we dedicate ourselves to work for peace. I firmly believe a strong aggressive, defensive posture is the best offense available to a country whose democratic ideals prevents it from initiating an attack against any enemy unless provoked beyond endurance.

Until we have made our country so impregnable, so invulnerable that an attack would be suicidal, will our enemies keep their distance. Until we have done this, the possibility of America becoming a major battlefield in a new world conflict becomes more apparent with each passing day.

Gentlemen. Now is the time for us to look to our defenses, time to follow the heritage which is ours. The time to demonstrate, once again, to all the world, that democracy is a living thing, transcending all other ways of life, and worth protecting at any cost.

NARCOTICS AND SOUTHEAST ASIA

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

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, at this point in the Record, I would like to insert the texts of several formal statements made before an informal hearing which the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MURPHY) and I held on June 6 in New York City.

The subject of the hearing was international narcotics traffic and I believe that my colleagues in the House will find this information most interesting and useful to their work in finding a solution to this vital problem:

NARCOTICS AND SOUTHEAST ASIA

(Opening statement of the Honorable LESTER L. WOLFF, of New York, June 9, 1972)

Let me open these hearings by stating that they are an extension of the investigations which we have conducted into the question of international narcotics traffic and its control.

The drug problem here in the United States has been steadily increasing over the past decade and now permeates our daily lives. The problem of hard drug addiction is no longer confined to the urban ghettos; it has spread into suburban communities and even into our armed forces.

As members of the Foreign Affairs Committee we bear the heavy responsibility of proposing and enacting legislation to assist in anti-smuggling efforts throughout the world. Such an important responsibility can only be discharged properly based on complete and accurate information. I for one must say in all honesty that I have not had cooperation in obtaining the necessary information. In fact, the reason for this hearing and the ones which will follow is to get at the information which we have thus far found elusive.

I have been told about the impact of our new anti-drug programs in the international sphere on the heroin supply in this country—some sources say it has had some effect, others say it has had no effect. I

have been told that we are making strong representations to other governments on this matter, and I have been told by our own agents that they cannot stop the drug traffic overseas because their hands have been tied for political reasons. Despite rosy predictions and statements by high officials in our government, the international traffic in narcotics continues to increase steadily.

I am deeply concerned that our priorities in dealing with foreign governments may be beclouded. Protecting our own people from the scourge of heroin addiction by halting the flow of narcotics at the source must be our number one priority. I feel that there is a question as to whether we are suppressing information related to the involvement of officials of foreign governments in the drug traffic reaching our shores. This perhaps is being done to preserve the sensitive nature of our international relations and we gloss over the massive domestic problem which confronts our nation. In effect we are basing policy decisions not on the national self-interest of protecting our own young people, but of protecting an international situation of questionable priority.

We are conducting this investigation precisely to bridge the gap between rhetoric and reality on this question. The rhetoric about the heroin traffic has been voluminous and emotive; the time has come to get the information necessary to halt this deadly traffic by firm action.

We shall publish the information which we uncover in this continuing investigation in the Congressional Record and we will be calling on the appropriate agencies of the Federal Government to report back to us as soon as practicable on the veracity of the information and on any actions they initiate to deal with the problem. I for one refuse to be satisfied with the contradictory and evasive answers which I have received and I am committed to bring the complete story to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and to the American people.

OPENING REMARKS BEFORE THE HEROIN TRAFFIC HEARING IN NEW YORK

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Good morning distinguished visitors and gentlemen of the press. I have just a few words before we begin today's proceedings.

I think most Americans are well aware of the situation we face today with the massive use of heroin and other drugs among our young people as well as a great number of military veterans.

I, along with the two other gentlemen here, have conducted numerous investigations on the use of heroin among our soldiers in Vietnam and our civilian population and the one fact discovered in all cases was that drugs are grown and refined illegally in foreign countries with the final product then being shipped clandestinely to the United States.

I think this is an important fact to remember because if we are ever going to prevent the use of illegal drugs we must first deal with the countries in which they are grown and processed.

In the course of past hearings, we have gathered a great amount of testimony from many witnesses and all this testimony has served to strengthen my belief that strong measures are necessary to deal with the drug epidemic.

Today, we are going to hear more testimony from several knowledgeable people in the fields of law enforcement, world health and from an author who recently completed a study on the politics of heroin.

Although we are planning more hearings around the country, let us hope that we can begin to further the education of the American public on the menace of drug abuse with the facts presented during this hearing.

ALFRED W. MCCOY

Mr. WOLFF. Alfred W. McCoy is presently a Ph. D. student in Southeast Asian history at Yale University. He has spent the last 18 months researching the international drug traffic and his findings will be published in a forthcoming book entitled "The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia," Harper & Row.

Mr. McCoy's findings are based on research, documents, and more than 250 personal interviews conducted in the United States, Europe and Southeast Asia. Sources of information include U.S. military, intelligence, and Embassy reports on narcotics, as well as interviews with U.S. Embassy, A.I.D. and C.I.A. personnel. Mr. McCoy also met with numerous officials of local military, intelligence, and customs bureaus in South Vietnam, Laos, Thailand, Hong Kong, and Singapore.

In addition, Mr. McCoy has spent a week living with an opium growing Meo tribe in Laos. I am informed that he has already briefed our Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs on his findings.

TESTIMONY BY ALFRED W. MCCOY BEFORE THE CONGRESSIONAL INQUIRY REGARDING INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS TRAFFIC, JUNE 9, 1972

Southeast Asia is fast becoming the major source of illicit narcotics for America's growing population of heroin addicts. International criminal syndicates began shifting their major sources of supply to Southeast Asia in the late 1960s when the Turkish government began a drastic reduction of its opium production. If current programs are completed as expected, Turkey will have completely eradicated legal opium production by the end of this year. And within the coming months Turkey's illicit drug traffic will also be eliminated. However, many responsible officials inside the State Department and the US Bureau of Narcotics are very much aware that unless serious preventative measures are taken it is only a matter of time until all of America's heroin supply comes from Southeast Asia. And if the drug traffic in Southeast Asia is ignored all our efforts in Turkey will have been wasted.

President Nixon has told us that there can be no end to the drug traffic in this country until illicit opium production has been eradicated. Even at its peak in 1967-68 Turkey produced an estimated 100 tons of illicit opium, equivalent to only 5% to 7% of the world's total illicit supply. According to the United Nations, Southeast Asia's bountiful Golden Triangle Region—which comprises the rugged mountain areas of northeastern Burma, northern Thailand, and northern Laos—harvests an estimated 1,000 tons of raw opium annually. This is equal to more than 70% of the world's illicit opium supply. By itself northeastern Burma accounts for over 50% of the world's illicit opium. In fact, more recent US Bureau of Narcotics reports estimate that northeastern Burma alone may now be producing 1,000 tons of raw opium annually.

Increasing quantities of Southeast Asian narcotics are entering the international smuggling routes and are finding their way to the United States. Clandestine laboratories located in the tri-border area where Burma, Thailand, and Laos converge are producing a high grade of heroin which is reaching the United States through the West Coast, Europe, and Latin America. Hong Kong's flourishing heroin laboratories use morphine base from Southeast Asia to refine high grade heroin for the American market. Finally, Indochina's Corsican syndicates have been supplying Marseille's heroin laboratories with limited quantities of Southeast Asian morphine base since the early 1950s.

In many ways, Thailand is the key to the

drug traffic in Southeast Asia. Most of the region's illicit narcotics transit through Thailand on their way to the international smuggling circuits. Across its northern border march vast mule caravans carrying hundreds of tons of Burmese opium. In fact, most of Burma's opium exports pass through Thailand. Opium refineries located along Thailand's northern border process morphine base and high grade heroin for the international markets. Thailand's ports on the Gulf of Siam serve as loading points for the wooden-hulled trawlers that sail regularly to Hong Kong loaded with morphine base for Hong Kong's heroin laboratories. Moreover, Thailand itself produces an estimated 150-200 tons of illicit opium every year, equivalent to roughly 15% of the world's total illicit supply. Given the importance of Thailand's role in Southeast Asia's drug traffic, it is not too much to say that the success or failure of our government's campaign against the international drug traffic hinges to a large extent on Thailand.

Secretary of State Rogers and Ambassador Unger have stated publicly that the Thai government is giving us its "full cooperation" and is doing everything possible to stem the flow of illicit narcotics across its borders. Despite these claims of progress, the opium caravans continue to cross Thailand's northern frontier unimpeded and the trawlers are still sailing for Hong Kong regularly. Those sympathetic to the Thai government have offered a number of plausible explanations for this failure: the rugged mountains which form the country's northern frontier are almost impossible to patrol; the Thai government has no control over the dozens of armed bands which bring opium across its northern frontier; and the Thai trawlers are extremely elusive and their movements are carefully concealed. However, these explanations are not borne out by the facts of the situation.

In reality, the Thai government has a great deal of control over the situation on its northern border. According to the CIA, some 80% to 90% of all the Burmese opium which crosses into northern Thailand is carried by caravans belonging to Nationalist Chinese irregular units known as the III Army, the V Army, and the 1st Independent Unit. Through an elaborate network of radio posts and purchasing agents scattered across northeastern Burma, these Nationalist Chinese irregulars buy up most of the available opium every year during the harvest season. Once the opium is collected from the hill tribe farmers, Nationalist Chinese army caravans comprising up to 600 mules and 300 armed men set out from their headquarters in northern Thailand. These caravans move from village to village through the rugged ridges and mountains of northern Burma and often return with up to 20 tons of raw opium. Once the opium is brought into Thailand it is processed, frequently at the National Chinese military bases, into heroin, morphine and smoking opium.

Even though they are heavily involved in the narcotics traffic, these Nationalist Chinese irregular units are closely allied with the Thai government. They patrol Thailand's northern border with admirable efficiency and collect an "import duty" of about \$5.00 on every kilo of raw opium entering Thailand. In addition, some 1,400 of these irregular troops are providing an invaluable service to the Thai government by battling anti-government rebels in northern Thailand and are used to prevent rebellions in other troubled areas.

The remaining 10% of Burma's opium exports are controlled by Burmese rebels who enjoy the covert support of the Thai government. The Thai government has granted all of these rebel bands closely guarded sanctuaries near its northern border. The Huel Krai

camp area in Chinagral province has long been a major sanctuary area for Burmese rebels engaged in the opium traffic east of the Salween River. The area surrounding the Nationalist Chinese III Army headquarters in Chiangmai Province is the most important sanctuary for Burmese armed bands involved in the opium traffic. Gen. Mo Heng's Shan United Revolutionary Army, Brig. Gen. Jimmy Yang's Kokang Revolutionary Force, Gen. Zau Seng's Kachin Independence Army, Gen. Jao Nhu's Shan State Army and Gen. Kyansone's Pa-O rebels are among those crowded together on a few mountain tops in the Chiangmai Province sanctuary area. The entrances to all of these camps are well guarded by Thai police. But so far there has been no serious effort to slow down the flow of opium crossing the border from Burma.

Similarly, the movement of the Thai trawlers between Bangkok and Hong Kong is one of the most meticulously monitored aspects of the entire international drug traffic. Through their own intelligence nets in Thailand, the US Bureau of Narcotics' agents are sometimes able to learn the precise details about the size of the drug shipments, the name of the trawlers, and their probable departure dates. For example, when I was in Bangkok in September 1971, US agents told me that a trawler had just loaded 1,500 kilos of raw opium and 260 kilos of morphine base for shipment to Hong Kong. However, because of systematic Thai police corruption it was impossible to stop the shipment. As these trawlers move into international seelanes, round the southern tip of Vietnam, and head north through the South China Sea to Hong Kong, they are monitored by US Navy patrol aircraft. Several times during their voyage, each of these trawlers is photographed and carefully studied by US Naval intelligence officials. Yet even with this detailed intelligence the Thai police have been unable to disrupt the trawler traffic in any significant fashion.

US narcotics agents have reported that systematic corruption among the Thai police makes serious enforcement work extremely difficult. According to US agents, almost every major narcotics trafficker has a high level "advisor" on the Thai police force. Before every major shipment of narcotics is moved the syndicates consult the police to make sure there will be no unexpected interference. US agents have learned through bitter experience that any intelligence they gather on the traffic will find its way to the syndicates if they share their information with their Thai counterparts.

In light of these enormous problems, Sec. of State Rogers' assertion that the Thai authorities are giving us "full cooperation" with our anti-narcotics effort hardly seems justified. In fact, responsible US officials in Washington, D.C. have admitted to me privately in recent weeks that the Thais are still very far from taking serious steps to end the narcotics traffic. These officials report that the sensitive state of Thai-American relations, particularly over the negotiations for the opening of new air bases for the Vietnam War, make it impossible for anti-narcotics work to be anything more important than "one of our top five or six priorities" in Thailand.

Once again we are faced with a situation where our diplomats have chosen to sacrifice anti-narcotics work to political and military objectives. And once again we are faced with a clearcut choice between our fruitless quest for military victory in Indochina and eradicating the international drug traffic. There are enough narcotics in Southeast Asia to fuel our heroin plague for generations to come. Until we make anti-narcotics work our No. 1 political priority in Southeast Asia we will have to learn to live with our heroin problem.

NELSON G. GROSS

Mr. WOLFF. Our next witness is the honorable Nelson G. Gross. We are pleased that Mr. Gross who serves as Senior Advisor to the Secretary of State and coordinator for international narcotics matters was able, on very short notice, to rearrange his schedule to appear here today. We look forward to hearing your comments.

STATEMENT BY NELSON GROSS, SENIOR ADVISOR TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE AND COORDINATOR FOR INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS MATTERS BEFORE THE CONGRESSIONAL INQUIRY REGARDING INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS TRAFFIC, JUNE 9, 1972

I welcome the opportunity of appearing today and setting the record straight on the progress and the integrity of the United States Government's anti-narcotics program in Southeast Asia. I shall address my statement essentially to the recent allegations regarding that program made by Mr. Alfred W. McCoy, a student at Yale, and then answer your questions.

With all due respect to Mr. McCoy's obvious interest in seeing the scourge of drug abuse brought to an end, our official information reveals that much of what he has reported is out of date and thus must be labelled misleading and inaccurate. The problem of drug abuse is an emotionally-charged issue. While it may well make good copy in the eyes of a book publisher to charge—as Mr. McCoy has done in sensational fashion—that the Government of the United States "is aiding and abetting the influx of heroin into our nation," nothing could be further from the truth. Equally sensational and, as far as we can ascertain, unsubstantiated, is the charge by Mr. McCoy that high government officials in Thailand, Laos and South Viet Nam "are actively engaged in the heroin traffic and are protecting the region's powerful narcotics syndicates."

Mr. McCoy somehow missed the name of the kingpin of the heroin traffic in Southeast Asia. The man is LO Hsing Han of Burma. His control of the area opium runs the gamut from opium poppy fields, along the smuggling routes, to his heroin refineries.

LO has a virtual monopoly on heroin refining in the section. Many of the refineries driven out of Laos and Thailand have come under LO's control in Burma.

We have discussed the urgent problem posed by LO's operation with the Burmese. But LO operates within insurgent-controlled territory and is beyond the control of the Burmese Government.

I now turn to the three major allegations made by Mr. McCoy in his June 2 statement before the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, U.S. Senate.

1. "Much of the heroin entering the United States now originates in Southeast Asia."

Southeast Asia is not a major source of heroin on our market. While the "Golden Triangle" area of Burma, Laos, and Thailand yields an estimated two-thirds of the world's illicit opium supply, most of that output is consumed in traditional Asian markets. The overwhelming majority of the heroin coming to the United States originates in the Middle East and is processed in European labs before being smuggled into our country. We estimate that probably only five percent, certainly no more than ten percent, of the heroin presently flowing to the United States originates in Southeast Asia. Whatever the figure, we are obviously concerned. We are further concerned about the prospect of a swing in international traffickers' interest from the Middle East to Southeast Asia, particularly as the Turkish Government's ban on opium poppy cultivation results in diminished supplies.

2. "The governments of South Viet-Nam, Laos, and Thailand are actively engaged in the heroin traffic."

It so happens that Mr. McCoy selected three of the countries with which we are working very closely. Perhaps progress has not been as rapid as one would like, but drugs have been tolerated over many generations in these countries, and the solution is far from an overnight solution. Trafficking in drugs in Thailand was legal until 1958, and not until last November did the Lao Government move to prohibit drug trafficking. At the moment in Laos, we have two BNDD agents with an additional one expected to arrive, four permanent Customs agents and five additional ones on TDY, two Public Safety Officers with three more scheduled to arrive in the near future, and one AID official.

In Thailand, we have ten BNDD agents, two Customs agents, and one Foreign Service Officer.

And in Viet-Nam, there are ten Public Safety Officers, two Customs agents, and one BNDD agent.

I should like to provide additional comments on each of the three countries:

South Viet-Nam—The U.S. troop withdrawal and suppression efforts have knocked the bottom out of the heroin market in Viet-Nam, causing prices to plummet from \$8,000 per kilo last year to \$3,000 or less at present. All indications are that heroin sellers have had little success in building an alternative market among the Vietnamese to replace their lost G.I. consumers. In such a situation, it is logical that suppliers will be tempted to seek channels to other markets, including the United States. For this reason, our authorities in Viet-Nam have been watching intently for signs of such a development. Our most recent intelligence indicates that there is no organized apparatus smuggling heroin from Viet-Nam to the U.S. Without exception, those implicated in such activities have been low level, individual entrepreneurs who lack an organized distribution system. With the disappearance of the G.I. market, many traffickers in the region appear to be abandoning heroin to return to the traditional opium trade.

The Government of Viet-Nam with the cooperation of the U.S. Mission has made considerable progress in reducing narcotics traffic and drug abuse. The U.S. Mission has been intensely aware of the heroin traffic in Viet-Nam since the drug first appeared in late 1969 and first became available to U.S. servicemen during the first half of 1970. In March 1970 the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs (BNDD) initiated a survey to define the role of Asia in the world's narcotics traffic which laid the groundwork for addressing the basic problems in Southeast Asia of production, distribution, suppression, and rehabilitation. As evidence of the Mission's concern over increasing drug abuse, MACV carried out a nationwide drug survey in July 1970 which indicated that heroin was being introduced in Viet-Nam in considerable quantity. As a result, a MACV drug abuse task force was formed in August 1970, and a comprehensive drug suppression program was developed and carried into effect. Under the program Combined Anti-narcotics Enforcement Committees were established in each military region. A joint American and Vietnamese Narcotics Investigation Detachment was to gather drug intelligence and provide a coordinated investigative capability to eradicate large supply sources of narcotics. Another important feature was the establishment of a joint U.S. Service Customs Group.

On the civil side, the Mission developed a narcotics control action plan which calls for the involvement of all elements concerned with the suppression of drug abuse and trafficking.

As soon as the narcotics problem began to assume serious proportions, high level coordination and planning efforts began between

the Mission and the Government of Viet-Nam. Prime Minister Khieu initiated a program to reduce the use of and traffic in drugs throughout the country. Ambassador Bunker and General Abrams met with President Thieu to discuss specific measures, and as a result President Thieu designated a team of experienced intelligence and police officials to develop and carry out an effective action program. He also set up interministerial drug suppression committees at the national and provincial levels, replaced key personnel in the police and other areas affecting narcotics activities, and dictated a nationwide customs crackdown to seal off all airports and harbors through South Viet-Nam. A tax-free reward system was established and a drug education campaign was begun. Prime Minister Khieu was given direct supervision of the national campaign and was instructed to use the coordinating machinery of the pacification program to carry it out.

As a result of these combined U.S. Mission/Vietnamese Government efforts, the number of arrests on narcotics charges went from 2,911 in 1969 to 4,644 in 1971. Heroin seizures throughout Viet-Nam rose from 12 pounds in 1969 to 271 pounds in 1971 and opium seizures increased from 11 pounds in 1969 to 1,071 pounds in 1971. Most important, the big time traffickers no longer find it profitable or safe to operate in the country. Even now, under existing conditions of martial law and the requirements of national defense against the North Vietnamese invasion, joint U.S./South Vietnamese narcotics operations continue.

The arrest last year of two pro-Thieu members of the Lower House is an indication the Vietnamese Government is actively engaged against the heroin traffic. One was dismissed and the other was sentenced to seven years.

Laos—The Narcotics Control Law implemented last November makes any commercial transaction involving opium or its derivatives illegal and for the first time gives the Lao Government a legal basis for interdicting illicit traffic. Strict controls have also been placed on the importation and distribution of acetic anhydride, a chemical required in the heroin refining process. Last November 7, 730 gallons of acetic anhydride—enough to make three tons of heroin—were seized. Also several seizures of opium and heroin have been made. The most recent seizures were 28 kilos of opium on May 26 and 30 kilos of opium and 9 kilos of #4 heroin on June 7. Inspection procedures on domestic and international air routes have been tightened up.

In the absence of laws forbidding narcotics trafficking, Lao law enforcement agencies had not been staffed, trained or equipped to interdict the traffic. Therefore, since passage of the law, the Government has concentrated on establishing an equivalent of the BNDD to lead and coordinate narcotics control. It is headed by a military officer who reports directly to the Prime Minister and has jurisdiction over civilian and military enforcement efforts. The Lao national police and customs agency have also established special narcotics control units.

The U.S. Mission was most effective in encouraging the passage of the Lao law. Our narcotics enforcement advisers from the BNDD, Customs, and USAID's Public Safety Division are hard at work advising and training their Lao counterparts in Vientiane and other key points, including Ban Houei Sai in the Golden Triangle. Specialized equipment will be provided to the new narcotics agencies as their personnel are trained to use it.

The production of opium in Laos, which may have been as high as 100 tons a year, has been sharply curtailed, and our intelligence indicates that the flow of opium and heroin through the country has also decreased considerably.

In Mr. McCoy's statement of June 2, he

indicated that most of the opium traffic in northeast Laos is controlled by Vang Pao. This statement ignores the fact that most of northeast Laos is controlled by the North Vietnamese. Opium production in those areas of northeast Laos still under Lao Government control could not exceed more than a few tons a year, and these are consumed by the hill tribesmen. As for Vang Pao, he has taken a strong public position against opium cultivation and trafficking by the Meo. He considers opium addiction a serious problem among his people and wishes to prevent further addiction and to rehabilitate those already addicted.

As for Ouan Rathikoun, it may be that he was involved in the opium traffic before it was illegal, but we are not aware of anything more than unsubstantiated allegations concerning his past or present complicity. With regard to his "control" of the "largest heroin laboratory in Laos," once again, all we have is allegation. Mr. McCoy was apparently referring to a refinery at Ban Houei Tap which was abandoned last summer. Equipment and chemicals were discovered in the jungle and seized by a team of Lao narcotics agents. Mr. McCoy quoted a CIA source in stating that this refinery had a capacity of 3,000 kilos of heroin per year. Members of our Mission have examined the site and have estimated that it could have produced less than 1,000 kilos assuming a 24-hour-a-day operation.

With regard to Mr. McCoy's allegation concerning Air America, I should like to quote the following statement released in Washington on June 2 by the Managing Director of Air America:

"Mr. Alfred W. McCoy today told the Senate Foreign Operations Committee: 'In Northern Laos, Air America aircraft and helicopters chartered by the U.S. CIA and USAID have been transporting opium harvested by the agency's tribal mercenaries on a regular basis.'

"This statement is utterly and absolutely false. AA and USAID have cooperated in a security program which effectively prevents the carriage of drugs on any of the airline's equipment. This program is constantly being reviewed to make sure that drug smugglers cannot misuse the company's facilities. There is an intensive program of inspection of both passengers and cargo carried out in close collaboration with local and U.S. authorities. At up-country sites, inspectors inspect all baggage of passengers and crew members departing from their stations. All cargo placed aboard up-country sites is inspected by members of the inspection service. All baggage of persons departing Vientiane on AA, CASI and Lao air development are inspected. Where boarding passengers refuse to submit to inspection or are found to have contraband in their possession, they are denied the right to board the aircraft and their names are turned over to local Lao authorities. Through these and related measures, attempts by individuals to carry opium on company airplanes have been detected and prevented. These small time smugglers and users are the greatest threat and the security inspection service has constituted an effective deterrent.

"Through its many years in the Far East, AA and its employees have been well aware of the dangers of drug use and the drug traffic. It has been the policy of the company and its many local employees to do everything in their power to oppose any traffic in drugs. To this end there has been close cooperation between the company and U.S. and local authorities concerned with the drug problem.

"If Mr. McCoy or any other individual can bring any proof that any Air America employee has been connected in any manner with the drug traffic appropriate disciplinary action will be taken and the matter referred to the proper authorities."

Thailand—For some years the Thai Gov-

ernment has been engaged in a major effort to settle the Meo hill peoples and to bring them under control. Unfortunately, these RTG efforts have been a major source of Meo resentment toward the Thai and have helped make the Meo receptive to Communist antigovernment propaganda and insurgency. In addition to military efforts to put down the Communist rebellion, the Thai are trying to improve hill tribe welfare. Particularly noteworthy is the interest of the King of Thailand in the welfare of the hill peoples: he is assisting in the development of other cash crops as alternatives to the opium poppy.

Enforcement efforts by the Thai Government are hindered by the impossibility of controlling adequately a long and mountainous border and the complexities of controlling passenger and commercial traffic inside Thailand. In its efforts to control narcotics trafficking, the RTG has initiated a resettlement program for the Chinese Irregular Forces (CIF) under which the CIFs would turn over all their opium stocks to the RTG and cease their involvement with narcotics in return to land upon which to settle. Twenty-six tons of CIF opium were burned by the RTG in March 1972.

During the past year, the Thai have increased their efforts in the drug field with U.S. and UN assistance. A US/Thai Memorandum of Understanding was signed in September 1971 providing for increased Thai enforcement capability through U.S. assistance to Thai police and customs officials. The Thai also signed an agreement with the UN in December 1971 establishing a program to deal with the long-range aspects of the drug abuse problem through crop substitution and addict rehabilitation.

After the US/Thai Memorandum of Understanding was signed, a planning group was forced and has been negotiating specific programs for implementation of the agreement. BNDD has assigned agents in Bangkok and Chiang Mai while U.S. Customs Service personnel are serving in Bangkok. Thai police have recently moved to crack down on local traffickers and several major Thai and American traffickers have been arrested. A promising start has been made and programs begun which have the potential to bring the drug problem under increasing control.

Based on all intelligence information available, the leaders of the Thai Government are not engaged in the opium or heroin traffic, nor are they extending protection to traffickers. There have been reports of corruption among some working level narcotics officials. Police General Prasert, head of the Thai National Police and a member of the ruling National Executive Council, has stated publicly that he would punish any corrupt official.

3. "The U.S. Government is aware of this traffic, but has not moved to stop it and has consciously concealed evidence of the involvement of our Southeast Asian Allies." Clearly, the U.S. Government is aware of narcotics trafficking in Southeast Asia, but to say we have done nothing to counter it is patently inaccurate. Since the President's message to Congress on June 17, 1971, we have moved urgently to commit Customs, BNDD, CIA, AID, and State Department personnel and resources to the fight against international drug trafficking. Moreover, far from concealing involvement of persons involved in pushing drugs, our Government has been sharing intelligence with friendly governments in a concentrated effort to uncover the various persons and systems which are operating in the area.

We feel that the drug problem is a major facet in our bilateral relations with many countries throughout the world. We have made that point clear to those countries and we are asking them to join with us in the fight. The Governments of Thailand, Laos, and Vietnam have already joined us in the

fight and, while we have a long way to go, we feel that during the past year some real progress has been achieved.

WHITNEY NORTH SEYMOUR, JR.

Mr. WOLFF. We are pleased to welcome the Honorable Whitney North Seymour, Jr. as our next witness. Mr. Seymour has served for the past three years with great distinction as the United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York. He has testified on this critical subject before other congressional panels and I feel sure that his remarks will be most relevant and useful to us.

TESTIMONY BY WHITNEY NORTH SEYMOUR, JR.,
U.S. ATTORNEY, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

So long as there is any cultivation of the opium poppy anywhere in the world, and so long as the huge profits continue, heroin traffickers will seek out the opium wherever it is grown and bring it into the U.S. market. That does not mean that we should not pursue every available means of control of opium and heroin production. It simply means that we must not be so naive as to assume that this will completely eliminate the narcotics problem.

There is no immediate prospect that the cultivation of the opium poppy will ever be eliminated, for it is needed in large quantities for legitimate medicinal purposes. Indeed, actual elimination of the poppy would do great harm in terms of world health because the supply of morphine as a pain reliever for medical purposes entirely depends upon it as a source of raw material. The only basis on which opium cultivation might be halted is through the development of an inexpensive substitute painkiller for opiates which could be made available in all parts of the world.

The major reporting world producers of legal opium have been India, Turkey, and Russia, in that order. Turkey and Russia produce about equal amounts of opium; India produces about three times the combined total of the other two. Countries producing legal opium in smaller quantities include Bulgaria, Japan, Pakistan and Yugoslavia. Production of legal opium has been increasing in recent years, but even so it is insufficient to meet all of the legitimate needs, and most countries have had to draw on existing stocks. The countries importing legal opium for medicinal purposes have obtained 95 percent of their supplies from India and Turkey.

According to reports filed by participating countries with the International Narcotics Control Board, the total legal manufacture of morphine in 1970 was more than 176,000 kilograms. The estimated illegal traffic of pure heroin in the United States is about 10,000 kilograms of pure heroin each year. Since one kilo of pure heroin is roughly equivalent to one kilo of morphine in terms of the opium consumed, it is apparent that only about five percent of the free world's opium supply is being diverted into the U.S. black market. Most businessmen would agree that this is quite a small percentage of loss in terms of ordinary pilferage.

One can be thankful that the controls over legal supplies of opium have been maintained as well as they have. The United States produced 20,000 kilograms of morphine in 1970, twice the amount of the illegal heroin in black market channels, and very little if any of this supply is believed to have been diverted into illegal markets. There is, of course, no diversion of heroin from legitimate channels in this country since there is no legal production or use of the drug in that form.

Other countries which consume a substantial amount of legal opium for medicinal purposes are Belgium, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Hungary, India, Japan, the Netherlands, Poland, Rumania, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, Russia, England and

Yugoslavia. With this much legitimate need, elimination of the opium poppy does not appear to be a realistic goal, at least not until a substitute pain-killer has been developed. The best that can be hoped for is the exercise of adequate controls over production, distribution and demand.

Although the United States is the prize market for illegal heroin because of the almost unlimited dollars that U.S. addicts have available to spend, it is not the only place where illegal narcotics traffic is a problem. Nearly all of the countries in Asia have an illicit traffic in opium. There has also been an increase in illegal opium in European countries. The main area of illicit traffic in heroin and morphine, in addition to the United States, are France, Iran, Southeast Asia and the Far East.

Law enforcement efforts, upon which we have relied primarily to control heroin traffic, must continue to play an important role. The key requirement is to readjust our enforcement thinking to meet the problems which have developed over the course of our experience with the narcotics black market. The heart of these problems is the difficulty of controlling the physical substance of heroin so that it cannot be grown, smuggled and distributed in the black market network without detection. Our present law enforcement machinery is little better than trying to hunt an elephant with a cork gun. If law enforcement is to have any major impact in curbing narcotics traffic, these minimal steps must be taken:

1. The machinery for international control of heroin growth and manufacture must be strengthened. International bodies charged with the responsibility of opium control must be adequately funded and staffed. Their mission should extend to controls over all stages of opium growth, shipment, cultivation, conversion and stockpiling.

2. Effective limitations on illegal opium production and heroin smuggling can be greatly advanced by technological research, if that research can produce practical tracer elements which can be used in fertilizers or sprayed on crops to aid in spotting concealed shipments of heroin. Research might also produce remote sensor devices which can themselves locate concealed shipments of the drug. There are indications that this type of technology could be developed with the adequate commitment of funds. These possibilities should be fully canvassed, for they strike at the very heart of the problem of controlling the illegal movement of heroin.

Law enforcement alone can never fully control the illegal black market in drugs without a major program for preventing additional addiction and reducing the demand of present addicts. With a significant reduction in the market for heroin, however, the resources of law enforcement could indeed play a much more meaningful role.

The single most important step that can be taken to stop the spread of narcotics addiction and to reverse the trend of continuing expansion of drug abuse is preventive education. It is absolutely essential to persuade the huge body of potential addicts that addiction is dangerous and undesirable. This cannot be done once drug use begins. It must be done beforehand. The potential addict must be satisfied that the only choice, when confronted with an opportunity to use drugs, is to refuse.

DR. RODOLPHE COIGNEY

Mr. WOLFF. Dr. Rodolphe Coigny of the World Health Organization and formerly director of the International Refugee Organization has devoted his entire life to the study of problems in international health.

Dr. Coigny who currently serves as director of the World Health Organization's liaison office with the United Nations received his M.D. from the University of Paris and a Master's Degree in public health from Co-

lumbia University. He has served in the world health organization since 1952.

We are grateful to him for taking the time to enlighten us as to the work of the World Health Organization in the matter of drug abuse control.

TESTIMONY BY DR. RODOLPHE COIGNEY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am honoured at the invitation extended to me to speak about the role my organization—the World Health Organization—is playing in the fight against the growing menace of drug-dependence around the world.

I used the phrase "drug dependence" deliberately to make the point that it is the area of drug dependence with which we are vitally concerned. The control of international narcotics traffic is not within our competence, although it is an essential part of one and the same problem that brings us all here today.

There is little doubt that drug misuse and abuse, which ultimately leads to drug dependence, has been on the upswing over recent years. This is so not only for narcotics, as opium, heroin, but also—and perhaps I should say particularly so—for the new, psychotropic drugs:

The amphetamines, or the stimulants;
The barbiturates, or the sedatives; and
The hallucinogens, as LSD.

The Global anxiety has been expressed through international agencies calling for action—action on all fronts, against illicit traffic, against illicit supply and against illicit demand of drugs.

The U.N. Commission on Narcotic Drugs, the U.N.'s Economic and Social Council, the U.N. General Assembly itself, all have spoken strongly to the issue—as has the governing authority of my own organization, the World Health Assembly.

As you know, a U.N. Fund for Drug Abuse Control has been created, financed out of voluntary contributions, to support programmes of such agencies as the World Health Organization, the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization, and others. To this fund, the United States has already pledged a contribution of \$2,000,000.

What then is WHO's role? As mentioned, the suppression of illicit drug traffic and supply is beyond its scope. But, even here, WHO has the responsibility of identifying dependence-producing substances, the availability of which should be controlled; and of defining the degree of control recommended in relationship to the therapeutic usefulness of the drug.

This suggests very strongly that the fight against drugs must be based on a multi-disciplinary strategy. The man from Interpol is needed to curb illicit traffic, but so is the public health worker.

The fight must also be a multi-national one, for often the producer of the drug and the user of it may not be countrymen. It is the view of WHO that drug-dependence is a disease that knows no national barriers and respects neither flag nor boundary.

What is, without doubt, a WHO matter is the task of reducing the demand for the dependence-producing drug.

According to a WHO expert committee, the characteristics of such drugs are mainly three:

They produce a psychic dependence in the user, that is a compulsive desire to take a drug for the mental and emotional effect it produces.

They may produce a physical dependence, which means that the body has become so dependent that the user becomes physically ill if the drug is taken away.

They may also produce a growing tolerance in the user, which means much more of the drug is needed to achieve mental and emotional satisfaction.

One way of reducing the demand for drugs, of course, is to limit the supply, and to make

sure drugs are put to legitimate medical use. And this is being done.

However, supply is governed by demand. And unless something is done to lessen the demand for drugs, supply will continue. As the WHO expert committee says:

"Until the demand for dependence-producing drugs is markedly reduced, it cannot be reasonably expected that measures to control their availability will have the desired result.

"A reduction in demand can be achieved only by preventive measures, designed to limit interest in drugs on the part of potential users, and through effective treatment and rehabilitation of drug-dependent persons."

It is in these areas—of prevention and of rehabilitation—that WHO's main responsibilities lie. A word about prevention, the heart of the problem.

Prevention essentially means information and education, mainly through the mass media. Thus, a group of experts convened by WHO has urged close consultation between the health official and the journalist in providing information about drugs.

Physicians are not the best people to take a message to the layman. Yet, journalists, when reporting on a successful raid by the narcotics squad also report the estimated price of the seized drugs, had they been sold by pushers in the city.

Though this is in the best journalist tradition of reporting the facts, some experts say such a fact might well encourage some to traffic in drugs—for the profit. Thus, it seems that not only accuracy is important, but the presentation of facts as well.

Programming aimed at children should also relate to immediate experiences. The message should not be simply that drugs are dangerous, rather what happens in the here and the now to the user.

To dissuade children from smoking with the threat of eventual lung cancer, it has been found, is less effective than underscoring the immediate effects of smoking—as for instance, coughing, or even an impaired performance in sports.

Another study group concerned with youth and drugs, held in Geneva in October 1971, reviewed the various interacting factors involved in the non-medical use of drugs. The group noted that, although many societies appear to be more concerned about the use of "newer" drugs, especially by younger people, the number of casualties from the non-medical use of drugs is still highest among older people using substances that have been taken for centuries. Nevertheless, the serious individual, public health and social problems associated with the use of certain drugs, in particular by young people of all socioeconomic classes, continue to increase in many parts of the world, although in some they are perhaps leveling off. The group noted that, since the causes of drug dependence are multiple and a given person may use drugs at different times for different reasons, a balanced community approach is necessary in dealing with drug-taking behaviour among all age-groups. The group suggested ways in which knowledge about the causes and extent of drug dependence might be improved and considered the relative effectiveness of different approaches in prevention and treatment.

In addition to prevention, and rehabilitation, another area of WHO responsibility is research. Even before a reduction in drug demand, as advocated by the expert committee, can be tackled, there is need for certain information:

What is the epidemiology of drug dependence in a given society? What are the socio-cultural factors that influence the spread of drug dependence? How effective are regimens of treatment and rehabilitation used?

And a question of most interest to me: Why is it that some do not take drugs?

WHO has recently received \$60,000 from the U.N. Fund for Drug Abuse Control for three projects, namely—for a study of the chronic effects of the long-term use of cannabis; for another study, this one of the effectiveness of maintenance in the management of narcotic-dependent persons; and for the preparation of information brochures on the non-medical use of dependence-producing drugs.

In addition, as part of its regular activities, WHO gathers information on drug dependence, calls meetings of experts, publishes their reports, provides technical advice to governments on request, carries on research, and works and advises with U.N. agencies on drugs.

Indeed, much more would need to be done in order to give us the means of a better understanding of the narcotics problem.

We feel, for example, that there is a need for a collaborative reporting system in order to determine from the medical social point of view the extent and patterns of drug dependence and abuse in various regions of the world, to detect the spread or other changes in the problem, and to obtain data that will serve as a basis for establishing priorities for medical social services.

There is a need to establish a methodology and guidelines in order to conduct sample surveys on the prevalence and incidence on non-medical use of drugs and on the associated human and social cultural factors.

I could go on mentioning a great number of projects which should be carried out, such as an international drug abuse monitoring system; an epidemiological study of drug abuse in America; a study on the social and psychological factors associated with drug dependence; a study on health education programmes concerning drug abuse in young people; training of health personnel on drug abuse; teaching of drug abuse in medical schools; developing and stimulating collaborative international bio-medical research on drug abuse, etc.

In closing this list, I wish to emphasize my belief that as long as we do not have an answer to these questions, efforts to stop the traffic of narcotics will not be successful because the demand will continue to exist and the self-administration of narcotic and non-narcotic dependence-producing drugs will continue to affect adversely the social, cultural, political, economic and educational structure of our society.

Finally, I would like to take the liberty of leaving with you, as exhibits, three of our technical publications for perusal of members at their leisure.

One is entitled "The Use of Cannabis", the other "WHO Expert Committee on Drug Dependence, 18th Report", from which I have liberally quoted, and "Dependence Liability of 'Non-Narcotic' Drugs."

I would also like to leave as exhibits issues of our magazine, *World Health*, devoted to the themes of drugs and youth.

I shall be glad to answer any questions put to me. Or should the Chair so decide, in the interest of time, you may want to submit questions to me in writing and proceed with the hearing.

I am at your disposal in either case.

INSPECTOR DANIEL J. COURTENAY

Mr. WOLFF. It is a pleasure to welcome Inspector Daniel J. Courtenay to this hearing. Inspector Courtenay is in charge of the field enforcement division of the Narcotics Division of the New York City Police Department.

The Narcotics Division has as its primary aim the apprehension of persons who violate laws relating to narcotic drugs. The division also coordinates police department efforts to suppress the illicit traffic in drugs.

Appearing along with Inspector Courtenay today are Deputy Inspector Michael Willis who heads the narcotics intelligence unit and

Lt. Vincent Hawkes, also of the narcotics intelligence unit.

THE NEW YORK CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT

In 1971 the New York City Police Department was restructured with an organized crime control bureau established under the direction of Deputy Commissioner William P. McCarthy. This structural change brought under a single control the narcotics and gambling enforcement. This brought about a complete reorganization of the existing narcotics division and gave a new emphasis on the suppression of narcotics traffic. Commissioner McCarthy stated, "Through this device we hope to centralize control over narcotics. The attack in the past has been fragmented. From now on, arrests will be made under the personal direction of a superior officer. The direction of investigators' efforts will be controlled at the staff level. There will be maximum use of search and arrest warrants. Superior officers will get out from behind the desk and be present in the field to assess actual conditions and be present as part of the arrest team. From now on, we are going to take the cell rather than the individual who works in the cell, and from there, work our way into the channels of organized crime. We are going to try for the total operation. Instead of arresting the street peddler on the corner, we are going to follow as far as we can go before we close in and thus get the whole operation. Our own operations are going to be more covert and so are likely to go undetected on the streets until such time as major arrests are made."

These statements by Commissioner McCarthy led to a complete reappraisal of our existing procedures and provided the Narcotics Division with the direction it lacked.

The Narcotics Division was restructured to provide a team or "module" concept, consisting of a sergeant and six investigators, answerable to a district lieutenant, who in turn reports to a borough captain. The borough captains are guided by an enforcement aide who is answerable to the commanding officer of the Narcotics Division. Thus the activities of each team are directed rather than haphazard. Each team or module is a completely self-contained investigative unit responsible for complete investigations.

In addition to the field units described above, the Narcotics Division contains an undercover unit, which is responsible for the undercover investigations and operations; an administrative unit, which handles records and communications; an intelligence unit, which gathers and disseminates all available intelligence information; and, a special investigations unit, which handles city-wide and sensitive investigations.

The present strength of the Narcotics Division is in excess of 625—superiors and investigators assigned to the various field or central units.

To digress for a moment, in addition to the more than 625 men and women assigned to the Narcotics Division, whose major thrust is to destroy the high-level and middle-level operator, each and every member of the New York City Police Department has an obligation and a responsibility to arrest any narcotics violator observed, and report any condition where he suspects unlawful narcotics activity.

Statistically, our arrest activity has decreased because of our concentration on the higher level dealer. Our investigations are more sophisticated and lengthy, but the results are more gratifying.

The Narcotics Division is concentrating on major violators. Recently, 100 major violators were designated as principal targets for our investigative activity. These violators were selected because of notorious drug activity and because their operation dealt in bulk narcotics. Since the 100 major violators were selected, 25 have been arrested and have

either been tried, or are presently awaiting trial.

As members of this group are sentenced to prison terms and their street activity ceases, they are replaced by others designated as major violators. These targets for enforcement are selected by the command staff of the Narcotics Division and channeled to its various field commands for necessary attention and arrest within a particular time frame.

In addition to the selected targets, each unit is responsible for local conditions or "targets of opportunity" which develop during the course of investigations. The intention with the "target of opportunity" is to attempt, by use of undercover personnel or "buy-operations," to move higher into the organizational structure, until a mid or high-level dealer is identified and apprehended.

Investigations of this nature are time consuming and sometimes frustrating. Many manhours are consumed and valuable talent expended before any discernible results are obtained. In many cases our undercover personnel, whose safety is in jeopardy, spend many dangerous days attempting to infiltrate the organization. Once accepted, buys are made and principals are identified. In many cases our people are wired to provide an accurate record of the transactions for future court presentation.

In any case, the arrest itself is not the end—an attempt is made to sift through all the intelligence and available information to develop leads that will lead to higher level arrests.

Our "buy-operations" are geared up to a level that will insure that whenever a dealer is convicted for selling to one of our people, he faces a life sentence. This is known as a class "a" felony, which results from selling 16 or more ounces of heroin or cocaine. Since January, 1972, a total of 57 individuals have been arrested for narcotics felonies of the "a" category and are presently awaiting trial. This is where the impact in the drug problem will be made. This is the area where the risks involved exceed the monetary gain. This then is the real direction for the narcotics division.

In New York City there is an estimated drug population of over 300,000 persons. There have been more than 1150 deaths in New York City in 1971 that were directly the result of overdoses.

The police department has seized over 130 pounds of heroin, 33 pounds of cocaine, and 2500 pounds of cannabis. The department has made 4,600 felony arrests and 5,200 misdemeanor arrests for narcotics violations since January 1st of this year. (These statistics may seem startling, but they represent the truth about the narcotics problem in this city.)

WHERE DOES IT COME FROM?

It comes from India, Turkey, Burma, Thailand, Laos, Red China, and Mexico. It is shipped from Italy, Spain, France, Puerto Rico, Montreal, and arrives in New York, Miami, and Los Angeles, where it is distributed.

During 1971, customs agents seized 1,100 pounds of heroin, worth 690 million dollars without any real significant impact on the total drug picture. Despite Federal, regional, State, and local police claims of massive crackdowns and seizures of narcotics, there has been no curtailment of drug traffic in the United States. If each of this city's 300,000 drug addicts used \$40. of heroin per day, then daily sales would result in \$12 million daily—incidentally, there never seems to be a shortage of available drugs.

HOW DO WE, AS LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES, HOPE TO STEM THIS TIDE?

1. Cooperation with all other law enforcement agencies—local, State, and Federal:

- (a) B.N.D.D.;
- (b) New York joint task force;

- (c) Drug abuse law enforcement;
 - (d) Bureau of Customs;
 - (e) Metropolitan Regional Council; etc.
 - 2. Commitment of Federal resources to stop drug traffic at the point of origin.
 - 3. Commitment of Federal resources to stop drug traffic at the point of entry.
 - 4. Commitment of local forces to stop drug traffic from the distributor to the user.
- Gentlemen, thank you for your indulgence—we will be happy to answer any questions about what I have covered or any other area of the drug problem in this city.

GENERAL LEAVE REQUESTS

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the subject of the special order by Mr. FUQUA on Laurence Walrath.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of the special order of Mr. MURPHY of New York, on the bill of rights for the mentally retarded.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KEE, for June 29, on account of official business.

Mr. KEE, from 5:30 p.m. today, on account of official business.

Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), from 2:30 until adjournment today, on account of official business.

Mr. McDADDE (at the request of Mr. AREND), for June 27, 28, and 29, on account of official business—inspect serious flood damage within the congressional district.

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. CONOVER) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. McCLOSKEY, for 60 minutes, on June 29.

Mr. HOGAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MAZZOLI) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. BRADEMAs, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MURPHY of New York, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSENTHAL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. PICKLE, for 60 minutes, on July 26.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon in five instances.

Mr. DINGELL, and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding an estimate of 3¼ pages, and a cost of \$455.

Mr. WOLFF and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the cost is estimated to be \$770.

Mr. HOGAN and to include extraneous matter on his special order today notwithstanding an estimated cost of \$455.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CONOVER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.

Mr. COLLIER in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. LLOYD.

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. McCLOREY in two instances.

Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. RIEGLE in two instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. WHITEHURST.

Mr. SCHERLE.

Mr. HUTCHINSON.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in two instances.

Mr. DELLENBACK.

Mr. KEATING.

Mr. CONTE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MAZZOLI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RODINO in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. HAGAN in three instances.

Mr. WALDIE in six instances.

Mr. ROGERS in five instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in three instances.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in two instances.

Mr. BARING in four instances.

Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.

Mr. YATRON.

Mr. SLACK in three instances.

Mr. ROE in three instances.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS in three instances.

Mr. POAGE.

Mr. HAWKINS.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in three instances.

Mr. DRINAN.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois in three instances.

Mr. HICKS of Washington in two instances.

Mr. ASHLEY in two instances.

Mr. BRADEMAs in 10 instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3001. An act to establish a Federal Financing Bank, to provide for coordinated and more efficient financing of Federal and federally assisted borrowings from the public,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 8140. An act to promote the safety of ports, harbors, waterfront areas, and navigable waters of the United States;

H.R. 13188. An act to authorize appropriations for the procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments, and to authorize the average annual active duty personnel strength for the Coast Guard.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 29, 1972, at 10 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2117. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting notice of the proposed transfer of the submarine U.S.S. *Ling* (AGSS-297) to the Submarine Memorial Association, Hackensack, N.J., pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7308; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2118. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the first semiannual report by the Department of the Interior on its withdrawal of lands in Alaska for addition to or creation as units of the national park, forest, wildlife refuge, and wild and scenic rivers systems, covering the period ended June 17, 1972, pursuant to section 17(d)(2) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2119. A letter from the Counsel to the Pacific Tropical Botanical Garden, transmitting an audit of the corporation for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 10(b) of Public Law 88-449; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2120. A letter from the Assistant Administrator of General Services, transmitting a request for the cancellation of the project authorization for the alteration of the old post office and courthouse at Springfield, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Works.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2121. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on reducing procurement of initial support stocks for Navy ships; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2122. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting an audit of the Majority Printing Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, for the fiscal year ended August 31, 1971, pursuant to section 451 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970; to the Committee on House Administration.

2123. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting an audit of the Minority Printing Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, for the fiscal year

ended September 30, 1971, pursuant to section 451 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970; to the Committee on House Administration.

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. BROOKS: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 12807. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 in order to establish Federal policy concerning the selection of firms and individuals to perform architectural, engineering, and related services for the Federal Government; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-1188). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOLIFIELD: Committee on Government Operations. S. 1152. An act to facilitate the preservation of historic monuments, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-1189). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 15679. A bill to amend section 203 of title 37, United States Code, to provide additional pay for permanent professors at the U.S. Military Academy, U.S. Naval Academy, U.S. Air Force Academy, and U.S. Coast Guard Academy (Rept. No. 92-1190). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. S. 3086. An act to authorize the disposal of nickel from the national stockpile (Rept. 92-1191). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. S. 764. An act to authorize the disposal of lead from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (Rept. 92-1192). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 1238. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for disaster relief (Rept. 92-1193). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1030. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 15692. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to reduce the interest rate on Small Business Administration disaster loans (Rept. 92-1194). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee of conference. Conference report on S. 979 (Rept. 92-1195). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADEMAs (for himself, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. DENT, and Mr. KOCH):

H.R. 15727. A bill to provide financial assistance to the States for improved educational services for handicapped children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 15728. A bill to provide for the humane care, treatment, habilitation and protection of the mentally retarded in residential facilities through the establishment of strict quality operation and control standards and the

support of the implementation of such standards by Federal assistance, to establish State plans which require a survey of need for assistance to residential facilities to enable them to be in compliance with such standards, seek to minimize inappropriate admissions to residential facilities and develop strategies which stimulate the development of regional and community programs for the mentally retarded which include the integration of such residential facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. KEMP, Mr. FREYER of North Carolina, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. HORTON, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. RODINO, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. HALPERN, and Mr. BRINKLEY):

H.R. 15729. A bill to provide for the humane care, treatment, habilitation and protection of the mentally retarded in residential facilities through the establishment of strict quality operation and control standards and the support of the implementation of such standards by Federal assistance, to establish State plans which require a survey of need for assistance to residential facilities to enable them to be in compliance with such standards, seek to minimize inappropriate admissions to residential facilities and develop strategies which stimulate the development of regional and community programs for the mentally retarded which include the integration of such residential facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. PODELL, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. PEYSER, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KOCH, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. REID, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. LENT, and Mr. HARRINGTON):

H.R. 15730. A bill to provide for the humane care, treatment habilitation and protection of the mentally retarded in residential facilities through the establishment of strict quality operation and control standards and the support of the implementation of such standards by Federal assistance, to establish State plans which require a survey of need for assistance to residential facilities to enable them to be in compliance with such standards, seek to minimize inappropriate admissions to residential facilities and develop strategies which stimulate the development of regional and community programs for the mentally retarded which include the integration of such residential facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEE (for himself, Mr. THONE, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. GRAY, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 15731. A bill non-point source pollution from agricultural, rural, and developing areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 15732. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to direct the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to prescribe radiation standards for, and conduct regular inspections of, diagnostic and other X-ray systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. KEAT-

ING, Mr. RODINO, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. REID, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. LENT):

H.R. 15733. A bill to provide for the humane care, treatment, habilitation and protection of the mentally retarded in residential facilities through the establishment of strict quality operation and control standards and the support of the implementation of such standards by Federal assistance, to establish State plans which require a survey of need for assistance to residential facilities to enable them to be in compliance with such standards, seek to minimize inappropriate admissions to residential facilities and develop strategies which stimulate the development of regional and community programs for the mentally retarded which include the integration of such residential facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. PODELL, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. PEYSER, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KOCH, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. KEMP, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. MAZZOLI):

H.R. 15734. A bill to provide for the humane care, treatment, habilitation and protection of the mentally retarded in residential facilities through the establishment of strict quality operation and control standards and the support of the implementation of such standards by Federal assistance, to establish State plans which require a survey of need for assistance to residential facilities to enable them to be in compliance with such standards, seek to minimize inappropriate admissions to residential facilities and develop strategies which stimulate the development of regional and community programs for the mentally retarded which include the integration of such residential facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mr. CELLER, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. KOCH, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. PODELL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. TERRY, Mr. REID, Mr. FISH, Mr. KEMP, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. SMITH of New York, and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H.R. 15735. A bill to authorize the transfer of a vessel by the Secretary of Commerce to the board of education of the city of New York for educational purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.R. 15736. A bill to assist the States to improve and equalize the quality of elementary and secondary education provided throughout each State and to provide for greater equalization and equality in school tax burdens; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 15737. A bill to provide that tobacco graders shall be retained in a pay status for 10 months in a calendar year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 15738. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for tuition paid for the elementary or secondary education of dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FISH, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 15739. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, to stabilize the retail prices for meat for a period of 45 days at the April 1, 1971, levels, and to require the President to submit to the Congress a plan for insuring an adequate meat supply for U.S. consumers, reasonable meat prices and a fair return on invested capital to farmers, food processors, and food retailers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DOW, Mr. DULSKI, and Mr. EDWARDS of California):

H.R. 15740. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, to stabilize the retail prices of meat for a period of 45 days at the April 1, 1971, levels, and to require the President to submit to the Congress a plan for insuring an adequate meat supply for U.S. consumers, reasonable meat prices and a fair return on invested capital to farmers, food processors, and food retailers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 15741. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make it clear that whenever services furnished an individual in a hospital or extended care facility are certified as necessary by a physician and approved by the appropriate utilization review committee, payment for such services under the hospital insurance program may not be denied on the ground that the level of care involved was not medically required; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 15742. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax simplification, reform, and relief for small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABOUREZK (for himself, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mrs. MINK, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. ROY, Mr. KEE, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. OBEY, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. KYROS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DENT, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. SCHWENDEL, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, and Mr. BEGICH):

H.R. 15743. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1970; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ABOUREZK (for himself, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. BURTON, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. YATRON, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. FISH, Mr. LINK, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BYRON, Mr. CLARK, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. McDADDE, and Mr. CELLER):

H.R. 15744. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1970; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ABOUREZK (for himself, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. KEMP, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. FLOOD):

H.R. 15745. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1970; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 15746. A bill to provide retroactive pay to certain members of the Armed Forces held as prisoners of war during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 15747. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 to exempt from its coverage individuals whose annual earnings are below \$10,000, except with respect to the portion of any increase which raises their annual earnings above \$10,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 15748. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase from 2 to 2½ percent the retirement multiplication factor used in computing annuities of certain employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CAREY of New York:

H.R. 15749. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to subject Federal Land Banks and Federal Land Bank Associations to the taxes imposed by such code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI (for himself and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 15750. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 500th anniversary of the birth of Nicolaus Copernicus (Mikolaj Kopernik); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 15751. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to World War I veterans and their widows, subject to \$3,000 and \$4,200 annual income limitations; to provide for such veterans a certain priority in entitlement to hospitalization and medical care; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. KEITH (for himself, Mr. VAN

DEERLIN, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BROZHILL of North Carolina, Mr. BROTZMAN, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. CURLIN, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. DENT, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. FISH, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FREY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HALPERN, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, and Mr. HARVEY):

H.R. 15752. A bill establishing a Council on Energy Policy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 15753. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to prohibit the making available of Government procurement sources to Federal grantees and contractors; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 15754. A bill to provide that existing Federal tax subsidies will terminate on January 1, 1974, and to provide for a maximum duration of 2 years for Federal tax subsidies hereafter enacted; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS of Arkansas:

H.R. 15755. A bill to amend section 165(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer to elect to deduct disaster losses occurring in the first 6 months of the taxable year from his income for the preceding taxable year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 15756. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first \$5,000 received as civil service retirement annuity from the United States or any agency thereof shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 15757. A bill to amend the Communications Act to express the intent of Congress to establish in the Federal Communications

Commission the exclusive jurisdiction for regulation over all aspects of cable television systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN (for himself, Mr. KEITH, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. MALLARY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REES, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WARE, Mr. ZION, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. PRICE of Texas, and Mr. HILLIS):

H.R. 15758. A bill for the establishment of a Council on Energy Policy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 1238. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for disaster relief; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LEGGETT (for himself, Mr. DORN, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. McFALL, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. ROUSH, Mr. REES, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. MANN, Mr. DON H. CLAYSEN, Mr. VEYSEY, and Mr. RHODES):

H.J. Res. 1239. Joint resolution authorizing the President to designate the calendar month of September 1972 as "National Voter Registration Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 1240. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the second full week in October each year as "National Legal Secretaries' Court Observance Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. MALLARY, Mr. GUDRE, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. REID, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. ROY, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. HORTON, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, and Mr. DENHOLM):

H.J. Res. 1241. Joint resolution authorizing the President to designate the calendar month of September 1972 as "National Voter Registration Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. KEMP, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. MITCHELL, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. SCHWENGLER, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. GALIFIANAKIS, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. KEATING, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. ELBERG, and Mr. MCCORMACK):

H.J. Res. 1242. Joint resolution authorizing the President to designate the calendar month of September 1972 as "National Voter Registration Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida (for himself and Mr. KEMP):

H.J. Res. 1243. Joint resolution making certain urgent supplemental appropriations for disaster relief, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DOW:

H. Res. 1031. Resolution amending the

rules of the House by adding rule XLV on House-authorized Federal budget; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEMP:

H. Res. 1032. Resolution amending the rules of the House by adding rule XLV on House-authorized Federal budget; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. LINK introduced a bill (H.R. 15759) for the relief of Arthur O. Bilden, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

249. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the County Legislature of Suffolk County, N.Y., relative to the proposed Public Service Employment Act of 1972; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

250. Also, petition of Francisco Catalan, Tolosa, Leyte, Philippines, relative to the Philippines becoming one of the United States of America; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

251. Also, petition of the Federation of Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C., relative to restoration of the west front of the U.S. Capitol; to the Committee on Public Works.

252. Also, petition of the city council, Youngstown, Ohio, relative to welfare reform proposals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE ENERGY CRISIS—REAL OR MANUFACTURED?

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD today an excellent and provocative article by Robert Sherrill entitled "The Industry's Fright Campaign," which appeared in the June 26, 1972, edition of the Nation.

This interestingly written and obviously well-researched article directly challenges the conventional wisdom concerning the "energy crisis"—that is, whether there is one. Whether one agrees with what Mr. Sherrill has to say or not, I urge those of my colleagues concerned with the "energy crisis" issue to read this important article. It is good, tough journalism at its best.

That article follows:

"ENERGY CRISIS": THE INDUSTRY'S FRIGHT CAMPAIGN

(By Robert Sherrill)

"With the story we have to tell, it is nothing less than a tragedy that we are not better heard, understood, and recognized as the vital consumer and environmental improvement force that we, in fact, are."—G. J. Tankersley, chairman, American Gas Association, and president, East Ohio Gas Company, October 18, 1971.

WASHINGTON.—Where did the "energy crisis" come from? To a large extent, it came out of the hats of the oil and gas industry's

propagandists. Some are more candid than others in peddling their message, none more so than Wilbur Cross, senior editor on the publicity staff of Continental Oil Company. Cross recently sent to a select portion of the membership of the Society of Magazine Writers a packet containing "sample" articles and "suggested topics," and a letter in which Cross offered to help them write industry-oriented articles.

Conoco was willing to go all the way, wrote Cross. "We'll even do typing, editing and proofing for you, if you like! And in certain instances we'll arrange transportation" on Conoco planes that happen to be going in the right direction. This ingenious proposal was first disclosed by Morton Mintz in *The Washington Post*. When I called Cross to get more details, he spoke as one sorely puzzled. Mintz, he recalled, "asked me if I was ghosting pieces! Why, I thought he must be joking." What in the world gave Mintz such an idea? (Ten of the fifty writers he approached, Cross said, requested some of his material. I did, too.)

Among the "background texts, outlines and subject ideas that we have been developing," said Cross, was, you guessed it, the energy crisis. "There's been a lot of interest in that." Indeed there has been, but the interest is not usually pointed in the right direction. A crisis of sorts really does confront the country; it is not yet one of supply, however, but rather one of control. It is probably safe to say that within the next five years either the public will seize control of its own energy supplies and see that they are dispensed in a sane and thrifty fashion, or the controls will slip forever into the hands of the landlord industry itself.

To achieve the latter results, industry propagandists have suddenly "discovered" an energy shortage in the United States and,

like Cross, they keep telling us about it in press releases and in magazine articles and newspaper ads. Some of them are marvelous flights of imagination. For instance, General Electric recently placed a full-page ad in a number of national magazines (see p. 68 of the April 24th *Newsweek*), showing a lump of coal displayed in a museum case. The ad's headline: "THIS VITAL RESOURCE IS BECOMING EXTINCT. GENERAL ELECTRIC IS WORKING ON ITS SUCCESSOR." The opening paragraph: "Experts say all the economically recoverable coal in the U.S. may disappear in 80 to 150 years. The world's supply in 300 years. And gas and oil before then."

The ad was a smooth pitch for public and government support of the fast-breeder nuclear power reactor, which is in trouble with the environmentalists. Unfortunately, GE didn't identify its experts. They must not be the ones we talked with over at the Bureau of Mines, who said that, even based on projected consumption in the year 2000, and assuming also that only 50 per cent of the known coal reserves is recoverable, we would still have enough to last us well into the millennium. We've got so much bituminous coal," one Bureau spokesman said, "that it's really impossible to figure out how long it would last."

Always accompanying the ominous warnings one finds a commercial hand groping for the consumer's pocket. When the petroleum propagandists sound off, their object is quite obviously to panic us (and those feeble representatives of "us," Congress and the Federal Power Commission) into freeing the industry from any controls—production controls, environmental controls, price controls.

In that packet from Cross was a paper by Conoco's chief executive officer, John G. McLean, which counseled that the only way