

time. For example, the following measures speak for themselves:

- First. Foreign Assistance Act.
- Second. Minimum wage bill.
- Third. Welfare bill.
- Fourth. No-fault insurance.
- Fifth. Maritime bill.
- Sixth. Marine mammals.
- Seventh. Military construction appropriation bill.
- Eighth. Agriculture appropriation bill.
- Ninth. Supplemental appropriation bill.
- Tenth. Foreign aid appropriation bill.
- Eleventh. Defense appropriation bill.
- Twelfth. Revenue sharing.
- Thirteenth. SALT Treaty and the Interim Agreement on Offensive Weapons.
- Fourteenth. Plus others.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 17, 1972

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move in accordance with Senate Concurrent Resolution 88, which has been agreed to by both Houses, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, July 17, 1972.

The motion was agreed to; and at 9:29 p.m. the Senate adjourned until Monday, July 17, 1972, at 12 noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 30 (legislative day of June 28), 1972:

U.S. ARMY

Gen. William C. Westmoreland, ~~xxx-xx-xxxx~~, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be general

Gen. John Hersey Michaelis, ~~xxx-xx-xxxx~~, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major general, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. Richard Ray Taylor, ~~xxx-xx-xxxx~~, ~~XXXX~~ Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier general, Medical Corps

Col. Robert Wesley Green, ~~xxx-xx-xxxx~~, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Marshall Edward McCabe, ~~xxx-xx-xxxx~~, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Charles Calvin Pixley, ~~xxx-xx-xxxx~~, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

U.S. NAVY

Rear Adm. Marmaduke G. Bayne, U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

Lt. Gen. John R. Chaisson, U.S. Marine Corps, when retired, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Maj. Gen. Foster C. LaHue, U.S. Marine Corps, having been designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general whole so serving.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The following officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general under the provisions of section 8962, title 10 of the United States Code:

Lt. Gen. John W. O'Neill, ~~xxx-xx-xxxx~~ FR (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

The following officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 8066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 8066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Edmund F. O'Connor, ~~xxx-xx-xxxx~~ FR (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Andrew E. Gibson, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Robert J. Blackwell, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Maritime Affairs.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

Ashton C. Barrett, of Mississippi, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner for the term expiring June 30, 1977.

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Samuel B. Block, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge, Superior Court of the District of Columbia, for the term of years prescribed by Public Law 91-358, approved July 29, 1970.

Robert H. Campbell, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge, Superior Court of the District of Columbia, for the term of 15 years.

Joseph M. Hannon, of Maryland, to be an associate judge, Superior Court of the District of Columbia, for the term of 15 years.

Margaret A. Haywood, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge, Superior Court of the District of Columbia, for the term of years prescribed by Public Law 91-358, approved July 29, 1970.

John R. Hess, of Virginia, to be an associate judge, Superior Court of the District of Columbia, for the term of 15 years.

Luke C. Moore, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge, Superior Court of the District of Columbia, for the term of 15 years.

Donald S. Smith, of Maryland, to be an associate judge, Superior Court of the District of Columbia, for the term of 15 years.

JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

Adm. Thomas Hinman Moorer, U.S. Navy, for reappointment as Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, for an additional term of 2 years.

IN THE ARMY

Army nominations beginning P. D. Ackerman, Jr., to be colonel, and ending Eugene W. Young, to be lieutenant colonel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 1972.

IN THE NAVY

Navy nominations beginning John F. Calhoun, to be commander, and ending James A. Morgart, to be commander, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 1972.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, June 30, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Meyer M. Abramowitz, Temple B'rith Sholom, Springfield, Ill., offered the following prayer:

God of all mankind, standing in this historic Chamber, we recall the vision of the founders of our Nation. We admire their zealous dedication and pray for the fortitude never to veer from their noble aims. May we emulate their prophetic boldness, their sincere dedication, and educated wisdom, as we meet the problems of our day.

Enlighten with Your wisdom, O God, and sustain with Your power, those who we, the people, have set in authority. Be their stay and support in the fulfillment of their awesome trust, to guarantee the implementation of the letter and spirit of our Constitution for all the inhabitants of our land, to provide equal opportunity of learning and labor and

well-being, for all our citizens, and shelter for those who seek refuge with us from tyranny.

Grant us the will to pursue peace relentlessly. May the blight of war be banished, and freedom prevail among all Your children everywhere, with none to make them afraid. May America stand unsurpassed as a citadel of human fellowship in a free and peaceful world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 15507. An act to amend the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969 to provide for Federal guarantees of obligations issued by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, to authorize an increased contribution by the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in mittee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13955) entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 56. An act to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, to provide for a National Environmental Data System.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House, with an amendment to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3343. An act to amend chapter 21 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum amount of the grant payable for specially adapted housing for disabled veterans.

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

S. 2577. An act to amend the International Travel Act of 1961 to provide for Federal regulation of the travel agency industry; and

S.J. Res. 245. Joint resolution authorizing the President to designate the calendar month of September 1972 as "National Voter Registration Month."

THE SAGA OF H. R. GROSS

The SPEAKER. The Chair is going to recognize first of all for a 1-minute speech the collator of the strongest two-man party in the House, the gentleman from Missouri, Dr. HALL.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, today will mark the last time that this "lame duck" will have the opportunity to stand before this body and salute the birthday of my close friend, and our colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, the Honorable H. R. GROSS. To commemorate the occasion I have, on this day, set pen to paper to record in rhyme what has long been in my heart. What will undoubtedly become an epic is entitled very simply:

THE SAGA OF H. R. GROSS

H. R. Gross is a friend, tried and true.
The conscience of the House, a conservative clear through.
His knowledge is awesome, his wit keen and ready,
His A.C.U. rating stands at 98 and steady.
When the quorum bells ring every day loud and clear,
It's H.R.'s way of saying that it is lonely in here.
In debate he's incisive, probing, tenacious,
But winner or loser, he's always been gracious.
We are glad you are here, "H.R. one forty four,"
The taxpayers are secure when you're on the floor.
Happy birthday to you from your colleagues young and old,
For after the Lord made you, He destroyed the mold.

Mr. Speaker, it is my fervent wish that HAROLD ROYCE GROSS will have a happy day, and in the future will continue to be as productive and capable as he has been in the past.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1238, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in

order at any time today to call up House Joint Resolution 1238, making a supplemental appropriation for disaster relief.

Mr. Speaker, this has been reported out unanimously by the Committee on Appropriations, and needs to be taken care of before we adjourn.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation from the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations about this bill, its current status and its parliamentary progress through the Congress as a whole, as well as what we might expect as to timing?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I would say to my friend, the gentleman from Missouri, that, as a result of the disastrous floods which have recently occurred, there is great loss and suffering throughout much of the eastern part of the United States. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Mr. Weinberger, advised me by telephone earlier this week that the President would send us a budget estimate for \$100 million. This was done on June 27—3 days ago.

The Committee on Appropriations met on the 28th of June and reported this joint resolution favorably. We were told that it was urgent that the Congress act on the matter before the scheduled recess today.

We were told by Mr. Lincoln, the head of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, that perhaps for a couple of months they could get along with \$100 million which is supplementary to the \$92.5 million in the regular 1973 bill for this purpose.

There seems to be the general feeling that ultimately the recent disaster will cost the Government considerably more than what we are now providing.

So, an amendment to the resolution was adopted in the Committee on Appropriations, raising the figure to \$200 million.

Similar action has been taken by the other body in another bill.

Thus, a \$200 million resolution will be called up in the House if the unanimous-consent request is granted.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I appreciate the gentleman's detailed explanation, and in fact, Mr. Speaker, he had previously coordinated it on the floor; and I think we recognize, as I said yesterday in the debate on the Small Business Administration extravaganza that was perpetrated on the House as an "urgent" and "dire emergency" even unto the wee small hours this morning but which we now learn is going to have extensive hearings over in committee in the other body, and will be finally considered at some distant date; that this, of course, involved only authorizing legislation and jurisdictional control, as I said on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, this is the proper way to go about it, but I still would like to know what the current legislative status is if we must accomplish it before we adjourn for the recess, and the gentleman's party's convention—including the Inde-

pendence Day celebration. What is its status in the other body; will ever the twain be meshed; and what can we expect today other than just unanimous consent to bring it on the floor from the gentleman's committee?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I am advised on good authority that it is the intention of the other body to act on the resolution promptly, so I would hope that this body would also pass it promptly. It supplements the disaster fund, the expenditure and the commitment from which are determined by existing law, and is not related to the bill which the House considered last night.

Mr. HALL. That is exactly the point I made last night in the colloquy. This is the proper way to do it, and I have no objection to what the gentleman is asking to do. Indeed, I shall not object, but I wonder if in the other body the \$100 million or \$200 million is attached to the same vehicle that the gentleman expects to bring out, and/or how are we going to get the two together?

Mr. MAHON. The other body added \$200 million for disaster aid to the Labor-HEW appropriation bill. It does not belong on that bill because it is not pertinent to that bill. Of course, we have not gone to conference on that bill and will not before the impending recess.

I feel confident that the other body will accept this joint resolution and that it can be enacted into law very quickly.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, but I think we ought to make just a little history on this because as the gentleman correctly stated we passed out the \$200 million appropriation from our committee and the other body put \$200 million on the HEW-Labor appropriation bill.

It is my understanding that what will happen over there is that if this is passed by this body it will go over there and they will pass it. But we have to remember we still have that \$200 million on the HEW-Labor appropriation bill.

I think that we ought to have a very strict understanding here on the floor of the House that this will come out in conference—otherwise we are talking about \$400 million and not \$200 million.

I see the distinguished chairman of that subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood) and I wonder if he could give us any assurance along that line.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. I would say that we are not, under any circumstances, going to accept the additional \$200 million that is attached to the Labor-HEW bill. It may be that further additional funds will be required. We have been advised by the administration that after the damages have been more accurately assessed a supplemental budget, if required, will be submitted at some later date. But there is no likelihood in the remotest sense, in my judgment, that the House would

agree to the \$200 million in the Labor-HEW bill.

Mr. CEDERBERG. This is a statement that the gentleman made in the full committee.

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Let me answer the gentleman's second question, if you do not mind.

Make no mistake about this—if you think you are making a grand gesture today by passing this \$200 million you are doing what you should do, but you are not doing a great thing.

The situation with which we are confronted today is the greatest civil disaster in the history of this Republic—exclamation mark. Make no mistake about that.

You are going to consider, as the chairman said, in proper order—you are looking now at at least one-half billion dollars right smack between the eyes on this present disaster. Be sure of that—the action you are taking now in the long range and in the proper order, and as will follow in the hearings, and I am sure this will pass in the Senate.

I knew about the action taken by the other body on the Labor-HEW bill.

That will not be before us prior to the recess. I knew they were doing that. But out of an abundance of caution do not think that this is a largess as of today.

I agree with the chairman that this should not be considered in the Labor-HEW bill and I have advised them already by telephone of that fact. But do not forget, this is no big deal today—the \$200 million—not a bit.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I can appreciate the gentleman's statement but I think it is important for the RECORD, and I can understand the problem that the gentleman from Pennsylvania and others have with reference to this crisis, and he is serving his people extremely well.

But there are orderly ways in which we should do it. And we just want to be sure that if additional funds are requested we would use the right method in order to accomplish the objective that we want to accomplish.

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to ask the gentleman from Texas if this procedure and bill will have the support of the new coalition that emerged in the House yesterday.

Mr. MAHON. Not having been a part of what the gentleman refers to as "the new coalition of yesterday," I am not sure, but I suspect that this \$200 million resolution will pass unanimously.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON)?

There was no objection.

CXVIII—1491—Part 18

RESIGNATION OF SERGEANT AT ARMS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following letter of resignation from the Sergeant at Arms:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 8, 1972.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby submit my resignation as Sergeant at Arms of the U.S. House of Representatives effective at the close of business June 30, 1972.

Sincerely,

ZEAKE W. JOHNSON, JR.,
Sergeant at Arms.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF ZEAKE W. JOHNSON, JR.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended by Public Law 197, 83d Congress (67 Stat. 387; 2 U.S.C. 75a-1(a)), the Chair appoints, effective July 1, 1972, Zeake W. Johnson, Jr., of Tennessee, to act as and to exercise temporarily the duties of Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Zeake W. Johnson, Jr., appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McFALL. 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. 255]

Abernethy	Dowdy	Kluczynski
Abourezk	Dulski	Landrum
Abzug	Dwyer	Lennon
Anderson,	Eckhardt	Link
Tenn.	Edmondson	Lujan
Ashley	Erlenborn	McCulloch
Badillo	Evins, Tenn.	McDade
Baring	Findley	McDonald,
Bell	Ford,	Mich.
Blatnik	Gerald R.	McKinney
Boggs	Ford,	Martin
Boland	William D.	Mathias, Calif.
Bolling	Fountain	Metcalf
Brown, Ohio	Frelinghuysen	Michel
Broyhill, N.C.	Fuqua	Miller, Calif.
Burke, Fla.	Gallagher	Mosher
Burton	Garmatz	Moss
Cabell	Gialmo	O'Hara
Caffery	Gray	Passman
Celler	Griffiths	Pelly
Chisholm	Grover	Pike
Clark	Hagan	Poage
Clawson, Del	Hanna	Poff
Clay	Harsha	Pryor, Ark.
Colmer	Hays	Rarick
Conyers	Hébert	Reid
Culver	Hollifield	Riegle
Curlin	Hosmer	Roberts
Davis, S.C.	Howard	Roussot
Dellums	Jones, N.C.	Ruppe
Dent	Karth	Scheuer
Diggs	Kee	Schwengel
Dingell	Keith	Scott

Shoup
Sikes
Skubitz
Steiger, Ariz.

Stephens
Teague, Calif.
Udall
Waldie

Wilson,
Charles H.
Wylder
Wylie

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 326 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 29, 1972.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Due to new and increased demands upon my time, I respectfully tender my resignation as a member of the Select Committee on House Restaurants effective upon the earliest possible date of its acceptance.

I have enjoyed working with this committee and wish to particularly commend Chairman Wayne L. Hays of the House Administration Committee for his efforts in improving food and services and reducing the operating costs as well.

Respectfully,

HAROLD R. COLLIER.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

LACK OF PUBLIC TRUST IS WELL-DESERVED

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

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, recent public opinion polls show that the public is skeptical about the promises of politicians.

Why is this?

I think I can show that this lack of trust is probably well-deserved by some politicians whose promises and statements do not even come close to reality.

I have in my hand a campaign brochure printed by the "Committee for the Reelection of the President" that states:

President Nixon has submitted proposals to Congress which would increase Social Security benefits to the nation's elderly by one-third.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who knows anything about the administration's record of foot-dragging and negativism on social security would be shocked by this statement alleging that the President favors a 33-percent increase of social security benefits.

If the President favors social security increases, why did he oppose the 15-percent increase granted by Congress on December 30, 1969?

If the President favors social security increases, why did he threaten to veto the 10-percent increase granted by Congress on March 17, 1971?

If the President favors social security increases, why did he opposing the 20-percent increase that is presently before the Congress?

These questions deserve an answer.

But, instead of answers, instead of positive proposals, all we hear from the White House are noises about a possible veto because of "inflation."

Mr. Speaker, I am becoming increasingly convinced that whenever the Congress suggests a reasonable increase in social security benefits; a knee-jerk, Pavlovian reaction automatically goes off in the White House labeling such a move as "inflationary."

Is there any doubt that many politicians are deserving of this lack of trust by the public?

I think not.

IS BEGGING BETTER THAN BOMBING?

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

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked this morning by an article in the paper which reported a speech by Senator McGovern in South Carolina in which he said:

Begging is better than bombing. I would go to Hanoi and beg if I thought that it would release our boys one day earlier.

I have disagreed with Senator McGovern's past statements calling for legalization of marihuana, national abortion laws, \$1,000 handout programs, and increased taxing of the middle-income group; but I have never felt the shame for him and those candidates and public officials who have endorsed him, as I did when he made his statement that "begging is better than bombing."

I truly fear for the future of this great land of ours if we had a leader who is ready and willing to go begging to the Communist capitals of the world. I am not ashamed of the United States and I do not feel we have to go on our knees to any other country.

PROOF OF THE ECONOMY'S VITALITY CONTINUES TO ACCUMULATE

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

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, solid evidence of the strength of our economy is becoming commonplace. Hardly a week goes by without another indication that the economy is expanding at a healthy rate, and providing jobs and income in growing quantities.

The statistics for the month of May, most of which have been released within the last several weeks, typify this undeniable evidence of economic expansion. For example, in May—

Employment grew by almost 190,000, seasonally adjusted, at an annual rate of 2.3 million jobs;

The Federal Reserve's index of industrial production rose five-tenths of a point for the ninth consecutive monthly increase, indicating strong expansion in the manufacturing sector;

Housing starts totaled 2.3 million units at a seasonally adjusted annual rate, bringing to 13 the number of consecutive months this indicator has exceeded 2 million;

The index of leading economic indicators rose four-tenths of 1 percent in May, the 11th successive monthly rise in this index since the years 1964-65; and

Average weekly earnings of American workers, measured in dollars of constant purchasing power, rose two-tenths of 1 percent, bringing the increase over the previous 12 months to nearly 3 percent, the largest gain since 1964.

There can now be no question about the economy's strength, due in significant part to the administration's economic policies. Moreover, these policies have helped restrain cost and price increases to insure that the income and production gains are real, and not eaten up by inflation.

ARGENTINA SENDS BEEF TO AMERICA?

(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, the same day that brought news of the elimination of quotas on the imports of cheap foreign beef into the United States came reports such as the following. The following UPI story from Buenos Aires indicates how quickly our friends abroad will take unfair advantage of the American cattle farmer and the American consumer and housewife. This clipping is from the same issue of the Columbia, S.C., State that announced in headlines the lifting of quotas:

ARGENTINA CURBS ON BEEF SALES NOW EFFECTIVE

BUENOS AIRES (UPI).—New restrictions on the sale of beef will become effective Monday in Argentina, a country renowned for the quality and abundance of its meat.

In an effort to increase the amount of beef available for export, the military government has broadened current restrictions on its sale domestically by decreeing that beef can be sold legally in Argentina only one week in every three.

Under the new law, no beef may be sold for two consecutive weeks but in the third week beef sales will be permitted.

THE BUSING ISSUE

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

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, last night the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. COLMER, showed us the way out of the quagmire which has engulfed the issue of school busing for racial balance.

Mr. COLMER pledged to take up House Joint Resolution 620 in the Rules Committee on August 1 if the Judiciary Committee has not brought the legislation to the floor by that time.

I applaud Mr. COLMER for his proposal, for as I have said on many occasions in the past several months, if we recess without taking effective action on busing,

we will have abdicated our responsibility in a flagrant and inexcusable way.

The antibusing provision attached to the higher education bill recently passed is not a solution to anything, a point I made when that legislation was being debated. I am not satisfied with it, and neither are a great many of my colleagues.

We have a responsibility to face this issue squarely and settle it once and for all. Delays are not sufficient, and the people will not be satisfied with mere moratoriums for very long.

We have already had legislation introduced that would deal much more effectively with the busing issue. I have introduced a constitutional amendment which would prohibit the assignment of students to schools on the basis of race, and thus eliminate the pretext under which massive busing orders have been issued.

President Nixon has offered legislation which would set strict guidelines on the use of busing, and which would restrict or eliminate many busing orders already in effect, in addition to those issued in the future.

And there are many other legislative proposals that have been introduced that would be far more effective than the very mild restraints we placed on busing orders recently with the higher education bill.

The busing issue has become the single most volatile and controversial issue on the American domestic scene. The people are rightly demanding that we act on this issue, and act now.

I believe we should not even think of recessing until we get this issue resolved by passing meaningful and effective legislation to banish forced busing once and for all from the educational process in America.

RETIREMENT OF WILLIAM CHILDS WESTMORELAND

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor of this House today to express on behalf of myself and I believe on behalf of a grateful nation, appreciation for the four decades of dedicated service of William Childs Westmoreland. This native of Spartanburg County, S.C., in the congressional district that I am privileged to serve, entered the U.S. Military Academy at West Point in 1932, 40 years ago. Today he concludes 40 years of brilliant and distinguished service to his country with a retirement ceremony at Fort Myer.

Earlier this week the President of the United States awarded the third Oak Leaf Cluster to the Distinguished Service Medal to General Westmoreland. Among other things the citation said—

During a period marked by significant changes in national strategy and priorities, General Westmoreland's outstanding professional ability, personal integrity, and untiring leadership efforts were an inspiration to all the Army.

And:

His exceptional leadership and selfless dedication to duty throughout this period

are the hallmarks of his brilliant career. A grateful Nation recognizes that General Westmoreland's long and distinguished service, covering three wars and more than thirty-six years of devoted duty, has been in the finest traditions of the military profession. His loyal and illustrious service to the United States, in successive positions of the greatest responsibility, reflects the highest credit upon himself, the Army, and the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the Fourth District of South Carolina is proud to have given the Nation this distinguished soldier. I do not believe that we have heard the last of him. His life of service is not over, because he is motivated to serve his country and his fellow man. I believe that he will do so as long as he draws breath. We can wish for him satisfaction for a job well done, and further satisfaction as he enters retired status.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 15585, TREASURY-POSTAL SERVICE APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 15585) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes, 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 26, 1972.)

Mr. STEED (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the report here today is probably the least involved report on this bill that we have been able to bring here in many years, because the original agreements between the two bodies were so much alike. We only had very few items in disagreement. The amount of money is almost balanced out between the two bodies.

There are two items, I believe, that might need a little explanation, because there has been some interest shown in them.

For several years the committee had been concerned about the inability of the Customs Service to interdict contraband crossing the borders at the preclearance centers they maintain in foreign countries. We have been trying to get these loopholes closed. Since we have invested so much money to interdict the flow of narcotics into the country, we think the time is past when we can tolerate these loopholes any more. So we have placed some language in the bill that we hope will enable the Secretary of the Treasury and the U.S. Customs Service to effect the kind of changes that we think are necessary to close these loopholes. I hope that this will solve the problem.

We think that this definitely is in the right direction.

Another item in this conference report has to do with the emergency health program. Due to the good work that our friend from Missouri, Dr. HALL, provided for the subcommittee, we became aware that this program was not getting the attention it deserved. An effort we made last year to try to get it tightened up did not seem to get any results. So this year we eliminated the funds for

this program. Since that time we have been advised by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Office of Management and Budget that they are having some conferences on plans to update and straighten out this program and eliminate some of the problems that exist there. The other body placed some funds back in the bill that are needed for the community activities part of this program under this fund which we have agreed to in this conference report. As soon as the powers that be get their plans made for the rest of the program, we should be in a position to go forward with it. What this involves are the packaged disaster hospitals that are positioned throughout the country to be used in case of national emergency or disaster. They have been permitted to get into a shocking state of deterioration, and we have been trying to find some way to put them back into the kind of shape they need to be in if they are going to be of any use.

I think now, through the steps that we have taken, we are going to get this matter cleared up. I wanted to take this opportunity to express the committee's appreciation to Dr. HALL. I think he is probably not only the most knowledgeable man in the Congress on this subject, but probably in the Government. Without his help we could not have made the progress we feel we have made in this direction.

I think we can assure the House that steps will be taken to bring the program in balance and give us this insurance policy which is so important. The recent happenings remind us very forcefully that all sorts of catastrophes can hit us that make the value of this sort of facility almost priceless.

I hope we do not have too much delay in getting this done.

I include the following:

SUMMARY

TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT BILL (H.R. 15585), 1973

Item	New budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1972	Budget estimates fiscal year 1973	Passed House (H.R. 15585)	Passed Senate (H.R. 15585)	Conference action (H.R. 15585)	Conference action compared with—			
						New budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1972	Budget estimates fiscal year 1973	House	Senate
Title I, Treasury Department	\$1,590,351,000	\$1,691,677,000	\$1,675,977,000	\$1,670,018,000	\$1,671,018,000	+\$80,667,000	-\$20,659,000	-\$4,959,000	+\$1,000,000
Title II, U.S. Postal Service	1,417,522,000	1,424,039,000	1,410,000,000	1,410,000,000	1,410,000,000	-7,522,000	-14,039,000		
Title III, Executive Office of the President	143,204,000	187,521,000	179,446,000	179,446,000	179,446,000	+36,242,000	-8,075,000		
Title IV, independent agencies	1,776,988,413	1,763,366,000	1,791,722,000	1,797,722,000	1,797,363,000	+20,374,587	+33,997,000	+5,641,000	-359,000
Title V, claims	387,190					-387,190			
Grand total, titles I, II, III, IV, and V, new budget (obligational) authority	4,928,452,603	5,066,603,000	5,057,145,000	5,057,186,000	5,057,827,000	+129,374,397	-8,776,000	+682,000	+641,000

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON) whatever time he may desire.

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, the minority side joins our chairman in recommending this conference report to the House and in urging its adoption.

I think some additional comment deserves to be made in addition to the matters the chairman of the subcommittee has explained to you, and that relates to the disaster relief fund of the President

about which we have been hearing so much in the last few days.

There was in the budget a request of \$100 million for this fund, as I recall it. We reduced this figure to \$92.5 million in light of an anticipated carryover of \$8 million to \$10 million. At the present time, the carryover is actually about \$6 million. The other body went along, in any event, with the \$92.5 million figure—this being before the havoc that was wreaked by Hurricane Agnes. The pending resolution to which the chairman of

the full Committee on Appropriations addressed himself, earlier this afternoon, would add, when adopted sometime this afternoon, and, if it is accepted by the other body, another \$200 million to the disaster relief fund, making a total of about \$298.5 million available in that fund, which should carry the Office of Emergency Preparedness through the next month or so, at least, insofar as its current needs can now be estimated.

I am certain, when the damage estimates are firmer, that, if they indicate

more than this is needed, this subcommittee and this Congress will give early and favorable consideration to that need.

I am happy now to yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY).

Mr. HARVEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am not certain whether to direct my inquiry to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON) or to the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. STEED, but I do have concern about the language in amendment No. 7 as it pertains to preclearance activities as they have gone on in the past and as it is intended that they go on in the future.

If I understand this language correctly, it is aimed at our neighboring country of Canada where preclearance takes place, and is also aimed at Nassau in the Bahamas and Bermuda. I think those are the only places where preclearance presently takes place.

My question to the chairman of the committee or to my good friend from New York is this: Is there reasonable assurance that the countries involved here, particularly Canada, which I never felt we have had a problem with in connection with smuggling or narcotics or anything of that sort—is there reasonable assurance that the Canadian Government will accept this language as well as the British Government in Bermuda and Nassau?

Mr. STEED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEED. I will tell the gentleman this. We have been getting the finest cooperation from the Canadian Government. We have had no problem there of preclearance or narcotic smuggling. They not only cooperate with us at the preclearance level but also in many other ways.

We are very happy with the cooperation we get out of the Canadians, and I see no problem there whatsoever. There are some problems, though, in the other places the gentleman has mentioned, and unless they can be straightened out I for one will insist that preclearance be stopped there because we cannot tolerate these wide open loopholes for narcotic smuggling.

We have been trying to get something done here for about 12 years, and all promises have gone for naught. The time has come when we just must insist that something be done. There is no real problem if they really tighten it up, but we will have to insist that they do tighten it up. If they do not, something will have to be done, but it is rather inconceivable to me that it cannot be worked out and I am sure that they can work it out.

I think the time has come that something must be done.

Mr. HARVEY. If the gentleman will yield further, I would say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that I have an interest in this because obviously if preclearance were taken away it would greatly affect the flights, for example, into the States of Michigan, New York, and other areas. It would disrupt them considerably and have a very great impact on the passengers going to those

areas whose baggage would have to be unloaded for inspection, and then reloaded.

In addition, without preclearance, all passengers on flights to New York from these areas would have to go through Kennedy International, then transfer to other airports, for their connecting flights.

Mr. STEED. If the gentleman will yield further, this committee is not against preclearance as such, but we are very much opposed to continuing loopholes for narcotics smugglers to have free entry into this country. We insist that preclearance be done in such a way that the smuggling of narcotics into our country can be stopped.

Mr. HARVEY. If I could just ask one final question, and that is, has there been any unwillingness or lack of cooperation on the part of the Canadian Government, the Bermuda Government, or the Nassau government to give our customs people the right to stop and arrest, or to search baggage for those sorts of things? If there has, I have not been aware of it.

I have been just as desirous and interested in the stopping of the flow of narcotics into this country as anybody, but I am also interested in seeing that we have just as free a flow of passengers as possible because this is in the interest of our country.

It has been my impression that preclearance has, by and large, worked well. If it has not worked then I would like to know about it.

Mr. STEED. I think the difficulty is that the conditions as they now exist, especially in Nassau and in Bermuda, are very unsatisfactory, but as for the Canadians we have had the finest cooperation with them in the world, and not only in this point of our relations with Canada, but in many other fields.

The Canadian officials in the last 3 years have been very, very cooperative, and I have nothing but the highest praise for them.

We are talking about only six locations. It would seem to me that the accommodation of the people that go through these six points is not worth subjecting all the American people to the dangers of narcotics with the conditions that exist now in our society.

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

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, if I can again recapture the floor, and go back to the suggestion of the gentleman from Michigan that this action is aimed—I think those were his words—against the Government of Canada, the government of Nassau, and the government of Bermuda, that that is not our true intention, and I am sure the gentleman understands that. It is aimed, instead, at whatever loophole here exists in the fight against the narcotics trade that so affects the young people of this Nation.

The subcommittee and this Congress must do everything that it can to close any possible loophole in that regard.

It seems to me, insofar as Canadian cooperation with us is concerned, that the language in the amendment as pre-

sented to us now permits preclearance procedures to continue, but under certain new rules or guidelines which would apply in all places where such procedures now exist. I think this is the way it ought to be. So, if there is any problem with respect to Canada, it can be resolved, and also with Nassau and Bermuda those problems can be resolved in the uniform way in which they should be.

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

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Members who are not already aware of it might appreciate knowing that as of midnight tonight there will be a substantial increase in the top level salaries in the new Postal Service Corporation. The top salary or salaries will go to \$60,000 a year, and there are other very substantial increases. I understand that some regional directors will draw approximately as much as Members of Congress.

Mr. STEED. I might say for the gentleman's information we have the further assurance that the reduction made in the appropriations for this item by the House and Senate probably will at least be well placed.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, last week's tropical storm Agnes caused severe flood damage in a nine State area and the District of Columbia. The State of Pennsylvania suffered the greatest damage and the property loss will amount to over a billion dollars; over 13,000 homes will need major repairs with over 500 totally destroyed; and 52,000 jobs were lost to business and industry. My own district in Fayette, Washington, Greene, and Allegheny Counties had losses in the million.

The Federal Government has always rendered assistance in special disasters. In 1970 Congress passed the Public Law 91-606, the Disaster Relief Act. This enabled the President to declare 35 counties in Pennsylvania disaster areas. I feel that the President should have ruled that all 67 counties should be included under the act, because almost every county was involved in the storm.

On June 27, 1972, the entire Pennsylvania delegation, including the two Senators from Pennsylvania, were briefed by the Governor of Pennsylvania and as a result House Joint Resolution 1237, cosponsored by all the members of the delegation, was introduced. It provided for a supplemental appropriation of \$250,000,000 for disaster relief. This would only help to begin the great amount of rehabilitation necessary, but it would move the program forward under the Office of Emergency Preparedness.

I want to congratulate the House Appropriations Committee for moving forward the same day the resolution was introduced and reporting out House Joint Resolution 1238. The full \$250,000,000 was cut to \$200,000,000. There is \$92,000,000 in the regular OEP fiscal year 1973 request, and a \$6,000,000 carryover. This means that a total of approximately \$298,000,000 will be avail-

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Schwengel.
 Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Gallagher.
 Mr. Baring with Mr. Clay.
 Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Metcalfe.
 Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.

Mr. Fraser with Mr. Vander Jagt.
 Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Del Clawson.
 Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Wylie.
 Mr. Leggett with Mr. Mailliard.
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Scott.
 Mr. Ashley with Mr. Mosher.
 Mr. Stephens with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.
 Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Bell.
 Mr. Hanna with Mr. Hosmer.
 Mr. Abernethy with Mr. McCulloch.
 Mr. Pepper with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. McKinney.
 Mr. Curlin with Mr. Clark.
 Mr. Eckhardt with Mrs. Dwyer.
 Mr. Colmer with Mr. Findley.
 Mrs. Abzug with Mr. Riegle.
 Mr. Rarick with Mr. Rousselot.
 Mr. Curlin with Mr. Clark.
 Mr. Link with Mr. Kee.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 15585, TREASURY-POSTAL SERVICE APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: Page 6, line 26, strike out:

"SEC. 102. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for expenses of Customs preclearance activities after March 31, 1973," and insert:

SEC. 102. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for expenses of Customs preclearance activities after March 31, 1973, in any country which does not presently grant preclearance privileges to the United States.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STEED

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STEED moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by the Senate, insert the following:

"SEC. 102. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for expenses of Customs preclearance activities after March 31, 1973, in any country which does not grant to the United States Customs officers the same authority to search, seize, and arrest which such officers have in connection with persons, baggage, and cargo arriving in the United States or which does not provide adequate facilities for the proper exercise of this authority, as may be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury."

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 12: Page 22, line 15, insert:

Appropriations herein and heretofore granted under this heading shall be available without regard to the second proviso under this heading in the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1972.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STEED

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STEED moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12 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. 14: Page 30, line 10, insert: *Provided further*, That \$29,041,000 of the amount appropriated is contingent upon enactment of authorizing legislation.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STEED

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STEED moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14 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. 15: Page 31, line 7, insert:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION EMERGENCY HEALTH

For expenses necessary for carrying out emergency planning and preparedness functions of the Health Services and Mental Health Administration, and procurement, storage (including underground storage), distribution, and maintenance of emergency civil defense medical supplies and equipment, as authorized by section 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2281(h)), and, except as otherwise provided, sections 301 and 311 of the Public Health Service Act with respect to emergency health services, \$3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STEED

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STEED moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15 and concur therein.

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

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, may I simply say that any interested man would be appreciative of the action of the subcommittee and certainly its distinguished chairman and its minority members, as well as the members of the committee, in trying to recoup that in which we have invested millions against the dire day of natural or manmade disaster, and certainly civil defense. I personally appreciate the comments directed to my interest and background. I want to compliment this group and the conferees on the part of both bodies in bringing this amendment and the motions back in, and thank the gentlemen for their expressions during the general debate prior to the conference report agreement.

Mr. Speaker, our national medical stockpile, conservatively estimated at \$140 million, is on the verge of being abandoned and destroyed. This is, therefore, a sorry decision for natural and manmade disasters, as well as civil defense.

This has come about by the decision of the Subcommittee on Appropriations to exclude some \$4.4 million from the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations for 1973—which was to be used to carry out the emergency medical activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The subcommittee deemed this action necessary because of the refusal by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to comply with a year-old directive of the Congress to upgrade their evaluation, procedure, and methods. As reported to this body on June 20, 1972, "of the 2,116 prepositioned disaster hospitals, approximately 1,380 were so deteriorated as to be almost useless."

This is obviously all part of a plan by the organized power seekers in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to eliminate the commissioned officer corps of the U.S. Public Health Service. In my view, they should be stopped immediately.

During our latest disaster, caused by torrential rains unleashed by Hurricane Agnes, some 28 instances of relief were made possible because of the emergency stockpile. Are we now laying the groundwork for that "cupboard to be bare," the next time it is needed? Apparently so. Quite an investment for out-of-hand rejection.

If this is true, the blame must be laid squarely on the doorstep of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, because the Congress has done everything possible to protect and carry on these supplies and keep them updated. In equity, I include a portion of a "position paper," for informational purposes. It shows perception, but fatalism. I know that in the future things will be better under the active oversight of this subcommittee:

Subject: 1973 Emergency Health Program, June 27, 1972.

The following constitutes a narrative summary of the 1973 Emergency Health appropriation history and the impending crisis which will result from Congressional actions of the past few weeks.

SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

1. The President's 1973 Budget recommended \$4,422,000 to carry out the Department's Emergency Health Activities in maintaining the program at about the 1972 level.

2. House action denied in its entirety the budget request of \$4,422,000. The House Subcommittee on Appropriations stated generally that the National Medical Stockpile is in such a condition of disrepair that it could no longer be counted upon as a usable medical resource for disaster situations and, therefore, should be discontinued.

3. Senate action recommended \$3,000,000 for Emergency Health Activities, a reduction of \$1,422,000 from the President's Budget. The Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations concurred with the House in respect to the medical stockpile activities but recommended continuation of the community preparedness activities.

4. The Conference Committee recommended an appropriation of \$3,000,000 for

Emergency Health Activities. It is assumed that the House receded from its recommendation and agreed to the Senate's recommended bill to continue community preparedness activities and to discontinue the medical stockpile.

EFFECT OF FINAL CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

1. The National Medical Stockpile, valued at approximately \$140,000,000, will be abandoned in its entirety. It is anticipated that millions of dollars worth of short shelf-life medical material will necessarily be destroyed and the remaining inventories exceeded as no longer a useful government commodity.

2. The furnishing of medical supplies and equipment for disaster situations will no longer be accomplished by this program, including the discontinuance of an agreement with the American National Red Cross to furnish certain medical stockpile items for community utilization during periods of disaster.

3. In the servicing and warehousing activities for the medical stockpile the General Services Administration will be faced with the massive workload and complex problems associated with the liquidation of the medical stockpile inventories. Lack of adequate financing (current financing will be accomplished from balances carried forward from advances of prior years) will force an immediate reduction of 95 technical General Services Administration positions. This action will leave approximately 38 positions to maintain a custodial function over the inventories but without any ability to perform mandatory services including liquidation if this should become necessary.

4. The impact of the loss of the medical stockpile, a civil defense resource will not create an immediate impact at the State and local level except in those areas that may suffer the effects of major disasters. The medical preparedness program, however, will cease to be a real and tangible resource.

In summary, we are faced with the immediate demanding decision as to whether the National Medical Stockpile (authorized by Section 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950) should be discontinued or whether efforts should be immediately undertaken to continue the program with acceptable goals as a part of the National Emergency Preparedness program for the civilian population of this Nation. Continuance can be accomplished through a Supplemental Appropriation of significant value to continue and realign the program in its proper perspective. Concrete plans would need to be developed for the future to assure financing mechanisms so that a preparedness program would be executed in a manner acceptable to all.

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous material.)

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 16: Page 33, after line 11, insert:

Sec. 505. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for the procurement of or for the payment of the salary of any person engaged in the procurement of any hand or measuring tool(s) not produced in the United States or its possessions except to the extent that the Administrator of General Services or his designee shall determine that a satisfactory quality and sufficient quantity of hand or measuring tools produced in the United States or its posses-

sions cannot be procured as and when needed from sources in the United States and its possessions or except in accordance with procedures prescribed by section 6-104.4 (b) of Armed Services Procurement Regulation dated January 1, 1969, as such regulation existed on June 15, 1970. This section shall be applicable to all solicitations for bids opened after its enactment.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STEED

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STEED moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16 and concur therein.

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. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

H.R. 13918, TO PROVIDE INCREASED FINANCING FOR THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING AND TO MODIFY THE PUBLIC BROADCASTING ACT OF 1967—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-320)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I find it necessary to return without my approval H.R. 13918 which is intended to provide increased financing for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and to modify the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 by making various changes in the structure of the non-commercial, educational broadcasting system.

Public broadcasting can and does make important contributions to our Nation's life by presenting educational and cultural programs of diversity and excellence. Programs such as "Sesame Street" and "the Electric Company" already have begun to repay the far-sighted decision the Nation made in the 1950's when channels were reserved for educational purposes. Public broadcasting deserves to be continued, and to be strengthened.

The legislation before me, however, offers a poor approach to public broadcast financing. It ignores some serious questions which must be resolved before any long-range public broadcasting financing can be soundly devised, and before the statutory framework for public broadcasting is changed.

There are many fundamental disagreements concerning the directions which public broadcasting has taken and should pursue in the future. Perhaps the most important one is the serious and

widespread concern—expressed in Congress and within public broadcasting itself—that an organization, originally intended only to serve the local stations, is becoming instead the center of power and the focal point of control for the entire public broadcasting system.

The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 made localism a primary means of achieving the goals of the educational broadcasting system. Localism places the principal public interest responsibility on the individual educational radio and television stations, licensed to serve the needs and interests of their own communities. By not placing adequate emphasis on localism, H.R. 13918 threatens to erode substantially public broadcasting's impressive potential for promoting innovative and diverse cultural and educational programming.

The public and legislative debate regarding passage of H.R. 13918 has convinced me that the problems posed by Government financing of a public broadcast system are much greater than originally thought. They cannot be resolved until the structure of public broadcasting has been more firmly established, and we have a more extensive record of experience on which to evaluate its role in our national life.

This administration has demonstrated its dedication to the principle of public broadcasting by increasing appropriations to the Corporation sevenfold in the past 3 years, from \$5 million in fiscal year 1969 to \$35 million in fiscal year 1972. On top of this, I have requested an additional 30-percent increase for next year to \$45 million. The funding proposed in H.R. 13918, which almost doubles next year's appropriation, and more than doubles the following year's appropriation over fiscal year 1972, is unwarranted in light of the serious questions yet unanswered by our brief experience with public broadcasting.

I urge the continuation of carefully measured annual funding for the Corporation, under the existing statutory framework, subject to regular budgetary oversight and review. Specifically, I ask the Congress to follow my budget recommendation by enacting a 1-year extension of the Corporation's authorization and providing it \$45 million. Since interim funds for the Corporation are included in a continuing resolution currently before the Congress, there should be no interruption of the Corporation's activities.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 30, 1972.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and message be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 15259, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H.R. 15259) making appro-

priations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. 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 Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 27, 1972.)

Mr. NATCHER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the budget for the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1973 when approved by the House contained \$875,662,000. \$716,124,000 was for operating expenses, \$28,144,000 for debt services, and \$131,394,000 for capital outlay.

It was estimated that the District of Columbia government would have a total of \$1,179,369,200 for operation of the District government during the fiscal year 1973. This amount includes the appropriation of \$875,662,000 in District of Columbia funds, Federal grants totaling \$291,924,800 and \$11,782,400 from reimbursements from Federal and other sources and from private donations. With a total population estimated now to be 741,000 people, this amount certainly was more than adequate.

For the first time in a great many years the other body adopted a budget for the District of Columbia which was below the amount approved by the House.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of the conference action, we bring back now a budget for the District of Columbia gov-

ernment for fiscal year 1973 totaling \$834,756,800.

The Federal payment adopted at the time we presented our bill to the House totaled \$185 million. The Federal payment adopted by the other body totaled \$183 million and the Federal payment which we present in this conference report totals \$181,500,000.

Instead of \$143,232,000 as proposed by the House, we present today for our loan program for capital outlay the total sum of \$130,819,000. The other body enacted a bill totaling \$126,632,000.

For general operating expenses, this conference report contains \$63,187,000 instead of \$65,029,000 as proposed by the House and \$63,242,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time I will ask permission to revise and extend my remarks and include a tabulation which will show in detail the totals and comparisons I have just reviewed. I will also include a table showing the capital outlay projects provided in the bill as agreed to in conference.

The tables follow:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1973 (H.R. 15259)—CONFERENCE SUMMARY

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1972	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	Conference action compared with—			
						New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1972	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)
FEDERAL FUNDS									
Federal payment to the District of Columbia:									
General fund.....	\$173,654,000	\$190,000,000	\$185,000,000	\$183,000,000	\$181,500,000	+\$7,846,000	—\$8,500,000	—\$3,500,000	—\$1,500,000
Water fund.....	2,572,000	2,550,000	2,550,000	2,550,000	2,550,000	—22,000			
Sanitary sewage works fund.....	1,514,000	1,524,000	1,524,000	1,524,000	1,524,000	+10,000			
Total Federal payment to the District of Columbia.....	177,740,000	194,074,000	189,074,000	187,074,000	185,574,000	+7,834,000	—8,500,000	—3,500,000	—1,500,000
Loans to the District of Columbia for capital outlay (from the U.S. Treasury):									
General fund.....	72,486,000	109,070,000	103,070,000	90,070,000	90,968,000	+18,482,000	—18,102,000	—12,102,000	+898,000
Highway fund.....	8,000,000	16,750,000	16,750,000	13,750,000	16,706,000	+8,706,000	—44,000	—44,000	+2,956,000
Water fund.....	6,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	2,600,000	2,933,000	—3,067,000	—67,000	—67,000	+333,000
Sanitary sewage works fund.....	15,600,000	14,160,000	14,160,000	13,960,000	13,960,000	—1,640,000	—200,000	—200,000	
Metropolitan Area Sanitary Sewage Works Fund.....		6,252,000	6,252,000	6,252,000	6,252,000	+6,252,000			
Total loan appropriation to District of Columbia.....	102,086,000	149,232,000	143,232,000	126,632,000	130,819,000	+28,733,000	—18,413,000	—12,413,000	+4,187,000
Total Federal funds to the District of Columbia.....	279,826,000	343,306,000	332,306,000	313,706,000	316,393,000	+36,567,000	—26,913,000	—15,913,000	+2,687,000
Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia.....	425,000					—425,000			
Grand total new budget (obligational) authority Federal funds.....	280,251,000	343,306,000	332,306,000	313,706,000	316,393,000	+36,142,000	—26,913,000	—15,913,000	+2,687,000
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS									
Operating expenses:									
General operating expenses.....	61,777,000	65,819,000	65,029,000	63,242,600	63,187,000	+1,410,000	—2,632,000	—1,842,000	—55,600
Public safety.....	171,616,000	182,969,000	181,700,000	181,513,900	181,119,000	+9,503,000	—1,850,000	—581,000	—394,900
Education.....	172,305,000	179,911,000	179,526,000	179,907,300	179,607,000	+7,302,000	—304,000	+81,000	—300,300
Recreation.....	12,892,000	13,875,000	13,860,000	13,843,500	13,829,000	+937,000	—46,000	—31,000	—14,500
Human resources.....	186,313,000	212,706,000	208,709,000	209,915,800	207,587,000	+21,274,000	—5,119,000	—1,122,000	—2,328,800
Highways and traffic.....	21,574,000	21,945,000	21,711,000	21,372,400	21,814,000	+240,000	—131,000	+103,000	+441,600
Environmental services.....	40,354,000	44,710,000	44,710,000	44,309,800	44,309,800	+3,955,800	—400,200		
Settlement of claims and suits.....	113,000					—113,000			
Additional municipal services, inaugural ceremonies.....		879,000	879,000	879,000	879,000	+879,000			
Total operating expenses.....	666,944,000	722,814,000	716,124,000	714,984,300	712,331,800	+45,387,800	—10,482,200	—3,792,200	—2,652,500
Repayment of loans and interest.....	23,573,700	28,144,000	28,144,000	28,144,000	28,144,000	+4,570,300			
Capital outlay.....	323,713,000	149,930,000	131,394,000	81,754,100	94,281,000	—229,432,000	—55,649,000	—37,113,000	+12,526,900
Grand total District of Columbia funds.....	1,014,230,700	900,888,000	875,662,000	824,882,400	834,756,800	—179,473,900	—66,131,200	—40,905,200	+9,874,400

† Reflects decrease of \$4,085,000 in H. Doc. 92-299.

‡ Reflects increase of \$4,085,000 in H. Doc. 92-299.

Project title	Amount
District of Columbia Obligations—	\$1,051,600
Public Schools:	
Anacostia Senior High School addition	1,000,000
Shaw Junior High School replacement	235,000
New elementary and junior high school, Oxon Run Pkwy. SE	16,380,500
New elementary school, 31st and Erie Sts. SE	6,983,000
Dunbar Senior High school replacement	13,181,000
Federal City College:	
Renovation of Old Central Library	550,000
District of Columbia Teachers College:	
Unused space in the Miner Building	135,000
Demountable classrooms	10,000
Department of Human Resources:	
Air condition remaining buildings (patient), District of Columbia General Hospital	1,778,000
New morgue building, District of Columbia General Hospital	150,000
Department of Highways and Traffic:	
Street lighting and communication extensions	431,000
Street improvements and extensions	2,960,000
Highway planning, programming, and research	400,000
Potomac River Freeway	2,345,000
H Street NE., grade separation	302,700
South Capitol Street Bridge	2,000,000
Cover on Federal aid streets	615,000
Heater on Federal aid streets	418,000
Metro betterment	880,000
Benning Road Bridge over Anacostia River	90,000
Connecticut Avenue Bridge over Klingle Valley	400,000
Southern Avenue SE	970,000
Chain Bridge	33,000
Northbound 14th Street Bridge deck repair	101,000
Anacostia Freeway Bridge over Oxon Run	250,000
Anacostia Freeway, Kenilworth Avenue safety improvements	169,000
Benning Road pedestrian overpass	29,000
Suitland Parkway pedestrian overpass	88,000
South Capitol Street	80,000
Bridge railing improvement program	37,000
Channelization on Federal aid streets	50,000
Emergency communications system	10,000
Department of Environmental Services:	
Advance of paving	2,950,000
Sewer separation	\$500,000
Service sewer extensions	1,020,000
Service extension and hydrants	1,200,000
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority:	
Capital contribution for construction—Regional Rapid Rail Transit System	33,498,000
Washington Aqueduct:	
Water treatment plant, improvements and extensions, Dalecarlia and McMillan	870,000
Plant major replacements and rehabilitation, Dalecarlia and McMillan	130,000
Total	94,280,800

The other body in marking up their bill approved the same amount that we

approved for our rapid transit system of \$33,498,000. For some reason or other the highway construction projects were deleted on the other side and, Mr. Speaker, everyone of those projects is back in this bill. We approved capital outlay projects for the Department of Highways and Traffic totaling \$12,658,700. This included the Potomac River Freeway amount request of \$2,345,000 along with our other freeway projects and our repair projects including street improvements and extensions. Mr. Speaker, as you well know, the Highway Acts of 1968 and 1970 provide for the construction of the Three Sisters Bridge and the freeway program. These two laws will be carried out, Mr. Speaker, and as we have stated from the very beginning, we intend to complete our rapid transit system. The District of Columbia budget subcommittee appropriated the funds that started the rapid rail transit system and our action placed the Metropolitan Washington Area Transit Authority in a position to begin construction of this part of our transportation system here in our Nation's Capital.

Mr. Speaker, we submit this conference report for the approval of the House.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, the ranking minority member on the subcommittee, and an outstanding Member of the House (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the comments that have been made by our distinguished chairman, who also served as chairman of the conferees in our deliberations on this conference report.

I think it is somewhat significant that in nearly every category, except for capital outlay, the amount included in this conference report is less than was the figure for the corresponding items in either the House or the Senate when this appropriation bill passed these two separate bodies.

In the area of education there had been some earmarking of funds in our committee report for special education at the time that the bill passed the House. The Senate version wrote into law that earmarking. It does not represent any difference in dollar amounts, but the conference report does make it a matter of legislation rather than report earmarking.

In the House version in this related area of education there was the language which related to the use of the children, the facilities, the funds, and the schools for engaging in demonstrations such as occurred here earlier in this calendar year. That language has been retained in the conference report.

In the area of human resources, our bill had anticipated the results of the review of eligibility and overpayments of aid recipients and also the anticipated results of 45 investigators who are now at work in this area. There had been a reduction of \$1 million in the estimated payments based upon those anticipated cullings of the rolls. The Senate went further than this and reduced it by an-

other \$3 million. The conferees agreed on that further reduction.

In the same area, however, the District government had requested that as of the second half of the 1973 fiscal year payments for aid for dependents would be primarily on the basis of 85 percent of the requirement based upon the 1970 cost of living index. Our bill had held the figure as it had been, at 75 percent of that figure, and as a part of the compromise this conference report contemplates that that figure will be at 80 percent for the second half of the 1973 fiscal year.

Last year your conferees on this measure indicated a limitation on capital outlay and, of course, these capital outlay items are financed through borrowing directly from the Federal Treasury, of \$150 million per year for all departments of the government. When this bill passed the House it contained capital outlay items which totaled something over \$149 million. The viewpoint in the other body was that the \$80 million or thereabouts that was approved in a supplemental bill earlier for the expansion and modernization of the Lorton detention complex, even though it was a 1972 appropriation, should be applied against the \$150 million ceiling. That was reflected in the figure that was included in the Senate version. We accepted that principle with the single exception of restoring the highway items for capital outlay that had been included in the House bill.

Mr. Speaker, I think we all recognize that for a number of years there have been inadequate appropriations for highway construction, highway maintenance, highway improvement, and highway modernization here in the District of Columbia. Our streets and highways have suffered as a result. The conferees on the House side took the position that we could no longer continue this inadequate funding in this area. So, as the chairman earlier indicated, those items in the bill were restored, and this is the only area in which the capital outlay items were restored that had been deleted by the Senate. It does account for the fact that in this single area alone, in the area of capital outlay, there is a figure in this conference report that exceeds the lower figure in this bill as it passed either body.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this conference report.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE).

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, members of the House District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee know that being a member of this subcommittee is not conducive to winning friends and influencing people. However, there is one consolation, and that is even though the bureaucrats do not like us, the taxpayers do. And the reason why we pursue our work with such earnest is we want the District of Columbia to be governed well, without the "pampering" that other areas of this Nation do not receive or expect.

Mr. Speaker, a child is not rewarded

for his mischievous conduct by being given compliments and candy. To do so would not only spoil the youngster, but guarantee his ultimate lack of respect for authority. Instead, he should be fairly but firmly disciplined. This maxim should also be true so far as the operation of the District of Columbia government is concerned.

The voluminous cases of misconduct, deception, and outright fraud by District officials are a matter of record, with additional daily revelations. All one has to do is read the hearings before our committee, or review the reports from the news media. However, many people refuse to recognize this documented, sorry situation evidenced by my supplemental views in the regular report.

Why is this true? The reasons vary from individuals who, like the proverbial ostrich, stick their heads in the sand and hope that trouble will go away. Others merely condone the misfeasance, malfeasance and nonfeasance, and attempt to sweep the mess under the rug. Still others believe they can buy good government which in effect, encourages the continuation of the ineptness that has plagued this city far too long.

However, if the problems of our Nation's Capital are to be solved we as Members of the Congress must accept our responsibility and firmly but fairly deal with the guilty culprits. They must be held accountable, and their feet must be kept to the fire.

I am sure there is not one Member of this body who does not love our Nation's capital dearly. However, this affection cannot interfere with the obligation to govern it. We are concerned because we care. Overwhelming facts support the cause and dictate our determination to make District government both responsible and responsible.

If we allow District officials to go undisciplined we are, in effect, guaranteeing their ultimate lack of respect for authority and, consequently, bad government. The citizens of this city and our Nation demand and deserve more than this of us. We are not here to win a popularity contest. In my opinion, the proper prescription has been omitted. For this reason I am voting against this conference report.

I would like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of the Members the supplemental views as expressed in the regular report, and hope that if time allows they will also read the hearings of the District Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post this morning, Friday, June 30, the headlines in the Metro section read, "D.C. Welfare Aide Quits, Raps Yeldell."

We are all familiar with the situation that Miss Thompson was faced with when she testified before our subcommittee. The question was asked of Miss Thompson:

What do you estimate the cost to be of overpayments, ineligible, and frauds as far as the District of Columbia welfare program is concerned?

And she answered honestly:

Between \$6 million and \$8 million.

It was not too many hours after that that Miss Thompson was given a lateral promotion and relegated to obscurity.

Miss Thompson has worked in public office, mostly with the Department of Human Resources, for over 30 years.

It is a sad commentary when a woman with the integrity and experience of Miss Thompson is demoted for being fair and honest with a congressional committee. She diligently tried to cooperate with the subcommittee so we could decide what appropriations should be made for the various categories.

Miss Thompson has now resigned for the simple reason that she sees the very problem that we have contemplated—that the Department of Human Resources is in one heck of a shape.

Quoting from this morning's paper:

Miss Thompson accused Yeldell of fostering inefficiency, favoritism and fear within the department, which has 12,000 employees and responsibility for administering the city's welfare programs.

She goes on—and this woman is in a position to know—"To date the bold new experiment of DHR"—that is the Department of Human Resources—"is a failure." And who would know better than Miss Thompson?

And she further stated:

I know you (Yeldell) are heading a sick organization.

The article continued—and I am going to provide this article for the RECORD so it will be available for everyone to read. As I said a moment ago it is because we love this city so much that we provide the means for them to live a little better than they do in other cities of our Nation. It is our Nation's Capital and all citizens throughout the country want it to be second to none.

There is not one single Federal program or pilot demonstration that is not here in the District of Columbia.

The average salary median in the District of Columbia is about \$10,500. Compare that with the average income in your own States. District taxpayers spend 23 cents to receive a Federal dollar back in return. That is the best rate of exchange compared to all the States.

I am not criticizing the Government for what we have provided. The only thing I am concerned about is the way the city has been mismanaged—and the fraud and the half-truths that prevail throughout the District government. It has been a daily routine, when these people in the District appear before our committee. You do not have to take my word for it. Just watch television and read the newspapers. These are not our revelations. They are investigations conducted by the news people, ferreting out all these wrongs to enlighten the public who end up paying for the abuses.

No, the bureaucrats are not going to like me and they are not going to like the committee. I think the committee is doing a fine job. But we could do a much better job if we have the facts from the very beginning.

We are not here to condemn—we are here to help and to assist. And it is irritating to sit there day after day after day and have the District officials come

in and use it as a pit stop to fuel up with a lot of money, and roar off and thumb their nose at us.

I do not operate that way and neither does this committee. I think it is high time that those people downtown got the message.

I can assure you so far as Mr. Yeldell is concerned he did not tell the committee the truth, so far as the CRC program is concerned. I refer to what Miss Thompson said today in the Post news article condemning Yeldell and his dictatorial methods.

A lot of people can call it frustration, but I call it irritation.

It is a constant source of irritation to have these people come up from downtown and think that they have a separate government, not responsible to anyone. It is high time that we made them operate just as efficiently and just as deliberately as your governments in your home States operate.

We have been kind and extremely generous to them for long enough. It is time that they played the game according to Hoyle.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my chairman for giving me this time and I certainly appreciate the great opportunity I have to work on a great committee.

People do not always like to hear the facts. They do not always like to hear the truth. Maybe if the shoe binds or pinches a little bit, the next time this crew from downtown appears before our committee they will know we mean business. I can assure you that I mean business, because our office is going to do a lot of research.

I include the following material:

[From the Washington Post, June 30, 1972]
D.C. WELFARE AIDE QUILTS, RAPS YELDELL—
MEMO CITES FAVORITISM, INEFFICIENCY

(By J. Y. Smith)

Winifred Grace Thompson, once one of the most influential officials in the D.C. government, has resigned from the department of human resources with a scathing attack on its director, Joseph P. Yeldell.

In a letter she made public yesterday, Miss Thompson accused Yeldell of fostering inefficiency, favoritism and fear within the department, which has 12,000 employees and responsibility for administering the city's welfare programs.

Yeldell, a former member of the City Council, was chosen by Mayor Walter E. Washington last November to succeed Philip J. Rutledge as head of the department. Since then, he has carried out extensive reorganizations, including dismemberment of the social services administration that Miss Thompson formerly headed. In February, Miss Thompson became a deputy director of the department of human resources.

"To date, the bold new experiment of DHR is a failure," she wrote. "It can chalk up few innovative new accomplishments. There has been much rhetoric but minimal decision-making and action . . . My office has become the chaplain's office, the 'listening post,' and I know you (Yeldell) are heading a sick organization."

Yeldell held a brief news conference yesterday in which he said he was accepting Miss Thompson's resignation, which is effective today, "with regret."

"Miss Thompson has given 35 years of dedicated service to the citizens and government of the District of Columbia," he said in a prepared statement. "Under her tenure, the so-

cial services administration has managed a welfare roll of increasing size and has brought needed social services to the less fortunate citizens of the nation's capital.

"It is my hope that Miss Thompson will be available to me and the department on a consultative basis to continue to give us the faithful service she has contributed over the past years."

He declined to comment further. Miss Thompson said she had no intention of associating herself with the department of human resources on a consultative or any other basis.

City officials said there were no immediate plans to fill Miss Thompson's position.

Rep. William J. Scherle (R-Iowa) a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the District and a frequent critic of city spending policies said:

"I am a little shocked to learn that Miss Thompson has resigned. There wasn't anyone on the Committee who failed to be impressed with her honesty, experience and integrity. And to lose that now cannot help but be a direct loss, not only to the department, but to the people who paid the bill."

Miss Thompson attached to her four-page letter of resignation a memorandum entitled, "Misleading Statements of Mr. Joseph Yeldell Before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations and the City Council on the Community Residential Centers Contract."

Community Residential Centers, Inc., is a private profitmaking organization that obtained a \$373,000 contract from the city last September to care for up to 56 homeless children. The contract was let as part of the former social services administration's effort to provide alternatives to Junior Village, the city's facility for homeless children that closed.

The CRC contract came to the City Council has ordered light in April in a series of articles in *The Washington Post*. The articles quoted CRC social workers and counselors as saying the firm was not providing proper care for the children.

Subsequently, Yeldell told a House subcommittee and the City Council that he had been unaware of the CRC contract. On June 8, he told the City Council the agreement would not be renewed this September.

In her memorandum, Miss Thompson quotes Yeldell as having said to the Council:

"I have never seen anything like the loosely defined contract with CRS... I've never seen anything like this and from a legal point of view, neither has the corporation counsel."

Miss Thompson added: "He was informed and his staff was informed about the contract with Community Residential Centers before the newspaper publicity... The corporation counsel did know about and reviewed the CRC contract."

Yeldell declined to comment on the memorandum.

Miss Thompson said in an interview that the CRC dispute was not the reason for her retirement. She said she had decided to leave the city government because of the frustration she felt in trying to work under Yeldell.

Miss Thompson, 59, has been receiving a salary of \$36,000 a year. With the exception of three years in the Women's Army Corps during World War II, serving as a corporal in the transportation corps in the European theater, she has been a city employee since 1937. Her retirement pay will be about \$21,000 a year, according to city officials.

Looking back at her work, Miss Thompson said that among her proudest accomplishments were the establishment of Junior Village in 1948, the establishment of the D.C. children's center in Laurel in 1954, and the successful desegregation of the city's facilities for retarded and delinquent children in the same year.

In the past two years, her name has frequently been linked with the controversy surrounding Junior Village. A series of ar-

ticles in *The Washington Post* early last year led to a congressional investigation of the facility. Later, the City Council ordered it closed by phases.

Miss Thompson said yesterday: "We made two big mistakes with Junior Village. First, we just didn't stay ahead of the trend to put children in residential settings rather than institutions. Secondly, we let it get too big."

When Miss Thompson first established Junior Village, it housed 60 children. At one time in the mid-1960s, it had 900 children.

In her letter to Yeldell, Miss Thompson said:

"People-oriented programs are used for political gain, and trade-offs occur according to how they increase the political power base. The best example is Junior Village and how the welfare of dependent children has been sacrificed for political gain."

She added: "Most decisions are made at the director level—regardless of importance—with limited delegation of authority to administrators and program managers. The result is a decision-making bottleneck..."

"You and your sycophants pat each other on the back and say all is well while DHR is collapsing around you."

Yesterday, Miss Thompson said she did not expect her career in government to end the way it has.

"I always knew I'd be leaving," she said. "But I thought it would be a smooth transition with no ripples. Well, it didn't work out that way."

[From the Washington Daily News, June 30, 1972]

MISS THOMPSON'S FAREWELL

The other day we visited a friend at a hospital here—and when we left, walking down the long corridors, we kept glancing into the rooms we passed, as one always does in a hospital. And there, lying flat in their beds were all those old eagle-beaked men, their eyes closed, their toothless mouths wide open like fish out of water, and in the chairs beside them the widows-to-be sewing or reading quietly, resigned to the ancient problem. And we wanted to call out, "Hey! Hang on! Don't go! Here's help on the way. Here's hope. Here's love."

Quite apart from the obvious efficiency with which this particular hospital was being run, the crying question remains: How much interest was there in these people? How much heart?

We say this as prelude to our feeling about today's tempestuous departure of Miss Winifred Thompson from the District's Department of Human Resources whose less grandiloquent predecessor, the Welfare Department, Miss Thompson had served for more than 30 years. If there was anything we thought the department lacked in the era of Miss Thompson's stewardship it was an outward show of warmth for the people it served.

The most important thing that the sweeping reorganization of the department under its new director, Joseph P. Yeldell, might have accomplished was a reaffirmation of the principle that every individual counts. Instead, Miss Thompson, a shy, loyal, unmonstrative but brilliant administrator, utterly honest, was shunted aside in favor of an administration which has done little to bolster the feeling that when it comes to the poor and their woebegone wives and fatherless children, the city much cares.

You can pass off the bitterness expressed by Miss Thompson in her "Escape into a New Beginning" letter of resignation to her boss—her sense of being banished and betrayed—as the natural feeling of any person of substance who, for reasons good or bad, has been put on the shelf. But there remains her Jeremiad, a ringing indictment of Mr. Yeldell as the head of a "sick organization," a "little band of sycophants" which subordinates people to politics, talks big and acts small, is

careless with the truth, racist and divisive in its personnel policies, and given to nepotism, internecine warfare and the unconscionable ragging of underlings.

These are serious charges. Mr. Yeldell, having given his department a traumatic overhaul without the reassurance that comes from inspired leadership, owes his people—and the city—some thoughtful answers.

[From the Washington Post, June 30, 1972]

AIDES AFRAID TO TALK—YELDELL DENIES HE MUZZLED CITY WORKERS

(By Ron Shaffer)

In the office of a lower echelon supervisor for the D.C. department of human resources, a telephone rang; the caller identified himself as a reporter and asked about wards of the city being kept at D.C. General Hospital.

The supervisor fumbled for words and there was a long pause, after which she blurted: "I'm not allowed to talk to reporters without clearance from Mr. Yeldell." Then she hung up.

A newsman taking a public opinion survey after the shooting of George Wallace last month found city residents and workers generally cooperative until he entered a small office of the department of human resources at 1716 14th St. NW. Employees there refused to comment.

"We work for the department of human resources, and we're not allowed to give out our feelings," said the supervisor, who threatened a lawsuit if any of her words were printed.

A counselor at a halfway house run by human resources, asked for his name, replied: "I don't have the authority to give you my name."

The responses in these recent incidents reflect the level of apprehension and uncertainty of many of the 12,000 human resources employees, who for lack of guidance, apparently do not know what to do when questioned by newsmen about their work.

"People just don't want to get in trouble, or get fired, or lose their job," said one social worker who did not want her name used for fear of retaliation. "People are just afraid."

"The feeling around here is don't talk to reporters—or else," said another social worker who also did not want to be named.

As a result, department sources are sometimes inaccessible, and there is delay in reporting news to the public involving an agency that encompasses public assistance, child care, mental health, D.C. General Hospital and narcotics treatment, and one that is asking Congress for \$225 million for its operation in fiscal 1973.

Joseph P. Yeldell, director of the department since last December, has repeatedly said that he does not muzzle his employees, but rather, encourages them to talk to the press.

"I favor a healthy, open discussion of the issues involving the department," he said not long after taking office. "All I ask is that they (the employees) let me know what they are going to be discussing."

Yeldell has said that his employees, particularly those involved in the social services administration (SSA), use so-called restrictions as excuses to keep from talking to reporters.

It is apparent that not even Yeldell's top aides know his policy for dealing with media queries.

When asked to outline the policy, Norman Pierson, acting head of the social rehabilitation administration, which includes the SSA, said: "You'll have to check with the boss (Yeldell) for that."

"Everyone knows what the policy is," said James H. Bohannon, executive assistant to the director. "All they have to do is call

this (Yeldell's) office. Anyone here, even the secretaries, can give clearance."

Natleen Green, a secretary in that office, said she was sure such a policy was "not true."

Joseph Douglas, associate director for inspection and analysis, said either he or two of his assistants, Willa Kester or Catherine Jensen should be called.

Mrs. Kester said she was the only designated press liaison in the department, and that she acted on the authority of Yeldell and Douglas. When a reporter started typing her remarks she said, "You're not taking this down are you?"

The confusion filters down to field workers, and is often passed along verbally by supervisors who apparently have made their own interpretations.

"They're all concerned with their images," said one social worker who did not want to be named. "They're afraid of the press and they're afraid of Congress. The feeling now is a lot of people will come down on you if you talk."

Some who have spoken have received verbal or written reprimands.

Dr. Thomas Reichelderfer, the director of pediatrics at D.C. General Hospital, told a reporter about healthy wards of the city languishing with sick children at the hospital. After an article appeared, he was told by a superior not to talk with reporters.

An official of the health services administration, who commented on conditions in a birth control clinic, was later ordered to write a report for her superiors explaining why her name appeared in the paper.

Four doctors who told reporters of a lack of staff and supplies at D.C. General Hospital received written letters of reprimand.

Dr. Paul Travis, the former director of Washington treatment center for chronic alcoholics, complained that budget cuts had reduced the center to a custodial institution. Two weeks after his remarks were printed, he was demoted. (Yeldell said at that time that the demotion was not linked to the article.)

Sam Eastman, director of public affairs for mayor Walter E. Washington, said that there is not a D.C. government directive covering the conduct of government employees who are questioned by the media.

Eastman said two weeks ago that Yeldell would make a major announcement regarding information policies, and that the announcement would be made early last week. Tuesday, Eastman said the policy was still being formulated.

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS ON THE 1973 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS

Although it is not customary for a Subcommittee member to refer to his own experience and register his own feelings in such a context, it is my belief that the circumstances in this case warrant a strong personal statement. I have served on the District of Columbia Subcommittee on Appropriations for almost two years. During that time, I have faithfully attended its hearings and meetings, and I will continue to do so as long as I have this assignment.

It is my understanding that the purpose of this Subcommittee is not only to provide funds for the operation of the D.C. government, but also to oversee the expenditure of the taxpayers' money. After listening to hundreds of official witnesses over the course of many months, I have come to the inescapable conclusion that the District government serves the interests of neither its own constituents nor the American taxpayers.

This is no condemnation of the Subcommittee. My colleagues are enormously industrious and conscientiously interested in assisting the operations of the city government. But this is a well-nigh impossible task without accurate information. We have repeatedly been fed half-truths in a deliberate

attempt to circumvent the authority of the Subcommittee. Faced with such obstructionist tactics, it is difficult for me to make fair judgments about the budget requests.

Judging from the actions of many D.C. officials with whom I have come in contact, the municipal government in this city exists largely to serve itself. My feelings about these minions of mammon can be summed up in one sentence. With few exceptions, they are stealing us blind! They are using this committee as a pitstop, coming in to fuel up, then roaring out in high gear thumbing their noses at us. These "professional" witnesses with their entourage of supporters give us the pleasure of their company and then sweep out in triumph.

Never before in my experience of government have I witnessed such a concerted effort on the part of individuals in positions of responsibility to cover up boondoggles, waste and mismanagement. Many cases border on outright fraud. The arrogance and duplicity displayed by these witnesses is sickening. Time after time, D.C. government officials have appeared before our Subcommittee and sanctimoniously assured us that their departments were operating smoothly and experiencing no problems. And time and time again, we learned subsequently from the news media that, on the contrary, mismanagement, waste and incompetence reign supreme.

For example, when Dr. Cook, President of the D.C. Teachers College, testified before our Subcommittee, he said in answer to my direct question, that he had no problems to discuss with the Subcommittee. Yet at that time Dr. Cook was fully aware of a highly critical report by the General Accounting Office which detailed serious irregularities in his administration of the College.

The recent disclosure of financial mismanagement at Federal City College and the Blackman's Development Center raise equally alarming questions. Officials of the D.C. public school system have also been delinquent in their responsibilities to their own pupils, to the members of the Subcommittee and, through us, to the taxpayers of this country. Dr. Scott, the Superintendent of Schools, was for instance unable even to tell our Subcommittee how many schools there are in the District! The Subcommittee was also shocked to discover that the District of Columbia operates virtually no facilities and provides little in the way of special programs for handicapped pupils. Children who start out in life burdened by blindness, deafness, dumbness or mental retardation have a greater need for special education than any other disadvantaged group. Yet District officials made no effort to apprise the Subcommittee of the needs of these children in their jurisdiction. We can only conclude that the D.C. School Board is indifferent to the needs of these pupils since no independent interest in their problems has been evinced by the Board to date.

The Superintendent and the members of the School Board seem to be more intent on marshalling student opinion to their pet political causes than on pursuing the primary goal of the school system, which is education. School officials have lately been indulging in partisan political demonstrations and instigating student participation to the detriment of their school work. I strongly disapprove of the scandalous role played by one Board member in the series of disgraceful incidents which took place recently on Capitol Hill. Led by this gentleman, a band of D.C. high school students left their classes, over the strenuous objections of their principal, and marched on Congress to protest the war. So unruly were these adolescent demonstrators that the Speaker of the House took the unprecedented step of closing the visitors' gallery to the public. Later, the students invaded and ransacked the office of Representative Pierre du Pont and stole arti-

cles of personal property from his staff. Earlier this year, D.C. elementary school pupils were encouraged to take part in a massive outdoor rally protesting the administration's welfare policies.

It is my belief that the District of Columbia schools exist solely for the purpose of educating children. They should never be used as a vehicle for mobilizing uninformed and immature student opinion for partisan political protests. This abuse of authority is all the more reprehensible in view of the schools' neglect of their legitimate responsibilities to handicapped children. Clearly a basic reordering of priorities is needed. School officials must refrain from such inappropriate misuse of their authority in the future and refocus their energies where they are most urgently needed. School bond issues are failing all over the country, yet Congress continues to provide generously for the District of Columbia. Simple gratitude ought to dictate a more responsive attitude on the part of the beneficiaries.

Ironically, the District of Columbia receives more federal aid than any other state in proportion of the federal taxes paid by its residents. A study by the Tax Foundation revealed that the District pays only 23 cents in federal taxes for each dollar of federal aid. I urge each member of the House to compare that with what residents of his own state pay in return for the federal aid dollar.

The lawmakers of this nation, who represent people from every part of the country, like to think of this city as a national home for all our citizens. Consequently we have striven diligently to make it a municipal showcase, a model city. Washington, D.C., enjoys almost unlimited access to federal patronage. We support a municipal payroll of close to 50,000 out of a total population of 740,000. It seems at times that the entire city is one big government employment agency. Many municipal employees, however, behave like the proverbial man with a wrench, trying to look busy but in reality doing nothing. There are a great many things to be done in this city, but the present lack of managerial capability virtually insures that they will remain undone. The problems of Washington, D.C., will never be solved by shovel-leaners and pencil-pushers.

Largely because of the federal payroll, Washingtonians boast the highest median income of any metropolitan area, \$10,500. Four hundred eighty of D.C.'s employees earn more than \$25,000 a year each! We shower its residents with the most socially enlightened and generous programs, and we provide experts to administer or advise them. Yet by and large the city fails to live up to the hopes invested in it. Despite the fact that the population is declining and the average income rising, D.C.'s welfare rolls have swelled by 30,000 a year and federal support increases annually, as we have seen, with negative results.

Yet this appropriation bill requests more federal support for the District of Columbia while many national programs are being curtailed because of limited funds. What is needed is not more federal money but stricter management and control of existing programs and responsible supervision by department heads.

There is no magic money machine here in the nation's capital. Each dollar we expend in federal funds must come from somewhere. There is every indication that, unless we cut government spending this year, it will be necessary to raise federal taxes for all Americans drastically next year. Yet we are offering the D.C. government, whose track record is among the most dismal in the country, a \$11.4 million increase in direct federal payments. In addition, it is estimated that federal grants to the District will be raised by another \$33.7 million, for a total increase

of \$45.1 million in FY 1973, a 10% hike to recipients whose performance can best be described as atrocious. Overall federal support for the D.C. government will thus approach half a billion dollars (\$465.5 million).

STATES PAYING MORE IN TAXES TO SUPPORT GRANTS THAN THEY RECEIVE IN AID

[In millions of dollars]

State	Tax burden	Total grants	Difference (distribution)	Tax burden per \$1 of aid received
Indiana	695	431	264	1.61
Ohio	1,574	1,016	558	1.55
Connecticut	622	403	219	1.54
Illinois	1,914	1,250	664	1.53
New Jersey	1,260	823	437	1.53
Delaware	99	66	33	1.49
Florida	931	650	281	1.43
Maryland	646	466	180	1.38
Wisconsin	582	422	160	1.38
Michigan	1,344	1,044	300	1.29
Pennsylvania	1,702	1,391	311	1.22
Nebraska	192	162	30	1.19
Iowa	352	302	50	1.17
Nevada	93	82	11	1.14
Massachusetts	940	839	101	1.12
Kansas	288	266	22	1.08
New Hampshire	99	93	6	1.06
Missouri	628	607	21	1.04
Virginia	596	572	24	1.04
Texas	1,431	1,387	44	1.03
Washington	497	488	9	1.02
Total	16,485	12,760	3,725	

Rhode Island	137	138	1	.99
New York	3,232	3,286	54	.98
Minnesota	506	531	25	.95
California	3,270	3,458	188	.95
Arizona	227	243	16	.93
Hawaii	122	133	11	.92
Oregon	279	327	48	.85
North Carolina	544	643	99	.85
Colorado	300	370	70	.81
Georgia	529	697	168	.76
Idaho	78	104	26	.75
Tennessee	425	605	180	.70
Maine	114	164	50	.69
South Carolina	247	365	118	.68
Wyoming	44	67	23	.65
Oklahoma	297	458	161	.65
Utah	113	181	68	.63
Kentucky	334	546	212	.61
Louisiana	381	634	253	.60
Vermont	55	96	41	.57
South Dakota	67	116	49	.57
North Dakota	61	113	52	.54
Arkansas	174	320	146	.54
Montana	84	159	75	.53
Alabama	329	644	315	.51
West Virginia	186	405	219	.46
New Mexico	105	245	140	.43
Mississippi	172	522	350	.33
Alaska	50	150	100	.33
District of Columbia	142	609	467	.23
Total	12,604	16,329	-3,725	

There may not be any simple solution to the fiscal problems of the District, but we can certainly begin by insisting that the money we appropriate be spent honestly and intelligently for the purposes for which it was intended. Otherwise we cannot justify this ever increasing drain on the taxpayers' resources.

Unfortunately the examples cited previously merely illustrate a pervasive problem. We have seen only the tip of the scandal-ridden iceberg of inefficiency and misdirected goals which characterize the D.C. government. These instances clearly demonstrate, however, that the officials in question are attempting to deprive the public of information to which the public has a right. The taxpayers are entitled to know that the D.C. government is administered to a great extent by incompetents and political hacks.

For this reason, I urge the Subcommittee to open all its hearings next year to the press, Congressional staffs and public. If we, as Members of Congress must live in a fishbowl, there is no reason why these officials should not be subject to the same public scrutiny. In the meantime, as long as I have this committee responsibility, as long as the taxpayers

of this country are footing the bill, and as long as the District of Columbia operates within the jurisdiction of Congress, I will continue to speak out against the failures of the present city government, which can only be described as one big "can of worms."

WILLIAM J. SCHERLE,

Member of Congress, Seventh Iowa District.

ADDENDUM

This critique should not be interpreted as an admission of weakness or inability to deal with the problems enumerated above. Rather it should serve notice that our patience is close to exhaustion. The indifference and hypocrisy displayed before our Subcommittee in the past will no longer be tolerated. Unless we see a drastic change in attitude on the part of the guilty officials in the D.C. government, I, for one, will not support the annual increase in appropriations for the District of Columbia. As far as I am personally concerned, the budget will be cut off "at the knees" until genuine reforms are instituted. A word to the wise is sufficient.

Mr. NATCHER. 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.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 1, line 9, strike out "\$185,000,000" and insert "\$183,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "\$181,500,000".

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: Page 3, line 4: Strike "\$65,029,000" and insert "\$63,242,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "\$63,187,000".

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 13: Page 4, line 15, strike "\$181,700,000" and insert "\$181,513,900"

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "\$181,119,000".

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 18: Page 5, line 21, strike "\$13,860,000" and insert "\$13,843,500"

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "\$13,829,000".

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 21: Page 6, line 3, strike "\$208,709,000" and insert "\$209,915,800".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "\$207,587,000".

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23: Page 7, line 22, strike "\$21,711,000" and insert "\$21,372,400".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "\$21,814,000".

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 41: Page 12, strike out the following:

Sec. 7. Appropriations in this Act shall not be used for or in connection with the preparation, issuance, publication, or enforcement of any regulation or order of the Public Service Commission requiring the installation of meters in taxicabs, or for or in connection with the licensing of any vehicle to be operated as a taxicab except for operation in accordance with such system of uniform zones and rates and regulations applicable thereto as shall have been prescribed by the Public Service Commission.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER 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:

"Sec. 6. Appropriations in this Act shall not be used for or in connection with the preparation, issuance, publication, or en-

forcement of any regulation or order of the Public Service Commission requiring the installation of meters in taxicabs, or for or in connection with the licensing of any vehicle to be operated as a taxicab except for operation in accordance with such system of uniform zones and rates and regulations applicable thereto as shall have been prescribed by the Public Service Commission."

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 43:

Page 12, strike out the following:

Sec. 9. All passenger motor vehicles (including water craft) owned by the District of Columbia shall be operated and utilized in conformity with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), and shall be under the direction and control of the Commissioner, who may from time to time alter or change the assignment for use thereof or direct the alteration of interchangeable use of any of the same by officers and employees of the District, except as otherwise provided in this Act. "Official purposes" as used in the section 16 shall not apply to the Commissioner or in cases of officers and employees the character of whose duties make such transportation necessary, but only as to such latter cases when approved by the Commissioner.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment, insert the following:

"Sec. 8. All passenger motor vehicles (including watercraft) owned by the District of Columbia shall be operated and utilized in conformity with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), and shall be under the direction and control of the Commissioner, who may from time to time alter or change the assignment for use thereof or direct the alteration of interchangeable use of any of the same by officers and employees of the District, except as otherwise provided in this Act. "Official purposes" as used in the section 16 shall not apply to the Commissioner or in cases of officers and employees the character of whose duties make such transportation necessary, but only as to such latter cases when approved by the Commissioner."

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 48, page 14, lines 3 through 15, strike the following:

Sec. 13. Except as otherwise provided herein, limitations and legislative provisions contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1961, shall be applicable during the current fiscal year: *Provided*, That the limitation for "Construction Services, Department of General Services" shall, during the current fiscal year, be 10 per centum of appropriations for all construction projects: *Provided further*, That the limitation on expenditure of funds by the Chief of Police for prevention and detection of crime during the current fiscal year shall be \$200,000: *Provided further*, That during the current fiscal year, the limitation with respect to a central heating system, under the heading "Department of Sanitary Engineering", shall not be applicable.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment, insert the following:

"Sec. 11. Except as otherwise provided herein, limitations and legislative provisions contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1961, shall be applicable during the current fiscal year: *Provided*, That the limitation for "Construction Services, Department of General Services" shall, during the current fiscal year, be 10 per centum of appropriations for all construction projects: *Provided further*, That the limitation on expenditure of funds by the Chief of Police for prevention and detection of crime during the current fiscal year shall be \$200,000: *Provided further*, That during the current fiscal year, the limitation with respect to a central heating system, under the heading "Department of Sanitary Engineering", shall not be applicable."

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 54: Page 15, line 22, strike the following: (budget classification 01).

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment, insert the following: "(except temporary positions provided for Courts and Department of Corrections in this Act)".

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk as follows:

Senate amendment No. 56: On page 16, lines 3 through 14, strike the following:

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

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

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

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment, insert the following:

"Sec. 17. Appropriations in this Act shall not be available, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, for the compensation of any person appointed—

"(1) as a full-time employee to a permanent, authorized position in the government

of the District of Columbia during any month when the number of such employees is greater than 39,619; or

"(2) as a temporary or part-time employee in the government of the District of Columbia during any month in which the number of such employees exceeds the number of such employees for the same month of the preceding fiscal year except temporary employees provided for Courts and Department of Corrections in this Act."

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 57: On page 16, lines 15 through 22, strike the following:

Sec. 20. No funds appropriated herein for the government of the District of Columbia for the operation of educational institutions, the compensation of personnel, or for other educational purposes may be used to permit, encourage, facilitate, or further partisan political activities. Nothing herein is intended to prohibit the availability of school buildings for the use of any community group during nonschool hours.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment, insert the following:

"Sec. 18. No funds appropriated herein for the government of the District of Columbia for the operation of educational institutions, the compensation of personnel, or for other educational purposes may be used to permit, encourage, facilitate, or further partisan political activities. Nothing herein is intended to prohibit the availability of school buildings for the use of any community group during nonschool hours."

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. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to, and that I be permitted to include a tabulation summarizing the action taken.

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

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of earlier today, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1238) making a supplemental appropriation for disaster relief, and ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

H.J. RES. 1238

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sum is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for disaster relief, namely:

**EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
DISASTER RELIEF**

For an additional amount for "Disaster Relief," \$200,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed 3 per centum of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Everyone is familiar with the disastrous floods which came to the eastern section of the United States in recent days. The basic law provides certain benefits to people and communities and States that have incurred damages due to the floods. This is under the law which was passed by the Congress in 1970. There are very many guidelines which have to do with the availability of funds for the States and communities confronted with disaster situations.

This fund is appropriated to the President. In the regular bill we approved a few moments ago, the Treasury-Postal Service bill, we provided \$92.5 million for this Presidential disaster fund.

There is on hand in the fund, we are told, about \$6 million that will be carried over into the new fiscal year which begins tomorrow, so that makes approximately \$100 million; more specifically, \$98 million-plus.

The resolution before us provides for an additional \$200 million, which in round figures would make a total availability to the President in disaster funds of about \$300 million. The disaster fund will, it is clearly indicated, need more money than that during the forthcoming fiscal year. There is no question about that.

The President sent up the budget estimate 3 days ago, requesting an appropriation of \$100 million, that is, an additional appropriation above the amount of \$100 million in the regular January budget.

The Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness has written a letter to the committee stating that the \$100 million, combined with the \$98 million-plus, would be adequate for a couple of months until a further evaluation of the needs can be made, explaining that it is impossible to certify the total amount of the damage at this time. It seems generally agreed that hundreds of millions of dollars in damage are involved in this recent flood.

Of course, we also have the Rapid City, S. Dak., flood situation, and then we have other responsibility throughout the Nation when disasters occur, so we need to have this fund sufficiently supplemented.

It is felt that for the next several weeks the \$92.5 million provided in the regular bill just passed today, and the \$200 million here, plus the \$6 million carryover balance will meet the situation

until there is a better understanding of what the cost of the recent flood will be to the Federal Government. We would expect an additional budget estimate at some later date.

It is true that the pending resolution provides \$100 million above the present budget. It will eventually be needed. I had originally introduced a resolution providing for \$100 million as per the request of the President, but in the committee, upon a motion by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood) the committee approved an additional \$100 million, bringing the total in the resolution now before us to the sum of \$200 million.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I will be glad to yield in just a moment.

With respect to the availability of these funds for disaster relief—and, of course, there are rules and regulations which obtain and which have been established by the Congress in the 1970 Disaster Act, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD certain documentation as to the availability of Federal funds to individuals and to communities.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) for guiding this supplemental appropriation through the Committee on Appropriations quickly so that we have the opportunity to vote on it today.

However, voting the money is one thing; getting it to the devastated areas is another. Baltimore County in my congressional district just last week received its first Federal payment for flood damage sustained a year ago. The check was for only one-quarter of the amount approved by the Federal Government for Baltimore. Harford County in my district has not received 1 cent of Federal money for damage received during that same flood, although the Office of Emergency Preparedness approved last September a modest request of over \$500,000; \$300,000 of this amount was approved as advance payment funds.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MAHON was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. MAHON. I yield further to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. This is due to bureaucratic foot-dragging. I want to thank the gentleman for his willingness to accept my suggestion made in the Committee on Appropriations that language be put in the report on the bill stating that the Committee on Appropriations recognizes the emergency nature of the requests for funds and is therefore acting on it quickly. In re-

turn the Committee on Appropriations expects the Office of Emergency Preparedness to use similar promptness in approving requests for these funds.

I hope the material in the report will be included as a part of the legislative history of this appropriation in order that the victims of this disaster may receive help when they need it and not months and years later.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I was glad to yield to the gentleman.

Of course, it is important that assistance be provided in a timely way, but it is also important that assistance be provided in strict compliance with the law and the related regulations with every effort being made to avoid waste and unnecessary Federal expenditure.

I would say this is an important piece of legislation. It is \$100 million above the budget. I for one do not take great pleasure in bringing in legislation which exceed the budget figures at a time when many of us feel we are overspending. In view of the fact that we are above the budget and in view of the importance of this matter, I shall at the proper time ask for a rollcall vote on it.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this joint resolution will be approved by the other body today and go to the President. It has been explained by Mr. Caspar Weinberger, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, that it is imperative from the standpoint of the administration that the funds be provided promptly and prior to the recess of the Congress which is scheduled for today or tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include excerpts from the committee report accompanying the resolution and excerpts from the disaster assistance guidelines handbook issued by the executive branch:

EXCERPTS FROM COMMITTEE REPORT

This joint resolution provides a supplemental appropriation of \$200 million, an increase of \$100 million in the estimate submitted by the President on yesterday (H. Doc. 92-316), to provide relief under the provisions of the Disaster Relief Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-606) to the areas devastated by Hurricane Agnes and other major recent disasters, including that at Rapid City, S. Dak.

The unprecedented damage resulting from these disasters makes quick enactment of this supplemental by the Congress an urgent matter so as to provide interim disaster relief pending an opportunity for the development of firmer estimates as to total requirements.

This supplemental, together with about \$6 million in currently available funds and \$92,500,000 in the Treasury-Postal Service-General Government appropriation bill for fiscal year 1973, which is pending final conference action this week, will provide a total of about \$298,500,000 that will be available immediately. The committee expects the Office of Emergency Preparedness to make every effort reasonably possible to expedite the advances of funds and reimbursements to the local jurisdictions involved.

As preliminary estimates run to hundreds of millions of dollars in disaster damage, the committee has recommended the increase in the President's request to assure the availability of adequate funds to expedite relief measures pending an opportunity for development of firmer estimates as to the cost of the flood disasters and the presentation to

Congress of a documented figure for such additional funds as may be required.

The Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness has advised the committee that the massive demand for funds, other than the disaster unemployment compensation and the requirement for temporary housing, will be for State, county, and municipal road and bridge repair.

Activities eligible for Federal financial assistance include: debris and wreckage clearance; repair and replacement of public facilities; emergency mass shelter; temporary housing; removal of timber; assistance to unemployed individuals; and repair of damaged public facilities under construction.

EXCERPTS FROM FEDERAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE PROGRAM HANDBOOK

ASSISTANCE UNDER A "MAJOR DISASTER" DECLARATION

A. The President's disaster fund

Congress appropriates funds to the President to carry out the provisions of the Disaster Relief Act. When a "major disaster" is declared, the President authorizes the OEP Director to use such amounts as are needed from the disaster fund to furnish necessary and eligible assistance. These funds are used to provide relief and recovery assistance to State and local governments as well as to individual victims in a disaster area. Such funds also are used to reimburse Federal agencies for disaster aid provided at the direction of OEP.

B. Public Law 91-606 assistance to individuals

The Disaster Relief Act of 1970 is notable for the numerous means of Federal assistance it provides to individual victims of a major disaster. These kinds of help may include:

Temporary housing for disaster victims with up to 12 months free rental based on need;

Temporary mortgage or rental payments (up to 1 year) for persons faced with loss of their residences because of disaster-caused financial hardship;

Food coupons or surplus commodities to needy victims;

Unemployment compensation and reemployment assistance to disaster victims who lose their jobs because of the disaster;

Legal services to low-income individuals or families unable to secure such services adequate to meet their needs;

The removal of debris and wreckage on privately owned lands and waters if determined to be in the public interest;

Liberalized loans by the Small Business Administration and the Farmers Home Administration to homeowners, business firms, and farmers. (The age of an adult applicant is not to be considered in determining whether such loan should be made or the amount of such loan. The law also provides for forgiveness of part of the loan principal.)

C. Public Law 91-606 assistance to communities

When a "major disaster" has been declared by the President, the available resources of all Federal agencies may be used, as necessary, to combat the effects of the disaster. Federal agencies are authorized, when directed by OEP, to provide emergency assistance by:

Making Federal equipment, supplies, facilities, personnel, and other resources (other than the extension of credit) available to State and local governments;

Distributing medicine, food, and other consumable supplies, or emergency assistance, through the American National Red Cross, the Salvation Army, the Mennonite Disaster Service, and other relief and disaster assistance organizations, or otherwise;

Donating or lending surplus Federal equipment and supplies;

Performing on public or private lands or waters any emergency work essential for the

protection and preservation of life and property, including the clearing and removal of debris and the repair or replacement of public facilities;

Providing temporary housing or emergency shelter.

Through the President's Disaster Fund, OEP can make financial contributions to State and local governments for the purposes of carrying out the last two of these measures.

To carry out his functions, the Director of OEP also is authorized to establish emergency communications in a "major disaster" area; these can be made available to State and local government officials and other persons as appropriate. Emergency public transportation to government offices, supply centers, stores, post offices, schools, and major employment centers also can be made available in the area.

In addition to emergency assistance, the Disaster Relief Act of 1970 provides that the Federal Government may pay the net cost of permanent repair or replacement of public facilities, up to a facility's predisaster design basis and current codes and specifications. Reimbursement of up to 50 percent of eligible costs can be made for certain public facilities that were damaged by the disaster while under construction.

A 1971 amendment to Public Law 91-606 authorized similar aid to tax-exempt non-government medical care facilities.

Public Law 91-606 also empowers the President to make grants to any local government which has suffered a substantial loss of property tax revenue as the result of a "major disaster." Grants may be made for the tax year in which the disaster occurred and for each of the following 2 tax years in accordance with the regulations prescribed by OEP.

D. Other Recovery Assistance

Other Federal agencies have special emergency programs which can be invoked upon a "major disaster" declaration by the President, depending upon their administrative procedures in effect at the time. Specific examples:

The Small Business Administration and the Farmers Home Administration can also make their disaster loans (for urban and rural areas, respectively) in declared "major disasters." With a presidential declaration, liberal forgiveness benefits (up to \$2,500) may be applied on the principal of the loan.

The Internal Revenue Service can provide special tax treatment for disaster-created losses suffered by property owners. In some instances, a taxpayer may elect to take the deduction for the casualty loss on his tax return for the preceding year rather than the year of the disaster.

The Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, can provide for the repair or replacement of damaged public elementary and secondary schools, and for maintenance and operating costs.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Veterans Administration can make adjustments under their respective insured home loan programs. Urban renewal programs can be expedited.

The Department of Agriculture can implement its donated feed program for commingled livestock.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD in connection with this joint resolution.

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

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I will, of course, support this supplemental appropriation

for disaster relief in the manner in which it is brought in. The President asked for \$100 million knowing that there was a conference report on the Treasury-Postal Service appropriation bill which was just adopted that has in it \$92.5 million, and then that there is a \$6 million carryover which would give the administration \$198.5 million, and I am sure that would be enough for the next 2 weeks.

But in an effort to bolster the funds, an offer of an additional \$100 million was made, and it will be used, but I do not believe within the next 2 weeks, after which we will probably bring in another bill.

So we will approve this, and we will support it, but it is unfortunate. It has become a habit to go above the budget.

There will be another conference report coming in shortly that is going to be billions of dollars over the budget. So there is nothing new here today about bringing in a bill that is over the budget. But it does seem to me that the day is coming—and probably very soon—when we will have to take a better look at the budgets and not bring in additional moneys—and I am not talking about disaster relief, because we know this has to be done, and the President knows it.

Regarding the suggestion of the language in the report to which the gentleman from Maryland refers, that the Committee on Appropriations expects the Office of Emergency Preparedness to make every reasonable effort possible to expedite the advances of funds, let me say that before the gentleman offered it in the committee, the President himself had gotten hold of the Office of Emergency Preparedness and told them to cut out the redtape, to get in there and get these funds moving.

So I am sure that the word of the President to that office will carry some weight, as will, of course, the language offered by the gentleman. But it should not be left to anyone's imagination by taking language of this kind that the administration is not cognizant of the need that this be done immediately.

I think also that the distinguished Governor of the State of Maryland has on several occasions quite recently said that he considers the Federal Government and the local governments are doing everything that is necessary, and he is perfectly satisfied in what is being done at this time.

So I would suggest that we do not get the idea that the administration is not for this disaster relief; every dime that is needed in it will be provided, and asked for, and the redtape will be cut.

I can assure the gentleman from Maryland that I will do everything I can to see that there is immediate action in connection with this, and I am sure that the administration will. I think the people in these areas should have some feeling of confidence from the action that has already been taken.

The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood) has done a magnificent job in his area in setting up his command post and handling it, but I think the gentleman will agree that he has had complete cooperation in trying to work this out.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his support for this supplemental appropriation, and particularly for his support for the language in the committee report.

I wonder if the gentleman will explain why it has taken a whole year to get this money out, when it is only for a relatively small number of people.

Mr. BOW. I would say to the gentleman from Maryland that if it were in my district I could answer, and I would have been down there after it. I thought the gentleman could tell us, because it is his district, and I am sure the gentleman will be trying to get some money into the district that has been authorized.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. We are getting some of the money finally. But we cannot get an adequate explanation as to why the money has been so slow in coming.

Mr. BOW. I am sure that if the gentleman would like, I will check. I think it ought to be checked as to why it has not been done.

I can assure the gentleman that in this instance in this great disaster that faces our country we will see that everything will be done.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Would the gentleman agree that a year is too long?

Mr. BOW. I would agree. And I would say to the gentleman that I would not have waited a year to get down there and try to find out why my people were not getting the money.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. The gentlemen from Maryland have not waited, but we cannot go down there and write the checks. We still have to rely on the administration to write these checks.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time for a number of reasons. You all know—not as well as I do—but pretty much what the situation is in the State of Pennsylvania and more especially in my congressional district and even more especially in the chief city of Wilkes-Barre.

I use the language of the distinguished chairman of the full committee who in his own right has a flair for Shakespeare—let me say it this way—never in the history of this country has there been a more desperate civil disaster.

This is the worst civil disaster in the history of the Republic.

It is unnecessary for me to say more. As the gentleman from Ohio said, as soon as I was advised by the Army Engineers that this would develop as it has, I went, as you would, to Wilkes-Barre, and adjacent and contiguous to the airport above the water lines I set up a headquarters to coordinate all efforts, civil and military, in the U.S. Naval Training Station, and stayed there until Tuesday, day and night, until I came back here to work with you to do what you are doing now.

Let me say this. There has been no request to any branch of the Federal Government made by me that has not

been promptly and completely met in every way as it was reasonable and humanly possible.

In a matter of an hour ago the SBA acted further, and I spoke to them, the Navy provided the aircraft, and there are now about this minute arriving in Wilkes-Barre 25 additional SBA experienced personnel. They will meet with the banking groups who are volunteering with people who are volunteering with other branches of the Government to come in and help the business community and the general public to do what can be done.

They are setting up substations down through the river area as far as 70 miles for convenience to the people—and so as not to bring them all into Wilkes-Barre.

Everything that is reasonable and possible that can be done is being done.

The same is true of the State of Pennsylvania.

Let me finish by saying this. Pennsylvania is the grand old Keystone State. The Members of this House since the birth of the Nation have come there and whenever there has been a disaster in any part of this country—a flood or earthquake or fire or tornado or a hurricane or what have you—every Member of the Pennsylvania delegation on both sides of the aisle, always with great heart and understanding, has done for the rest of the Nation what we are doing here for Pennsylvania and the other States involved in this immediate disaster.

Two hundred million dollars—yes—the President understood, and asked for \$100 million. Before the Committee on Appropriations I did demand to make it \$200 million. It was approved unanimously by the Committee on Appropriations, and it comes to us. You realize I am sure, and so do I, that \$200 million will not do this. Only God knows just how many \$100 million can help. I see in the State of Pennsylvania perhaps a billion dollars—just one State. But it is very bad there.

Do not forget this, the State of Pennsylvania will do its share more and more and more than you would expect; and of that you can be sure, and we always have.

We want nothing free. We want nothing thrown at us by largesse. We, as you do, feel that we have some kind of right, and that you know that.

We want nothing free. We want nothing thrown at us by largesse. We—as you feel—we have some kind of right, and that you know. And I bring to you from the State of Pennsylvania and from my district the compliments that down through the years this House has earned.

Mr. CONOVER. Mr. Speaker, I compliment this body for quick passage of this legislation, both through the Banking and Currency Committee and the Appropriations Committee. The \$200 million is needed with great haste and there must be additional funds appropriated later, because just the losses in Pennsylvania will be into the billions.

I hope we will also follow the lead of the President and cut the red tape that may occur in the issuance of moneys to the people. I would want all the various agencies to know my concern on the mat-

ter, not only in Pittsburgh, but throughout all of the areas damaged by Hurricane Agnes. This is truly a time for Government to show its response to human need in time of disaster. We have every indication that all agencies are cooperating and working well; let us hope it continues.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the joint resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution 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 joint resolution.

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

Mr. MAHON. 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 356, nays 1, not voting 75, as follows:

[Roll No. 257]
YEAS—356

Abbott	Chappell	Fulton
Abourezk	Clancy	Gallifanakis
Adams	Clark	Garmatz
Addabbo	Clausen,	Gaydos
Alexander	Don H.	Gettys
Anderson,	Cleveland	Glaimo
Calif.	Collier	Gibbons
Anderson, Ill.	Collins, Ill.	Goldwater
Andrews, Ala.	Collins, Tex.	Gonzalez
Andrews,	Conable	Goodling
N. Dak.	Conover	Grasso
Annunzio	Conte	Gray
Archer	Conyers	Green, Oreg.
Arends	Corman	Green, Pa.
Ashbrook	Cotter	Griffin
Aspin	Coughlin	Gross
Aspinall	Crane	Gubser
Badillo	Culver	Gude
Baker	Daniel, Va.	Hagan
Barrett	Daniels, N.J.	Haley
Begich	Danielson	Hall
Belcher	Davis, Ga.	Halpern
Bennett	Davis, Wis.	Hamilton
Bergland	de la Garza	Hammer-
Betts	Delaney	schmidt
Bevill	Dellenback	Hanley
Blagel	Dellums	Hansen, Idaho
Blester	Denholm	Hansen, Wash.
Bingham	Dennis	Harrington
Blanton	Derwinski	Harvey
Blatnik	Devine	Hathaway
Boland	Dickinson	Hawkins
Bow	Diggs	Hechler, W. Va.
Brademas	Dingell	Heckler, Mass.
Brasco	Donohue	Heinz
Bray	Dorn	Helstoski
Brinkley	Dow	Henderson
Brooks	Downing	Hicks, Mass.
Brotzman	Drinan	Hicks, Wash.
Brown, Mich.	Duncan	Hillis
Brown, Ohio	du Pont	Hogan
Broyhill, N.C.	Edwards, Ala.	Hollifield
Broyhill, Va.	Edwards, Calif.	Horton
Buchanan	Ellberg	Howard
Burke, Mass.	Esch	Hull
Burleson, Tex.	Eshleman	Hungate
Burlison, Mo.	Evans, Colo.	Hunt
Burton	Fascell	Hutchinson
Byrne, Pa.	Fish	Ichord
Byrnes, Wis.	Fisher	Jacobs
Byron	Flood	Jarman
Cabell	Flowers	Johnson, Calif.
Camp	Flynt	Johnson, Pa.
Carey, N.Y.	Foley	Jonas
Carlson	Forsythe	Jones, Ala.
Carter	Fountain	Jones, N.C.
Casey, Tex.	Fraser	Jones, Tenn.
Cederberg	Frenzel	Kastenmeier
Chamberlain	Frey	Kazen

Keating	O'Konski	Smith, N.Y.
Kee	O'Neill	Snyder
Kemp	Passman	Spence
King	Patman	Springer
Koch	Patten	Staggers
Kuykendall	Pelly	Stanton,
Kyl	Pepper	J. William
Kyros	Perkins	Stanton,
Landgrebe	Pettis	James V.
Latta	Peyser	Steed
Leggett	Pickle	Steele
Lent	Pike	Steiger, Wis.
Lloyd	Pirnie	Stokes
Long, La.	Podell	Stratton
Long, Md.	Powell	Stubblefield
McClary	Preyer, N.C.	Stuckey
McCloskey	Price, Ill.	Sullivan
McClure	Price, Tex.	Symington
McCollister	Pucinski	Talcott
McCormack	Purcell	Taylor
McCulloch	Quile	Teague, Calif.
McEwen	Quillen	Teague, Tex.
McFall	Rallsback	Terry
McKay	Randall	Thompson, Ga.
McKevitt	Rangel	Thompson, N.J.
McKinney	Rees	Thompson, Wis.
McMillan	Reid	Thone
Macdonald,	Reuss	Tiernan
Mass.	Rhodes	Udall
Madden	Robinson, Va.	Ullman
Mahon	Robison, N.Y.	Van Deerlin
Maillard	Rodino	Vanik
Mallary	Roe	Veysey
Mann	Rogers	Vigorito
Mathis, Ga.	Roncallo	Waggonner
Matsunaga	Rooney, N.Y.	Waldie
Mayne	Rooney, Pa.	Wampler
Mazzoli	Rosenthal	Ware
Meeds	Rostenkowski	Whalen
Meicher	Roush	Whalley
Mikva	Roy	White
Miller, Ohio	Roybal	Whitehurst
Mills, Ark.	Runnels	Whitten
Mills, Md.	Ruth	Widnall
Minish	Ryan	Wiggins
Mink	St Germain	Williams
Minshall	Sandman	Willson, Bob
Mitchell	Sarbanes	Willson,
Mizell	Satterfield	Charles H.
Molohan	Saylor	Winn
Monagan	Scherle	Wolf
Montgomery	Scheuer	Wright
Moorhead	Schmitz	Wyatt
Morgan	Schneebell	Wyman
Murphy, Ill.	Scott	Yates
Murphy, N.Y.	Sebellius	Yatron
Myers	Selberling	Young, Fla.
Natcher	Shipley	Young, Tex.
Nedzi	Sisk	Zablocki
Nelsen	Skubitz	Zion
Nichols	Slack	Zwach
Nix	Smith, Calif.	
Obey	Smith, Iowa	

NAYS—1

Blackburn

NOT VOTING—75

Abernethy	Evins, Tenn.	Mathias, Calif.
Abzug	Findley	Metcalfe
Anderson,	Ford, Gerald R.	Michel
Tenn.	Ford,	Miller, Calif.
Ashley	William D.	Mosher
Baring	Frelinghuysen	Moss
Bell	Fuqua	O'Hara
Boggs	Gallagher	Poage
Bolling	Griffiths	Poff
Broomfield	Grover	Pryor, Ark.
Burke, Fla.	Hanna	Rarick
Caffery	Harsha	Riegle
Carney	Hastings	Roberts
Celler	Hays	Rousselot
Chisholm	Hébert	Ruppe
Clawson, Del	Hosmer	Schwengel
Clay	Karth	Shoup
Colmer	Keith	Shriver
Curlin	Kluczynski	Sikes
Davis, S.C.	Landrum	Steiger, Ariz.
Dent	Lennon	Stephens
Dowdy	Link	Vander Jagt
Dulski	Lujan	Wydler
Dwyer	McDade	Wylie
Eckhardt	McDonald,	
Edmondson	Mich.	
Erlenborn	Martin	

So the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mrs. Dwyer.
 Mr. Boggs with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
 Mr. Dent with Mr. McDade.
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
 Mr. Dulski with Mr. Hastings.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Findley.
 Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Lujan.
 Mr. Sikes with Mr. Burke of Florida.
 Mr. Stephens with Mr. Poff.
 Mr. Hays with Mr. Mosher.
 Mr. Hanna with Mr. Del Clawson.
 Mr. Moss with Mr. Hosmer.
 Mr. O'Hara with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
 Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Erlenborn.
 Mr. Colmer with Mr. Martin.
 Mr. Davis of South Carolina with Mr. Wylie.
 Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.
 Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Broomfield.
 Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Keith.
 Mr. Metcalfe with Mrs. Abzug.
 Mr. Eckhardt with Mrs. Chisholm.
 Mr. Curlin with Mr. Bell.
 Mr. Clay with Mr. Pryor of Arkansas.
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Baring.
 Mr. Ashley with Mr. Wydler.
 Mr. Link with Mr. Shoup.
 Mr. Carney with Mr. Grover.
 Mr. Lennon with Mr. Shriver.
 Mr. Karth with Mr. Harsha.
 Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Mathias of California.
 Mr. Caffery with Mr. Riegle.
 Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Michel.
 Mr. Roberts with Mr. Rousselot.
 Mr. Rarick with Mr. Gallagher.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 15390. An act to provide for a four-month extension of the present temporary level in the public debt limitation.

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

S.J. Res. 247. Joint resolution extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases.

NATIONAL SHUT-IN DAY

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 208) authorizing the President to proclaim the first Sunday in June of each year as "National Shut-In Day."

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution as follows:

S.J. RES. 208

Whereas the sick and old constitute an often neglected segment of our people; and

Whereas many shut-in persons, who now suffer the oblivion of solitude and indifference, have in the past contributed greatly to our present well-being, by being good parents, hard workers, and concerned citizens; and

Whereas there is no other hardship more amenable to human kindness than is this problem of loneliness; and

Whereas solitude knows no social or racial barriers, but is recognized by all men as a cause for bitterness and heartbreak; and Whereas we, as individuals, possess the will to change our indifference to consolation and useful concern: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the first Sunday in June of each year as "National Shut-In Day" and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day by visiting at least one shut-in person on this special day if possible, and by participating in other appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. EDWARDS of California: On pages 1 and 2, strike out the entire preamble.

On page 2, lines 4 and 5, strike out the phrase "the first Sunday in June of each year" and insert in lieu thereof "the third Sunday in October of 1972".

The amendments were agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Authorizing the President to proclaim the third Sunday in October of 1972 as 'National Shut-In Day'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(Mr. YATRON, at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of California, was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD).

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, the resolution which we are considering today, Senate Joint Resolution 208, to establish a National Shut-In Day, is one of special significance. It serves to focus attention on the Nation's elderly and ill and would set aside a day for visiting the sick and the aged. The measure, as amended, provides for an October date which is in the early part of the fall season, an appropriate time to pause and reflect on the plight of those whose confinement and loneliness do not end with the coming or ending of any season.

The resolution, as amended by the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, is consistent with my bill, House Joint Resolution 794, which would establish the third Sunday in October as National Shut-In Day.

The shut-in movement began with the untiring efforts of Father Felix A. Lasito, of Reading, Pa., whose work along with that of the people of Pennsylvania, resulted in the declaration by Gov. Milton Shapp of Pennsylvania Annual Shut-In Day. The concept has been enthusiastically received by Pennsylvanians and I am certain that many Americans throughout the country would take advantage of the opportunity to express concern for our shut ins on a National Shut-In Day.

I urge my colleagues to lend their full and active support to Senate Joint Resolution 208, as amended, thereby indicating our willingness and ability to change our indifference to consolation and useful concern.

NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION MONTH

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 245) authorizing the President to designate the calendar month of September 1972 as "National Voter Registration Month."

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution as follows:

S.J. RES. 245

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in recognition of the importance of Congress promotion and encouragement of voter registration by all qualified citizens, especially those newly enfranchised by the twenty-sixth amendment to the Constitution, the President is authorized and directed to proclaim the period beginning September 1, 1972, and ending September 30, 1972, as "National Voter Registration Month", and to call upon the people of the United States to observe such month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution 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.

PROVIDING FOR CELEBRATION OF HONOR AMERICA DAY ON JULY 4, 1972

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 87) providing for celebration of Honor America Day on July 4, 1972.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution as follows:

S. CON. RES. 87

Whereas it is the sense of Congress that 1972 be recorded as the year that all freedom loving Americans demonstrate a reaffirmation of their patriotism and love and respect for these United States of America upon the occasion of the 196th anniversary of its founding; and

Whereas the Congress is aware that while many of the problems confronting America may appear to be monumental, they are problems that are surmountable through the exercise of the American spirit and will; and

Whereas the rekindling of that spirit and will can begin by honoring America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress declares July 4, 1972, as a day to honor America, and let there be public gatherings and activities at which the people of the United States can celebrate and honor their country in appropriate manner.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL INVENTORS' DAY

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Joint Resolution (H.J. Res. 1232) designating, and authorizing the President to proclaim, February 11, 1973, as "National Inventors' Day."

The Clerk read the title of the Joint Resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 1232

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in honor of the important role played by inventors in promoting progress in the useful arts and in recognition of the invaluable contribution of inventors to the welfare of our people, February 11, 1973, is hereby designated "National Inventors' Day". The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to celebrate such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the four resolutions just passed.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 15390, PUBLIC DEBT LIMITATION

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 15390) to provide for a 4-month extension of the present temporary level in the public debt limitation, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request conference with the Senate thereon.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume they must have amended the title.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I am not certain. I want to go to conference to find out what they have done.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. We do not even know what they have done in the other body, and we are going to go to conference?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I never do know altogether what they have done in the Senate when I ask for a conference with the Senate. I find out when I get to conference that things have happened that I do not know about.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speak-

er, let me make this clear, that I am very much opposed to the procedures that have been followed and what is being done. I do not want to be unreasonable in terms of the procedures that are used. I assume that the chairman could, if this is objected to at this time, call the Ways and Means Committee together and report out a motion to instruct the Chair to send it to conference.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. If the gentleman will yield, that is exactly what the chairman of the committee would propose to do if there is objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Right. And I do not know that anything really would be served by inconveniencing the Members in that respect. The meeting would not be related to a resolution of the issues on the merits, Mr. Speaker, so I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is the bill on which the Senate had increased social security benefits by 20 percent. Will those of us who have long agitated for this kind of increase have an opportunity to vote on this kind of issue whenever this goes to conference?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Whatever the conferees might want to do with respect to the social security amendment, under the rules that could not be included as a part of the conference report. I might say to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois, it has to be brought back to the House in disagreement and a separate vote can be had on that type of amendment since it is not germane under the rules of the House to the subject matter of the House-passed bill.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Further reserving the right to object, then do I understand the Members will have an opportunity to vote on that question when it comes back?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. That is in accordance with the rules of the House, yes.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, may I ask the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, or perhaps make a plea. As the distinguished gentleman is fully aware, in addition to AFDC recipients, there are some 3 million persons who receive either aged aid or disabled or blind aid, and unless there is added protective language or disregard language in the bill, all of their social security increase will be denied them, because there will be a dollar-for-dollar offset in their grants.

My plea to the distinguished chairman is as follows: First, if the date of payment requires a retroactive payment, just for administrative simplicity, I ask, that retroactive payment be completely disregarded for all public assistance recipients.

The second plea would be I would urge with all the compassion at my command that the conferees pay notice to the dilemma confronted by these AFDC recipients and the 3 million persons at whatever level of increase in social security benefits may be approved. I think there should be some recognition of the

impact on these people. I do not seek any more assurances than just, if you will, the sympathetic review and analysis of that particular question.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I cannot advise the gentleman whether such a provision is in the Senate-adopted amendment or not. I doubt that it is, frankly, and I do not know what authority within the conference we might have. Certainly I have the same sympathy for this situation as my friend from California has. I do not know whether it is even retroactive or not. I have not had a chance to even look at the amendment, but the gentleman can be assured that if we cannot do something about it here, we shall not forget it, and shall try to do something about it in connection with some other legislation.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, if this unanimous consent is agreed to and the conference reaches agreement, would it be the purpose of the gentleman to call the conference report up this afternoon?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I cannot tell the gentleman. I would hope that we could avoid being the ones—that is, the House conferees and the Senate conferees—who would be charged with being the ones that delayed the expected recess of the Congress. It is possible to do it, if everybody cooperates in the conference. Perhaps we can; I do not know. I cannot tell the gentleman "yes" or "no" in response to the inquiry. I do not know that we can have a conference report.

Mr. GROSS. That, too, would require a unanimous consent for approval?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. It would require unanimous consent for approval of such a conference report.

Mr. GROSS. Or a rule?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. If the conference report is to be called up and acted upon today, yes, or it would take a rule to do it.

Mr. GROSS. Or it would require a rule to do it. This is the same bill.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. It is a 4-month extension.

Mr. GROSS. This is the same bill that the House passed recently under a closed rule; is it not?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. What does it now carry? Four, five, or six, major amendments?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I am not certain. I am not certain, because I just found out that the Senate had passed the bill only a few minutes ago, and it has just come to us.

I do not know whether there is any amendment. I am told, that is germane to the bill under the House rules. Perhaps the amendments—how many there are I do not know—are not germane to the bill under the House rules.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. If anyone

is looking for responsibility as to delay, and delay should occur in our adjournment, they do not have to look very far. All they have to do is look to the other body, which put nongermane amendments on a bill of this House.

Mr. GROSS. I certainly agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin. That was exactly the point I was trying to make. If there is any allegation that the House has shirked its duty, that is as fallacious as it can be.

They have had the social security amendment for some 15 months, have they not?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. It has been a long time, but we passed the bill, as the gentleman will recall, on June 23, 1971.

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

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MILLS of Arkansas, ULLMAN, BURKE of Massachusetts, BYRNES of Wisconsin, and BETTS.

EXTENDING AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 250) to extend the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to interest rates on insured mortgages and to extend laws relating to housing and urban development.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire whether we have this Senate joint resolution paper in our hands? Has it been printed, and does it comply with the rules of the House and the Reorganization Act?

The SPEAKER. It has been engrossed as a joint resolution. The engrossed Senate joint resolution is at the desk.

Mr. HALL. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may we have a bit of explanation as to why we were asked to give unanimous consent for this, what it is, and whether it is another one of these urgent emergency things, performed in haste or not, such as the one on which we worked until the wee small hours of last night.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Joint Resolution 250, a joint resolution to extend the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to interest rates on insured mortgages and to extend certain laws relating to housing and urban development.

Section 1 of this joint resolution would extend for 1 year until June 30, 1973, the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to set interest rates on FHA insured mortgages

and VA guaranteed mortgages. It simply extends the existing law, giving the Secretary the authority to establish an interest rate at a market rate in excess of 6 percent.

This resolution also extends from June 30, 1972, to September 30, 1972, the date within which appropriations can be made for the model cities, community facilities, comprehensive planning, and open space land programs. This is necessary because the Congress has not yet completed action on the HUD appropriations for fiscal year 1973.

Finally, this resolution extends the waiver of certain mortgage limitations applicable to the purchase of mortgages by the Government National Mortgage Association for an additional 3 months.

This is a temporary measure, of course, because they expire tonight at midnight.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, this naturally brings up the question as to why the authorization for this extension has to be handled in this manner and why it has not been brought up previously when we had adequate time for discussion and debate.

Mr. PATMAN. We had a number of bills like this, I will state to the gentleman from Missouri. This is just one of them. We have gotten the rest of them through, I believe. All except this one.

Mr. HALL. Does the gentleman expect to bring them all up under extreme urgency and emergency, with haste, in the waning hours before recess to the point where one would begin to think that that is a part of the prescribed technique of his committee and, quote, stellar leadership, unquote?

Mr. PATMAN. We have passed all of them except this one, and one that is in the housing bill that has not been passed on yet. We expect to get to it this week, but we were interfered with on account of other measures, and we could not get to it.

Mr. HALL. Can we expect that one this afternoon while we are dilly-dallying, waiting for Rome to burn?

Mr. PATMAN. No.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if I could ask the gentleman one question, how long has this been in mothballs, either in the Senate or in the House, or in the gentleman's committee, or wherever it has been?

Mr. PATMAN. It passed the Senate on June 23, less than a week ago.

Mr. GROSS. How long has it been in the House?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know that. I can find out when it was introduced. It was introduced June 23, incidentally.

Mr. GROSS. This is the first action on it in the House; is that right?

Mr. PATMAN. It just came over last night.

Mr. GROSS. From the Senate?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Why has it not been moved out of the House before?

Mr. PATMAN. These extensions are in the House bill which is still being worked on in our committee. We have been working on them for 2 or 3

months, but the Senate passed the housing bill.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder whether politics interfered with it, whether it was on the House side or the Senate side.

Mr. PATMAN. This is strictly not partisan.

Mr. GROSS. I did not say anything about partisanship, I am talking about candidates for office interfering with the legislation that comes before the House.

Mr. PATMAN. Partisanship is often involved in politics.

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

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like the gentleman to know that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs tried to do something on this, and it passed the House some time ago on a different bill. They took it off that bill and placed it on the bill that is presently being considered. And it is most important that this pass the House today.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I think from ordinary observation, to say nothing of the explanation of both the gentlemen from Texas, that it is important that it pass and be expedited, and, having brought to light the perfidy and the dalliance of the committee that ordinarily handles the FHA part of it, at least, I am prepared to withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am cognizant of the necessity for action being taken at this time, but I would like to suggest to the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the committee, that there are tremendously important programs that are involved in not only this resolution here, but in the provisions of the housing bill itself, sections 235 and 236, FHA, Urban Problems, Foreclosures, and so forth, and I would concede also that it is not a political matter that is holding up the action on the bill, but that it is very complex and has innumerable ramifications. But I do wonder, and ask the gentleman what the prospects are in his opinion for a report of this bill and a prompt resolution of these problems?

I believe this is a 3-months stay that is requested here, which is very substantial in terms of the time that is involved.

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

Mr. MONAGAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. The problems mentioned by the gentleman are involved in the housing bill that is now before the committee for a mark-up session. I think within a week when we get the time we will have it all reconciled and we will be ready to get it to the House.

The part that the gentleman mentioned is in section 9, I believe. That has been carefully considered but we are going to consider it some more. There is a difference of opinion about it. But I believe it will be reconciled to the satisfaction of all reasonable parties.

Mr. MONAGAN. It is only the FHA request that is in the housing bill and also in this request before the House today?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 250. Despite the most sincere effort and much hard work by the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee it has not been possible to complete action on this year's housing bill. The result is that HUD's authority to continue several important programs will expire tonight—tomorrow night—unless this resolution is enacted before we adjourn for your trip to Miami.

The resolution would extend for 1 year the Secretary's authority to set maximum interest rates on FHA insured mortgage loans to meet the mortgage market; extend the model cities authorization 3 months; extend the community facilities authorization; extend the section 701 planning authorization; and extend the waiver of certain limitations applicable to the purchase of mortgages by GNMA.

In addition, I have an amendment that I feel must be added in this resolution. It extends for 3 months the waiver of certain planning requirements in connection with the basic water and sewer facilities grant program. It is essential to maintain this waiver in the law for this additional period as there are certain areas throughout the country which have not, as yet, satisfied all the planning requirements required by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Many of these areas contain local communities which are in desperate need of Federal assistance in order to face the critical need for adequate water supply and sewage disposal. These areas are making a bona fide effort to meet the planning requirements and will be faced with great hardship if their opportunity for Federal grants for water and sewer facilities is cut off at this time.

I feel that in the interest of fairness, this waiver of the planning requirement should be extended for this additional time so that all communities will be eligible on the basis of their need. I urge adoption of this amendment.

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

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. We are in accord with what the gentleman says and we would accept the gentleman's amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 250

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

FLEXIBLE INTEREST RATE

SECTION 1. Section 3(a) of the Act entitled "An Act to amend chapter 37 of title 38 of the United States Code with respect to the veterans' home loan program, to amend

the National Housing Act with respect to interest rates on insured mortgages, and for other purposes", approved May 7, 1968, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1709-1), is amended by striking out "June 30, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1973".

EXTENSION OF MODEL CITIES AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 2. Section 111(c) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 is amended by striking out "July 1, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1972".

EXTENSION OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 3. Section 708(b) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "July 1, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1972".

EXTENSION OF COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 4. The fifth sentence of section 701(b) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by striking out "July 1, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1972".

EXTENSION OF OPEN-SPACE LAND AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 5. Section 708 of the Housing Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "July 1, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1972".

EXTENSION OF WAIVER OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS APPLICABLE TO THE PURCHASE OF MORTGAGES BY THE GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

SEC. 6. Section 3 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to extend the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to interest rates on insured mortgages, to extend and modify certain provisions of the National Food Insurance Act of 1968, and for other purposes", approved December 22, 1971, is amended by striking out "6 months" and inserting in lieu thereof "9 months".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WIDNALL

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIDNALL: Following Section 6 insert the following new section:

SEC. 7. Section 702(c) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "June 30, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1972."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 250. The purpose of this joint resolution is to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development with respect to interest rates on insured mortgages and to extend certain other laws relating to housing and urban development. Continuation of the housing and urban development authorities contained in this joint resolution is an urgent necessity. Although the Senate has already passed authorizing legislation for these programs, an interim authorization is required at this time because house action on the 1972 Omnibus Housing bill has not yet been completed.

I would like to emphasize that this measure does not contain any increase in dollar authorizations. Rather, it merely extends for approximately 90 days the time within which funds already authorized may be appropriated.

The Senate joint resolution 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate joint resolution just passed.

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

There was no objection.

INCREASING GRANT PAYABLE FOR SPECIALLY ADAPTED HOUSING FOR DISABLED VETERANS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 3343) to amend chapter 21 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum amount of the grant payable for specially adapted housing for disabled veterans, with Senate amendments to the House amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments to the House amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments to the House amendments, as follows:

Strike out the matter proposed to be inserted by amendment No. 2 of the House engrossed amendments.

Amend the amendment of the House to the title so as to read: "An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum amount of the grant payable for specially adapted housing for disabled veterans."

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas if the Senate amendments are germane and/or if they add to the cost of the bill as passed by the House.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The Senate amendments are germane and they do not add to the cost of the bill.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments to the House amendments were concurred.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN PRINTING FOR THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 92-1204) on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 553), authorizing certain printing for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and ask for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 553

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That after the conclusion of the second session of the

Ninety-second Congress there shall be printed for the use of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives fifty-six thousand one hundred copies of a publication entitled "Summary of Veterans Legislation Reported, Ninety-second Congress, Second Session", with an additional forty-four thousand copies for the use of Members of the House of Representatives.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF REPORT ENTITLED "PAPERS SUBMITTED TO SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING PANELS ON HOUSING PRODUCTION, HOUSING DEMAND, AND DEVELOPING A SUITABLE LIVING ENVIRONMENT"

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 92-1205) on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 559), providing for the printing of the report entitled "Papers Submitted to Subcommittee on Housing Panels on Housing Production, Housing Demand, and Developing a Suitable Living Environment," and ask for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 559

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed for the use of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives five thousand copies of the two-volume committee print entitled "Papers Submitted to Subcommittee on Housing Panels on Housing Production, Housing Demand, and Developing a Suitable Living Environment," printed for the use of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF REPORT ENTITLED "HOUSING AND THE URBAN ENVIRONMENT, REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THREE STUDY PANELS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING"

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 92-1206) on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 560), providing for the printing of the report entitled "Housing and the Urban Environment, Report and Recommendations of Three Study Panels of the Subcommittee on Housing," and ask for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

H. CON. RES. 560

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed for the use of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives five thousand copies of the committee print entitled "Housing and the Urban Environment, Report and Recommendations of Three Study Panels of the Subcommittee on Housing Including Summaries of the Administration's Housing Consolidation and Simplification Act of 1971, and

Community Development Act of 1971," printed for the use of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to consider was laid on the table.

PRINTING AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT THE PAMPHLET ENTITLED "OUR FLAG"

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 92-1207) on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 605), to authorize the printing as a House document the pamphlet entitled "Our Flag," and to provide for additional copies, and ask for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 605

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed as a House document with illustrations, a revised edition of the House document "Our Flag"; and that two hundred and seventy-one thousand additional copies be printed, of which two hundred and nineteen thousand five hundred shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and fifty-one thousand five hundred shall be for the use of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON THE "ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT OF 1971"

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 92-1208) on the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 60) to print additional copies of hearings on the "Environmental Protection Act of 1971," and ask for immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 60

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Commerce two thousand additional copies of part 1 of the hearings entitled "Environmental Protection Act of 1971" held before the Senate Committee on Commerce.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT NUMBERED 56, ENTITLED "STATE UTILITY COMMISSIONS—SUMMARY AND TABULATION OF INFORMATION SUBMITTED BY THE COMMISSIONS"

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 92-1209), on the Senate con-

current resolution (S. Con. Res. 62), authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Document No. 56, entitled "State Utility Commissions—Summary and Tabulation of Information Submitted by the Commissions," and ask for immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 62

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for use of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, one thousand additional copies of Senate Document Numbered 56, Ninetieth Congress, first session, entitled "State Utility Commissions—Summary and Tabulation of Information Submitted by the Commissions" (September 11, 1967).

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE HEARINGS ON THE CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY ACT OF 1971

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 92-1210) on the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 70), authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate hearings on the Consumer Product Safety Act of 1971, and ask for immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 70

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Commerce two thousand additional copies each of parts 1 and 2 of its hearings during the first session, Ninety-second Congress, on the Consumer Product Safety Act of 1971.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT 92-634, ENTITLED "INTERIM REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF THE PRIVATE WELFARE AND PENSION PLAN STUDY, 1971"

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 92-1211) on the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 74), authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Report 92-634, entitled "Interim Report of Activities of the Private Welfare and Pension Plan Study, 1971," and ask for immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 74

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare two thousand additional copies of Senate Report

92-634, entitled "Interim Report of Activities of the Private Welfare and Pension Plan Study, 1971," a report by its Subcommittee on Labor pursuant to section 4 of Senate Resolution 35, Ninety-second Congress.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE HEARINGS ENTITLED "AMPHETAMINE LEGISLATION, 1971"

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 92-1212) on the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 79) authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate hearings entitled "Amphetamine Legislation 1971," and ask for immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 79

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary five thousand additional copies of the hearings of its Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency during the Ninety-second Congress, first session, on S. 674, to amend the Controlled Substances Act to move amphetamines and certain other stimulant substances from schedule III of such Act to schedule II, and for other purposes.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPRINTING BROCHURE ENTITLED "HOW OUR LAWS ARE MADE"

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 530) to reprint brochure entitled "How Our Laws Are Made," with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, after line 4, insert:

Sec. 2. There shall be printed for the use of the Senate fifty-one thousand five hundred additional copies of the document specified in section 1 of this concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES TOGETHER WITH DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 552) to provide for

the printing of the Constitution of the United States together with the Declaration of Independence, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, after line 8, insert:

Sec. 2. There shall be printed for the use of the Senate fifty-one thousand five hundred additional copies of the document specified in section 1 of this concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF SPECIAL PROJECT GRANT AUTHORITY UNDER MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH SERVICES PROGRAM

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 9410) to amend title V of the Social Security Act to extend for 5 years—until June 30, 1977—the period within which certain special project grants may be made thereunder, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object and I shall not object—I do this solely for the purpose of permitting the distinguished chairman to explain the bill.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. H.R. 9410, as amended by the committee, would extend for 1 year the provisions in present law which provide that 40 percent of the funds appropriated under the maternal and child health program are to be used for special projects in maternal and child health and crippled children's programs.

Under present law, effective July 1, 1972, the 40 percent for special projects would be added to the funds allocated under formula grants to the States. In addition, on July 1, 1972, State plans approved for allocation would have to include provisions for projects in areas of infant care, maternal health services, dental services, and children and youth projects.

H.R. 9410 provides that these changes in allocation would go into effect on July 1, 1973, rather than July 1, 1972. Neither the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, nor the States generally have performed the planning necessary for the transition of the special projects. The General Accounting Office made the following statement on this point:

Although Title V specifically requires the change in the methods of fund distribution on July 1, 1972, GAO found that HEW had

made no plans for an orderly transition. Because plans have not been made at the Federal level, few States have made plans for the transition.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has recommended and approved the provisions in H.R. 9410 and the bill was reported unanimously by the committee.

I want to take special note of the efforts of the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH) on behalf of this legislation. He gave excellent testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means on this subject and has continually expressed his interest to me on moving this legislation. There are mothers-to-be and children yet unborn who will owe him a debt of gratitude.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the bill.

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

Mr. COLLIER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I appreciate the coordination of the chairman and the committee before this unanimous consent request was made. I think this is a must. But, again it comes on the last day for action prior to recess.

The reason for my rising and asking the gentleman to yield at this time is to point out that this is the second time today that committees and/or their reports have reported the Department of HEW has failed to comply with statutory orders of the legislative branch that provides not only the policy but the jurisdiction, the surveillance, the oversight, and the funding to make such transition plans. The Subcommittee on Appropriations, that handles the emergency medical service of the U.S. Public Health Service on prepackaged disaster hospital units, warned over a year ago that they should make a survey, study, and take corrective actions; and the investigative staff of that subcommittee and the GAO both found that they have not turned stone No. 1, toward this directive of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, it simply indicates that that sprawling octopus down there is either defiant of the surveillance, oversight, review, and policy-making capacity, to say nothing of the fund granting or the purse-string control of the Congress—defiant, I say, or else they are such a sprawling octopus, so poorly led, that they fail to accomplish any direction whatsoever.

I think it could be both, and it is high time that either the highest authority jerk a knot in their tail and tell them to "get with it," or it is time that the Congress begin to practice a little incisive purse-string control.

The distinguished gentleman is exactly right. There is absolutely no point at all in letting a 40-percent grant for special projects amalgamate with the 50-percent formula grants and give them 90 percent control of all of the allocated funds in even this most sacred cow of all social security benefits, that is, the maternal and child health and welfare benefits, unless they have made an orderly plan for transition. I think somebody ought to say "achtung," snap to, and then see that they do it.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri. Let me point out that we have had 5 years in this instance for this transition. It has not been done. I can only conclude that perhaps the gentleman is right in his summary of what is the cause of it, plus this one additional factor, if I might add it to the gentleman's conclusion. Perhaps they have so many people over there that it is so difficult for them to get out of one another's way that they do not have time to really do anything about what we suggest. They do need to have somebody jerk them out of it.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 9410, extending the present distribution formula for maternal and child health programs and crippled children's services for another year.

In order to put the problems this bill deals with in context, it may be appropriate to review a little history. In the Social Security Amendments Act of 1967, we reviewed title V of the Social Security Act providing authorizations for maternal and child health and crippled children's services. A number of separate earmarked authorizations in the then existing law were consolidated by the 1967 amendments into one single authorization with three broad categories. It was felt desirable to give the States more discretion to respond to the varying problems that existed in the area of maternal and child health and crippled children's services in each State.

Accordingly, beginning with fiscal year 1969, 50 percent of the total authorizations were provided for formula grants for maternal and child health services and crippled children's services; 40 percent of the total authorizations were provided for special project grants for maternity and infant care, health of school and preschool children, and for dental health of children; 10 percent of the total authorizations were provided for research and training of administrative personnel in these programs. The 1967 amendments provided that, beginning in July of 1972, the States would assume responsibility for the special project grants, with 90 percent of the total authorization for maternal and child health and crippled children's services being allocated to the States as formula grants.

The Ways and Means Committee has been advised by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that neither the Department nor the States have performed the planning necessary for the assumption by the States of responsibility for the special project grants. The Comptroller General studied the problem and concluded that significant dislocations in the program would occur unless the present distribution formula is extended for another year. The Comptroller General recommended such an extension which would provide an additional period during which the Ways and Means Committee could consider other potentially desirable changes. I should make it clear that the bill does not involve any additional Federal costs, but

simply relates to the manner in which Federal funds for maternal and child health and crippled children's services will be distributed during fiscal 1973.

For the reasons outlined, Mr. Speaker, I urge that the bill be passed.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 9410

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 501 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "\$350,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$630,000,000".

SEC. 2. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 502 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "each of the next 3 fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "each of the next 8 fiscal years".

(b) Paragraph (2) of section 502 of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1978".

SEC. 3. (a) Section 505 (a) (8) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "July 1, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1977".

(b) Section 505(a)(9) of such Act is amended by striking out "July 1, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1977".

(c) Section 505(a)(10) of such Act is amended by striking out "July 1, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1977".

(d) Section 508(a)(3) of such Act is amended by striking out the comma after "service" and inserting in lieu thereof "during fiscal years ending on or before June 30, 1973".

(e) Section 508(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1977".

(f) Section 509(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1977".

(g) Section 510(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1977".

With the following committee amendment:

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

That (a) paragraph (1) of section 502 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "each of the next 3 fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "each of the next 4 fiscal years".

(b) Paragraph (2) of section 502 of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1974".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 505(a)(8) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "July 1, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1973".

(b) Section 505(a)(9) of such Act is amended by striking out "July 1, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1973".

(c) Section 505(a)(10) of such Act is amended by striking out "July 1, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1973".

(d) Section 508(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1973".

(e) Section 509(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1973".

(f) Section 510(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1973".

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, all of us are acquainted with the amendment. I ask

unanimous consent that the committee amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD and be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read:

A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to extend for one year (until June 30, 1973) the period within which certain special project grants may be made thereunder.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS TODAY

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time during the balance of the week for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, first of all I would like to know what the gentleman means by "the rest of the week."

Mr. O'NEILL. I hope I mean by 6 or 7 o'clock tonight. It is subject to the debt ceiling limit and the social security matter. They are the only matters I know pending before the House before we go on our vacation.

Mr. GROSS. Is Sunday construed to be included within "the rest of the week" or is it excluded, as it properly should be?

Mr. O'NEILL. I think that is next week. That means only today or tomorrow.

I believe there is also a continuing resolution by Mr. MAHON to be brought up.

Mr. GROSS. If we leave it subject to the call of the Chair, what business is proposed to be transacted thereafter? Would we be convened to hear more of the so-called cats-and-dogs legislation, or would it be for a specific purpose?

Mr. O'NEILL. To my knowledge, there is only the legislation that Mr. MILLS of Arkansas has gone to conference on. If he comes back, he will have to ask unanimous consent or go to the Committee on Rules. And there is a continuing resolution Mr. MAHON will offer. Those are the only two items I have knowledge of. I do not anticipate any "cats or dogs" other than the usual unanimous-consent requests.

Mr. GROSS. Unanimous-consent requests under the circumstances can mean most anything.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Iowa, as far as I know, I know of no other legislation coming along at this particular time.

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

Mr. GROSS. I will be glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if I under-

stand correctly the distinguished acting majority leader's statement, if this request is granted, we would recess soon, presumably after the special orders, or according to the leadership's desires, and then be called with the usual bells 15 minutes or so before at any time the rest of this day, or this weekend, for further consideration. Does that mean that the previous announcement and agreement to recess on the completion of business today, Friday, June 30, is obliterated and negated?

Mr. O'NEILL. I do hope that we can recess. All I can say is that I am sure the gentleman is aware, as I am, that it is the expressed desire of the leadership to be out of here as quickly as possible. I cannot estimate as to what time the committee will come back. I do not know whether there is going to be an objection to a unanimous consent request, and that the bill therefore will have to go to the Committee on Rules, or whether when they do bring it up they will take the full time on it or not.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, as I understand, the sole remaining business after the recess is, No. 1, the continuing resolution and, No. 2, the social security provision that has been attached, like a Christmas tree ornament to the "legalized" debt ceiling proposal, and any unanimous requests that might come up?

Mr. O'NEILL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALL. And that it is the plan to adjourn for the recess after these have been handled?

Mr. O'NEILL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, after yesterday's experience I have the impression that we are being treated as though this was the preface to a sine die adjournment of the 92d Congress. That is what I gather from the experience of yesterday.

Mr. O'NEILL. I wish it were so, but we both know better.

Mr. GROSS. When we worked yesterday from 10 o'clock in the morning until 12:30 this morning, I know it is not the case, but I wish it were true that this recess meant sine die adjournment of the 92d Congress.

However, I still do not understand why we went through the grueling, brutal procedure that we did yesterday. I just do not want a repetition of that day again if it can be avoided.

I wonder if the gentleman would not change his recess request to read, "today," rather than "for the remainder of this week," because that is really dealing with the unknown.

Mr. O'NEILL. Yes. I will do so.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent that my request be changed, and that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time today, subject to the call of the Chair.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and

I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

I have heard this rumor, and does the gentleman know if in the Senate-passed bill on the debt increase there was the continuing resolution language included in there? Does the gentleman know?

Mr. O'NEILL. I have no way of knowing. I have not seen the legislation.

Mr. SMITH of California. The gentleman does not know?

Mr. O'NEILL. No, I do not.

Mr. SMITH of California. Because I had heard the rumor, and I just wondered if the gentleman from Massachusetts knew whether that was true or not.

Mr. O'NEILL. I do not know.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if the gentleman would consider changing his request to a time certain? I recall that the last time we had this problem we went on for many, many hours, and then when we returned we found out we still did not have legislation ready.

Would the gentleman consider changing the time to make it a time—say, 6 o'clock?

Mr. O'NEILL. I am sorry, but I cannot. I just cannot explain to you any better than I have that I really do not know what time the conferees are going to come back. They could be back in half an hour, and then if we had set a time certain we would be waiting around here for perhaps an hour or more longer.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Could the gentleman set a maximum time, say that the maximum time would be 6 o'clock, so that we could at least be in here for a report at that time?

Mr. O'NEILL. That is really unprecedented, and I think would be uncalled for. We cannot estimate things like that.

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

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that we have reached the point that this unanimous-consent request can be handled. It should be satisfactory, and I hope that it is agreed to.

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

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

There was no objection.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS STATEMENT ON WELFARE REFORM

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, little that has been said or done by the Congress or the White House over the last 3 years has contributed to the need for effective reform of our present welfare system. Mr. Nixon's statement at his press conference of last week that he would refuse to seek a compromise on

the welfare legislation contained in H.R. 1 is but the latest in a series of politically motivated actions that are not in the best interests of welfare recipients or the Nation.

The congressional Black Caucus Tuesday issued a statement detailing the disastrous events that have befallen welfare reform during the last 3 years. In this position paper, the Black Caucus also calls for the adoption by the Senate of seven stopgap measures that would bring us a small step forward instead of the reactionary step backward of H.R. 1. I trust that all those concerned with this vital question will read the statement which I insert in the RECORD at this point.

STATEMENT ISSUED BY THE CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS REGARDING WELFARE REFORM—TUESDAY, JUNE 27, 1972

The stance taken by President Richard Nixon on the question of welfare reform at his news conference last Thursday comes as no surprise to those who have been following the wayward course of welfare reform over the last three years. Ever since he revealed the contents of his Family Assistance Plan to the Nation on August 8, 1969, the President has displayed scant interest in his legislation and has been equally as lacking in his adherence to the principles he set forth in August, 1969, as the basis for reform of the welfare system.

The actions taken by the Congress over the last three years in relation to the Family Assistance Plan have also been contrary to the cause of welfare reform. The decisions made on this issue in the Senate in the next few weeks will determine whether this harmful trend is to continue, or whether this Congress will enact legislation that will deal humanely and effectively with the mounting crisis in welfare.

Spurning the advice of his own Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as well as nineteen of his party's members in the Senate, Mr. Nixon last Thursday termed his welfare program as amended by the House Ways and Means Committee the "middle position" among the various proposals currently being offered in the Senate. To buttress his position, the President claimed that his legislation had been "overwhelmingly approved by the House of Representatives." The facts indicate otherwise, however.

Title IV of H.R. 1, the welfare legislation which passed the House of Representatives and the President now claims to be the middle position on the issue, differs in several respects from the proposal originally offered by Mr. Nixon. The President stated in August, 1969, that no one would be worse off financially under the Family Assistance Plan than he is under the present AFDC system. Under H.R. 1 an estimated 90% of the welfare families in forty-five states and the District of Columbia would be receiving federal benefits that are lower than their present combined level of AFDC payments and food stamps. The \$2,400 payment level for a family of four established under H.R. 1 is far short of the federal government's official determination of the poverty level. Ways and Means Committee Chairman Wilbur Mills and high ranking officials in HEW have acknowledged that \$2,400 is insufficient to provide a family of four with a minimally adequate income. Unless states supplement the newly created federal floor under incomes, families will be forced to exist on less money than they do at present. Instead of insuring that states maintain their present level of benefits, H.R. 1 contains provisions likely to spur reduced state contributions for welfare. The poor in only four or five states might end up better off with the creation of a federal minimum payment.

The President also declared in introducing his Family Assistance Plan to the Nation that the new program—by supplementing the income of the working poor—would increase the incentive to work of welfare recipients. The President also spoke of providing those on welfare with "a chance to qualify not just for any job, but for good jobs, that provide both additional self-respect and full self-support." "The cold hard truth," continued Mr. Nixon in August, 1969, "is that a child born to a poor family has less chance to make a good living than a child born to a middle-income family." We find it impossible to square these statements with the callous pronouncements made by the President since then. "Let us recognize once and for all in America that any work is preferable to welfare," said the President to the Congress on September 9, 1971. "There is as much dignity in scrubbing floors or emptying bedpans as there is in any other work to be done in this country, including my own," Mr. Nixon told the Republican Governors Conference on April 19, 1971. Such statements may find favor with the right wing of the Republican Party, but they must be condemned for the political demagoguery and the lack of human concern that they represent.

In formulating the sections of H.R. 1 dealing with employment opportunities, the Ways and Means Committee has followed the President down a path that is not lighted by the realities of the situation. The Administration has estimated that 2.6 million families would contain persons required to register for employment services under the Bill. Yet H.R. 1 authorizes 412,000 training and job placement slots, 200,000 public service employment slots, and 187,000 places under the existing AFDC Work Incentive Program—a combined total of 799,000 positions, 1.8 million less than are needed. Under the President's original proposal, welfare recipients were compelled to participate only in "suitable" employment and manpower services programs, but recipients are unable to challenge the suitability of such programs under H.R. 1. At present the lack of adequate child care facilities is considered an adequate basis for a mother to refuse to participate in a manpower program. H.R. 1 does not specify that that practice will continue under the Family Assistance Plan.

H.R. 1 is also a nightmare of questionable provisions that have already been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court or that do away with safeguards that are presently part of welfare law or practice. States are authorized to reimpose the residency requirements that were overturned by the Court in *Shapiro vs. Thompson*. Hearing procedures need no longer conform with many of the present regulations regarding due process. There is no provision in the Bill guaranteeing a recipient's right to receive benefits pending a hearing—in violation of the Supreme Court's decision in *Goldberg vs. Kelly*.

Although the President stated his intention to replace "demeaning and costly" investigations of welfare recipients with simplified reviews and spot checks when he first introduced his welfare reform, H.R. 1 compels recipients to reapply for benefits every two years. The President has said nothing about this inconsistency. Rather he has encouraged the thinking among many that such checks are needed to prevent wholesale welfare fraud. Mr. Nixon knows that such thinking is unfounded, for his message to the Senate on welfare this past March, he cited state quality control surveys indicating that less than 5% of welfare recipients were ineligible for the funds they were receiving.

H.R. 1 would also require mothers to seek work once their children became three, instead of six, as is the case under current law. HEW Under Secretary John Veneman has

revealed the President's opposition to this provision. However, Mr. Nixon has failed to address this point with the zeal or the concern that he displayed in vetoing the comprehensive child care Bill because of what he considered the family-weakening implications in that legislation. We cannot comprehend why the President's legitimate concern for the family apparently does not extend to the mother of a four-year old child who would be forced to work without any provision being made for the adequate care of her child.

It was because of these harmful and inequitable provisions that the Congressional Black Caucus voted last June to strike Title IV, the section containing the Family Assistance Plan, from H.R. 1, and falling in that, opposed the entire bill on final passage. We were not alone in expressing our disgust with the provisions of H.R. 1. Whereas the Family Assistance Plan had passed the House by a margin of 88 votes in 1970, that figure was nearly cut in half on the decisive vote to strike Title IV last June. The legislation might even have gone down to defeat had many of our liberal colleagues who shared our reservations about Title IV had not accepted the argument offered by some that we could expect the Senate not only to remove these harmful provisions from the bill but to extend the scope and quality of coverage under the legislation.

Instead of adhering to that rosy scenario, the Senate Finance Committee, in its actions on the welfare bill, has expanded upon the faulty foundations first erected in H.R. 1. The Long plan does not even guarantee the existence nationwide of a minimum benefit of \$2,400—the level of the inadequate floor established under a family's income in H.R. 1. A family of four in the state of Mississippi could still be forced to exist on \$60 a month under this regressive legislation. By prohibiting federal administration of welfare services, the Finance Committee bill guarantees that the discriminatory and inhumane treatment of welfare recipients will continue unabated in those states where it has been practiced so frequently in the past.

The provision in this legislation which has justly received the most attention has been the creation of the Federal Employment Corporation as part of the Guaranteed Jobs Opportunities Program. Under this forced work program, American citizens would be required to take jobs for which their total weekly wage would be \$60.00—below that which they would earn at the federally established minimum wage. Such a program is not only counter to constitutional and other safeguards against involuntary servitude and peonage, but it totally ignores the real situation in relation to the employment capabilities of welfare recipients. If work were available—which it certainly is not at this moment—only 5% of those individuals currently receiving welfare benefits would be considered employable, according to figures prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Finance Committee bill is even more punitive than is H.R. 1, by cutting off benefits to mothers of school age children, whether they are able to find employment or not. The Senate bill also fails to make provision for the training of welfare recipients so that they will become equipped to obtain higher-paying jobs. We strongly support efforts to secure jobs for all able-bodied Americans and have backed legislation to that effect, but we must reject demagogic and reactionary attempts to force people to take jobs at inadequate wage levels and in violation of their constitutional rights.

We all recognize the urgent need for reform of our welfare system. But any change is not necessarily improvement. The Congress must not pass legislation bearing the title of welfare reform so that it can claim to have done something constructive in the area of welfare when in reality it has not.

Now that the President has destroyed any chance for a major reform bill passing the Congress this year, the Congressional Black Caucus must join the Urban League, the Friends Committee on National Legislation, and the National Council of Churches, among other groups, in calling for the adoption of the following stop-gap measures.

- (1) Full federal administration of welfare.
- (2) The setting of a federal floor at \$2,400—to be increased as soon as possible.
- (3) Hold harmless on recipient benefits as of December 31, 1970.
- (4) State fiscal relief.
- (5) Amend Talmadge amendment to set a career profile for recipients referred to jobs or job training.
- (6) Amend Talmadge amendment to set minimum child care standards.
- (7) Make the AFDC-U program for families with unemployed fathers mandatory in all 50 states. Only 23 states are currently in the program.

President Nixon knows that Title IV of H.R. 1 lacks the support needed for it to pass the Senate. A study by the League of Women Voters has indicated that as few as seven Senators favor the House-passed bill. Certainly a bill with such limited backing falls far short of occupying the "middle position" on this issue. The overwhelming majority of the Senate has rejected this regressive legislation and rightly so.

Despite such evidence to the contrary, President Nixon will undoubtedly continue in his effort to paint this bill as a moderate proposal deserving of broad support. We have been exposed to such sham before. We have been told before that we were seeking too much. We have been told before that we should accept a compromise that has been presented to us.

We could not then, nor can we today, compromise on that to which we are entitled as American citizens. We cannot accept what is termed the only viable alternative available but is in fact the condemnation of millions of Americans—especially children—to a continued existence of want and need.

We urge the Senate to reject H.R. 1 or any vain attempt to improve it by a compromise that will be undone in the conference committee. We urge the Senate instead to enact into law those measures noted above which would bring us a small step forward in welfare reform instead of a reactionary step backwards.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am unrecorded on several rollcall votes this session and wish to state my position for the Record:

On rollcall No. 151, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 152, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 183, I would have voted "nay."

On rollcall No. 196, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 207, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 208, I would have voted "yea."

FORCED BUSING TO ACHIEVE RACIAL BALANCE

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

minute, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to note the resolve of the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee (Mr. COLMER) in pressing for action on the legislation to prohibit forced busing to achieve racial balance in our public schools.

Forced busing is a major issue in many sections of the country, and it most certainly is one of primary importance to several of the metropolitan communities in Tennessee, including the city of Chattanooga where a tremendous investment in transportation equipment must be made before any busing decree can be carried out.

One of the major faults of the higher education bill was the modified provision on busing which differed from the strong stand the House conferees were instructed to insist upon. President Nixon took special note of this failure when he signed the higher education bill into law. He called upon the Congress to take separate action on the legislation he sent to the Hill for the purpose of drawing up new uniform national desegregation standards for all school districts.

We have his bill and we have the constitutional amendment which many of us favor as being the most effective way to resolve this issue. I certainly support the chairman of the Rules Committee in any move he makes to bring this legislation to the House floor while there is an opportunity to act on it during this session. He has worked closely with my colleagues and me in this joint effort to correct the inequities caused by forced busing.

ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I recently had occasion to address the 75th Jubilee Conference of the Zionist Organization of America in Chicago. At that meeting, I discussed the continuing need of Jews to remain vigilant in the defense of the sovereignty of the State of Israel. American Zionists struggled for many years in behalf of the creation of a Jewish state. Many who labored in that effort gave up their concerns after the emergence of the State of Israel.

Zionist anxiety today centers around threats to the continued survival of Israel in the face of an unprecedented threat to its existence posed first by the Soviet Union and second by the Arab clients of the U.S.S.R.

Nation states have come and gone. Such names as Latvia, Lithuania, or Estonia once identified nation states. Today, most young people cannot identify these names and even older Americans have forgotten the circumstances underlying the demise of these once proud, once independent states.

It is, perhaps, easy to be indifferent to the demise of small nations if one has no immediate interest in the nation's suffering such a fate. Zionists, under-

standably, do not have such an indifference over the fate of Israel. But all thoughtful, freedom-loving people should maintain an active interest in the survival of nations threatened with extermination by Communist aggression.

No nation—large or small—is exempt from the imperialist ambitions of the dictators in the Kremlin. Americans should bear this in mind. As Herman Weisman, president of the Zionist Organization of America, so incisively stated:

If the United States Government has given credits to Israel, it is because the United States Government recognizes that Israel is the de facto ally of the U.S. in the Middle East and is doing a job for the U.S. in that area.

As the Zionists met in Chicago, the situation in the Middle East remained a precarious one, with Israel's future security more in doubt than at any time since its successful fight for independence. This has resulted from a combination of Soviet military and diplomatic advances, the danger of a new American isolationism and cutback in defense spending, and in international radical assault not only upon the integrity of Israel but upon Judaism and the Jewish people as well.

In a speech by Soviet Premier Kosygin on February 11, 1972, the posture of the Soviet Union in the Middle East came out strikingly at variance with the "peaceful-coexistence" formula presented at other times and other places.

An Iraqi delegation had suddenly arrived in Moscow the day before, 6 days after the departure of Egyptian President Anwar Sadat. At the luncheon given in its honor the day after its arrival, Kosygin began his speech by saying that the Soviet Government attached great importance to the visit of the party and government delegation from Iraq.

"The Middle East," he said:

Is one of the parts of the world where the forces of progress are waging a ceaseless struggle against the forces of reaction and imperialism. The imperialists are doing everything in their power to hold on to their positions in that area and to undermine the progressive regimes in the Arab states.

He continued to note that:

Some people in Israel and the United States presume that in the present situation the Arab peoples will in the final analysis reconcile themselves to the occupation of their territories. Such hopes are devoid of any foundation. . . . The Soviet Union is giving its Arab friends all-out political and economic support and effective assistance in strengthening their defense capacity so as to enable them to administer a fitting rebuff to the imperialist intrigues in the Middle East.

In that same month, February, 1972, Marshal Andrei Grechko left Moscow for visits with the leaders of the Somali Democratic Republic, which is situated opposite Aden and alongside the Straits of Perim, forming the entry into the Red Sea from the Indian Ocean. His talks, it was stated, resulted in "complete mutual understanding on the question of Soviet-Somali military cooperation and its further development." Grechko then went on to Cairo.

At this same time, another Soviet delegation visited Syria. Ten days after signing a communique in Damascus pledging "development of economic cooperation . . . and . . . assistance in strengthening the defense potential of the Syrian Arab Republic" on March 7, the Baathist leaders announced that a "Syrian National Progressive Front" had been formed.

This front comprised all major political parties, including the Communists. Under article 1 of its declaration it is charged with "the liberation of the Arab Territory occupied after June 5, 1967." The future policy of the Front is spelled out in great detail in article 6.

This article reasserts the Palestinian Arab people's inalienable national rights to its territory. This clause stated that:

There will be no peace nor negotiation with the Zionist state and no relinquishment of any part of the occupied Arab territories.

It continues to give complete support to the Palestinian Resistance, to protect it against attacks and "to give it freedom of movement." It declares that:

World Zionism and its protegee Israel is the foremost and direct enemy of our Arab nation. The main conflict is between our nation on the one hand, and Zionism, Israel and world imperialism headed by the United States on the other.

The Front then names the Soviet Union as the nation which provides "every kind of military, economic and political support."

Discussing recent Soviet moves in this area, Jon Kimche, former editor of the *New Middle East* and now editor of *Eastern Questions*, writes that:

For the first time, the Soviet Union has been seeking to ensure for itself a degree of direct rule in the Arab countries. In Egypt, this has been developed through introduction of some 500 officials of the GRU (military intelligence) and the KGB security services into the Egyptian administration. The ultimate objective in Cairo—as in Damascus and Baghdad—is clearly to establish a government which provides the Soviets with direct access through the Communist parties or other groups working closely with the Soviet Union.

The purpose of these Soviet machinations, states Mr. Kimche:

Is to change the balance of political and military power in the Middle East and the Mediterranean despite the new arrangements between the United States and Israel and despite the presence of the U.S. Sixth Fleet and NATO in the Mediterranean. It is the most ambitious and dramatic initiative which the Soviet Union has undertaken in the Middle East.

It is ironic indeed that the Soviet Union is expressing its desire for "peaceful coexistence" and an "era of negotiation" in its talks with Western leaders, and in its advocacy of a security conference to consider the future of relations between East and West Europe, while it has supported the most uncompromising and hostile forces in the Arab World. This, however, is nothing new for world communism. "Peaceful coexistence," according to Communist terminology, is simply another means of waging war.

In his important volume, "Deceitful Peace," Prof. Gerhart Niemeyer of the

University of Notre Dame, points out that:

When the Communists speak of coexistence they are sincere in the sense that this is a relationship they have decided to accept. To be more specific, if the Communist Party of a country declares that it wants to run its own candidates for parliamentary election one should not assume that their sole purpose is to get into the building in order to blow it up—the writings and authoritative speeches of Communists again and again exhort the party to be ready for abrupt switches of methods, which may mean from overt clash of force to peaceful coexistence, but also the reverse.

In this sense, the Soviet Union is pursuing a policy of "coexistence" toward the United States and the West, but a policy of confrontation with Israel, in the hope thereby to divide Israel from its traditional allies.

Professor Niemeyer declares that the new policy being pursued by the Soviet Union has at least three targets:

The first is the dismantlement of all Western resistance to the Soviet Union, and liquidation of "anti-Communism" or the assumption that Communism is a worldwide threat. Secondly, "radical reforms" mean broad and massive nationalization of industries, banks, and other key economic positions.

Thirdly, something called "broad democracy" is desired, i.e., official and flexible permissiveness for all kinds of protest movements and leftist political mass organizations.

Anyone looking at America's political scene today can see how well world communism is doing in fulfilling the goals of its strategy. How many national political figures today call for a foreign policy based on something different from the alleged "adolescence" of anticommunism? How many now urge increased trade with Communist countries, and how many urge dramatic cuts in our own defense spending?

It is unfortunate, but true, that Israel, which occupies one of the battlefronts of today's conflict with world communism, would be clearly victimized were such policies ever to be enacted by the United States. This, in large measure, is what the Soviet Union is counting on when it encourages Arab radicalism and intransigence. It believes that there is no need to compromise, for by waiting long enough the West will retire from its commitments, and Israel will remain exposed, thereby leading the way to a Soviet dominated Middle East. This, of course, is exactly the same strategy being posed by world communism with regard to the war in Vietnam.

It is important to remember that the political and diplomatic advances of the Soviet Union in this area are matched with important military advances.

In the 10 years before 1967, Moscow armed Arab States at a cost of \$2.5 billion. Since the Israeli victory in the 1967 war, it has replaced the lost arms of the Arab States at a cost of more than \$5 billion, and has sent thousands of military experts to Egypt and hundreds to Syria. It is estimated today that there are 15,000 uniformed Soviet personnel in Egypt and an additional 1,500 advisers in the Sudan.

Simultaneously, Russia has increased its Mediterranean Fleet from 40 to at least 50 ships, has warmed up its courtship of Turkey, and offered commercial opportunities to Britain, Italy, and Germany. The immediate aims are the reopening of the Suez Canal, Israel's retreat to the 1967 frontier, Soviet participation in all decisions concerning the Mediterranean, dominance of the Middle East oil areas upon which both Western Europe and Japan are dependent.

While the United States Navy has yet to develop an effective surface to surface missile, and has fallen behind in the whole technology of modern guns and gunnery, the Soviet Union holds at least a 10-year lead in seaborne missiles designed to sink other ships. The existence of Russian missiles aboard the new *Kynnda* and *Kresta* classes of destroyers prompted Secretary of the Navy John Chafee to predict that our own aging 6th Fleet would have only a 45-percent chance of survival in a fight against the Russian Mediterranean Fleet.

That our position in the Mediterranean is in a serious state of decline is beyond question. In an important report in the July 19, 1971, issue of *Newsweek* magazine, Senior Editor Arnaud De Borchgrave stated that:

There is no question in my mind that the Russians see America's loss of taste for international leadership as the opportunity to become the dominant power in the Mediterranean and, ultimately, in the entire Eurasian land mass and adjacent oceans.

Looking forward to the possible "Finlandization" of all of Western Europe, Mr. De Borchgrave points out that:

With the proliferation of Soviet power in the Mediterranean and along Europe's oil supply routes, Moscow hopes to discourage a separate European defense effort as futile, thereby encouraging a trend toward West European neutralism.

Looking to the future, and aware of the danger of the growing neoisolationism in the United States, not only among the New Left but even among more allegedly responsible spokesmen, Mr. De Borchgrave notes that:

The combination of neoisolationism in the U.S. and neutralism in Europe could be the mix that removes the Sixth Fleet from the Mediterranean without a shot being fired.

It is this danger of a new American isolationism which threatens to leave Israel exposed before its enemies. Historically, it is not unusual that an attack upon the military and upon our world commitments would come at this time. In this respect, the advocates of the so-called "new politics," are not being very new at all.

In the 1930's, for example, President Franklin Roosevelt attributed World War I to the "mad race in armaments" which had preceded it, and in turn attributed the armaments race to "the uncontrolled activities of the manufacturers and merchants of engines or destruction."

Prior to World War II, the Nye Committee investigated the so-called merchants of death who, as a result of armaments, had allegedly drawn us into World War I. The result was virtual American disarmament, leaving the

Nation helpless just prior to Munich and exposed at Pearl Harbor.

In 1945, General George Marshall wrote:

We finish each bloody war with a feeling of acute revulsion against the savage form of human behavior, and yet on each occasion we confuse military preparedness with the causes of war and then drift deliberately into another catastrophe.

Today there are calls for the withdrawal of American troops from Europe, for a cut in our defense spending, and for disengagement from our commitments in the world—and such a call cannot be expected to leave our commitment to Israel any more intact than it does our commitments to other allies.

This development represents part of the West in international affairs. In a powerful and affirmative call for a true challenge to communism, Charles Malik, former president of the General Assembly and the Security Council of the United Nations, stated that we were yet to hear—

One Western leader who, assured to his face that he is doomed and will be "buried" can muster enough courage and conviction, if not to use the vulgar phrase "bury" with respect to Communism itself, at least to use some such civilized expression as that the days of Communism will one day be completely forgotten. Mr. Malik stated that the Communists should be answered, not apologetically, not as though they were right, but in terms taking them completely off their guard. They should be answered in human, moral and spiritual terms.

It is essential that America not repeat the isolationism of the thirties which blinded us to the dangers of Hitler. Without an American commitment to depend upon, the security of all of our allies would indeed be in jeopardy.

Yet, it is not popular at this time to speak of Communist aggression, or to call attention to Soviet activities.

An American reporter recently asked Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban about his charges against the Soviet Union. He said that Mr. Eban sounded as if he wanted to "restart" the cold war.

Fortunately, Abba Eban responded with his usual eloquence and declared that the question was simply one of understanding what the Soviet role really is. He stated:

The Soviet role is provocative of war and hostile to peace, one-sided rearmament of the Arab States, blind identification with Arab demands, a very provocative penetration of the Mediterranean in order to change the international equilibrium.

He went on to point out that:

Since that is our view of the Soviet role, since Soviet policy lies at the root of the 1967 war and the inability to get peace ever since, then we ought to say so. I don't want a Cold War. I would like to see East-West cooperation, but you don't get cooperation by pretending that it exists when it does not exist. I'm against a wish-fulfillment approach. In the Middle East—the Soviet Union is acting against the interests of peace, stability and equilibrium.

It is impossible to divorce the Soviet Union's hostility to Israel from the policy of anti-Semitism which has infected that government ever since the Revolution of 1917.

Soviet hostility to Israel is matched at home by a campaign of repression against Soviet citizens of the Jewish faith that can only be described as a policy of cultural and spiritual genocide.

Judaism in the U.S.S.R. is subject to unique discrimination. Jewish congregations are not permitted to organize a nationwide federation or any other central organization. Judaism is permitted no publication facilities, and no Hebrew Bible has been published for Jews since 1917, nor is a Russian translation of the Jewish version of the Old Testament allowed.

The study of Hebrew, even for religious purposes, has been outlawed and the production of religious objects, such as prayer shawls, is prohibited. The number of Jews in the Soviet Union is close to 3 million of whom at least 1 million have been estimated as believers. No new rabbis are now being trained and the average age of rabbis is over 70. There are approximately 60 synagogues and rabbis at this time, or one synagogue and rabbi for every 16,000 believers. Little hope remains for a continuation of Jewish religious life in the Soviet Union.

In recent days there has been a great deal of discussion about the alleged "liberalization" of life in the Soviet Union. Many clergymen, for example, have expressed the view that religion and communism are, in fact, compatible and that past misunderstandings may have been based upon ignorance rather than truth. Carrying this new philosophy into action we have found a religious activism which holds that capitalism and not communism may be the enemy.

Yet, a recently published volume, "Aspects of Religion in the Soviet Union, 1917-1967," reminds us of the fact that ever since the Russian Revolution of 1917, religion has been held in disrepute in the Soviet Union and from that time forward the most strenuous efforts have been made by the Soviet Government to eliminate it.

In 1925, for example, the League of Militant Atheists was formed in the Soviet Union to publish and spread anti-religious material and, like the government's economic plan, an atheistic 5-year plan was launched in 1927 and again in 1932. The program aimed at the complete disappearance of God's name from the U.S.S.R. by 1937. In the late 1930's the league was reported to have 3.5 million members.

The much heralded decree on the separation of church and state and of school and church of January 23, 1918, was not aimed at religious freedom or tolerance but at the undermining of the very existence of religion. The clergymen of all faiths were deprived of voting rights and were considered obscuring and enemies of the people—not engaged in work. By order of Lenin, the All Russian Extraordinary Committee for the Suppression of 1918 and during the first 3 years of Communist rule thousands of clergy were victims of Soviet terror.

According to official Soviet data, 423 churches were closed and 322 destroyed in the first half of 1929, and 1,440 churches were closed by year's end. Synagogues were converted into clubs, Buddhist

monasteries were closed, Moslem mosques were converted into atheist museums and the printing of the Koran was prohibited.

No one who studies this record will suffer under my further illusions about communism.

In the essay, "The Communist Party and Soviet Jewry," Zvi Gitelman, professor of political science at the University of Michigan, discusses one of the more bizarre aspects of the campaign against the Jewish religion: the trials.

On Rosh Hashana, 1921, the Jewish section of the Communist Party in Kiev "tried" the Jewish religion in the same auditorium, ironically, where the Bellis trial, highlighted in the recent novel, "The Fixer," had been held. According to a non-Communist source, a weird cast of characters appeared before the "Judges:" a lady dressed in old-fashioned clothes explained that she sent her children to religious school because, she proclaimed haughtily, she was no "low-class tailor or cobbler" but of a "distinguished religious family."

This was submitted as evidence that the Jewish religion was a creature of the bourgeoisie. A "rabbi" testified that he taught religion in order to keep the masses ignorant and servile. When someone in the audience accused him of being a "lying ignoramus," stormy applause broke out, according to a stenographic report. The culprit in the audience was immediately arrested. After further testimony by a corpulent woman bedecked with glittering gold and diamond rings, the Communist "prosecutor" summarized "the case against the Jewish religion" and asked for a "sentence of death for the Jewish religion."

The "Judges" retired to their chambers and returned with a verdict of death to the Jewish religion. Professor Gitelman reports that a similar trial—this time of the kheder, or religious school, took place in Vitebsk. The yeshiva was tried in Rostov, and circumstances was "put on trial" in Kharkov in 1928.

In 1924 a "Red Haggadah" was read which substituted the deliverance from Czarist rule for the deliverance from Pharaoh's oppression. Following the example of the Living Church—the Communist dominated effort at using religion to serve political purposes—the state tried to set up a "Living Synagogue" in 1964. "Communism is the Mosaic Torah translated by Lenin into the Bolshevik tongue," one of its founders declared.

The "Living Synagogue," however, died a quick death and Professor Gitelman estimates that of the 1,000 rabbis in the U.S.S.R. only six are known to have had pro-Communist sympathies. In 1922-23 alone over 1,000 religious schools were closed.

Things have not changed since that early period. Despite repeated statements to the effect that conditions since Stalin have improved in the Soviet Union with regard to Jews, the facts do not bear this out. B'nai B'rith, in a documented analysis of textbooks used in Soviet schools, accused Moscow of "systematically excising history" in an attempt to make the Jew a "nonperson."

Findings of the study said that Jews "are rarely mentioned and their culture ignored" in basic history textbooks used by the Soviet educational system.

The sixth edition of "Recent History," published in 1967 as a ninth grade teaching manual, makes no mention of anti-Semitic persecution in recounting the history of the Nazi regime from 1933 to 1939. The same book, discussing Nazi death camps, says that "in 1933-34, 100,000 Communists were thrown into prison and into especially established concentration camps" but makes no mention that Jews were victims.

A chronology in a 10th grade textbook listing nations newly independent since World War II omits reference to Israel, although such countries as Algeria and the United Arab Republic are treated in separate sections.

The Great Soviet Encyclopedia has adopted the same tactic of exclusion. In contrast to the 1932 edition which dealt with Jewish history and culture in 117 pages, the second edition, published in 1952, has but two pages devoted to Jews. Virtually all Jewish history is deleted. B'nai B'rith declared:

The inevitable result is that the students are denied a positive image of the Jews.

Soviet anti-Semitism has accelerated in recent days. The persecution suffered by Soviet intellectuals, for example, is particularly poignant in the case of Jewish intellectuals in the Soviet Union. Jews, in fact, lack the "privileges" that other Soviet minorities are permitted.

Other minorities, such as the Ukrainians and Armenians, have their own provinces where they can speak their language and exercise a degree of cultural autonomy. The Jew is forbidden his own schools, and he cannot learn Hebrew or Yiddish in the public schools. They are not taught. Since the 1940's, the Hebrew and Yiddish theater has been almost completely closed down. The only Yiddish periodical that is allowed to be published is a monthly journal edited by a Communist Party functionary. The so-called Jewish Autonomous Region of Birobidzhan, which Stalin established as a showplace in Siberia, has only 30,000 Jews in a population of 163,000.

The Jew in the Soviet Union is also handicapped by a strict quota system in universities and higher training schools. Jews may make up only 3 percent of the total, and while that figure is twice as high as the Jewish percentage of the Soviet population, it is nonetheless impossible for many highly qualified young Jews to receive higher education.

One of the vehicles through which anti-Semitism has been carried to the people of the Soviet Union is through the written word. In 1970, for example, two novels by Ivan Shevtsov, published one month apart, show how the Soviet regime is exploring the uses of fiction in promoting anti-Semitism reminiscent of Nazi Germany.

Shevtsov's novel, "In the Name of the Father and the Son," was published in March 1970. A first edition of 65,000 was exhausted within a few days. The book equates Zionism with nazism, plays on the same themes as the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion," and updates them.

Zionism, a leading character observes: Moves under cover, covertly infiltrating all the life cells of the countries of the entire world, undermining from within all that is strong, healthy and patriotic—grasping all the important administrative, economic and spiritual life of a given country.

As evidence of Zionist penetration of even the Communist Party, Shevtsov's character points to "Judas-Trotsky (Bronstein)" as "a typical agent of Zionism" and "intellectual provocateur number one."

Characteristic of Shevtsov's "updating" of myths is the following:

You undoubtedly think that international Zionism is in the service of American imperialism. The opposite is true. American imperialism is the economic and military basis of Zionism. It serves the aims of Zion.

Shevtsov's second novel, "Love and Hate," was published in April 1970 in an edition of 200,000 copies by the Ministry of Defense—a formidable and official imprimatur.

Its arch-villain is Nahum Holtzer, a pervert, sadist, drug peddler, rapist, who kills his own mother, disembowels her and wraps her intestines around her head. A delicate, beautiful Russian teenage girl ends up in similar condition after Holtzer corrupts her by introducing her to hashish and raping her.

The book depicts two other Jews in equally savage fashion. Jacques Sidney Davey, a Western journalist, with whom Holtzer has close connections, and Samuel Peltzig, an American professor of literature, are drug peddlers. Holtzer smuggles both drugs and Zionist literature into Russia.

When Ekaterina Furtseva, Soviet Minister of Culture, was asked at a press conference in April whether the Shevtsov novels did not contradict the best traditions of Soviet literature, she replied that literary standards are a "matter of taste" and that Shevtsov was an accepted member of the Soviet literary fraternity.

This is the level of Soviet intellectual life today. The novels of Shevtsov are published by the Soviet Government with an official imprimatur. The novels of a Solzhenitsyn are banned. The ancient Russian anti-Semitism continues.

Jews in the Soviet Union have become virtual captives, not able to practice their religion, and not able to emigrate. One Soviet Jew who did manage to leave, Lyuba Bershadskaya, describes the scene at her departure:

The day I left Moscow to go to Israel, 200 people came to the airport to say goodbye. They already considered me a free person. They trusted me, they could say anything. People kept calling out: "Lyuba, tell Nixon, tell U Thant, tell Nixon."

Those who advance the idea that the Soviet Union is no longer a tyrannical dictatorship, that it no longer has aggressive designs in the world, that its goal has ceased to be the destruction of the nations of the free world, are living under an illusion. The facts clearly demonstrate that the opposite is true.

Israel and the Jewish people are under attack not only from the Soviet Union itself but also from the New Left in West-

ern countries and from the Communist regime in Peking.

It has long been known that Arab guerrillas were receiving training under the tutelage of the Chinese Communists and their allies. Recent tragic events in Tel Aviv's Lod International Airport provide another example of this attack.

On May 20, three gunmen armed with automatic rifles and handgrenades attacked a crowd of 300 people at Lod Airport, spraying them with bullets and flinging five grenades in their midst. The floors of the airport's customs hall were splattered with the limbs of dismembered bodies and pools of blood, shattered glass and broken doors. The walls were pockmarked with bullet holes. Some 25 people, 14 of whom were pilgrims from the United States, died in the bloodbath, and 76 were among the injured.

The background of the three Japanese gunmen is interesting indeed. Newsweek magazine noted that:

A little more than two years ago, nine sword-wielding Japanese radicals hijacked an airliner to North Korea and, in the ensuing publicity, became overnight folk heroes to millions of their countrymen. In the months that followed, however, the romanticized "samurai" image of the group, the Rengo Sekigun (United Red Army), began to tarnish as its Japan-based members carried out a series of brutal fire-bombings and assassinations of police officials. That was bad enough. But what no one suspected was that the original band of skyjackers had been plotting the United Red Army's biggest coup of all. In the North Korean capital of Pyongyang, the young terrorists made contact with fanatical members of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine and began to plan last week's massacre at Lydda Airport.

Police officials in Japan and in the Middle East have pieced together an outline of their relationship. Shortly after the Japanese arrived in Pyongyang, they met George Habash, the leader of the Popular Front. Several of the Japanese traveled to Jordan for guerrilla training while Kozo Okamoto, a brother of one of the Pyongyang hijackers, volunteered as a Popular Front partisan and flew halfway around the world to link up with two of his colleagues who were training in Lebanon for their forthcoming suicidal attack—in which Okamoto was the only gunman who survived.

What brought about this coalition between Japanese leftists and Arab guerrillas? Newsweek provided this assessment:

One answer seemed to be frustration at home. In the wake of the United Red Army's wave of terrorism, Japanese police emasculated the group by arresting hundreds of its members. Setback followed setback for the radicals. In February, five of the group's leaders were captured after a nine-day police siege of their mountain hide-out. Thereafter, with the disclosure that fourteen young people had been tortured to death for deviating from the Red Army's revolutionary line, virtually all support for the extremists vanished in Japan.

The Chinese Communist involvement in fomenting such trouble has been significant, and it has been said that Soviet intransigence in the Middle East is at least partially explained by pressure being placed upon it by Peking. If the Soviet Union permitted a compromise settlement, the Chinese Communists would

then assume the mantle of revolutionary leadership.

Writing in Middle East Forum, David P. Forsythe declares that:

The reactivation of Chinese foreign policy after the cultural revolution presented the Russians with a number of theoretical and practical difficulties. Not only did the Chinese embarrass the Soviets by pointing out lack of Soviet support for their revolutionaries and other forms of "revisionism," but the Chinese directly supported such groups as Al-Fatah and PFLP with both small arms and money. And there is some evidence from both Russians and Western sources that the Chinese had a hand in fomenting the student and worker riots in the UAR during the Fall of 1968. Hence the Chinese seemed to be trying to undermine the Nasser-USSR axis as well as the Soviet-led effort to negotiate rather than fight.

The idea that the Chinese Communists might replace them as the preeminent power in the Arab world has caused the Russians to support and encourage the most radical Arab elements, and to discourage those in the Arab world who would be willing to negotiate a compromise peace settlement. The Chinese and Russians, in effect, are competing for the support of the world radical movement. The Sino-Soviet split which is often discussed in this country as a reason for being less concerned about communism is, in fact, a radicalizing influence. It makes the prospect of war even greater than a unified and controlled monolithic communism which we faced in the past.

The Soviet Union is rapidly becoming the most powerful military force in the Middle East. The Soviet Navy expanded operations in the Mediterranean from 650 ship-days in 1964 to 20,000 in 1970. Soviet forces do not operate alone, and since September 1969, the Soviets have periodically conducted limited naval exercises with the Egyptian and Syrian Navies, which have been supplied with a number of landing craft and coastal defense vessels. These maneuvers have provided potentially valuable experience for other types of naval undertakings.

Israel is, thus, the target. It is the target not only of its Arab enemies but also of world communism, both Russian and Chinese varieties, as well as the worldwide radical movement of the new left. And Israel is not alone. Judaism and the Jewish people are also targets, as is evident by the treatment received by both in the Soviet Union today.

POSTMASTER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES H. H. MORRIS RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, today, June 30, our old and good friend, Hap Morris, retires from his duties as Postmaster of the House of Representatives.

H. H. Morris was elected Postmaster on January 5, 1955, and thus will have served this House 17½ years upon his retirement.

The House, I observe, holds its employees in a kind of special regard, and this is certainly true in this instance. There is no more beloved figure anywhere on the Hill than Hap Morris.

His leaving us today breaks a chain of direct and continuous service to the Congress that reaches back more than 40 years. He went to work on the Hill on January 4, 1932, as an assistant to late Virgil Chapman, then a Member of the House, and later a U.S. Senator from Kentucky.

But 1932 is hardly the beginning of Mr. Morris' association with the Congress. His father, the late Joseph Watkins Morris, served in this House from 1923 to 1925. And prior to that the father had been secretary to the late Representative J. Campbell Cantrell from 1909 to 1923—the period during which Postmaster Morris was born.

So in actual fact, Hap Morris has been associated with the Congress—directly or indirectly—all of his life.

His service to the House has been performed efficiently and well. This is no small accomplishment, when we consider that the workload—and the volume of mail—has increased enormously during the last decade.

The Postmaster was born in Carrollton, Ky., in 1911, and is married to the former Miss Lyda Secrest of Shelbyville, Ky.

I understand that he is going to make his home in Lexington, Ky., after his retirement. I know he is going to be a busy fellow during the next few years, doing all of those things he has not had time to do as an employee of the House.

We all wish him well. And he knows, I am sure, that we are going to miss him here in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that other Members of the House have 5 days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the retirement of H. H. Morris.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, "Hap" Morris is retiring after 42 years of Government service; and while, like others here, I have a genuine sense of sadness in seeing him go, I join in wishing him the pleasurable retirement that such a good man deserves.

"Hap" Morris has served in the great tradition of the Postal Service. Neither wind, nor rain, nor hail, nor sleet, nor flood can stay him from the swift completion of his daily round of gin rummy encounters.

You know "Hap" Morris has been around a long time. And not too many people know this, but in his early days in the House he was a doorman. Also serving as a doorman at the same time was a fellow named Lyndon Baines Johnson. The two used to pal around together. One time they were out on a double date and things were going pretty good until the girls indicated they would like a hamburger. The two swains then discovered they did not have enough money between them to buy the girls hamburgers.

Those were pretty lean days.

We all know "Hap" Morris is a great sports fan. He has traveled the country attending some of the big sports events. I am sure he will have a chance to attend a lot more events now that he is retiring. But let me warn all Members—he is not retiring from betting. And he is as shrewd as ever.

"Hap" Morris came to Washington in 1932 under the aegis of the late Virgil Chapman and served on Mr. Chapman's staff both here and in the Senate. "Hap"

has served as Postmaster of the House for 17½ years, longer than any other man in the history of the House of Representatives. In all, he has served his Government for 42 years. It is a record of tremendous service for which he richly deserves the tributes paid him here today.

But with that service he has brought a warmth of spirit that has touched all of those who have come in contact with him over the years, and we will miss the cheerfulness of his countenance and the warmth of his greeting.

I hope he will come back and see us often.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is a special privilege for me to join in the tribute to my old and dear friend, our retiring Postmaster, "Hap" Morris.

In the annals of the House of Representatives it will be said of "Hap" Morris that his work was good, his heart was big, his thoughts were noble and his gin rummy was tolerable.

It is not true, as has been rumored, that "Hap" Morris was born in the Democratic cloakroom and raised on the folding room floor. He was born in Carrollton, Ky., and it is known that he was born in humble surroundings. His full Christian name is H. H. Morris. He never had a first name. His folks were too poor.

There is a story they tell in Kentucky of the time "Hap" and a friend were canoeing at midnight on the Kentucky River, which flows very swiftly. Neither of the friends could swim. But they decided to change canoes in the middle of the river—somehow managing to survive the experience.

When someone asked "Hap" later why they did it, he replied:

I don't know. But it seemed like a wonderful idea at the time.

When I came to the House of Representatives 31 years ago, "Hap" Morris was already a veteran here, having come in 1932 with the late Virgil Chapman. Later "Hap" went to the Senate side when Mr. Chapman was elected a Senator, but in time he came back to where the real folks are.

"Hap" Morris has a name he earned because he is a truly happy person who appreciates and enjoys life. That joy in life is contagious; he brings happiness wherever he goes. That is one reason why we are going to miss him here on the Hill.

He has given over 40 years of valuable service to the Congress and he should take great pride in that service. I join in commending him for his service and thanking him for his friendship.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues today in paying due honor and tribute to our great friend, the distinguished Postmaster of the House of Representatives, Hap Morris.

Hap Morris came to the House of Representatives in 1932 on patronage of the late Virgil M. Chapman, Representative and Senator from Kentucky. The only people I know that have been here longer than our friend Hap Morris are the gentlemen from New York and Texas, Mr. Celler and Mr. PATMAN.

Hap was elected Postmaster in January

1955 and has served the Members of the House with distinction.

Knowing Hap as I do, I am sure his feeling about retirement is the same as our former beloved colleague, Carl Vinson, who, upon retirement from this House, said:

I do not intend to rust away in my remaining years; I intend to wear out, little by little, day by day, as we all must.

With his energy and his enthusiasm for life, I know Hap will not rust away when he gets back to Kentucky. We will miss him, and he will miss us too, because the House has been his life for 40 years, and I know he will always remember the many friends he has here as we will remember him.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my friend H. H. Morris, Postmaster of the House of Representatives.

After many years of dedicated public service, Mr. Morris is retiring effective as of today. His first assignment in the House of Representatives was in the year 1932. At that time he received a recommendation for the position of Doorkeeper on the west lobby door. The Sixth Congressional District of Kentucky was represented by Virgil Chapman who was a very close friend of "Hap" Morris and Representative Chapman made the recommendation that secured the position of Doorkeeper. Two years later he was named assistant in charge of telephones on the Democratic side and in 1941 Representative Chapman selected him as his office secretary.

Mr. Morris remained as secretary to Representative Chapman until May 1949 when Mr. Chapman was elected to the U.S. Senate. He served as one of Senator Chapman's secretaries until May 1949 when he was named administrative assistant to the Clerk of the House of Representatives Ralph R. Roberts. In November 1951 following the death of Senator Chapman our friend "Hap" Morris served as administrative assistant to Senator Thomas R. Underwood who succeeded Senator Chapman in the Senate. In November of 1952 following the defeat of Senator Underwood, he served as secretary to the late John C. Watts, Representative of the Sixth Congressional District.

On January 5, 1955, he was elected Postmaster of the House of Representatives and has served from that time in this position.

I was sorry to hear that "Hap" Morris had decided to retire. He will be missed by every Member of the House and all of his associates and employees in the legislative branch of the Government. He was always cheerful, humble, and dedicated. He handled every assignment with honor, ability, and integrity.

Mr. Speaker, history will record the fact that "Hap" Morris was an outstanding public servant and one of the great Postmasters of the House of Representatives. I want to wish him and the members of his family the best of everything in the future.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of

the House may have 5 days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on the subject of my special order today.

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

There was no objection.

AN ADEQUATELY EQUIPPED MERCHANT MARINE IS THE WORK OF THE AMERICAN BUSINESSMAN

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, a primary key to America having an adequately equipped merchant marine is the American businessman.

Whenever possible, American factories should specify, or have their freight forwarders specify, "U.S.-flag ship" for the shipping of their imports and exports.

Why is this important?

Because cargo is the magic word with shipping lines that have to finance the construction of tankers and bulk carriers. By encouraging more cargo for American-flag merchant vessels, the businessman is ultimately encouraging the building of more merchant marine ships.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1970, which I cosponsored in the U.S. House of Representatives, called for the building of 30 merchant ships a year over a 10-year period in an effort to upgrade America's fleet and keep it up to par with the fleets of other countries.

The provision has been properly funded and President Nixon has supported the program with much vigor.

However, from preliminary reports, the shipbuilding program is bogging down at the private level. The shipping lines just are not ordering new ships. So far only 14 vessels have been ordered and only 13 have been converted. This is a far cry from 30 a year. I am told that contracts for an additional 16 ships will be let soon. But the point is that the number of ships ordered under the Merchant Marine Act of 1970 has been disappointing.

Apparently there is some feeling that cargo tonnage will not increase sufficiently to justify more ships. This attitude apparently has been prompted by an overabundance of tankers built following the Suez Canal shutdown and by the 1970 act itself which requires a certain amount of shipping time be spent at American ports for those vessels constructed with Federal funds from the program.

But it is my hope that the only problem in the final analysis is the normal delay in making plans for construction under the relatively new act. If I am wrong, then we may have to consider amending the law.

Congress is now attempting to find ways to generate more cargo on American merchant vessels. There is a bill in the House now (H.R. 12314) which will require 50 percent of all oil brought into this country to be imported on U.S.-flag ships. Other measures are being considered to increase the amount of cargo.

America is almost completely dependent on foreign merchant vessels for the importation of her oil, an important energy item. As a matter of fact, we haul only about 6 percent of all our cargo in our own ships. I think that is a deplorable situation.

Making the merchant marine a viable contributor to the commerce of our Nation is something for which I have worked some 8 years and something which President Nixon has supported since he has been in the White House. We must continue our efforts in our shipbuilding and rebuilding programs to provide the merchant marine with the means to perform its important tasks.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1970 was a real All-American Act. It called for building ships in American yards so that they could be sailed by American seamen. The whole idea was to haul more American goods.

Businessmen who specify "U.S.-flag ship" for their imports and exports will be helping their country as well as helping their own interests.

EDITOR CLARENCE D. ROBERTS RETIRES

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a career towering with achievement is something we all work for in ourselves and something we greatly admire in others.

Therefore, I would like to pay tribute to a man who has just ended such a career. He is Clarence D. Roberts, who has just retired as editor and assistant publisher of the Sun Chronicle in Attleboro, Mass., in my 10th Congressional District.

Mr. Roberts, known as "Robbie" to his fellow newsmen, thus completed 50 years as a journalist, 40 of them with the Sun Chronicle. Besides the enormous contributions he made during a half century as observer and chronicler of the world's triumphs and foibles, he specifically served his community, State, and Nation in appointive positions.

Mr. Speaker, no less can be said of Robbie than that he was a craftsman in a very demanding and explicit art. No more can be said of him than that he was a journalist in the very best sense of the word for 50 years.

I am sorry to see him go, but I wish him well in his retirement. Everyone whose life he touched is in his debt.

I submit from the Sun Chronicle of June 26 the front page story of his retirement and some editorial page comments from his colleagues:

"ROBBIE" RETIRES AS EDITOR: SUN CHRONICLE "VOICE" WRITES "30" TO 50-YEAR CAREER

ATTLEBORO.—Clarence D. Roberts has retired as editor and assistant to the publisher of The Sun Chronicle, climaxing 40 years of continuous service here and 50 years as a newspaper professional.

Roberts and his wife Lucille left this weekend for Hollywood, Fla., where they will establish residency. During the past several years they have lived in North Attleboro.

Roberts' duties at The Sun Chronicle will be shared by three of his associates. Gen. Mgr. Paul Rixon, Managing Editor Douglas

Reed, and William E. Hannan, who becomes editorial page editor.

Roberts will continue to serve The Sun Chronicle as an editorial consultant.

In connection with the staff realignment Robert Gusetti becomes state area editor; Oreste D'Arconte becomes local editor; and Henry Reilly III becomes editor of the Franklin Sentinel, a sister newspaper. D'Arconte was formerly editor at Franklin and Reilly was a staff member with The Sun Chronicle.

STARTED AS CORRESPONDENT

Roberts spent 46 years with The Sun Chronicle, and its predecessor, The Attleboro Sun. He was with the Greenfield newspaper for four years, as city editor of the Recorder in 1928 and as managing editor of the Recorder-Gazette in 1931.

His newspaper service started at Foxboro in 1922 as correspondent for the Attleboro Sun. He returned to the Sun in June 1933, and a few months later was named editor.

On Nov. 5, 1963 Publisher Guy DeVanny appointed Roberts assistant to the publisher and editor.

Commenting editorially today on the retirement, Publisher DeVanny described Roberts as a man with "total dedication, total selflessness, total devotion, total loyalty." The editorial continues . . . the Attleboro Sun was Robbie, The Sun Chronicle is Robbie. The Sun Chronicle will always be Robbie. So long as it exists, he lives with it."

Other commentary on Roberts' association with this newspaper has been written by Hannan and Gusetti for publication on today's editorial page.

In his message to the staff Roberts said, "I leave The Sun Chronicle with wonderful tokens of your esteem, but I also leave with the best possible experience—the life of a newspaperman."

His experiences span the era when news reports were first transmitted by the wireless teletype to an age when news is being set into type by laser beams.

Early in the 1930s, Roberts participated in an experiment in which the International Newspaper Service transmitted news over wireless-operated teletype to a newspaper for the first time in the United States.

CHARTER MEMBER

Roberts was a member of the original Associated Press Managing Editors Association and served on its executive committee in 1940. He was chairman of the New England Associated Press members in the same year, and in 1952 he was elected as a member of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. He also held memberships in the New England Associated Press News Executives Association, Sigma Delta Chi, journalism fraternity, and the Elks.

Under Robert's editorship, the circulation of this newspaper grew from 5,600 to 18,000. During this period, he also edited two anniversary editions: the 50th in 1930 and the 112-page Pride in Progress 75th anniversary in 1964.

Throughout most of his career, he also wrote under the name of Delmont Rogers. Most recently, he signed the editorial page feature, "Today's Theme," with that name. Delmont is his middle name.

COMMUNITY SERVICE

Besides his newspaper activities, Roberts also served the community in several capacities.

He was a member of the Six-Year Planning Committee under Mayors John W. McIntyre and Francis J. O'Neill; a member of the Zoning Board of Appeal from 1942 to 1957; and in 1950, the then Gov. Paul A. Dever named him a trustee of the Bristol County Hospital and he was reappointed by every governor thereafter until the hospital was abolished and the Bristol County Hospital District was dissolved in 1968.

CXVIII—1493—Part 18

In 1958, Gov. Foster Furcolo named Roberts to a legislative recess committee to make an investigation and study of the construction and maintenance of new facilities for the sitting of Superior and probate courts in Bristol County, and for a house of correction in Bristol County.

During the administration of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, Roberts was invited three times to the U.S. State Dept. of Foreign Policy Briefings conducted by Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

Public recognition of his newspaper and community service was given in 1968 by the Jaycees when they named him "Attleboro's Boss of the Year."

THERE WILL NEVER BE ANOTHER LIKE ROBBIE

(By Bill Hannan)

It would require more space to enumerate the qualities that we admire in Clarence D. Roberts than is available here. We first heard of Robbie as an editor who was helped to neophyte newspapermen. Later, we were to agree with the former pupil of Robbie's who said he learned more in a brief time under his guidance than he did in a much longer period with other teachers.

There are many newsmen throughout the country who owe their success in large measure to the training they received from the man who retired Friday after 39 years as editor of the Attleboro Sun and its successor the Sun Chronicle.

The training he gave was important but it was but one side of this talented and immensely likable man. He was a gentleman in the days when gentlemen were frequently encountered. He is a gentleman today when they are more rare.

Robbie is so shy and self-effacing that the Sun Chronicle family despaired of getting him to attend a farewell party. Instead, he was tricked into an informal but utterly sincere sendoff when he dropped in for the social part of the second annual Sun Chronicle Golf Tournament at Norton Country Club.

Robbie must have made enemies. No editor can avoid it. You are constantly meeting 1) People who want their name in the paper, 2) People who don't want their name in the paper. Often, your duty to your reader conflicts with one or both of these groups and you have made an enemy.

One thing seems certain. Robbie never made an enemy among the people who worked for him or with him. No one who knows him could dislike him.

Those of us who have known him for part of his tenure and have worked with him even for only a short span of that time feel as close to him as those who have known him since the early days.

When he calls occasionally from Florida, we hope he will say, "This is Robbie of the Sun." That cheerful, familiar voice will make that day, no matter what else happens, one of the better days of any year.

RECOLLECTIONS OF A FRIEND

(By Bob Gusetti)

Things just didn't seem right in the Sun Chronicle newsroom today . . . and for a good reason.

The man who daily for about 40 years was the captain of the former Attleboro Sun and now The Sun Chronicle news ship dropped anchor in another port starting today.

And as this column is being written, I have no idea what my other colleagues are planning to say elsewhere on this page about the man who quietly slipped away from his daily tasks last Friday with little fanfare, because that's the way he wanted it.

But I do have recollections of the man I had the pleasure of knowing and working with for the past several years, and I'd like

to share them with the many others who also had the privilege of calling him a friend.

If you could list the attributes of Clarence D. Roberts, chief among them was the fact that he was a man who could listen.

There aren't too many people these days who can do this.

But he was a listener, and that's one of the reasons why he built up a long list of friends.

For a number of years, you could count on several individuals coming into the newsroom and chatting with Robbie, telling him what they knew or heard was new around the city.

Robbie would sit there . . . and listen . . . and make mental notes, passing along the "tips" to the news staff members who often came up with exclusive stories which the paper wouldn't have had if Robbie hadn't been told first.

And if someone gave Robbie a bit of information late in the morning when it was obvious that he was aware of the situation hours before, he would never let on. The person always felt he was the first one to inform Robbie about the matter. That's another way he kept his news pipeline open and kept his finger on the "pulse" of the city.

But perhaps one of the most outstanding attributes which endeared Robbie to those who worked alongside him was his humbleness.

He was the Sun Chronicle editor, but he wasn't one to flaunt the privileges that go with the title.

As one fellow worker noted the other day, Robbie was never one to "pull rank" in the newsroom.

When a visitor would enter his glass enclosed office in the corner of the newsroom, Robbie would usually get out of his comfortable leather chair and sit on top of some rolled up newspapers tossed on a nearby chair. Robbie always insisted that his visitors get the best seat.

And only a few days ago when some Boston newspapers came in late, Robbie volunteered to pick them up at a downtown store. It didn't matter that it was raining at the time and someone else volunteered for the errand. He was like that.

Robbie was the editor but he was what is known in this business as a member of the "working press." When one of the news editors had a day off, Robbie would be there to carry out the news editing duties of the local page, or the area page, the sports pages or Page One.

And when he had a few minutes breathing space, Robbie would continue to process columns for the editorial page and write local editorials and the "Today's Theme" column.

There was also the mail to open, phones to answer, and the numerous personal visits and details that only Robbie could handle.

But today, that's all over. The last of Robbie's news "bulletins" have been posted in the Sun Chronicle windows on South Main Street.

Other "bulletins" will appear daily, but they'll lack the flavor Robbie could extract out of a story.

Robbie wanted no fanfare when he retired to Florida and those who worked with him respected his wishes.

He was a man this writer and many, many more were privileged to call a friend.

SEEKS TWO JUDICIAL DISTRICTS FOR MARYLAND

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the State of Maryland has one U.S. judicial district. That district was created almost

200 years ago in 1789. At that time, the State of Maryland had a population of a little over 300,000. The population of Maryland is now over 4 million. Maryland now has the third largest population of any single judicial district State in the country. Its population is larger than those of 10 of the multijudicial district States. It has within its borders two mushrooming metropolitan areas—Baltimore and suburban Washington. For example, my home county of Prince Georges increased 80 percent in population from 1960 to 1970.

The practice of Federal law in these two metropolitan areas differs in that litigation arising in the Washington metropolitan area of Maryland is by its nature more likely to be interstate than other parts of the country. Understandably, a tremendous number of cases involve diversity of citizenship situations. All of these factors result in an increase in the caseload. This, coupled with the fact that the Washington metropolitan area is the most populous and most rapidly growing area in Maryland, re-emphasizes the need for establishing U.S. judicial district which sits principally in the Maryland suburbs of the District of Columbia.

For these reasons, I have today introduced a bill, H.R. 15832, which would divide Maryland into two judicial districts, one sitting at Baltimore as at present and one sitting at Hyattsville.

The convenience afforded the legal profession, witnesses, and litigants by dividing Maryland into two judicial districts can be achieved with a minimum of administrative cost and effort. Under the provisions of this bill Maryland would be divided into the eastern and western districts of Maryland, approximately equal in geographical size and population.

The eastern district would include the counties of Worcester, Somerset, Wicomico, Dorchester, Talbot, Caroline, Queen Anne's, Kent, Cecil, Harford, Baltimore, and the city of Baltimore. The western district would be comprised of Garrett, Allegany, Washington, Frederick, Carroll, Howard, Montgomery, Anne Arundel, Prince Georges, Calvert, Charles, and St. Mary's Counties. Court would be held for the eastern district in Baltimore and for the western district in Hyattsville, Prince Georges County.

No additional judgeships would be created by the bill. Three incumbent judges would be designated for the eastern district and three others for the western district. The seventh incumbent judge would be a roving judge serving in both the eastern and western districts as needed.

An additional U.S. attorney, court clerk, and U.S. marshal would have to be appointed; and supporting personnel would have to be relocated.

There is every reason to believe that this cost would be offset by the savings in the more expeditious disposition of cases and the curtailment of traveling expenses of court personnel, attorneys and witnesses.

During the 91st Congress my bill calling for the creation of a Federal court

facility at Hyattsville was enacted, but thus far no steps have been taken to carry out the will of Congress.

I feel the bill which I have introduced today will solve the problem and eliminate the present inequitable situation which requires attorneys, witnesses and litigants in the Maryland suburbs of Washington to travel to the Federal court in Baltimore. The cause of justice will be well served by enactment of the bill I have introduced today which would divide Maryland into two U.S. judicial districts.

Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 15832, reads as follows:

A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to create an additional judicial district in southern Maryland

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 100 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 100. Maryland.

"Maryland is divided into two judicial districts to be known as the Eastern and Western Districts of Maryland.

"(a) The Eastern District of Maryland comprises the counties of Worcester, Somerset, Wicomico, Dorchester, Talbot, Caroline, Queen Anne's, Kent, Cecil, Harford, Baltimore, and the City of Baltimore. Court for the Eastern District shall be held at Baltimore, Maryland.

"(b) The Western District of Maryland comprises the counties of Garrett, Allegany, Prince Georges, Calvert, Washington, Frederick, Carroll, Howard, Montgomery, Anne Arundel, Charles, and St. Marys Counties. Court would be held for the Western District at Hyattsville, Prince Georges County, Maryland.

SPIRALING COST OF HOUSING

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Housing Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee, I am constantly reminded of the spiraling cost of housing. One of the major components of each home is lumber. As this body so well knows, timber prices have tended to fluctuate violently within the past 3 years, a main reason being the uneven and sporadic supply of timber resources: there is a greater demand for timber at certain times than our Nation's forests can produce.

One of the areas of our country which has been neglected, but which could develop great timber resources, is the southeastern United States. At one time this area had large forests, but through mismanagement and intensive agricultural cultivation, the forests have been depleted. However, through the proper management of forests belonging to small landowners, there is a chance that we could correct this situation. To help this needed contribution become a reality, today I am introducing a bill which gives special emphasis to providing assistance to nonindustrial forest landowners to increase the flow of public benefits for the proper management and use of those forest lands in private hands.

Of the Nation's possible productive land base, small landowners hold 49 percent, which is more than three times the acreage available in the National Forest System. These lands in aggregate already produce huge amounts of pulpwood, sawlogs and other timber products needed by America's growing economy. However, due to neglect and mismanagement, these small properties are producing less than half of their potential in terms of wood products.

I am sure the question arises, "What needs to be done?" I suggest the following: planting trees, practicing reforestation in established stands, seeding to prevent soil erosion, creating wildlife habitats, and providing public access for recreational use. But all of these activities require money. Because the immediate return from cultivation of forest lands is not quickly realized and because of the work and taxes involved, many people, even those owning sizable tracts of land, have been reticent to invest in this area. My bill would provide for the financial incentives necessary to trigger these vital investments.

As I have already stated, expanding demand for timber, pulp and other products used to meet housing and other needs is clearly evident. For example, housing starts in 1971 set an all-time high. Unless well-planned investments on these private lands are made now, the pressures of meeting this demand will continue with the relative increase in prices to be met by future consumers. In addition, increased costs will encourage the use of substitute materials which must come from the Nation's store of nonrenewable resources rather than the renewable forest resources. To try to avoid the predicted increase in prices, we need to insure an abundant supply of timber in the species and sizes needed by the construction industry.

Three hundred million acres of land is the key to solving our future timber construction supply problems. This is the acreage affected by my legislation. The act would encourage nonindustrial farm owners to apply modern forest practices that would result in a wide range of public benefits. The primary incentive will be the sharing of the cost of installing these practices, with the Federal or public share of the cost not exceeding 80 percent of the total expenditure. However, this will not be another Federal give-away program where private landowners benefit at the expense of the general public. My bill provides that whenever these forest products are transferred through sale, the Federal Government will have a first lien on the properties, and the money that has been invested by the Government will be paid back to the Secretary of Agriculture with the appropriate interest. In addition, there are many side benefits that will come from this program: Investments in thousands of acres of idle forests will make them productive and many new jobs will be created to insure the necessary planting, cultivation, and harvesting of the product. I feel that this is the only fair and equitable way in which the Government can encourage investment in this sector. I urge the Committee

on Agriculture to consider holding hearings on this legislation as soon as possible.

GRAND JURY TESTIMONY OF NEWSMEN

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Supreme Court decided that requiring newsmen to appear and testify before State or Federal grand juries does not abridge the freedom of speech and press guaranteed by the first amendment. Five Justices composed the majority in deciding the newsmen's privilege cases, Branzburg against Hayes, In re Pappas, and United States against Caldwell. Four Justices dissented, arguing that there was a constitutional newsmen's privilege.

The Court's disposition of the newsmen's privilege cases is indicative of the difficulty that lower courts have had with the issue. As the Wisconsin Supreme Court declared in February of this year, the courts "have not found a consistent approach to the problem."

The majority opinion, written by Mr. Justice White, conceded that:

The argument that the flow of news will be diminished by compelling reporters to aid the grand jury in a criminal investigation is not irrational.

The majority seemed particularly concerned about the capacity of the Court to lay down a satisfactory rule in a Court opinion to cover a complex controversy. As Mr. Justice White stated, speaking for the majority:

We are unwilling to embark the judiciary on a long and difficult journey to such an uncertain destination. The administration of a Constitutional newsmen's privilege would present practical and conceptual difficulties of a high order.

The dissenters argued forcefully for a constitutional privilege. Mr. Justice Douglas said:

Today's decision will impede the wide open and robust dissemination of ideas and counterthought which a free press both fosters and protects and which is essential to the success of intelligent self-government.

A discussion of the merits of the majority and minority Court opinions on the cases would not be productive at this point. It is clear, however, that the larger issue of the newsmen's privilege has not been resolved. This important issue concerning the freedom of the Nation's journalists to gather information and provide the public with a free flow of information now is clearly a congressional responsibility. The Congress must now study, debate, and act on the issue of the newsmen's privilege. As the Court acknowledged in yesterday's ruling:

At the Federal level, Congress has freedom to determine whether a statutory newsmen's privilege is necessary and desirable and to fashion standards and rules as narrow or broad as deemed necessary to address the evil discerned and, equally important, to refashion those rules as experience from time to time may dictate.

As the sponsor of H.R. 4271, the Newsmen's Privilege Act, I am hopeful that early hearings can be scheduled in the

House Judiciary Committee. I do not have to elaborate on the crucial nature of any issue involving the free flow of information to the American people, because an informed citizenry is the very foundation of democratic government. Therefore, I urge prompt and careful evaluation of the Newsmen's Privilege Act by the Judiciary Committee and by this House.

TOO "CIVILIZED" FOR CAPITAL PUNISHMENT?

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. WYMAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the High Court's 5-to-4 decision basically holding that in virtually all cases the imposition of the death penalty is unconstitutional as "cruel and unusual" flies in the teeth of society's need for the protection of the death penalty in horrible cases. What about Manson, for example, who deliberately slew by knife in her own home an 8 months pregnant woman whose plea for the life of her living but yet unborn child were brutally denied? What about the person whose planted bomb in an auditorium kills 5,000 innocent citizens? What about planned assassination of a President of the United States? Or calculated poisoning over a period of months murdering a wife or husband?

There are situations that merit the death penalty in all but the minds of those who are opposed to it in principle and under any circumstances and for any crime, even the slaying of their own family. Happily, this is not the view of the great majority of Americans. I say, happily, because most of us want to be darn sure that anyone who deliberately plans such horrible criminal acts knows that, if he does so, he will pay for it with his life.

The Court's holding is all the more confusing because the Constitution itself in the fifth amendment explicitly refers to "capital cases," thus recognizing in its own words that there are cases for which the death penalty may be imposed. The word "capital" means subject to a penalty of "off with one's head."

The realities of this unfortunate decision are that what the five members of the Supreme Court are really saying is that in this day and time we have become so "civilized" that capital punishment is barbaric. Justice Marshall makes this clear in his opinion referring to the decision as a "major milestone in the long road up from barbarism."

Today's Washington Post echoes the same line in a masthead editorial referring to capital punishment that says in part:

The use of it has grown increasingly repugnant and it quite appropriately should join disemboweling and drawing and quartering as a remnant of an uncivilized past.

What about Manson's deliberate, brutal disemboweling of pregnant Sharon Tate?

What about the guards at prisons across the land who must be constantly exposed to inmates sentenced to life plus

99 years? What protection are these men to have, lacking any further penalty?

What about the fact that capital punishment for kidnaping plus death ended this terrible offense for the most part after Hauptman?

What about the indisputable fact that society is entitled to the deterrent of the prospect of capital punishment for certain terrible crimes? Let it not be claimed that it is not a deterrent because whether it is or it is not it is impossible to know. Statistics are virtually meaningless. It is a good guess that the Lord knows how many individuals have hesitated before planning murder, or kidnaping, or bombing from awareness that if they are caught they will be hanged, or electrocuted, or gassed.

Not a pretty prospect, not even a pleasant subject. On this we are all agreed.

But neither are the crimes against humanity and society that might have been committed but were not because of the prospect of the death penalty. Who knows how many, but we do know that crime is rising, especially crimes of violence. We need the death penalty in this country for a limited number of terrible crimes.

Congress should propose a simple constitutional amendment to the States for ratification providing that State legislatures may impose the death penalty, if they see fit, at the very least for cases involving the deliberate taking of human life.

And Congress should also be authorized to impose the death penalty for conviction of treason. Even this is denied under yesterday's unfortunate and unnecessary judicial legislation by five of nine Members of the one Court of last resort in the United States from which there is no appeal.

To show how far the eager-beavers would carry the decision, I include the editorial in the Post to which I have made reference, which calls for dismantling the death chambers even though the precise limitations of the Court's decision remain to be more precisely established in subsequent cases whatever may be the disposition of a constitutional amendment. Not without relevance to the dismantling call is the fact that should any one of the majority leave the Court, the rule could change overnight. In fact, it is safe to predict that such a replacement will very probably turn the Court squarely around on this same subject, which is one of the difficulties with 5-to-4 decisions in so important a field.

The editorial follows:

DISMANTLING THE DEATH CHAMBERS

It is impossible to read even a part of the outpouring of words from the Supreme Court in the death penalty cases without recognizing the momentous nature of the question it faced and the prolonged deliberations that led to its resolution. Perhaps never before has the question of death as a legitimate punishment been so thoroughly canvassed as it is in the nine opinions encompassing more than 50,000 words. The effective holding of the Court—that death penalties may no longer be imposed unless they are automatically imposed on all those convicted of a particular crime—is not the result we would have preferred. We would have joined those two Jus-

tices, Brennan and Marshall, who voted to bar death outright as a cruel and unusual punishment. But this intermediate step should be just as effective in closing down the death chamber of the Nation. No legislature is likely to decide that all rapists and/or murderers must be executed.

The differences between the Justices on this issue are fundamental, not just on the matter of death as a punishment but on the place of the Court itself in the American system of government. It is easy to make the argument, as the four dissenting Justices do, that the Court has overreached itself and stepped into an arena more appropriately reserved for Congress and the state legislatures. It is an argument based on strong underpinnings and substantial precedents but one that materially weakens both the power of the Court and the strength of the protections the Bill of Rights provides to all Americans.

It is true, no doubt, that at the time the Constitution was written the bar against "cruel and unusual punishments" was not regarded as abolishing the death penalty. But neither did it bar flogging, expatriation, sentences to be served in chains, or imprisonment for illness as punishments. These have become recognized over the years as penalties which must fall as "cruel and unusual" because of changes in the temper and the conduct of American society. So it is, it seems to us, with the death penalty. The use of it has grown increasingly repugnant and it quite appropriately should join disembowling and drawing and quartering as a remnant of an uncivilized past.

By almost any contemporary definition, the death penalty is both cruel and unusual. It is the only punishment imposed in American law which inflicts pain. It is the only punishment that is used so rarely as to be unusual. Indeed, it is that latter point which provides much of the evidence of the nation's changing standards. Among the thousands of cases tried each year in which juries could impose the death penalty, it is actually imposed in only a hundred or so. Of these, governors regularly commute many. Of the others, many more are never carried out because of the unusual care and scrutiny every appellate court gives to them in the name of due process. No one has been executed anywhere in the country in the last six years and only 93 in the last 10—a figure smaller than that for any single year for which records were kept prior to 1950. There is much truth in Justice Brennan's observation that "the likelihood is great that the punishment is tolerated only because of its disuse."

There is another point about the death penalty which should not be overlooked. Justice Douglas put it this way:

"Former Attorney General Ramsey Clark has said, 'It is the poor, the sick, the ignorant, the powerless and the hated who are executed.' One searches our chronicles in vain for the execution of any member of the affluent strata of this society. The Leopolds and Loeb are given prison terms, not sentenced to death."

Given evidence of this kind, and there is much more of it, about the impact of death sentences in practice, we are driven inevitably to the conclusion that the distaste of it is so widespread as to justify fully the Court's decision. To hold otherwise, to rely primarily or exclusively on past history, as some of the dissenters would, is to read the cruel and unusual punishment clause out of the Bill of Rights. That clause, at the very least and in the words of Justice Stewart, "cannot tolerate the infliction of a sentence of death under legal systems that permit this unique penalty to be so wantonly and so freakishly imposed."

We trust that the death chambers will now be dismantled.

A FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY FOR AMERICA, AND HOW IT CAN HELP AT HOME

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, for almost 40 years, the United States has been the leader in removing the shackles from international trade. It was American initiative, vision, and persistence that led the principal trading nations to dismantle the bulk of the trade restrictions imposed during the great depression. The result has been a remarkable expansion of world trade and a rapid and sustained growth in world production. Our positive trade policy has been nonpartisan, supported by the 19 Congresses and six Presidents since 1934.

That policy is now under heavy attack, perhaps the heaviest in recent history. Important elements in business and labor, in growing numbers and with growing insistence, argue that our country needs increased protection against imports. They assert that jobs and industry in the United States are threatened.

The rest of America's traditional foreign economic policy is also under attack:

The free international movement of capital, technology and knowledge, which played a key role in the economic development of our country and which continues to be a major factor in world economic growth, is now charged with "exporting jobs" from the United States.

The international monetary system, developed at Bretton Woods and strengthened by the unplanned use of the dollar as the world currency, provided a solid and yet flexible base for the steady economic expansion of the postwar period. Yet, the strains on the monetary system had been growing over the 1960's. The result was a breakdown in 1971. The system must be revitalized. But all the present administration seems to be concerned about is finding the proper forum to discuss the problem.

I want to discuss these three issues today—international trade, investment, and monetary arrangements. They form the heart of our foreign policy. What we do on these matters must help to achieve our broad foreign policy goals—to create a world in which the United States can prosper and live in peace, a world in which nations solve common problems in a cooperative, helpful spirit, a world which is congenial to the achievement of our basic national objectives.

Our foreign economic policies have far-reaching international political and military consequences. But I do not want to consider this aspect alone—however important it may be—of our foreign economic policies. Instead, I want to look at these policies in domestic economic terms. I want to consider how they can best achieve our basic domestic economic goals set by the Employment Act of 1946—maximum employment, production, and purchasing power; how they

can help to create jobs, raise wages, keep prices stable, and promote equity.

TRADE

We must regain our former momentum in opening up the channels of world trade.

If we succeed in this endeavor, we will:
Create jobs for Americans;
Raise wages of the American worker;
Keep prices down, and thereby raise real wages; and

Help the disadvantaged in our country.

If we fail to move forward on trade—indeed, if we only stand still—we shall necessarily slide backward. Britain and three other nations are scheduled shortly to join the European Community, or Common Market. Some 50 other nations now have, or shortly will have, preferential trading arrangements with the Community. This large and expanding trading bloc will necessarily put U.S. exporters at an increased competitive disadvantage. For example, the Austrian manufacturer of electrical equipment will soon be able to sell in France, Germany and England without paying any duty; the American competitor, however, will still have to jump the tariff wall.

The only practical way to avoid such retrogression is to reduce barriers to world trade. We can reduce—and indeed, eliminate—the growing disadvantage to American industrial exporters if we can persuade the Common Market to reduce, or eliminate, its common external tariff and to avoid a variety of nontariff barriers. This can be done only if we are to reciprocate, reducing our own barriers.

The same prescription applies to helping our farmers. Europe's common agricultural policy is costly for European consumers and taxpayers, as well for our farmers. But, as a practical matter, it can be modified only as part of a general reduction of world barriers to trade.

Finally, if we do not move forward to open up world trade, we may well find ourselves acting to limit it, we may find ourselves hypnotized by those who would restrict our imports across the border. If we follow this course, we will: raise unemployment, reduce money wages, stimulate inflation, and deepen the poverty of the poor and lowly paid.

Let me develop more fully the arguments behind these assertions.

First, let us look at the historical record. The domestic critics of American trade policy argue—explicitly or implicitly—that our past approach has been a failure. They surely do not mean that American leadership in bringing down trade barriers has been bad for the world. In the 27 years since World War II—a period which the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade was agreed upon and six rounds of tariff reductions were negotiated—the world, especially the major industrial trading countries, has had the longest period of sustained and rapid growth in history. We have had a quarter of a century of rising employment, rising production, rising levels of personal consumption and well-being. Throughout all this time, international trade has been a leading sector.

Production in the industrial countries of Europe and Japan grew by more than

100 percent since 1950, while their foreign commerce grew twice as fast. Our own experience has been similar. In the 1960's, when our gross national product rose by 50 percent, our exports doubled. Over the past two decades, our GNP more than doubled and our foreign trade more than tripled. Indeed, the years in which our foreign trade—imports as well as exports—flourished were years of unparalleled prosperity for the American people. It was also a period of rapidly expanding employment. Jobs in the United States grew from 58 million in 1949 to 86 million in 1971. Yet, after adjusting for inflation, imports were four times higher in 1971 than they were in 1949.

So much for the historical record.

But to do the opponents of trade policy justice, they are talking about the present effects of foreign trade on our economic life. They speak of jobs and job opportunities destroyed, and of industries threatened with extinction now. Let us examine these assertions.

JOBS

Expanding trade—increased imports as well as exports—creates jobs for Americans. Import restrictions, on the other hand, actually destroy jobs—more than are destroyed by import competition.

About 25 percent of U.S. imports are not competitive with goods produced in the United States—coffee, cocoa, chrome, tea, for example, commodities which could not be produced commercially at home, if at all, and commodities in short supply such as bauxite, asbestos, and newsprint, which supplement domestic production. No employment is lost by such imports. Indeed, without such imports a part of American production would be lost, and so would the jobs associated with it.

The remaining 75 percent of U.S. imports are competitive with U.S. products—that is, if the goods were not imported, Americans could produce them at home. For this reason, protectionists argue that such imports cost us jobs and ought to be limited.

But a careful analysis of the relationship between imports and jobs will uncover five factors which argue that imports, even competitive imports, create jobs to offset, in whole or part, the jobs lost by import competition.

First, clearly, the processing and marketing of imports create jobs in the United States. This applies to Volkswagens as well as bananas. Federal Reserve Governor Andrew Brimmer has estimated that some 650,000 jobs were involved in such activities in 1971.

Second, imported goods often embody materials or components exported from the United States. For example, imported textiles and clothing contain U.S. cotton, imported appliances contain U.S. electronic components, automobiles made in Canada incorporate many parts manufactured in Michigan. If such imports were curtailed, our exports would be as well.

Third, since the United States is the largest importing nation in the world, an increase in our imports necessarily increases output and income in the rest of the world, and this necessarily is re-

flected in increased U.S. exports. Conversely, any cut in U.S. imports quickly results in a cut in our exports. We are so large a factor in the world economy that our exports are tied to our imports.

Fourth, imports also create jobs at home when the foreign goods are less expensive than the domestic product would be. For example, if competitive imports—which amounted to some \$40 billion in 1971—were 10 percent cheaper than domestic goods, American consumers would have an additional \$4 billion to spend on other goods. This would not only leave us with more satisfied consumers; it would also create some 400,000 additional jobs at home.

Fifth, if we tried to stimulate domestic employment by a massive cut in imports, other countries would have the legal right under GATT to retaliate. And they would do so—they would be under pressure from their labor unions and other political forces not to let an affluent America impose unemployment on them.

If, as a result, U.S. exports were cut by the same amount as imports, there would be a net loss in jobs at home, because more American jobs are created through \$1 million of exports than are lost by an equal amount of imports. This observation is called the Leontieff paradox, after its discoverer. Prof. Lawrence Krause of the Brookings Institution estimates that every billion dollars of additional exports creates 110,000 new jobs in the United States, while each billion dollars of additional imports supplies goods which would take 88,600 Americans to produce. In short, if we increase exports and competitive imports equally, we create jobs at home. If we reduce competitive imports and exports equally, we cut the number of jobs available for Americans.

All of this is not to say that import competition in itself does not cost American jobs. It does. While an expansionist trade policy such as I have been advocating will create jobs, it will also cost us jobs.

Therefore, starting tomorrow, what we must do is to find jobs for all—not only for those hurt by import competition, but for those who lose their jobs, or cannot find a job for any other reason. Full employment without inflation is our top domestic imperative.

I have been urging for a long time that what needs to be done is to reduce our current more than 5 million unemployed—almost 6 percent of the work force—to something like one-half that many. A public service employment program could provide at least 500,000 jobs in public safety, conservation, recreation, education, public health. Such an immediate "Jobs Now" program could generate an additional 1 to 2 million jobs by creating additional purchasing power on the part of the 500,000 newly employed workers, by its associated accelerator effect on capital spending, and by increasing consumer confidence generally. This could reduce our unemployment by almost half, and bring the rate of unemployment down to the 3- to 4-percent range. Backstopping the Jobs Now program should be a whole series of in-

dustrial-Government consortia to get to work on the great domestic needs of the 1970's—mass transit, rebuilding our cities, air and water pollution, new schools and hospitals. The list is long.

Such a generalized full-employment policy should be buttressed by meaningful—as opposed to the present lip-service program—adjustment assistance for workers and plants endangered by import competition.

A full-employment society is a necessary precondition for a policy of expanded trade for two main reasons.

In the first place, despite the jobs which expanded trade creates, there is no assurance whatever that this will automatically result in full employment. We thus have to pursue full employment as a necessary first goal.

In the second place, as a political matter, it will not, in my judgment, be possible to launch a drive for freer trade until we have with at least equal vigor launched a drive for full employment. Though our unemployment may be due in large part to causes other than import competition, the unemployed worker sees import restrictions as one quick step that can be taken simply because it is within the control of the Government. A government that asks labor to support a program of broadened trade must present labor with a full-employment economy.

Our trade policies ought to be designed to improve productivity, not primarily to provide jobs. Indeed, the right way to look at foreign trade is to recognize that it has the same impact on our economy as investment in machinery or improvement in technology. Foreign trade raises U.S. productivity by permitting U.S. labor and capital to shift from industries with low returns to those with higher returns. We import those goods which can be produced more cheaply abroad, freeing our own capital and workers to produce goods we can make more efficiently.

Because this increase in productivity may cause temporary distress and unemployment—and this is true whether we install a new machine or reduce a trade restriction—there is no reason to destroy the machine or, what is equivalent, to protect American industry from foreign competition, provided our Government does its job and creates full employment.

We are not Luddites—the British workers who destroyed textile machinery in the early days of the industrial revolution. We do not want to destroy the machine—or to restrain imports. But we do recognize that a sharp increase in imports can cause temporary unemployment.

This is a serious problem regardless of its cause, and society must meet it. If we can keep our economy at close to full employment and moving vigorously, temporary unemployment resulting from increased imports will not be a problem. For example, in 1968 imports rose by a phenomenal 23 percent. If imports were destroying jobs this would have been the year to show it. Yet, the number of Americans at work rose by more than 1.5 million, and unemployment fell.

But we must be prepared for times, such as the present, when our efforts are not rewarded with success and the econ-

omy is soft. Under such conditions we need to provide help to those whose jobs are threatened by imports—financing, training, counseling, and a new job—and, on occasion, we may want to provide restraints on imports. But the restraints must be of limited duration. We should not provide protection—a subsidy by American society as a whole—to any industry in perpetuity.

WAGES

As we have just seen, the prime role of foreign trade is to improve the productivity of the American economy. The result should be increased wages. This, in fact, is the result. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has determined that wages are 9 to 10 percent higher in U.S. export industries than in those industries which compete with imports. It is clearly in the interest of American labor as a whole to stimulate exports, where wages are high and technology more advanced, than to protect industries where this is not the case.

PRICES

Lowered restrictions on trade, and the resulting increased imports, are an important antiinflationary factor. It is easy to see why. And increased supply of goods and competition from foreign producers help to keep a lid on prices.

The contrary is also true. Clearly, tariffs raise prices. And so do quantitative restrictions on imports. Limitations on the amount of imports—or the total supply of goods in the country—and reduced foreign competition, encourage price rises.

Despite protestations to the contrary, the United States does impose significant restrictions on imports. We are not the "only open market" in the world. We are not the guys with white hats while the Japanese and Europeans wear black. We have duties on industrial products which average about 10 percent, with many duties considerably above the average. In addition, we have quantitative controls on imports of a number of products, principally petroleum, steel, textiles, sugar, meat, and dairy products.

No one knows the effect of these restrictions on U.S. prices. One scholar, C. Fred Bergsten, has estimated that the cost to the U.S. consumer amounts to \$10 to \$15 billion per year.

Equity: Trade restrictions imposed by the U.S. Government affect importantly the poor, raising the prices of the things they buy. For example:

The voluntary textile import restrictions which have been in force since 1962 and were enlarged in 1971 to include woolen and synthetic textiles, certainly raise the cost of apparel to Americans. A reasonable estimate is that they increase prices by at least 10 percent. In addition, tariffs average roughly 25 percent. The 35-percent increase in textile and apparel prices is borne largely by the poor. They are the ones who buy heavily the sort of inexpensive textile imports which our Government limits.

Sugar is also subject to quotas. As a result, U.S. sugar prices have generally been twice as high as world market prices in recent years.

Voluntary restraints on imports of

fresh and frozen meats generally affect low-cost meats which go into frankfurters and hamburgers, items bought heavily by low-income families. The temporary lifting of meat quotas by the President will provide temporary relief.

The restrictions on shoe imports proposed in the Congress in 1970 would have raised shoe prices by an estimated one-third, and would have affected largely the inexpensive shoes, purchased by the poor.

In short, U.S. trade restrictions could well be called our own anti-anti-poverty program.

INVESTMENT

Recently, in sharp contrast to our traditional posture, there has been a ground swell of opinion in the United States favoring the limitation of the export of investment and technology from the United States to other countries. Large-scale foreign investment by our consumer electronics industry is only the most conspicuous example of American jobs lost.

The argument for restricting the outflow of U.S. capital and U.S. technology deserves to be examined seriously. The limitations of the case against U.S. foreign investment should not be overlooked.

First, the greater part of U.S. direct investment abroad is in raw materials and related manufacturing, in distribution facilities for U.S. exports, in foreign utilities, transportation, and other services, and, consequently, cannot be regarded as displacing U.S. domestic production or employment.

Second, U.S. foreign investment is not as large as the storm about it would lead one to believe. Over the past 5 years, gross foreign direct investment, including reinvested earnings, has averaged about \$6 billion per year. By comparison, gross domestic private investment, minus residential construction, has averaged over \$100 billion per year over the same period.

Third, much U.S. foreign investment in manufacturing is defensive in character—that is, American entrepreneurs go abroad to produce when they see that a foreign enterprise would expand and take over the market. In such cases, continued production in the United States is not a realistic alternative. If the American firm had not gone abroad, foreign firms would have preempted the opportunity and U.S. jobs and exports would have been lost in any event.

Finally, America gains by foreign investment. As is well known, the income on our private direct investment abroad is rapidly expanding and now amounts to some \$8 billion a year. In addition, American parent companies often export large amounts of capital goods, component parts, and associated products to their foreign subsidiaries—exports which would not be made if U.S. foreign investment were curtailed. Purchases by foreign affiliates of American corporations in the United States account for an estimated one-quarter of the non-agricultural exports of the United States. Moreover, by raising levels of living and contributing to economic development abroad, foreign investment further

stimulates U.S. exports. And, of course, the American consumer benefits from lower cost products, increased research and development, and improved access to raw materials which accompany foreign direct investment.

In short, as with trade there is reason to believe that U.S. foreign investment on balance raises U.S. income and employment.

But when all these favorable effects of foreign investment are cited, there remain unfavorable effects—on U.S. jobs, on balance of payments, on productivity, on equity. It is fair to ask, therefore, that U.S. governmental policy be neutral with respect to investment abroad.

This means several things.

First, it means that we should never again allow the dollar to become grossly overvalued, as it was until the December 1971 Smithsonian agreement. An overvalued dollar means that U.S. corporations can buy up foreign manufacturing assets at a discount, and thus drives them into excessive foreign investment. The kind of international monetary reform which will enable the United States to have reasonable control over the international value of the dollar is discussed below. It is urgently needed.

Second, a neutral U.S. foreign investment policy requires that existing tax concessions to foreign investment—notably tax deferral of unrepatriated income and the foreign tax credit—be critically reexamined. The case for re-evaluating these preferences was well put by Peggy B. Musgrave, associate professor of economics at Northeastern University, Boston, in a June 11, 1972, paper prepared for the Joint Economic Committee:

It is possible that production by U.S. affiliates abroad, particularly in manufacturing, may serve to displace U.S. exports and even domestic sales in the United States. This displacement effect is the more likely since those corporations accounting for the bulk of manufacturing investment abroad are also major exporters. Moreover, sales of manufacturing subsidiaries abroad are now two to three times the level of U.S. exports of manufactured products. It should be recognized that the economic and political effects of maintaining a share of foreign markets via foreign production are very different from doing so via domestic production and export. The principal difference lies in the effects on labor productivity and shares in national income. Foreign investment may enhance the private profitability of U.S. capital but it is likely to reduce the real wage to U.S. labor as well as the Government's tax share in the profits.

There are sufficient doubts about the effects of foreign investment on the U.S. Economy to lead to the conclusion that the U.S. tax treatment of foreign investment income should be reviewed and reevaluated. This applies especially to deferral, but consideration may also be given to limiting the present credit for foreign taxes to less than 100 percent. Such measures would not be incompatible with opposition to trade restriction. Indeed, they might be supportive of free trade policy.

To do more—to have a Capital Issues Committee which would pass on every projected foreign investment—has been advocated by the AFL-CIO. The proposal obviously presents excruciating administrative difficulties.

I suggest that the best remedy for the

unfavorable domestic effects of foreign investment is the same as that suggested in the case of trade—full employment without inflation at home. If that goal is reached, the case for direct administrative controls over foreign investment is obviously weakened, since new domestic jobs will be created to replace those jobs exhortated. Indeed, full employment at home would in and of itself tend to keep American capital at home. It is only a stagnating domestic economy which induces hyperthyroid foreign investment. Likewise, a prosperous American economy would induce greatly expanded foreign investment in this country. Both types of investment make jobs here.

REFORM OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY SYSTEM

We need an international monetary system which avoids recurrent monetary crises. These have been too frequent, especially in recent years. We had such a crisis in August 1971, when the President cut the tie of the dollar to gold and imposed a surcharge on imports, in May 1971 when the German mark was floated, in 1969 when the German mark was revalued, and in 1968 when the two-tier gold system was adopted.

Unless we can avoid such crises in the future, the world economic system will be faced with periodic disruptions and the imposition of direct controls over trade and capital movements.

The adverse economic implications of such controls were sketched out earlier. In addition, more often than not, direct Government controls raise serious political problems with countries which are adversely affected by the controls.

Clearly, if we are to preserve and extend freedom of international trade and capital movements, effective ways will have to be found to deal with imbalances in international payments. The most effective and equitable way to do so is to encourage changes in exchange rates when imbalances threaten, and before they become serious. The prime cause of the monetary crises of the 1960's was excessively rigid exchange rates.

Greater flexibility of exchange rates will reduce the length and severity of imbalances in international trade and payments. They will allow the United States and other governments to focus on the significant economic problems—how to increase productivity and real income, and how to promote a system which will distribute the increased production wisely and compassionately. The preoccupation of governments with the balance of payments under the rigid exchange rate system of recent years has often led to a situation where they sacrificed desirable domestic goals in a vain attempt to maintain an inappropriate exchange rate.

In more general terms, the international monetary system needs to be reformed to take account of the dramatic changes which have taken place in the world economy over the past quarter of a century. While the United States remains the single most powerful economy in the world, it no longer dominates the world as it did for a quarter of a century after Bretton Woods. The

phenomenal economic growth of Western Europe and Japan has altered the balance of economic power.

A new international monetary system will no longer reflect U.S. predominance, but rather U.S. partnership with other countries. This has a number of implications for the international monetary system as a whole.

First, it means that the United States must have greater freedom to change its exchange rate than it has had. Of course, we are so large an economy that we can never be as free as Guatemala or even Britain. But, unless the world wants to be on a dollar standard, the United States must have some degree of independent control over its exchange rate.

Second, the financial basis for the monetary system can no longer be gold or dollars, but should be some multilaterally managed asset. This was recognized in the late 1960's when the countries of the world agreed to create a new international reserve asset called special drawing rights or SDR's. These should gradually replace gold and dollars as the major official reserve asset.

Third, any reform of the international monetary system must find a way to deal with the large and often disruptive flows of interest-sensitive capital among nations. The wider margins for exchange rates temporarily adopted at the December 18, 1971, Smithsonian agreement is an attempt to deal with this problem.

Fourth, before the United States can restore full international convertibility of the dollar, a way must be found to deal with excess dollars held by foreign monetary authorities.

Fifth, while U.S. balance-of-payments deficits were important to the vigorous economic expansion of the immediate postwar years, with the creation of SDR's the deficits are no longer needed. Indeed, they are undesirable from the point of view of both the United States and the rest of the world.

If our payments are to aim for rough balance, how is this to be achieved? In 1971, net receipts from foreign investments were \$8 billion; net payments for military expenditures and foreign aid were \$7 billion, net payments for travel, transportation, and miscellaneous services \$1.5 billion, net remittances and other transfers \$1.5 billion, and net private capital outflow \$4 billion, for a total deficit of roughly \$6 billion. The prevailing view seems to be that we will thus need to convert our present trade deficit into a trade surplus of some \$6 billion in order to balance our accounts.

This may be a large order. Of equal importance are energetic efforts to curtail such red-ink items as excessive U.S. military expenditures, excessive military aid, excessive capital investment abroad induced by tax preferences, and to augment some black-ink accounts, such as foreign tourism to the United States and foreign investment in the United States. To the extent that we can do so—and I believe we can—every dollar of deficit diminished is a dollar off what may be an unrealistically high projected trade surplus.

These then are the major problems and opportunities we face in international trade, investment, and money. I have tried to show how the cooperative resolution of these problems will favorably affect our material well-being—jobs, wages, prices and equity in the United States. But their resolution will also improve the prospects for world peace and stability for generations to come.

THE FRENCH POW CAPER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, from the days of Dean Rusk's "billion Chinese armed with nuclear weapons" to the present time, the mythological rationales for our continued presence in Vietnam form one of the most colorful chapters in American folklore.

Last night President Nixon made a major contribution to this mythology. In the course of his press conference, he said we had to continue mining, bombing, and retaining a residual force in Vietnam because that was the only way to give the other side "incentive to return our POW's rather than not account for them, as was the case when the French got out of Vietnam in 1954 and 15,000 French were never accounted for after that. I shall never let that happen to the brave men who are POW's."

Mr. Speaker, mythology and folklore are fascinating subjects for those who are drawn to them. But national policy should be based on fact.

The fact of this matter is this: According to the French Government, the last French prisoner was returned within 3 months of the conclusion of the Geneva agreements. This point is made by the French Ambassador to the United States in recent correspondence between us on this exact subject.

Mr. Nixon could do worse than to subject the American POW's to the fate of the French POW's. In fact, he has done a good deal worse and is expected to continue to do so.

The French recovered all their prisoners. Mr. Nixon has recovered zero American prisoners. As long as he continues his residual force policy, he will continue to recover zero prisoners.

I insert in the RECORD my letter of January 18, 1972, to Mr. Charles Lucet, our Ambassador from France at that time, and Mr. Lucet's February 3 answer to me:

JANUARY 18, 1972.

HON. CHARLES LUCET,
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary,
Embassy of France, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: It is sometimes asserted that, at the conclusion of your country's war in Indochina in 1954, the Viet Minh refused to return all French prisoners of war, and to this day holds several hundred of them.

What is your government's view of this matter? Do you believe that all living prisoners were returned after the conclusion of hostilities, or do you believe that some have been detained in violation of the Geneva Convention on Prisoners of War?

I will be most grateful for your reply.
Kind personal regards.
Very sincerely,

ROBERT L. LEGGETT,
Member of Congress.

AMBASSADE DE FRANCE,
Washington, D.C., February 3, 1972.

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LEGGETT: Thank you for your letter of January 18, 1972 asking me whether the French government believes that, after the conclusion of the first Indochina war, all French living prisoners of war were returned, or thinks that some may have been unduly detained.

We have already conducted intensive research on this matter, and concluded that the last French prisoners were returned less than three months after the conclusion of the Geneva Agreements. We therefore consider this question as definitely settled.

Hoping to have been of any help,
Very sincerely,

CHARLES LUCET.

AID TO NEW ENGLAND FISHERMEN INVOLVED IN INTERNATIONAL INCIDENTS AT SEA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

MR. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday HASTINGS KEITH, MARGARET HECKLER, LOUISE DAY HICKS, and I introduced H.R. 15800 to provide immediate payments to fishermen whose gear or boats have been damaged by foreign vessels.

The compensation program would be under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce, who would certify whether claims were valid and would be authorized to make immediate reimbursement for all costs directly resulting from any damage to, or destruction of the vessel or any of its gear or other equipment. This Federal compensation would be retroactive to January 1, 1971, and the legislation authorizes \$5 million for past and future claim reimbursement.

The bill is unique in that it will pay damage claims immediately out of general revenues instead of requiring the claimant to await the U.S. Government's attempt to obtain compensation from foreign governments.

It also provides reasonable reimbursement for losses suffered by the vessel owner as a result of lost or reduced fishing hauls directly resulting from the damage. Thus, the vessel owner and his family will be protected from loss of income while awaiting the U.S. Government payment of the claim and for repairs or replacement to the vessel or its equipment.

At this time there is no governmental assistance to American fishermen who have suffered economic hardship from foreign vessels. The legislation we introduced is essential to redress that wrong.

The New England fishing industry—indeed, all American fishermen—have enough to worry about from foreign competition without the additional fear that they will be economically annihilated by a vessel which is in no way required to pay for the damages it inflicts.

For example, foreign competitors have been able to occupy the same harvest areas as American fishermen. In New England in 1960, 93 percent of fish caught off the Continental Shelf were caught by New England fishermen. By 1965, the percentage had dropped to 35 percent.

In addition, as a general rule, a larger portion of the working capital of foreign fishermen are subsidized by their government. This means that they are more technically advanced than the U.S. fleet, more productive, and consequently, able to undersell the U.S. fleet in U.S. markets. On the other hand, the U.S. fisherman because his equipment is obsolete and because his competition is strong, receives an unduly small compensation for uncertain yields.

U.S. fishermen also encounter many obstacles in their attempts to modernize their equipment. They are small businessmen and can not generally afford the initial capital investment for modernization. As it is now, most profits must be used for repairs.

They find it difficult to receive loans from the private sector because of the unpredictability of catches, the obsolescence of the boats and the inability of most fishermen to obtain the insurance necessary for loans.

Therefore, when a foreign vessel damages or destroys the gear or vessel of the fishermen, he cannot usually obtain a loan to replace the vessel because he cannot obtain the insurance and because he usually has no collateral other than his vessel.

The fact that foreign vessels have inflicted severe damage to our fishing vessels and gear is not generally well known. The fishermen of this Nation have to run many risks that other businessmen have never had to cope with. The danger of damage to these foreign vessels has created incredible hardships for many fishermen.

For example, in the month of June alone two of my constituents experienced severe financial losses from foreign ships. One fisherman, fishing off Nantucket sustained thousands of dollars worth of damage when his lobster traps were destroyed by a Russian trawler. A second New England fisherman, Stephen Biondo, was fishing north of Gloucester when an East German fishing trawler rammed his boat and destroyed it.

Neither of these men has any Government official to whom he can turn for financial assistance. He cannot get a loan guarantee, he cannot get income maintenance other than welfare while his claim is being settled, and in many cases he cannot get his claim settled. There is no help for him.

The State Department has informed me that they estimate that gear losses resulting from foreign vessels over the past 2 years amount to about \$150,000 to \$200,000. Vessel losses would not account for a great increase in this amount.

We are not speaking here of a bill costing the taxpayers millions of dollars. We are speaking of legislation which is reasonable and equitable. The legislation filed by my colleagues and

myself is the most fair and direct solution to the problem.

We owe it to this strong, independent, and important part of our economy to provide fishermen with the assistance they need to recover from damage accruing from foreign vessels. The legislation filed yesterday provides the insurance our fishermen should have against the hazards of foreign vessels and demonstrates the support of Congress for this important industry.

HON. FRANK E. SMITH RETIRES

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 10 minutes.

MR. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished former colleague and longtime friend of many in this Chamber, the Honorable Frank Ellis Smith, has recently retired as a member of the Board of Directors for the Tennessee Valley Authority after 10 years of outstanding service to the people of the Nation and of the Tennessee Valley area.

Frank Smith's service with the TVA Board rounds out another chapter in his remarkable record of public service extending back to 1942 when he entered the Army as a private in World War II.

During his tenure, the TVA continued to help enhance the quality of life of the people who live within the valley while witnessing phenomenal gains in economic development and higher standards of living. Although such an idea is contrary to the conventional wisdom of nouveau environmentalists, it has happened and is happening in the Tennessee Valley area.

As a director of the TVA, Frank Smith has been able to be a decisive influence in shaping and guiding growth and development of the region while assuring that proper and increased consideration be given to the environment and quality of life.

Such a course comes naturally to Frank Smith. He was an active practicing conservationist long before environmental concern gained popular acclaim. As a Member of the House of Representatives, he was always at the leading edge of the legislative effort to make a proper accounting of the natural resources of this Nation. His concern included a dimension not always present in many current environmentalists—an understanding of and compassion for mankind as a part of the total environment.

He was able to continue to advance this philosophy from the standpoint of an administrator during the past 10 years in the service with TVA, the foremost example of proper resource management in the world.

To the TVA, he contributed a thorough understanding of the problems of legislation, a rich experience and knowledge of the requirements of his fellow man, a reputation for political honesty and courage, a probing intellect and keen talent for expression, and a diligence to duty which has marked his entire career.

Because of his service on the House Public Works Committee, Frank Smith

was particularly knowledgeable about legislative matters relating to the TVA. He had helped manage the TVA self-financing bill for electric power operations of the agency and then helped engage the legislation to double the generating capacity of the TVA electric system.

His wise counsel and devotion to the public interest have been meaningful for the continued advancement of the Authority.

His thoughtful and scholarly approach to public issues will continue to serve him well.

Through his attainment of high public trust, Frank Smith has been uniquely able to contribute to the total improvement of the United States by making the Tennessee Valley a better place in which to live and enjoy life.

As he departs from the Board of Directors for the Tennessee Valley Authority, he has my warmest congratulations for another job well done and my sincere best wishes for continued success in his unceasing efforts to help others.

SAVING ELECTRICAL ENERGY

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken before about the critical problems we face with regard to the supply of and demand for fuel and energy resources. Electrical energy shortages are one aspect of this problem that too many Americans will be experiencing this summer. The need for conservation has never been more impelling and, as the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs learned at their recent hearings, there are steps individuals can take to help.

Mr. L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress, has directed employees of the Library to conserve electrical energy in a number of specific ways. I commend our Librarian for his initiative, and with the thought that it may be a useful example or model for others, I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD following these remarks. Energy conservation is not going to be pleasant or easy for a society that has never had to think beyond flipping the electrical switch. Conservation is in the highest of American traditions, and we should remember that conservation is essential to the protection of our resources and our environment.

The article follows:

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
OFFICE OF THE LIBRARIAN,
June 20, 1972.

To: Members of the Staff.

From: L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress.

Subject: Conservation of Electricity.

Because of the critical shortage of electric power in this area, I am asking for the support and cooperation of each member of the staff in conserving the use of electricity and reducing to a minimum the possibility of electrical brownouts and blackouts during peakload periods in the coming summer months.

Whether or not such brownouts or blackouts occur will depend upon (1) how well electric power is conserved this summer, (2) climate conditions, and (3) the availability of certain critical power generation units.

Individual staff members are urged to follow the conservation measures listed below which have been identified by the Government Conservation Group as responsibilities of individual employees.

CONSERVATION OF ELECTRICITY

Responsibilities of individual employees

Upon notification of an impending power shortage by appropriate officials, individual employees should take the following actions as the situation warrants:

1. Utilize minimum artificial lighting during daylight hours in rooms provided with adequate windows or skylight illumination.
2. Keep other unnecessary lights turned off, such as those in storerooms, closets, or other space not being occupied.
3. Shut off lights and appliances when leaving the office or other work area.
4. Keep windows and outside doors closed when airconditioning units are in service.
5. If individual window units are provided, close the damper which admits outside air.
6. If you occupy a room having individual temperature control or equipped with a window unit on days expected to be hot, consideration should be given to cooling the room below normal during the early morning hours and letting the inside air temperature rise during the afternoon. The action would reduce the cooling requirement and the amount of power consumed by the airconditioning equipment during the peakload period.
7. Turn off electric fans, coffeemakers, and other appliances when not required during peakload periods.
8. Schedule the use of all equipment where possible that consumes electricity or generates heat at a time other than the period of peakloads.
9. Do not turn on equipment such as Xerox machines, fans, etc., until needed. Shut equipment off when it is no longer needed.
10. Use the stairs in lieu of elevators, especially at quitting time.
11. Draw or partially close blinds, shades, and draperies on the sunny side of the building.
12. In the event a power shortage does occur and lights go out, carry out the instructions previously given to you by your supervisor.

THE COLORADO RIVER BASIN

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, as you and many other Members know, on numerous occasions during the past 20 years I have stood on the floor of the House of Representatives and requested the Congress to help in resolving problems of the Colorado River Basin. Sometimes these problems have been exceedingly complex. At other times they have been relatively simple. I presume that because of the pronounced imbalance of other natural resources in relation to its deficient water supply the Colorado River will continue to present problems for so long as man is involved with it.

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, the legislation that I am introducing today for myself and for my esteemed colleagues, Mr.

EVANS and Mr. McKEVITT of Colorado, Mr. LLOYD and Mr. McKAY of Utah, Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming, and Mr. RUNNELS and Mr. LUJAN of New Mexico has as its basic purpose the correction of a situation that has persisted for a number of years, perhaps inadvertently, due to operations of the executive branch in a manner never intended by the framers of the Colorado River Storage Project Act of 1956. You and many of our colleagues will remember, Mr. Speaker, that I have a deep paternalistic interest in that law which was conceived, nurtured, and given birth by the Congress to make possible the conservation, development and utilization of the water resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin in my State of Colorado and her sister States—Utah, New Mexico, and Wyoming.

The Colorado River Storage Project Act of 1956 authorized the Secretary of the Interior to construct and operate Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir on the Colorado River near the Utah-Arizona border. The law also created the Upper Colorado River Basin fund to receive all revenues derived from sales of electric power and water of the storage project and from which expenditures for operation and maintenance, interest charges, return of capital costs of the project to the U.S. Treasury are to be made. Revenues in the basin fund in excess of those used for the specified purpose are earmarked on percentage bases for aiding in paying for the development of future water developments in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah and Wyoming—subject, of course, to authorization and appropriations by the Congress.

In 1956 southern Utah and northern Arizona were vast expanses of barren desert. There were no roads and no habitable communities in close proximity to the Glen Canyon damsite. The settlement of Page, Ariz., was constructed to provide housing and other essential services for the men and their families who were required to endure the hardships of a remote western desert while constructing and operating Glen Canyon Dam and powerplant. Page became a first-class reclamation construction town. As such, it was proper to charge the cost of municipal operations to the account of the Glen Canyon storage unit and, consequently, to the upper basin fund.

At the peak of construction on the dam in 1962, Page had a population of 6,100. By 1967, after completion of construction, the population dropped to 1,280, part of which was directly involved in operation and maintenance of the Glen Canyon storage unit. In 1968, as an integral and necessary part of the central Arizona project, the Congress authorized construction of the Navajo powerplant near Page. The community now is the residence of approximately 5,200 people. In a year or two it is expected that 7,000 to 8,000 persons, or maybe more, will reside there. After the Navajo powerplant is completed it is anticipated that the population will stabilize at about 5,000 to 6,000 citizens. Many of these will be associated with the operations of the pow-

erplant; some will be retirees seeking a nice place to live. Yet others will be operating new businesses and services principally related to the recreation industry.

With the increases in population the costs of municipal functions and operations of municipal facilities have increased correspondingly. The preponderance of these facilities and functions have no direct relationship to the operation and maintenance of the Glen Canyon storage unit. In fact, only a very minor proportion of them could be termed essential so far as the operation of the upper basin's Colorado River storage project is concerned. Page has evolved from a reclamation construction town to an extremely pleasant, attractive business and recreation center. Presently, it is also enjoying the economic stature of an established, advanced construction city for the lower basin's Navajo powerplant.

Studies made at Arizona State University show conclusively that, as an incorporated municipality, Page could become self-supporting and, under the aggressive leadership of fine citizens, prosperous.

Mr. Speaker, the Upper Colorado River Basin fund has been paying the operation, maintenance, administration, and capital improvement costs related to expansion of Page for too long. The time has now arrived for the community to become a proud, self-supporting, incorporated city—divorced from dependence on revenues of the upper basin fund. From the response to queries I have directed to the Department of the Interior, we have learned that the Department is programming the spending of approximately \$2.7 million more from the upper basin fund in 1972-74 for operation, maintenance, and capital improvements and additions in Page. Of this sum, about \$1.6 million are anticipated to be used for capital improvements. I firmly believe that in the interest of equity all of these costs should not be charged to the upper basin fund, nor should Page continue in the future to be subsidized half a million dollars per year by the storage project.

As one of the authors of the Colorado River Storage Project Act of 1956, I can tell my colleagues that it was never intended that the upper basin fund should continue to subsidize the operation, maintenance, administration, and expansion of the community after Glen Canyon Dam was completed. The time has arrived when this situation must be corrected, especially when all the evidence points up the fact that the Page community will have many advantages over the average community in making the transition to a self-supporting incorporated city. We want to provide all of these advantages that are within reason to the Page citizenry in order to alleviate the birth pains of incorporation.

The legislation that I am introducing will facilitate incorporation of the community by providing millions of dollars worth of assets as a starter. It will, at the same time, sever responsibility for

future municipal costs from the upper basin fund, thereby reserving these revenues for water development in Colorado and other upper basin States, as originally intended. My colleagues who remember the 1956 act will also be reminded that the basin fund is of major importance to my State which, under the law, has been apportioned the use of 46 percent of the excess revenues that will accrue to the fund in future years for water resource development.

We all want to see Page start as a well-established municipal corporation. We want it to be initiated financially sound and with more than an even opportunity to stand on its own feet. To meet this objective my bill will authorize the transfer of 10,700 acres of land and improvements thereon to the new city. Retained by the Federal Government, of course, would be those lands and facilities necessary for the operation and maintenance of Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir. Homes and lots that have already been sold to citizens will be excepted from the transfer and remain in private ownership. Also, the school buildings will be transferred directly to an appropriate school district.

This legislation will assign to Page sufficient water supply from Lake Powell for 9,000 to 11,000 people—subject to the "law of the river" as expressed in the Colorado River compact and Upper Colorado River Basin compact.

In order to ease the vicissitudes of the transition, from a Federal community to an incorporated city, a direct grant of \$330,000 will be made to the city fathers. Another grant of \$50,000 will go to the Page Hospital as a revolving fund so that it can continue efficient, self-liquidating operation. The Department of the Interior will be authorized to pump domestic and municipal water into the city's water system for a limited time without cost. A number of specified capital improvements and repair and maintenance items will be authorized to be completed at a cost of about \$500,000. Included are a number of street expansions and improvements, new curbs and gutters, water system repairs, sprinkler system for the cemetery and, also, the taking of a population census.

My bill provides for generous annual payments in lieu of taxes to the city from the Upper Colorado River Basin fund to cover property taxes not forthcoming due to the Federal Government retaining and using property needed directly in the operation and maintenance of the Glen Canyon storage unit. This will be a financial aid to Page and recognition of the fact that having the opportunity to have certain of its essential functions within a fine city is a worthwhile convenience.

This legislation authorizes a congressional appropriation to pay for the capital improvement work, the transfer of municipal functions, financial grants and other costs associated with creating the municipality.

As an incentive to the citizens of Page to meet their responsibilities in expedit-

ing the incorporation process, this bill directs the Secretary of the Interior, in the event Page has not become a city by December 31, 1973, to make the community self-supporting by raising service fees and other municipal charges to levels sufficient to cover the cost of all municipal functions—except those directly necessary in the operation and maintenance of the Colorado River storage project. By December 31, 1973, there will have been at least two opportunities for the people of the area to create their city under the laws of the State of Arizona. This is more than ample time, if they sincerely desire to have the advantages that are available to municipal corporations under county ordinances, State laws and Federal laws.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is not based on any new concepts. Similar laws have been enacted by the Congress to transfer Federal functions, responsibilities, properties and facilities to incorporated cities. Two instances that are comparable and which immediately come to my mind are the cities of Grand Coulee, Wash., and Boulder City, Nev., at Hoover Dam on the Colorado River. Both of these fine communities were sprouted as reclamation construction villages.

In conclusion, allow me to reiterate that we want Page to become a viable, well-respected, attractive city. We will do everything reasonable from an upper basin standpoint to aid in accomplishing this objective—while at the same time removing financial responsibility for municipal functions from the Upper Colorado River Basin fund.

REVENUE SHARING

(Mr. ROUSH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, a general revenue sharing bill (H.R. 14370) passed the House on June 22. This bill establishes a program of payments to State and local governments, totaling almost \$30 billion over a 5-year period.

The bill provides initially for aid at a rate of \$1.8 billion a year to the States and \$3.5 billion to local governments, with annual increases of up to \$300 million provided for the States.

This new and original aid program for hard-pressed State and local governments stipulates and restricts the funds for local government to operation and maintenance expenses for public safety, environmental protection and public transportation, and capital expenditures for sewage collection and treatment facilities, waste disposal systems and public transportation. State funds are unrestricted as to use.

I supported this legislation because I felt that financial aid was necessary to State and local governments in a time of inflated prices and increasing costs. For the Fourth Congressional District of Indiana this legislation, if passed intact by the Senate, will mean the following in dollar amounts:

REVENUE SHARING, 4TH DISTRICT, INDIANA

County	Total to all government	Total to county government	Total to city government	Total to township government	Cities	Cities
Adams	\$321,719	\$151,305	\$141,556	\$28,857	Berne, \$29,786	Decatur, \$93,241.
Allen	5,316,672	1,714,044	3,289,882	312,745	Fort Wayne, \$3,141,631	New Haven, \$102,158.
Dekalb	374,456	193,832	160,991	19,633	Auburn, \$63,298	Garrett, \$43,257.
Huntington	408,711	185,270	202,028	21,413	Huntington, \$158,750	
LaGrange	265,503	189,327	44,548	31,629		
Noble	379,000	179,323	167,743	31,934	Kendallville, \$85,376	Ligonier, \$36,020.
Steuben	240,182	116,187	57,156	66,839	Angola, \$37,073	
Wabash	417,738	192,325	210,420	14,993	Wabash, \$131,372	North Manchester, \$60,492.
Whitley	270,695	167,165	74,845	28,685	Columbia City, \$45,239	
Indiana	1113,800,000	31,000,000	82,800,000			

* Total share.

* State share.

* Local share.

THE PRESIDENT'S NEWS CONFERENCE POLICY: WHO IS USING WHO?

(Mr. VAN DEERLIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the press and I am sure much of the public heaved a collective sigh of relief last night when Mr. Nixon conducted his first televised news conference in fully 13 months.

Mr. Nixon clearly appreciates the potency of the media, in conveying his policies to the electorate—but at the same time he seems to suffer from a woeful misunderstanding of the proper role of the media in reporting on our national life.

The tipoff came last night, I think, in the President's discussion, toward the end of the session, of how he "uses" the press conference only when he believes that is the best way to inform the people.

No doubt, all of us in public office would find certain advantages in being able to "use" the press in this fashion, if we thought we could get away with it.

But most of us would recognize the obvious: that relations with the news media is, or least ought to be, a two-way street. Few of us, here in the House or in the White House would get along without the media; but, by the same token, the newsmen must depend at least to a degree on the officeholders for the stories that are their own bread and butter.

Unfortunately, Mr. Nixon, somewhat isolated perhaps by the grandeur of his office, may have forgotten that he, more than any of us, should be answerable to the press in its function as surrogate for the public.

Fault is not solely with the President. Some newsmen at times seem to regard access to the President as their personal right, rather than as a necessary part of their responsibility to the watching and reading public.

No law on the books requires any Presidential contact with the press. But as a former newsmen of 20 years' standing, I would suggest that both press and President are remiss if either side in this traditionally adversary relationship thinks its main concern is how best to "use" the other.

The overriding concern should be how best to serve the public—and I emphasize the word "serve."

Mr. Nixon is not the only President with antipathy toward the press. Every Chief Executive has from time to time expressed unhappiness with newsmen—especially in the era of television, which has given a new and sometimes awkward immediacy to the Presidency and other major news sources. It may be that Presidents are sensitive to the nuances of the media because the coverage they receive is so extensive.

But Mr. Nixon's record does not look good in comparison with that of his immediate predecessors—men who, like himself, have had to cope with the glaring lights of television.

Prior to last night, Mr. Nixon had, in the previous 12 months, held no televised news conferences at all and only two nonbroadcast conferences. Both of the latter were held in his office without advance notice. As is well known, the President has frequently—on at least 40 occasions—preempted prime-time television for various pronouncements.

In his 41 months in office, Mr. Nixon has had a total of only 31 news conferences, 16 of which were on live television.

In contrast, President Eisenhower had 193 press conferences in 96 months; President Kennedy, 72 in 34 months, and President Johnson, 135 in 62 months.

In other words, President Nixon's three predecessors averaged at least two news conferences a month, while his norm has been less than one. And, of course, in the past year the Nixon record has deteriorated even further.

What is most lamentable is that this dismal record has been compiled at a time when the physical capabilities of the media have never been greater. There are more correspondents than ever before in Washington, and they have the best equipment for getting their stories out.

The text of Mr. Nixon's remarks on presidential news conferences, as published in the New York Times this morning, follows:

[From the New York Times, Friday, June 30, 1972]

FREQUENCY OF NEWS CONFERENCES

Q. Mr. President, this is kind of an in-house question but I think it's of interest to [Laughter] A. I know.

Q. Nevertheless I think this is of interest to our viewers and listeners and readers and that is that you seem to have done very well tonight. You're certainly in command of the

situation and yet this is the first time in a year that you've been willing to meet with us in this kind of forum. What is your feeling about these types of press conferences?

A. It isn't that I'm afraid to do it. I have to determine the best way of communication and also—this will sound self-serving and it's intended to be—I have to use the press conference. I don't mean use the reporters, but use the press conference when I believe that is the best way to communicate or to inform the people.

Now, for example, I had to make a decision that may have been wrong but I concluded that in the very sensitive period leading up to the Peking trip and the period thereafter and in the even more sensitive period, as it turned out to be, leading up to the Moscow trip and the period immediately thereafter, that the press conference even non-committing questions, was not a useful thing for the President of the United States to engage in.

I felt I was, of course, on television enough in that period anyway and that was the problem.

As you know I have met the press not perhaps as often as some members of the press would like—or maybe as often as I would like, but I have met them in other formats than the televised conference.

The other point that I should make is this that I know that many members of the press have been discussing the press conference and they feel that perhaps the President, this President, is tempted to downgrade the press or downgrade the press conference.

I'm not trying to do that. It is useful. It is important. It requires hard work in preparing for it, I can assure you. But I think I can best put it this way: every President has got to make a decision when he enters office about his relations with the press, and about his job.

I mean I'm as human as anybody else. I like to get a good press, but on the other hand I had to determine—as I did determine, as I'm sure most Presidents do, that what was most important at this time was for me to do a good job, because the stakes were so high, particularly in foreign policy and also in some areas of domestic policy.

Now if I do a good job, the fact I get a bad press isn't going to matter. If I do a bad job, a good press isn't going to help.

And when November comes the people will decide whether I've done a good job or not and whether I've had so many press conferences is probably not going to make a lot of difference. I trust we can do both because it is essential for a President to communicate with the people, to inform the press, who, of course, do talk to the people, either on television, radio as through what they write, and I will perhaps in the future, we can avoid the feeling on the part of the press that the President is antagonistic to them. I can't say whether the President thinks the press is antagonistic to him. But that's another matter.

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON MISUSE OF LEAA FUNDS

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, last month the House Government Operations Committee issued a report titled "Block Grant Programs of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration," which is the culmination of a 2-year investigation by the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee which I chair. There has been considerable public attention given to the operations of LEAA as a result of the subcommittee's investigation. With one of the most important domestic missions in the Federal Government LEAA requires close oversight review if the goals of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 are to be attained.

Recently the New Haven Register editorialized on the subject of LEAA and I append the editorial for the benefit of my colleagues.

[From the New Haven (Conn.) Register, June 12, 1972]

STOP THE WASTE OF ANTI-CRIME FUNDS

The lesson comes home over and over again. It has to be re-learned no matter how many times the point has been made. Money from Washington doesn't automatically help solve social problems. We now are seeing, to our sorrow, that federal funds have not been nearly as effective as had been hoped in cutting down crime.

Millions of federal dollars are doled out annually to police departments under the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA). This costly expenditure has been made with the urgent purpose of beefing up local operations to reverse the rising tide of crime that has been undermining the American way of life.

In many instances the money has been well spent. But the numerous cases of misuse of the funds are appalling. While the federal government needs to save every cent it can in the face of heavy deficits, there has been widespread squandering of the anti-crime funds. Throughout the nation there has been abuse of the LEAA program. It ranges from corruption to inefficiency and maladministration. The intent of Congress, in appropriating this money, has been violated in too many states where partisan political manipulation has made a mockery of the program.

The outrageous situation has been uncovered through a study of a House Subcommittee, headed by Rep. John S. Monagan, of Connecticut's Fifth District. Investigation by the legislators led to numerous disclosures of money being used for unnecessary equipment or activities rather than for serious law-enforcement purposes.

The list of abuses is long. An airplane bought by the State of Indiana with federal anti-crime funds has been, according to Monagan, used to fly the governor of that state and his family to vacation spots. It was found by investigators that the head of a regional LEAA office was the principal stockholder with a consulting firm which had a \$600,000 contract with LEAA. Lucrative consulting contracts were awarded to hastily-formed firms.

The legislation providing reauthorization for this federal anti-crime program comes up next year. Before any more money is poured into it, let's insist upon controls that assure that the money will go for the vital war against crime.

A CRY FOR FREEDOM

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the proud nation of Lithuania experienced a brief 22 years of independence—an independence which abruptly terminated in June 1940. Although 32 years have elapsed since the Lithuanian people were forcibly incorporated within the U.S.S.R. by Stalin, their desire for freedom persists.

Reports of an upsurge of resistance to the Soviet presence in that country with its long record of cultural identity and individual development have lately been published. Demonstrations, riots, and several self-immolations have recently taken place. Courageously, 1,700 Lithuanian Catholics petitioned the United Nations to complain that Soviet leaders interfered with freedom of worship in that country.

We must not forget these valiant people nor their long struggle to attain the freedom which we so fortunately enjoy.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following excellent editorial entitled "A Cry for Freedom Heard in Lithuania," which appeared in the June 23 edition of the Hartford, Conn., Courant:

A CRY FOR FREEDOM HEARD IN LITHUANIA

For all its menace, Russia's Iron Curtain hardly has proved to be sound-proof during the last two decades. First came the muffled cries of the East Germans and the East Berliners in active protest against the Soviet-imposed regimes. And since then the Hungarians, the Poles and the Czechs also have lifted their voices and their arms in a vault for freedom.

Futile as their attempts thus far have been, the Western world has never ceased to admire the courage of those men and women who would dare strike their own special blows for freedom in the face of such formidable odds. Now the Lithuanians can be added to the list.

Any news of unrest behind the Iron Curtain usually is slow in seeping to the outside and that has been the case along the Baltic Sea this spring. But seemingly reliable reports are now circulating in Moscow that thousands of Lithuanians, mainly young people, battled Soviet security forces last month in Kaunas, the country's second largest city. They reportedly shouted "Freedom for Lithuania!" and tossed sticks and stones at policemen and paratroopers. One young man even burned himself to death in protest against Soviet tyranny.

Now another self-immolation has been reported in the small city of Varina, about 50 miles south of the Lithuanian capital of Vilna. And such a grim gesture of defiance is reminiscent of the Buddhist monks in South Vietnam who burned themselves to death in the 1960s to protest the policies of Saigon. Man does indeed fight for causes in ways that are not always easy to fathom.

Lithuania, a predominantly Roman Catholic state, was annexed by Russia in 1940. Nationalist sentiment reportedly has been rising in the last six months with the Catholic community demanding freedom of worship. Fortunately, if history is any judge, the call for liberty is eventually answered no matter how long or tortuous the wait. May the Lithuanians be no exception.

DUBIOUS APPROACH TO DRUGS PROBLEM

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, when the House passed legislation on June 12 to control drug abuse in the military, I voted against the bill to protest against what I feel to be an inadequate program for curing addiction. Because it relied on a voluntary approach, I felt that this bill was totally unrealistic, and unfair both to the GI addict and to the society to which he would return with his habit intact.

This legislation does provide for 30 days mandatory treatment, but this is clearly an inadequate period of time to cure many drug users. The most seriously addicted will return to society still craving narcotics. They will not seek treatment on their own, but will probably be caught in the endless cycle of drugs and crime.

I have recommended in place of the voluntary approach a compulsory program of drug treatment. Early last year, I introduced legislation requiring that no GI addict be discharged from the service until judged free of his habitual addiction. By placing the responsibility for drug treatment on the military, this legislation would assure the proper and complete treatment of addiction. The heavy user would not be allowed to take home an expensive habit. He would be treated mandatorily, an approach which the House has rejected, but which I hope the Senate will accept in its consideration of drug treatment legislation.

I am pleased to have editorial support for my approach to combating drug addiction in the military. I include at this point this editorial from the Bridgeport Post of June 20.

DUBIOUS APPROACH

Congress has not distinguished itself in its attitude toward drug addiction in the military. A few days ago the House approved a measure which would detain addicts for up to 30 days after their regular discharge date. During the month they would be treated for their problem and then set free unconditionally.

Congressman John S. Monagan of Waterbury worked since early last year on behalf of a more sensible and effective bill. He and 50 co-sponsors introduced legislation to give GI addicts medical and emotional assistance until they are rehabilitated.

Mr. Monagan reasoned correctly that there is no such thing as a 30-day instant cure for victims of narcotics.

If soldiers are to enjoy a decent chance for recovery, they must have compulsory extended care. As important as the servicemen are, they are not the only consideration. Setting loose drug dependent persons in the towns and cities of America is certain to breed more crime and social problems.

Many people suffer when a heroin user is forced to live by his wits, often dependent on crime to support his craving.

The House bill is predicated on the assumption that most soldiers will seek additional help after becoming civilians. Past evidence has shown this hopeful expectation to be fanciful. Last year the Army offered 4,440 soldiers the opportunity for voluntary commitment to treatment centers. Only 23 accepted.

When the Senate takes up the plight of military addicts in the near future, the spirit of Mr. Monagan's plan should be revived.

In dealing with men who have been enslaved by drugs while serving their country, half measures are not acceptable. Almost surely the House version would be a waste of money and most importantly, a squandering of young lives.

KANGAROO MEAT IMPORTED

(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, the lifting of import quotas on meat including beef will be a serious blow to the American cattle farmer and to the American consumer.

Cheap, low-wage foreign meat imports are not the answer to inflation. We must prevent the American housewife from becoming the victim of inferior meat products.

For the first time, the American farmer is now receiving a fair price for his meat production.

The following article appeared some years ago in a publication in Pennsylvania. I commend its attention to those who favor accelerated imports of cheap, low-wage foreign meat products.

ARE YOU JUMPY THESE DAYS? KANGAROO MEAT FOUND IN PENNSYLVANIA

In announcing that the Department of Agriculture has uncovered evidence that Pennsylvania firms have been importing kangaroo meat, Attorney General Anne X. Alpern said:

"The Department of Agriculture had done an outstanding job in ferreting out the use of kangaroo meat in Pennsylvania, in violation of State laws and regulations.

"While kangaroos are intriguing animals in zoos, there is nothing amusing about the use of kangaroos shot in Australian fields and shipped to Pennsylvania without the normal veterinarian examinations made in the case of all other animals."

The Department in its investigation found that kangaroos are killed in the field in southwestern Australia and then are transported from the field under inadequate refrigeration.

Kangaroo meat is not used generally as a food in Australia today.

At least 33,000 pounds were shipped to Pittsburgh in 1958. There were at least 3,000 pounds stored in Pittsburgh in 1959. Over 5,000 pounds were delivered in Philadelphia in 1959, and seized by the Department of Agriculture.

A shipment of 6,360 pounds of kangaroo meat went from Pittsburgh to Wilkes-Barre in late 1959. The Department has received reports that as much as 2 million pounds of kangaroo meat has been imported by a Pennsylvania firm.

There is rigorous inspection in Pennsylvania of meat that is slaughtered for human consumption and careful supervision of meat destined for use by animals.

None of the kangaroo meat has been sold over the counter as kangaroo meat. It has been used without disclosure as to the nature of the meat.

Violators of the Pennsylvania meat regulations will be given a hearing by the Department of Agriculture. If no proper examination of the violation of basic meat regulation is received, action will be taken by the Department of Justice.

THE DEATH PENALTY

(Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker. I have introduced a joint resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to give States and the Federal Government the right to impose the death penalty in two instances. These two instances are the willful, premeditated taking of human life and treason.

Once again the Supreme Court, by the margin of a single vote, has trespassed on the domain of the State and Federal legislative bodies. One of the dissenters, Mr. Justice Rehnquist, points out in his opinion the need for the Court to defer to the legislative judgment, a judgment more responsive to the people. It is the purpose of my resolution to assert to this legislative judgment.

I should note that I am not passing judgment on any or all of the 600 men and women who were under death sentences at the time of the decision, since I am not familiar with the facts in each case. However, I do feel that wholesale banning of the death penalty is wrong.

As Chief Justice Burger pointed out in his opinion, there is such an infinite variety of cases and such an infinite number of variables within each case that to rule out the death penalty in every case is unsound both in principle and in practical application.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT MARKS FIFTH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. MOORHEAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, July 4, 1972, marks the fifth anniversary of the effective date of one of the most unique laws ever passed by the Congress—the Freedom of Information Act, section 552 of title 5, United States Code.

The philosophy of the Freedom of Information Act is based on the people's right to know about the activities of their Government, consistent with the need to afford protection to those vital secrets that affect our national defense, foreign policy, and certain limited areas of normal governmental functions.

The law was the product of some 11 years of investigations, hearings, and concentrated effort by the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, House Government Operations Committee, and its predecessor subcommittee. The long struggle to enact the law was spearheaded by my able and distinguished predecessor, the gentleman from California (Mr. Moss), who served as chairman until last year.

President Johnson emphasized the vital importance of the basic purpose of the new law:

This legislation springs from one of our most essential principles: a democracy works best when the people have all the information that the security of the Nation permits. No one should be able to pull curtains of

secrecy around decisions which can be revealed without injury to the public interest . . . I signed this measure with a deep sense of pride that the United States is an open society in which the people's right to know is cherished and guarded.

Mr. Speaker, the key principles of the Freedom of Information Act are:

First, that disclosure of information by Government agencies be the general rule, not the exception;

Second, that all individuals have equal rights of access;

Third, that the burden be on the Government to justify the withholding of a document, not on the person requesting it;

Fourth, that individuals improperly denied access to documents have a right to seek injunctive relief in the Federal courts;

Fifth, that there be a change in Government policy and attitude to further the objectives of the Freedom of Information Act, as Congress clearly intended; and

Sixth, that exemptions contained in 552(b) of the act relating to national defense, foreign policy, personnel and medical files, trade secrets, investigatory files compiled for law enforcement purposes, interagency or intra-agency memoranda, and similar areas are not mandatory in their use to deny information, but are only permissive and should be used sparingly.

Mr. Speaker, since March 6 of this year, the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee has held 34 days of hearings on all aspects of the economy and efficiency of operations by Federal agencies in the administration of the Freedom of Information Act. These have been the only indepth hearings on the act held since its enactment and have covered every aspect of information policies and practices of executive departments and agencies. An additional 7 days of hearings were held last summer by the subcommittee on information matters connected with the publication of the "Pentagon Papers."

During the course of these hearings, we have received testimony from 134 witnesses. Some 34 Federal departments and agencies were represented at our hearings and an additional 91 outside experts from all segments of the public having experience under the act also testified or submitted statements for the hearing record. Four volumes of the hearings are already in print and the remaining portions will be available during the summer. Copies may be obtained from the subcommittee office—B-371B, Rayburn House Office Building, or by calling 225-3741.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to prejudge the findings and recommendations that will be contained in the various reports to be considered by our committee as a result of our hearings. However, it is fair at this juncture to point out that we have uncovered many shocking cases of where the Federal bureaucracy has chosen to ignore the intent of Congress and conduct all too much of its business behind closed doors. Many of the shortcomings in the Executive administration

of the act are due, it appears, to resistance on the part of the bureaucracy, rather than the compromise in its language that are inherent in the legislative process that produced the law. It is likely, however, that we will recommend certain amendments to the act that will tighten up on abuses of the exemptions and to clarify, in some cases, what was the original intent of Congress.

Other major problem areas we have uncovered during our hearings are:

First, the bureaucratic delay in responding to an individual's request for information—major Federal agencies took an average of 33 days—and in acting upon an appeal from a decision to deny the information to an individual—major agencies took an average of 50 additional days;

Second, the abuses in fee schedules by some agencies for searching and copying of documents or records requested by individuals; exorbitant charges for such services have been an effective bureaucratic tool in denying information to individual requesters;

Third, the cumbersome and costly legal remedy under the act when an individual who is denied information by an agency chooses to invoke the injunctive procedures to obtain access; although the private citizen has won—and the Government bureaucracy has lost—a majority of the more than 150 cases under the act that have gone to the Federal courts, the time it takes, the investment of many thousands of dollars in attorney fees and court costs, and the advantages to the Government in such cases makes litigation under the act less than feasible in many situations;

Fourth, the lack of involvement in the decisionmaking process by public information officials when information is denied to an individual making a request under the act; most agency regulations provide for little or no input from public information specialists and the key decisions are made by political appointees—general counsels, assistant secretaries, or other top-echelon officials;

Fifth, the relative lack of utilization of the act by the news media, which had been among the strongest backers of the freedom of information legislation prior to its enactment; the time factor is a significant reason because of the more urgent need for information by the media to meet news deadlines, the delaying tactics of the Federal bureaucrats are a major deterrent to more widespread use of the act, although the subcommittee did receive testimony from several reporters and editors who have taken cases to court and eventually won out over the secrecy-minded Government bureaucracy; and

Sixth, the lack of top-level priority in most Federal departments and agencies toward the full implementation and proper enforcement of Freedom of Information Act policies and regulations; a more positive attitude in support of "open access" from the top administrative officials is needed throughout the executive branch; in too many cases, in-

formation is withheld, overclassified, or otherwise hidden from the public to avoid administrative mistakes, waste of funds, or political embarrassment.

Mr. Speaker, contrary to general opinion, the vast amount of information denied by Government agencies under the act has little to do with hydrogen bombs, weapons systems, state secrets, or other sensitive classified information that does require safeguarding in the interest of our national defense and foreign policy. The large number of denials have involved information dealing with the day-to-day program details that have nothing to do with classified information, but which have great significance to the taxpayer public and the Congress. The subcommittee uncovered many cases where some Federal bureaucrats are maladministering certain programs, blatantly ignoring the clear intent of Congress. If such types of information can be withheld from the public, and if Congress is denied basic facts about Federal programs through the abuse of so-called Executive privilege by the President, there will be little chance to maintain the proper checks and balances between the executive and legislative branches of our Government. The American taxpayer will thus be the loser and the power of Congress as a coequal branch will continue to erode.

The mania for secrecy in Government is not new; nor was it invented by the present administration. Down through our history, no administration has been able to resist the overwhelming political pressures to withhold information from the public and the Congress to prevent embarrassment, scandal, or blunders to those in power. But no President has totally escaped the embarrassment of "leaked" information thought safely hidden away in the dark corners of the Federal bureaucracy.

In recent decades, this critical problem has been called Government secrecy, news management, the credibility gap, or truth in Government. Whatever label we give it, however, we all know that it is a real problem. It is a political problem, but it is not a partisan problem. It is a constitutional problem, but it affects newsmen, editors, publishers, and the public as a whole more than lawyers.

It is obvious to us all that free access to information about the affairs of our Government is essential if we are to enjoy the fruits of a free society, where Government is the servant—not the master—of the American people. But, if the basic rights of the first amendment are breached, if the news media are denied information from Government to which it is legitimately entitled, then the electorate is deprived of the facts needed to make the most intelligent decision at the ballot box and our entire political system is undermined.

The longer range effects of widespread withholding of information by Government could lead to the type of society so graphically described in George Orwell's "1984." If Government information prop-

erty belonging to the American public is systematically hidden—as is too often the case—then people eventually become oblivious to the public business on which their well-being depends. They develop a distrust in their Government or a cynicism that results in many people just "copping out" on a broad front—refusing to register to vote or to participate in the political process; refusing to become involved in social or economic affairs of the communities in which they live; or refusing to become a full participant in the society that is the fabric of our entire governmental system. And, in the final analysis, vast numbers of Americans could thus become incapable of making valid decisions affecting their own lives or at the polls on election day, because of the public ignorance of crucial events and the implications of governmental policies withheld from them by the administration in power—and seeking to remain in power.

As the late Adlai Stevenson once said:

Those who corrupt the public mind are just as evil as those who steal from the public purse.

This is what public information and the fight to preserve the "people's right to know" is all about. A free press is the bulwark against those Government bureaucrats and political news manipulators who "corrupt the public mind" through skillfully disguised propaganda, phony statistics, or misleading canned handouts. It is equally important as a protection against maladministration, political deals, or against those who hide mistakes under a secrecy stamp and lock them securely in 1,000-pound file cabinets.

Mr. Speaker, truth in Government is a vitally important issue to be dealt with by the Congress. It affects every other domestic issue, as well as our national defense and foreign policy. In some way, it touches the life of every American citizen.

As we mark this fifth anniversary of the Freedom of Information Act as a milestone in our representative system, we must rededicate ourselves to the principle that, to the maximum extent possible, the Government's business must always be the people's business if Americans are to retain unity of purpose and fulfill our destiny as a nation.

NATIONAL HOUSING SCANDAL

(Mr. O'NEILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, we all owe a debt of gratitude to our distinguished colleagues on the Government Operations Committee for their preparation of a recently released report probing the causes of rapidly skyrocketing FHA foreclosures in our cities. While the report deals primarily with the Detroit disaster, it is apparent that HUD management inadequacies bordering on the incompetent, and in some instances crim-

inal, are equally applicable in virtually every major city.

The Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, chaired by my good friend, JOHN MONAGAN, is entitled to our special appreciation for the objective and thorough manner which categorized the hearings and the final report itself. The fact that the report was adopted unanimously by the full Committee on Government Operations is remarkable indeed in this, a presidential election year, and I commend my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their objectivity and their willingness to avoid interjecting partisan politics in an area of such critical sensitivity, inner city housing for the poor.

The disgraceful disclosures by the committee of HUD incompetency and less-than-vigorous followup by the Department of Justice which has permitted unconscionable profiteering at the expense of the poor must be dealt with immediately. Without minimizing for 1 minute the difficulty of providing decent housing for the low income in the cities, it should be perfectly apparent that the best law the mind of man is capable of drafting will not work if incompetently and improperly administered as has been the case under the Nixon administration.

I strongly urge my colleagues to study carefully the report itself—House Report 92-1152, and include at this point in the RECORD an excellent news account and subsequent editorial appearing in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, June 22, 1972]

FHA ABUSES IN DETROIT MAY COST TAXPAYERS \$200 MILLION

(By Edward W. O'Brien)

WASHINGTON.—Taxpayers could be hit by \$200 million in losses through abuses in federal housing mortgage insurance programs in Detroit, the House Government Operations Committee has found.

The committee reported Wednesday that the same costly "weaknesses" in Federal Housing Administration programs have been exploited in other cities and may be even worse in some of them.

By unanimous vote, the committee urged a crackdown nationally by FHA, the parent Housing and Urban Development Department, and the Justice Department.

One recommendation was for creation by the Justice Department of "urban housing strike forces," patterned on the federal organized crime drive, to investigate and prosecute law violations "in selected cities where defaults and foreclosure acquisitions are high."

In a series of hearings, a subcommittee headed by Rep. John S. Monagan (Dem.), Connecticut, unearthed conditions in Detroit which turned out to have many similarities to St. Louis area abuses which have been described in the Globe-Democrat.

Much of the inquiry was concentrated on FHA programs intended to help inner-city low and moderate income families to buy homes.

The committee said that "real estate speculators" used the programs to make "huge profits" at the expense of the home buyers and FHA.

"Speculator profits of 60 to 70 per cent on houses held less than eight weeks are not uncommon," the report said.

These "fast-buck artists" were "abetted by

incompetent federal bureaucrats," the committee said.

In typical cases, rundown houses were purchased by these professional operators for \$5,000 or \$6,000, given "cosmetic repairs," and resold immediately for \$12,000 to \$14,000, the committee said.

In Detroit alone, FHA owns 8,000 foreclosed houses, with at least 18,000 more houses likely to be acquired. FHA is losing up to \$10,000 per house as it tries to sell off the foreclosed properties, the committee said.

The report disclosed that FHA is seeking a \$195 million appropriation from Congress to meet inner-city losses incurred by its "special risk" mortgage insurance fund.

This is the first such request for tax funds to offset mortgage losses by FHA's several insurance funds.

To prevent it from happening again, the committee's recommendations included:

That FHA and HUD field offices be allowed to hire enough employees to do their jobs right, without reliance on outside property appraisers hired for a fee.

That fee and staff appraisers be required to disclose "related" outside financial interests.

That appraisers and others involved in inflated appraisals be dismissed.

That lenders who have indulged in "imprudent" practices be blacklisted.

That "undesirable" brokers and mortgagors be barred from doing business with HUD.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, June 24-25, 1972]

NATIONAL HOUSING SCANDAL?

There are strong indications that the multimillion-dollar abuse of federal housing mortgage insurance programs uncovered in Detroit will prove part of a nationwide housing scandal of monumental proportions.

The House Government Operations Committee, in reporting an investigation of federal housing policies, said in Washington the government stood to lose up to \$200 million in Detroit alone because of lax management of Federal Housing Administration programs.

The committee reported it found the same costly "weaknesses" in FHA programs have been exploited in other cities and may be even worse in some of them.

Conditions similar to the abuses unearthed in Detroit already have been found in St. Louis—described in stories in the Globe-Democrat—and congressional sources hinted a new scandal may surface soon in Los Angeles.

There already have been charges brought against real estate speculators and government officials in New York and Philadelphia. A large portion of the House panel's probe has concentrated on FHA programs intended to help inner-city low and moderate income families to buy homes.

The committee said "real estate speculators" used the programs to make "huge profits" at the expense of the home buyers and the FHA, which insured the mortgages.

In typical cases, speculators purchase, at cheap prices, run-down houses in low-income areas, give them "cosmetic repairs" and then sell the houses at much higher prices with FHA-insured mortgages.

The buyers, finding themselves with faulty dwellings and often already deeply in debt despite federally required credit checks, default on payments and the federal government is stuck with the mortgage.

In Detroit alone, the FHA owns 8,000 foreclosed houses, with at least 18,000 more houses likely to be acquired.

These rapidly rising mortgage defaults ultimately have to be paid for by the taxpayers. The anticipated \$200 million loss in

Detroit will come out of the working public's pockets.

The congressional findings point up a shocking incompetency in the administration of federal housing programs. Why has the Department of Housing and Urban Development, parent of FHA, permitted its offspring to overvalue structurally unsound houses on such a wide scale? Occasional mistakes in appraisals might be understandable, but when they have occurred on a wholesale basis, it's inexcusable.

To present such abuses from happening again, the House made several recommendations, including:

That FHA and HUD field offices beef up their staffs so they can do their jobs right without having to rely on outside property appraisers hired for a fee.

That appraisers be required to disclose "related" outside financial interests, and that anyone involved in inflated appraisals or recommending unsound houses be dismissed.

That lenders who have indulged in "imprudent" practices be blacklisted and that "undesirable" brokers and mortgagees be barred from doing business with the government.

The committee report also urged the Justice Department to investigate and prosecute law violations "in selected cities where defaults and foreclosure acquisitions are high" to protect the intended beneficiaries of federal housing programs.

In view of the disgraceful disclosures, the House panel is right to call for a crackdown nationally by HUD, FHA and the Justice Department. A major housecleaning of this federal mess is obviously overdue.

REPRESENTATIVE PAUL ROGERS OF FLORIDA: HEALTH'S NEW STRONG MAN IN CONGRESS

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

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, the 92d Congress is being called a do-nothing Congress, and that label may be justified in some areas. A conspicuous exception, however, is the impressive record of achievement piled up by the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee chaired by Congressman PAUL ROGERS of Florida.

The list of major bills acted on by this committee so far in this Congress includes: The National Cancer Act of 1972; the Health Manpower Act; the Nurse Manpower Act; the Special Action Office on Drug Abuse Prevention Act; the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism and Digestive Diseases; the noise control bill; the heart, lung and blood vessel bill; the sickle cell anemia prevention bill; the National Institute on Aging bill; the Health Maintenance Organization bill; the communicable diseases bill; the emergency medical services bill; the safe drinking water bill; the food labeling and inspection bill; a bill to catalog all the drugs on the market; and a bill to strengthen the consumer protection powers of the Food and Drug Administration. In addition there have been extensive oversight hearings on implementation of the Clean Air Act, drug law enforcement, and food poisoning.

All this from one subcommittee.

I am convinced that there are two reasons a performance like this is possible. The first is obviously the drive of the chairman to get things done. But just as important is the way he treats the people he works with, both colleagues and staff. PAUL ROGERS presides with the kind of instinctive courtesy and courtliness that has aptly been called "The South's Secret Weapon." This remarkable manner has lulled many an unwary bureaucrat into disclosures that later cost them dearly. It also smoothes the differences between legislators that seem to bog down most committees.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to see a recent article from the *Medical World News* which very well describes Chairman ROGERS and the high regard for him that exists on both sides of the aisle. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the *Medical World News*, Apr. 28, 1972]

HEALTH'S NEW STRONG MAN IN CONGRESS

In dark blue suit, white shirt, and rep tie, he stands John Wayne tall behind the lectern on the stage of the Washington Hilton's cavernous ballroom. His large, round face is tanned from the Florida sun, graying sideburns contrast with the dark horn-rimmed glasses and black hair. He begins to speak, with a quote from the *Book of Common Prayer*. "We have left undone those things which we ought to have done; and we have done those things which we ought not to have done; and there is no health in us..." Those words are dramatically precise in describing our national performance in the delivery of health care in this nation," he declares.

In a year when attention is focused on the election of a President, Paul Grant Rogers, Democratic congressman from Florida's ninth district and health's emerging strong man in Congress, has drawn a sizable crowd of medical educators to a Sunday morning session of the prestigious Association of American Medical Colleges, then meeting in the nation's capital. Significantly, the educators turned out, as do members of other groups of clinicians, researchers, and laymen around the country, to hear a man who, they find, is exercising more and more influence on national health legislation. Depending on a listener's point of view, Representative Rogers may not say what he wants to hear, but the audiences gather nonetheless. Here is a sample of the Floridian's message:

"I have found that the idea of a coherent system of federal health programs is a myth. I have found that the idea of over-all health policy leadership by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is a myth."

He leads his audience through a quick description of fragmented health programs in the federal government. "What we need is a plan; we need to decide what we want to do; we have to decide how we're going to do it." The delivery is warm, with a touch of the Southern evangelist.

"I feel strongly that we need a new Cabinet-level department of health. I intend to introduce legislation to establish such a department. But we need to go further than this. We need to sweep the spotlight of public attention across the whole front of federal health activities; support of biomedical research, support for the educational of scientists and health professionals, and delivery of health services to the aged, the needy, and other federal beneficiaries." For a fleeting instant the observer sees the lectern trans-

formed into a pulpit, and hears the soft shuffle of converts with heads bowed, moving down a sawdust aisle.

Sweeping the spotlight of public opinion across federal health programs and the nation's health problems has become a crusade for Representative Rogers, who, as chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee's subcommittee on public health and environment, is fast carving himself a reputation as "Mr. Health."

Even in the Senate, where Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.) sits in the driver's seat of the health bandwagon, Rogers has earned a reputation as a major figure to be reckoned with, a hard-nosed negotiator who eventually gets his way.

The Administration has felt his strength also, most recently on the issue of closing the eight remaining Public Health Service hospitals. Now, in the legislation promised at the AAMC meeting and introduced last month, Rogers is pressuring the Administration to form a department of health. The Administration is countering with a plan to form a department of human resources, even broader than HEW, thus drawing the lines for a major battle next year, assuming that the voters allow President Nixon to renew his lease at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Indeed, Paul Rogers has had a major influence on every piece of significant health legislation to clear the Congress in the past seven years, and that means more than 50 separate acts embracing federal aid to education of health professionals, community mental health and mental retardation centers, regional medical programs, comprehensive health planning and services, communicable disease control, air, water, and noise pollution, drug abuse, and the National Cancer Act—to name but a few of the major ones. In each, Rogers has embraced the practical and rejected the grandiose.

"There is a lot of crusader in Paul Rogers," says HEW's Deputy Assistant Secretary for Health Legislation, John S. Zapp. "In my judgment, he is probably the most knowledgeable health man on the Hill—and his intentions are good ones."

Rogers' constant focus on health and environment problems—be it the need to separate the "H" from HEW or the danger of sharp pull-off lids on kid's pudding cans—has drawn criticism from some who say he is shallow and is simply trying to score publicity points. "I don't think so," says HEW's assistant secretary for health, Dr. Merlin K. DuVal. "All the pieces are part of a larger fabric. He is interested in trying to represent the interests of the American people in health in the way he sees it."

Though there may be political gain in the title "Mr. Health," Rogers is sincere in his concerns about health problems. "Health is a field affecting every American, the old, the young, the rich, the poor, the educated, and the uneducated," he tells MWN. "When you see the problems as we do through our committee work, then you want to do more."

These days, however, it is impossible for one legislator to exert total control over health. Right or wrong, health responsibilities in the Congress are split among six committees—three in the House and three in the Senate. The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which the Rogers subcommittee is a part, is a legislative, or authorizing committee. It acts on bills to create new programs or to change or extend old ones. In the process, it sets annual ceilings on the funds the programs can spend judiciously in keeping with the need. It is one of the more conservative committees in the House, so far as authorizing money is concerned. "More money falls through the floor

of the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance committees than you can bulldoze through the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for health programs," says one lobbyist.

The appropriations committees decide how much money, within the ceilings set by the authorizing committees, programs can have to spend in any given year. (Whether the Administration in turn actually spends the appropriated funds is yet another matter.) Rep. John E. Fogarty (D-R.I.), chairman of the Health Appropriations Committee until his death in 1967, was responsible, along with his colleague in the Senate, Lister Hill of Alabama, for granting additional millions to the National Institutes of Health, which before 1965 was one of the major sources of funds for health.

In recent years, however, Fogarty's successor, Rep. Daniel J. Flood (D-Pa.), has seemed to delight in holding back funds for health.

In the Senate, Hill had a unique position. He authorized health programs as chairman of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and its health subcommittee. Then, putting on his hat as chairman of the health appropriations subcommittee, and with help of Fogarty, he would push the necessary funds through the Congress.

The third committee that has a major influence on national health policy and whose influence will grow in the future is the House Ways and Means Committee, chaired by Rep. Wilbur Mills (D-Ark.). Because it handles all tax legislation, including the Social Security Act, it has primary responsibility for Medicare and Medicaid and is preparing to shape a national health insurance plan.

Thus there are two week spots in Paul Rogers' reign over health. He has no influence over the Ways and Means Committee, which one Rogers fan calls "a committee of one," nor has he authority over the research programs of the National Institutes of Health, save for the National Cancer Institute, because the NIH Research Institutes have permanent authorizations with no ceilings on how much money can be appropriated.

Although Rogers cannot hope to have the kind of power in health that Hill and Fogarty had in an age gone by, he is trying and trying hard. The National Cancer Act would give him control of a major chunk of the NIH research empire, because it sets spending ceilings and has to be extended every three years. A bill now pending, which he introduced jointly with Senator Kennedy, would give him essentially the same power over the National Heart and Lung Institute. This trend, to say the least, is making NIH officials uneasy.

Then if he can consolidate all HEW health activities into a department of health, he will gain influence over the policy-making machinery governing Medicare and Medicaid, or whatever evolves from the Congress in the form of national health insurance. "If the department head had the program and the planning, it could control the financing. As it is now, the financing controls the program," says the chairman.

Though his goals in health are ambitious and his manner aggressive, Rogers is not a liberal Democrat in the likeness of Senator Kennedy. He is generally classed as a moderate conservative. The Americans for Constitutional Action, an organization that rates legislators' voting records against conservative guidelines, gives him an 81% rating. The Americans for Democratic Action scorecard shows he voted liberally 11% of the time. Because of his basic conservatism plus his "great leadership ability, Paul can go on the

floor and he listened to by everybody and carry the Southern Democratic vote," notes Dr. William R. Roy (D-Kan.), a physician-lawyer and a member of Rogers' subcommittee.

"Paul is a pretty practical guy, in a field where it is easy to be gung ho," says the subcommittee's ranking Republican, Ancher Nelsen, a Minnesota farmer-turned-congressman. "All I can say is he ought to be on our side. He ought to be a Republican." But here, too, Rogers can be chameleon-like. He doesn't run a partisan show, but tries to get full support for what he wants to do from both Democratic and Republican members of his subcommittee.

Doctors will find that Representative Rogers doesn't stray too far from the philosophy of organized medicine: "We should maintain a private health system," he says, "a pluralistic approach, building on what we have already built." But in the same breath he acknowledges a responsibility of the federal government to see that the problems are solved and "to get the country to shift from curative medicine to preventive medicine—health maintenance as a way to reduce costs and improve the level of health. True, we will have to have coordination and planning, but it would be an error to scrap the system."

Rogers believes that most physicians would agree with him on basics. "Doctors realize that it is not possible to avoid the federal government in health matters—there is just too much to do."

While the relative agreement of the nation's doctors is not known, Representative Rogers is heartily supported by his constituents, who gave him a ringing 70% of the vote in the 1970 election. Comments Rogers: "I have plenty of opponents, I just don't have the opposition." He has apparently done well for his constituents over the years, with a voting record against rising federal spending (he received the "watchdog of the treasury" award from the National Associated Businessmen). He has maintained a hard line against Cuba, fought to give local government control over migrant-farm-worker programs, and protested against the lack of coastal defenses in Florida. Beginning his congressional career as a member of the powerful Public Works Committee, Rogers got a flood control district for south central Florida which since has saved millions of dollars in damages. He has been a major sponsor of "sea grant colleges," his concept of "land grant colleges," as part of his push for federal support of oceanographic research.

He learned grass-roots politicking early. The son of the late Congressman Dwight L. Rogers, whose House seat Paul now holds, he recalls, "I used to go around with Dad when he campaigned. There is no doubt that growing up with a lawyer-congressman had an influence on me." Moreover, the junior Rogers is considered a local son. Although he was born in Ocilla, Ga. (June 4, 1921), the family moved to the Sunshine State when he was four years old. He attended the state's University at Gainesville, majoring in political science and speech. Following meritorious service in World War II, Rogers returned to the University of Florida to get his law degree. He then joined a West Palm Beach law firm and practiced until his father's unexpected death and the special election in 1955.

Once in Washington, Rogers became known as one of the most eligible bachelors in town and he was an oft-invited guest on the capital's party circuit. His eligible status ended, however, in December 1962, when he married Rebecca Bell Mozley of Alabama. They have one daughter, eight-year-old Rebecca Laing.

Even opponents agree that open friendliness and dogged determination have made

Paul Rogers one of the most effective congressmen in Washington. Typical of his regard for constituents and an increasing number of correspondents outside his district—he reads and signs the replies to all of the 100 to 350 letters that this office receives each day.

"He's a guy you can see, he'll listen to you," says Noble Swearingen, a long-time Washington health consultant. "Rogers doesn't always buy what outside groups want," says Dr. John A. D. Cooper, president of the Association of American Medical Colleges, somewhat ruefully. In last year's health manpower legislation, the AAMC tried to get Rogers to back off on his provision requiring medical schools to increase their enrollment by 10% or ten students before they can qualify for capitation grant support, regardless of the amount of support.

During the 1970 debate on the Clean Air Act, the Senate bill set a 1975 deadline for auto makers to clean up exhaust emission, a deadline not in the original House-passed bill. When the bill came to conference, vested-interest groups turned on the pressure—the conservationists to keep the provision, the auto manufacturers to kill it. Rogers was flexible. He studied up, talked to people on both sides of the issue, plus experts on the technical side, who said the deadline was technologically feasible. He decided to back the Senate deadline and so convinced the House conferees.

But he will compromise. Last year, when the Senate passed a National Cancer Act—against the sole nay vote of Sen. Gaylord Nelson (D-Wis.)—which would have created a cancer research agency separate from the NIH, Rogers dug his heels in against it. He announced extensive hearings before his subcommittee. Rogers was determined to preserve the integrity of the NIH, but at the same time boost cancer research.

Recalls Ancher Nelsen: "When I saw the storm clouds brewing, I started to search for ways to make the House version acceptable to both the White House, which had already endorsed the Senate bill, and to Senator Kennedy, the chief sponsor in the Senate." Nelsen, who has a reputation as a compromiser, proposed a three-man panel in the White House to give over-all policy supervision to the National Cancer Institute. "Paul agreed with that, put it in and made it acceptable to the President, and as a result we came out with a good bill. You see, Paul is not a fellow to try to outdo the other guy. He didn't take a 'this is it or else' attitude on the cancer act. Rogers works his way in the Congress with facts, not fancy." "He is a very sharp interrogator, and he can be very rough," says HEW's Dr. DuVal, who has sat in the hot seat before the Floridian many times. Rogers goes after information with a vengeance that occasionally borders on arrogance. He seldom if ever allows personalities to enter a hearing. He is after information, and he will press and press, with sharp, targeted questions, to get it. "Paul wants to know all he can," says HEW legislative aide Zapp. "Yet he is independently knowledgeable when he goes into a hearing. He does not depend on someone feeding him questions. By doing his homework, he builds a tremendous base of support for his position along the way. He seldom goes to a hearing without knowing where every major interest group sits on an issue."

After the public hearings are over, the subcommittee begins the tedious process of incorporating the suggestions of witnesses and their own thinking into a final piece of legislation that they can support as a subcommittee, and that stands a good chance of

winning House passage. Rogers runs these executive sessions quietly and informally. At first, he identifies the major policy issues that have to be settled. Once these are taken care of, technicians then work the decision into legislative language. Second time around, the chairman goes through the bill line by line, giving ample opportunity for comment. "Whatd'y'all think?" he asks, looking up and down the table. If there are objections from subcommittee members, he stops and Irons them out.

Most health bills coming from Rogers' subcommittee get rubber-stamped by the full committee and sent on to the Rules Committee which decides when and how to send the bill before the House. Because Rogers is astute at reading the mood of the House, he seldom has trouble getting one of his proposals through the Rules Committee.

"Paul has developed an effective subcommittee which has great respect for its chairman," says Representative Roy. "His members are informed and well-grounded in the facts. Because he spends much time and energy on health matters and does his homework, the rest do it, too. I think it is one of the best subcommittees in the House."

When differences in House and Senate versions of a bill must be compromised in joint conference, Rogers is a "bear," says one aide. In both the Cancer Act and the Health Manpower Act, the House conferees, led by full committee chairman Harley O. Staggers (D-W.Va.) with Rogers doing the infighting, emerged with 80% of the House version intact. "Rogers will sit in there all day until he gets what he thinks is the will of the House," says Steve Lawton, his health aide.

But the business of competing with the more flamboyant Senate has its frustrations for Rogers. Often, House members do all the work and the Senate gets the credit. Rogers' department of health bill is an example. This has been his goal since 1966 when a special subcommittee on HEW, which he chaired, recommended a separate department. His staff took a draft of the department of health bill to Senator Kennedy and others, asking them to cosponsor it. Rogers and Kennedy announced the legislation at a joint press conference. Then Sen. Abraham Ribicoff (D-Conn.), a former HEW Secretary, introduced his own bill. Next day, the newspapers were calling it a Kennedy-Ribicoff measure which was being co-sponsored by Rogers in the House. "Don't forget," warns one health lobbyist, "Rogers is a politician and he has to compete with Kennedy who is one of the best of all time. Paul's not running for the Senate but he doesn't want to be upstaged, either. It's hard on a guy like Rogers to do his homework, go do a good job, and then, when Kennedy walks into the room and takes his seat, all the TV cameras click on."

To a politician, the best of all possible worlds is to be able to push an issue he sincerely believes in, while at the same time score points against the opposition and pick up a few chits from his friends.

As soon as Rogers heard that HEW was going to close up its eight remaining PHS hospitals, he knew instantly that he had an issue. In these days of health care crises, closing eight hospitals is difficult to justify to the public even if the facilities are in need of repair and are about 50% utilized, in this case by merchant marine seamen. The Administration sought to close them outright. Rogers headed that one off with a resolution stating the intent of Congress that the hospitals not be closed, that HEW study the possibility of turning the facilities over to local community control, but that it do nothing without approval of Congress.

Although he hasn't a PHS hospital in his district, or anywhere in Florida for that mat-

ter, Rogers fought the Administration hard. He saw in the hospitals a source of care for the poor and a center in which commissioned PHS officers could demonstrate new forms of care. In addition, he said that the hospitals were necessary for the recruitment and training of physicians to serve in the new Emergency Health Service Corps, a program created by Congress last year, over the objections of the President, to bring medical care to underserved rural and inner-city areas. After some initial misgivings, Rogers enthusiastically sponsored the bill in the House.

The view of the Administration, as expressed by HEW's Dr. DuVal, is that since the hospitals are not running at full occupancy and the number of beneficiaries is declining, they are not a proper use of federal funds. "I further disagree with the philosophy that the government should be directly involved in providing services to people who are poor." Dr. DuVal further points out that the military draft is going to end in 1973 and with it goes the only significant recruiting tool the PHS Commissioned Corps has. Without the draft, there will be no doctors to staff the hospitals anyway, he says.

Dr. Vernon E. Wilson, chief of the Health Services and Mental Health Administration, agrees. "Conceptually, Mr. Rogers has greater faith in the capacity of the federal government to render care than perhaps I do. My position on the PHS hospital issue is that the hospitals could do a better job benefiting the community if there were greater community involvement and control."

Apart from his belief in the real need for both hospitals and the Commissioned Corps to run them, there may be another, more political reason for Rogers' dogged defense of the eight hospitals. The primary beneficiaries of the PHS hospitals are merchant mariners. Rogers is a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, which held the first public hearings on HEW's efforts to close the hospitals. It is this committee, and its subcommittee on oceanography, that pushed Rogers' sea grant college act through the House, and which in 1970 handled an extension of the program. Two Florida universities have already been named to receive grants from the program. Paul Rogers is, after all, a politician.

However, there are inconsistencies in Rogers' stewardship of health. On the one hand, his push for a department of health seeks to streamline and coordinate federal health programs. On the other hand, his committee continues to pump out categorical programs that add to the administrative layering at HEW. For example, three years ago, even before he was named chairman, the health subcommittee under his leadership broke eye research out of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness and created the separate National Eye Institute. This year the group nearly created a national institute on gastrointestinal diseases, but agreed just to add the responsibility for metabolic diseases to the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases. Moreover, the Rogers panel is likely to create a national institute on aging. It will vote to continue the Communicable Diseases Act and fight for funds to operate it. This act, passed last year, is a reincarnation of the old Vaccination Assistance Act which HEW allowed to expire in favor of bloc grant support for immunization programs under the Comprehensive Health Planning and Services Program.

"Tactically, we have to run to the Hill to testify on bills that are not needed," says Dr. DuVal, "bills which serve primarily as a vehicle to establish a track record. Take the bill to create a separate Heart and Lung Institute, for example. There is nothing in

that bill which we can't do right now. I say if you don't need these laws, why write them?"

Rogers is asking very many of the same questions. "In the past and even now," he told the New England Hospital Assembly last month, "we have dealt with our problems on a half-remedy basis. We had what could be called 'disease of the year' type of operating procedure. It was cancer and health manpower last month. This year we hope that heart, lung, and sickle cell disease will be given added emphasis. We have continually dealt with one area or another. But we have not properly looked at the total health picture, no one has put the pieces together. And so our nation's health resembles a patchwork quilt with no pattern, without end."

His solution, of course, is a department of health that can oversee all the pieces and that will put a man looking after health in the President's cabinet. "If you have a man at the President's table speaking only for health, with health as his only cross to bear, then he'll get through," Rogers believes.

As it is now, there will be no action on Rogers' department of health bill this year. Next year, the measure will have to be re-introduced, and then go before the House Government Operations Committee, which takes a conservative view of major reorganizations. Nevertheless, there will probably be hearings on both Rogers' proposal and the proposal of the Administration to create a department of human resources. If the committee were to approve a compromise measure of some sort that would create an under-secretary of health with control over the same functions as Rogers proposes for his department of health, that is, the policy matters of Medicare and Medicaid, Rogers would probably accept it.

But like most crusaders, Paul Rogers—Mr. Health—would not be satisfied. There's always more to be done.

AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 14896, passed by the House on Thursday, June 29, amends the School Lunch and Child Nutrition Acts to assure adequate funding for the summer food service programs, and for other purposes related to expanding and strengthening the child nutrition programs.

This is an urgent measure, since a number of the provisions of Public Law 92-153 expire on June 30; I have received a number of telegrams from interested groups of educators, school food service directors, and private service groups, which stress the need for immediate enactment of H.R. 14896, to give continuity to the feeding programs. I am inserting several of these wires as follows:

ASFSA LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Atlanta, Ga., June 29, 1972.

Congressman CARL PERKINS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Urgent passage of 14896 to strengthen school lunch program.

JOSEPHINE MARTIN,
Chairman.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

June 29, 1972.

HON. CARL D. PERKINS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The National Education Association commends you, Mr. Quile, and the committee for your work on H.R. 14896. We are supporting the bill as reported out of committee and urging favorable action on the floor of the House.

STANLEY J. MCFARLAND,
Director, Government Relations.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

June 29, 1972.

HON. CARL PERKINS,
Chairman, House Education and Labor Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

The American association of School Administrators believes that immediate favorable consideration of H.R. 14896 as reported by your committee is vital. The needs are great and immediate. Your efforts to secure such consideration will be significant and appreciated.

JAMES R. KIRKPATRICK,
Association Secretary, AASA.

AMERICAN FOOD SERVICE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., June 29, 1972.

HON. CARL PERKINS,
House Education and Labor Committee, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

American School Food Service Association endorses and warmly supports your efforts to secure passage of H.R. 14896. Although we are troubled by and opposed to the vending machine provision we laud all other provisions of the bill and support its passage.

DR. JOHN PERRYMAN.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

June 29, 1972.

HON. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, Washington, D.C.:

Experience with our survey "Their Daily Bread" confirmed our commitment to the right of every child for adequate nutrition. H.R. 14896 will write into law the national standards and Federal funds necessary to allow States to reach every needy child. H.J. Res. 157 which contains these provisions expires June 30, therefore immediate congressional action is required to enact this legislation.

MRS. EARL MARVIN,
National President National Council
of Jewish Women.

AUGUSTA, MAINE,
June 29, 1972.

HON. CARL D. PERKINS,
Committee on Education and Labor,
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciate your strong interest in the school food service program. I trust that you will support H.R. 14896 imperative that bill be passed prior to July 1. Insure continuance of program on fiscal '72 level.

CARROLL R. MCGRATH,
Commissioner Maine State Department
of Education.

PUEBLO, COLO.,
June 29, 1972.

HON. CARL D. PERKINS,
Committee on Education and Labor, Washington, D.C.:

Urgently request passage of House bill H.R. 14896.

MRS. BETTY HARNEY,
Director of Food Services,
Pueblo School District.

COLORADO SCHOOL FOOD
SERVICE ASSOCIATION,
Denver, Colo., June 29, 1972.

HON. CARL PERKINS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

We urge passage of H.R. 14896. In Denver
six of ten programs not operating because of
lack of funding in time to begin.

SALLY CARNAHAN,
Legislative Chairman.

ILLINOIS SCHOOL FOOD
SERVICE ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., June 29, 1972.

HON. CARL PERKINS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

We urge you to support the passage of H.R.
14896 bill.

EDWARD F. GAIDZIK,
Legislative Chairman.

DIVISION OF FOOD SERVICES,
Saint Louis, Mo., June 29, 1972.

Congressman CARL PERKINS,
Washington, D.C.

Urge passage of H.R. 14896 for benefit of
school children around the Nation.

DAVID R. PAGE,
Director.

AMHERST, MASS.,
June 29, 1972.

Representative CARL PERKINS,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

Massachusetts School Food Service Asso-
ciation pleads support of House 14896.
(Unsigned).

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX.,
June 29, 1972.

Congressman CARL PERKINS,
Chairman, House Education and Labor Com-
mittee, Washington, D.C.

To strengthen the schools food service pro-
gram and to remove uncertainty we urge your
support of H.R. 14896.

GERTRUDE APPLEBAUM,
Director Food Service, Corpus Christi,
Tex.

NEW BRUNSWICK, N.J.,
June 29, 1972.

HON. CARL PERKINS,
Member of Congress, Chairman Committee
on Education and Labor, Washington,
D.C.

Fifty State school food service directors as-
sembled in conference at Rutgers University,
June 28, unanimously and enthusiastically
endorse the provision of H.R. 14896. We urge
passage of this bill by the House of Repre-
sentatives.

LAWRENCE BARTLETT,
Chairman State Directors Section Amer-
ican State Food Service Assn.

GRAND JUNCTION, COLO.,
June 29, 1972.

HON. CARL PERKINS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Urge passage of H.R. 14896 to strengthen
program and to remove uncertainties.

LOUISE NEUBERGER.

BRUSH, COLO.,
June 29, 1972.

HON. CARL PERKINS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

We urge passage of H.R. 14896 to strengthen
the program and remove uncertainties.

NORTHEAST AREA COLORADO FOOD SERVICE.

WHEATRIDGE, COLO.,
June 29, 1972.

HON. CARL PERKINS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

We urge passage of H.R. 14896 to strengthen
lunch program.

ALICE BRACHLE.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,
June 29, 1972.

HON. CARL PERKINS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

We in this district strongly urge the pas-
sage of H.R. 14896 to strengthen the school
food service program and remove uncertain-
ties.

LOIS M. BECKMAN,
Director of School Food Service, Sacra-
mento City Unified School District.

YARMOUTH, MAINE,
June 29, 1972.

CARL PERKINS,
Chairman of House Committee on Education
and Labor, U.S. Representative, Wash-
ington, D.C.

Appreciate your strong interest in the
school food service program. Trust you will
support PLHR14896. Imperative bill be
passed prior to July 1.

FRANK H. HARRISON,
President, Maine School Superintendent
Association.

WARREN, MICH.,
June 29, 1972.

Congressman CARL PERKINS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Urge your support of HR14896.

HOWARD W. BRIGGS,
Detroit Public Schools.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order
of the House, the House stands in recess
subject to the call of the Chair. The bells
will be rung 30 minutes prior to re-
convening.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 17 min-
utes p.m.), the House stood in recess
subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House
was called to order by the Speaker at 6
o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 4494. An act for the relief of Mrs.
Latife Hassan Mahmoud.

H.J. Res. 1234. Joint resolution making
continuing appropriations for the fiscal year
1973, and for other purposes, and

H.J. Res. 1238. Joint resolution making
supplemental appropriations for disaster
relief.

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

which the concurrence of the House is
requested, a bill of the House of the fol-
lowing title:

H.R. 12350. An act to provide for the con-
tinuation of programs authorized under the
Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and for
other purposes.

The message also announced that the
Senate agrees to the report of the com-
mittee of conference on the disagreeing
votes of the two Houses on the amend-
ments of the House to the bill (5979)
entitled "An act 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 termina-
tion date thereof, and for other pur-
poses."

The message also announced that the
Senate agrees to the report of the com-
mittee of conference on the disagreeing
votes of the two Houses on the amend-
ments of the Senate to the bill (H.R.
14734) entitled "An act to authorize ap-
propriations for the Department of State
and for the United States Information
Agency."

The message also announced that the
Senate agrees to the report of the com-
mittee of conference on the disagree-
ing votes of the two Houses on the
amendments of the Senate to the bill
(H.R. 14734) entitled "An act making
appropriations for the government of the
District of Columbia and other activities
chargeable in whole or in part against
the revenues of said District for the fiscal
year ending June 30, 1973, and for other
purposes."

The message also announced that the
Senate agrees to amendments numbered
1, 7, 13, 18, 21, 26, 41, 43, 48, 54, 56 and
57 to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the
Senate insists upon its amendments to
the bill (H.R. 15390) entitled "An act to
provide for a four-month extension of
the present temporary level in the public
debt limitation," disagreed to by the
House; agrees to the conference asked by
the House on the disagreeing votes of
the two Houses thereon, and appoints
Mr. LONG, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. TALMADGE,
Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. CURTIS to be the
conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the
Senate agrees to the report of the com-
mittee of conference on the disagreeing
votes of the two Houses on the amend-
ments of the Senate to the bill (H.R.
15585) entitled "An act making appro-
priations for the Treasury Department,
the United States Postal Service, the
Executive Office of the President, and
certain independent agencies, for the
fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for
other purposes."

The message also announced that the
Senate agrees to the amendment num-
bered 7 to the foregoing bill.

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

S. 3772. An act to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to extend the expiration date of certain authorities thereunder, and for other purposes.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 15390, EXTENSION OF PRESENT TEM- PORARY LEVEL IN PUBLIC DEBT LIMITATION (H. REPT. NO. 92- 1215)

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas submitted the following conference report on the bill (H.R. 15390) to provide for a 4-month extension of the present temporary level in the public debt limitation:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 92-1215)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15390) to provide for a four-month extension of the present temporary level in the public debt limitation, having met, after full and free conference, have been unable to agree.

WILBUR D. MILLS,

AL ULLMAN,

JAMES A. BURKE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

RUSSELL B. LONG,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,

HERMAN TALMADGE,

WALLACE F. BENNETT,

CARL T. CURTIS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COM- MITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15390) to provide for a four-month extension of the present temporary level in the public debt limitation, report that the conferees have been unable to agree.

Amendment No. 1: The Senate amendment amends section 165(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to disaster losses) to provide that any loss attributable to a disaster which occurs during the first 6 calendar months of the taxable year in an area subsequently determined by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Government under the Disaster Relief Act of 1970 may, at the election of the taxpayer, be deducted for the taxable year immediately preceding the taxable year in which the disaster occurred. Existing law has a similar provision (existing section 165(h) of the Code), except that the taxpayer may elect under this existing provision only if the disaster occurs on or before the due date for the return (April 15 in the case of a calendar year individual taxpayer). Under the Senate amendment, this change in the law applies to disasters which occur after December 31, 1971. Thus, for example, a calendar year taxpayer who has suffered a loss on or before June 30, 1972, which qualifies under section 165(h) of the Code may elect to deduct that loss against the income which he had for his taxable year ending December 31, 1971.

The amendment is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 2: Increase in Social Security Benefits: The Senate amendment added to the House bill a new title II providing a 20 percent increase in social security benefits and making related changes in the OASDI program. In addition to the benefit increase (which applies also to benefits for certain individuals age 72 and over), the amendment—

(1) provided for automatic increases in social security benefits (which could first become effective in January 1975) to reflect rises in the cost of living;

(2) provided for automatic increases in the contribution and benefit base (i.e., the amount of earnings which can be taken into account for tax and benefit purposes) whenever an automatic cost-of-living increase in benefit occurs, and in the meanwhile increases the present contribution and benefit base from \$9,000 to \$10,800 for 1973 and \$12,000 for 1974;

(3) made appropriate adjustments in the rates of the social security taxes (both OASDI and HI) to assure adequate financing for the benefit increase; and

(4) made appropriate adjustments in the rate of allocation to the Disability Insurance Trust Fund. The amendment is reported in disagreement.

The Senate amended the title of the bill to reflect the additional material added by amendments numbered 1 and 2. The amendment is reported in disagreement.

WILBUR D. MILLS,

AL ULLMAN,

JAMES A. BURKE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

RUSSELL B. LONG,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,

WALLACE F. BENNETT,

HERMAN TALMADGE,

CARL T. CURTIS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. 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. 258]

Abbutt	Erlenborn	Martin
Abernethy	Evans, Colo.	Mathias, Calif.
Adams	Evins, Tenn.	Metcalfe
Anderson,	Findley	Michel
Tenn.	Flynt	Miller, Calif.
Andrews,	Ford, Gerald R.	Mosher
N. Dak.	Ford,	Moss
Ashbrook	William D.	O'Hara
Baring	Frelinghuysen	Pelly
Bell	Fuqua	Pike
Betts	Gallagher	Poage
Bevill	Gray	Poff
Bingham	Griffiths	Pryor, Ark.
Boggs	Grover	Rarick
Bolling	Gude	Riegler
Broyhill, N.C.	Haley	Roberts
Hanna	Hanna	Rooney, N.Y.
Hansen, Wash.	Hansen, Wash.	Rooney, Pa.
Harsha	Harsha	Rousselot
Hastings	Hastings	Ruppe
Hawkins	Hawkins	Ruth
Hays	Hays	Scheuer
Hébert	Hébert	Schmitz
Hicks, Wash.	Hicks, Wash.	Schwengel
Hosmer	Hosmer	Shoup
Karth	Karth	Shriver
Kee	Kee	Sikes
Keith	Keith	Steiger, Ariz.
Kluczynski	Kluczynski	Stephens
Landrum	Landrum	Teague, Tex.
Lennon	Lennon	Udall
Link	Link	Vander Jagt
Lloyd	Lloyd	Waldie
Lujan	Lujan	White
McClure	McClure	Wilson, Bob
McDade	McDade	Wright
McDonald,	McDonald,	Wydler
Mich.	Mich.	Wylie
Edmondson		

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 323 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 15390, EXTENSION OF PRESENT TEM- PORARY LEVEL IN PUBLIC DEBT LIMITATION

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 15390) to provide for a 4-month extension of the present temporary level in the public debt ceiling.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report.

The Clerk read the conference report.

(For conference report, see prior proceedings of today.)

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, after line 5, insert:

Sec. 2. (a) Section 165(h) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to disaster losses) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) attributable to a disaster which occurs during the period after the close of the taxable year and on or before the last day of the 6th calendar month beginning after the close of the taxable year, and"

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to disasters occurring after December 31, 1971, in taxable years ending after such date.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I make this parliamentary inquiry so that the Members of the House can be apprised of the parliamentary situation which we are in.

Under normal circumstances, Mr. Speaker, a conference report is filed, it either lays over under the rule for 3 days—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Wisconsin to please state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my first parliamentary inquiry involves a question, and the question is: Why does this conference report differ, and why does this not follow the normal rules of the House with regard to laying over with respect to the required legislative days?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Wisconsin that the conference report was reported back in complete disagreement from the conference committee.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, may I point out that I was a member of this conference. We reached agreement in the conference. The conferees agreed, on two votes, supported by a majority—and I was not a party to that majority vote—but the vote was to

recede and concur with the Senate amendments, and the Senate, of course, accepted that action by the House, and we therefore broke up in agreement.

We had receded, the Senate had accepted our receding.

So, Mr. Speaker, my second parliamentary inquiry is why have we come back in disagreement when we did agree?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Wisconsin that the Chair has knowledge only of what is shown in the conference report.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. If I may be heard on the parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of responding to the gentleman from Wisconsin, actually, the rules of the House preclude the conference committee on the part of the House from formal agreement of amendments that are not germane to the subject matter of a House-passed bill. Now, these two amendments, as the gentleman from Wisconsin knows, comply with the rules of the House in that respect; they are not germane to the bill. The conference committee could do nothing more in conference than informal action. The formal action is what we have taken here.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I wonder, I would ask the gentleman, if we could still have a little time to just clear this up—I wonder why we went to conference if there was nothing we could discuss in conference, because we had no authority to agree to any of the amendments because they were all outside of our jurisdiction, being nongermane.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. There is nothing strange about this procedure. This procedure is followed every year by each of the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations when they cannot agree to something as part of a conference committee, because there is no authorization for it in law, and if we get into that, we bring that agreement back in disagreement, and then the manager of the bill on the floor of the House makes a motion to recede and concur, or recede and concur with an amendment, or to insist upon the House position. We do that all the time.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. May I say to the chairman that in those situations, I have always found that a report has been filed, and we come back in disagreement. Here we know that there has been an agreement made.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. There cannot be an agreement under the rules of the House other than informal agreement.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, maybe I have, in asking the gentleman these questions, confused the House more than they were before, but I did feel that there were a number of Members, Mr. Speaker, who had been unable to understand the procedure. Frankly, I do not believe that very much light has been shed on it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is this: At what point could a point of order against further consideration of the conference report, either in alleged disagreement or otherwise, be lodged?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Missouri that that can be done at this point.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against consideration of the conference report, albeit we understand it is in full "disagreement," but we also know the fine print of the rules of the House whereby this procedure could be deemed possible and drawn out by a circuitous route in a tenuous mind, and immediately thereafter move to recede on each issue.

My point of order is that this is in fact consideration of such a report. It is a travesty upon the rights and privileges of each individually elected Member of Congress. It is the use of a device which has been decried, and is in the process of consideration of change by the Joint Committee on Continued Congressional Operations, and I believe it should not be considered under these circumstances.

The SPEAKER. The precedents are clear.

Where conferees report in disagreement all of the amendments of the Senate no action is taken on the report. It is filed, ordered printed and called up and read before further action is taken on the amendments in disagreement.

Where the conferees report they have been unable to agree on all amendments submitted to them the report is not acted on and the Speaker directs the Clerk to report the amendments in disagreement.

That is what the Chair is getting ready to do.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the parliamentary situation that will prevail, there are two amendments which will be offered and then a motion will be offered, presumably by the gentleman from Arkansas, to recede and concur.

At that time, Mr. Speaker, is that motion divisible?

The SPEAKER. It is.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry—if the motion to recede is carried, then a motion to concur is then in order; is that correct?

The SPEAKER. That is part of the pending motion to recede and concur.

Mr. RHODES. But further, a motion of

a higher order would be a motion to concur in the amendment?

The SPEAKER. That is correct—after the House has receded.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is this.

There is only one copy of the so-called amendment which is available in the Chamber. I have not been able to get a copy of it in order to draft an amendment which I would otherwise draft to change the social security portions of the raise to a different figure.

Do not the rules of the House provide that each Member should be provided with a copy of the amendment to be offered like this so that amendments could be perfected and submitted at the appropriate time?

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows of no such rule.

Mr. RHODES. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALL. Is it true, Mr. Speaker, that if any one of the motions made by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means was voted down by the House, then the entire conference report would go down with that divided portion?

The SPEAKER. If the motion were voted down then there would have to be a further motion to dispose of the Senate amendment.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, before I move to recede and concur in this amendment I would like to take a moment to explain it.

The first amendment made to the bill relates to the immediate deduction as casualty loss of the flood losses which recently occurred.

Under present law, if a casualty loss results from a presidentially proclaimed disaster before the income tax return filing date—which for substantially all individuals means between January 1 and April 15—then the taxpayer may elect to treat the loss as though it had occurred in the last taxable year. This means that he can file his return, or an amended return, and deduct the loss from last year's income. The taxpayer thereby receives whatever tax benefit he would be otherwise entitled to—reduction of income taxes to be paid or refund of income taxes already paid—promptly, instead of having to wait until the following year to claim the deduction. However, under present law, if, for example, an individual suffered damages from floods in June of 1972, then he must wait until early 1973, when he files his income tax return for 1972, before he can deduct his losses from these floods.

This amendment extends to these presidentially proclaimed disasters in the first 6 months of the taxable year the same treatment that present law provides for such disasters occurring, in the case of individuals in the first 3½ months of the taxable year and in the case of

corporations in the first 2½ months of the year. This will enable those who suffered from the recent floods to file claims for refund based upon a recalculation of their 1971 taxes, deducting from their 1971 incomes the amount of their casualty losses from these floods. This will provide funds that can be used promptly to rebuild lost homes and property. This provision will also be available for similar losses in the future.

I have been assured by the Treasury Department that the Internal Revenue Service will provide assistance to taxpayers to determine the amount of their damage and to file their refund claims and that the Internal Revenue Service will do everything possible to expedite the payment of those refunds.

I would not ask the House to agree to this amendment but for the urgency of this particular situation and the assurances of the Treasury Department that prompt congressional action will result in prompt tax relief to those people who have been so unfortunate as to suffer damages from these floods. The relief is not new, in the sense that it builds upon an existing provision in the law. The Internal Revenue Service has already had experience in administering the existing law. The provision will speed up tax benefits, but it probably will have no effect upon tax revenues during fiscal 1973, merely hastening by about 9 months the time when the refunds will be made to the taxpayers.

The need is widespread. Disasters to which this amendment applies have occurred since April 15 in Tennessee, Kentucky, Texas, Washington, North Dakota, South Dakota, Florida, Virginia, Pennsylvania, New York, and California.

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has just read a series of States in which damage was sustained as a result of the hurricane. I presume that this is not exclusive of other States which suffered damage?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Oh, not at all. There may be other States. It applies to all States in which a presidentially declared disaster has occurred.

Mr. McCORMACK. I should like to point out that the State of Washington was also declared a disaster area by the President.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. If the President declares an area a disaster area it would qualify. However, he must so declare it before the State would qualify for this provision.

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Are we now considering a limitation on the debt ceiling or an increase in the debt ceiling?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. We are considering a nongermane amendment that

we brought back to the House, because we could not, under the rules of the House, agree to a nongermane amendment. The rules of the House say specifically that such an amendment, even if there is a desire on the part of the House conferees to agree to it, has to be brought back for a separate vote as an amendment in disagreement.

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. To what is the nongermane amendment attached?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. It is attached to the debt ceiling.

Mr. GROSS. That is what bill?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. They did not amend the debt ceiling provision in the bill. It is exactly as it passed the House. These are two amendments bringing up nongermane material.

Mr. GROSS. So this is the way we are determining when a conference report is not a conference report; is that correct?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. All I am doing is following the rules of the House. I would have liked to agree to these amendments in conference and brought them back, but had I done so, the conference report itself would have been subject to a point of order.

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Suppose a person has flood insurance and suffers a loss. Would he be able also to deduct that loss from his income taxes?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. No, not if they are protected by flood insurance.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. The flood insurance received would offset what would be claimed in the total loss, would it not?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Yes. An individual or corporation cannot take a deduction against income for the amount of any loss which is covered by insurance.

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BROOKS. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means if a copy of the amendment we are considering is available to any Members of this Congress?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. It is not except in the official papers.

Mr. BROOKS. Would it be possible in the future for a committee with the responsibility that this one has to have a thermofax copy made for all Members? It would not take but about 10 minutes to do so. There is a copying machine in the Chamber. I think it is a travesty on the rules of the House that we come in here late at night to consider an amendment that I may well support but one which I have not had an opportunity to read and no one else has. I think it is really a disgrace.

We should figure out a way to improve this procedure. We ought to have a copy available. It does not take long, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I do not like this procedure for bringing the matter up. However, I do not want the Members to have to be back here on Wednesday or Thursday to consider this when all the Members are looking forward to getting away from here for a brief period. I did not have the time to thermofax the amendments. They adopted this amendment in the Senate this afternoon not long before we went to conference.

Mr. BROOKS. It does not take that long, Mr. Chairman, frankly, to make copies.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. When you consider the fact that we had to spend our time until a little while ago in conference, we had very little time to prepare copies, even if it had been suggested.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think I can assure the House, Mr. Speaker, that as far as this amendment is concerned, it really does not change anyone's tax liability. It does, however, make it possible for those people who have suffered a loss this year, for instance, between April 15 and the end of June, not to have to wait to receive a refund on their taxes—because of that casualty loss—until next year. That is really what we are trying to do here.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Exactly.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. If a person wants to wait that long, he can wait, but we do make it possible for him to be in the same position as a person who might suffer a casualty in February. At present he may file his tax return in April and he can show that casualty loss as a loss against his previous year's income. What we are doing is merely extending that, and I do not think anyone need worry as far as this particular amendment, that it is extremely complex, or that there is anything controversial really about it.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MILLS OF ARKANSAS

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment No. 1.

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 1, after line 5, insert:

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM

INCREASE IN OLD-AGE, SURVIVORS, AND DISABILITY INSURANCE BENEFITS, AND IN BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS AGE 72 OR OVER

SEC. 201. (a) Section 215(a) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out the table and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"TABLE FOR DETERMINING PRIMARY INSURANCE AMOUNT AND
MAXIMUM FAMILY BENEFITS

I (Primary insurance benefit under 1939 Act, as modified)		II (Primary insurance amount under 1971 Act)	III (Average monthly wage)		IV (Primary insurance amount)	V (Maximum family benefits)
If an individual's primary insurance benefit (as determined under subsec. (d)) is—		Or his pri- mary insur- ance amount (as deter- mined under subsec. (c)) is—	Or his average monthly wage (as determined under subsec. (b)) is—		The amount referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this subsection shall be—	And the maximum amount of benefits pay- able (as pro- vided in sec. 203(a)) on the basis of his wages and self- employment income shall be—
At least—	But not more than—		At least—	But not more than—		
\$16.21	\$16.20	\$70.40		\$76	\$84.50	\$126.80
16.85	16.84	71.50	\$77	78	85.80	128.80
17.61	17.60	73.10	79	80	87.80	131.70
18.41	18.40	74.50	81	81	89.40	134.20
19.25	19.24	75.80	82	83	91.00	136.50
20.01	20.00	77.40	84	85	92.90	139.40
20.65	20.64	78.80	86	87	94.60	141.90
21.29	21.28	80.10	88	89	96.20	144.30
21.89	21.88	81.70	90	90	98.10	147.20
22.29	22.28	83.10	91	92	99.80	149.70
22.69	22.68	84.50	93	94	101.40	152.20
23.09	23.08	85.80	95	96	103.00	154.50
23.45	23.44	87.40	97	97	104.90	157.40
23.77	23.76	88.90	98	99	106.70	160.10
24.21	24.20	90.60	100	101	108.80	163.20
24.61	24.60	91.90	102	102	110.30	165.50
25.01	25.00	93.40	103	104	112.10	168.20
25.49	25.48	95.10	105	106	114.20	171.30
25.93	25.92	96.60	107	107	116.00	173.90
26.41	26.40	98.20	108	109	117.90	176.90
26.95	26.94	99.70	110	111	119.70	179.60
27.47	27.46	101.10	112	113	121.40	182.10
28.01	28.00	102.70	114	115	123.30	185.00
28.69	28.68	104.20	116	117	125.10	187.70
29.26	29.25	105.90	118	119	127.10	190.70
29.69	29.68	107.30	120	121	128.80	193.20
30.37	30.36	108.70	122	123	130.60	195.80
30.93	30.92	110.40	124	125	132.50	198.80
31.37	31.36	111.90	126	127	134.30	201.50
31.77	31.76	113.30	128	129	136.00	204.00
32.01	32.00	115.00	130	131	138.00	207.00
32.61	32.60	116.40	132	133	139.70	209.60
33.21	33.20	118.00	134	135	141.60	212.40
33.80	33.80	119.50	136	137	143.40	215.20
34.51	34.50	121.00	138	139	145.20	217.80
35.01	35.00	122.60	140	141	147.20	220.80
35.81	35.80	124.00	142	143	148.80	223.20
36.41	36.40	125.70	144	145	150.90	226.40
37.09	37.08	127.20	146	147	152.70	229.10
37.61	37.60	128.60	148	149	154.40	231.60
38.21	38.20	130.30	150	151	156.40	234.60
39.13	39.12	131.80	152	153	158.20	237.30
39.69	39.68	133.10	154	155	159.80	239.70
40.34	40.33	134.80	156	157	161.50	242.70
41.13	41.12	136.30	158	159	163.60	245.40
41.77	41.76	137.90	160	161	165.50	248.30
42.45	42.44	139.40	162	163	167.30	251.00
43.21	43.20	141.10	164	165	169.40	254.10
43.77	43.76	142.60	166	167	171.00	257.80
44.45	44.44	143.90	168	169	172.70	263.10
44.89	44.88	145.60	170	171	174.80	267.30
	45.00	147.10	172	173	176.60	272.60
		148.40	174	175	178.10	277.80
		150.10	176	177	180.20	282.00
		151.60	178	179	182.00	287.30

"TABLE FOR DETERMINING PRIMARY INSURANCE AMOUNT AND
MAXIMUM FAMILY BENEFITS—Continued

I (Primary insurance benefit under 1939 Act, as modified)		II (Primary insurance amount under 1971 Act)	III (Average monthly wage)		IV (Primary insurance amount)	V (Maximum family benefits)
If an individual's primary insurance benefit (as determined under subsec. (d)) is—		Or his pri- mary insur- ance amount (as deter- mined under subsec. (c)) is—	Or his average monthly wage (as determined under subsec. (b)) is—		The amount referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this subsection shall be—	And the maximum amount of benefits pay- able (as pro- vided in sec. 203(a)) on the basis of his wages and self- employment income shall be—
At least—	But not more than—		At least—	But not more than—		
		\$153.20	\$273	\$277	\$183.90	\$292.60
		154.70	278	281	185.70	296.80
		156.20	282	286	187.50	302.10
		157.90	287	291	189.50	307.40
		159.20	292	295	191.10	311.60
		160.90	296	300	193.10	316.80
		162.40	301	305	194.90	322.10
		163.80	306	309	196.60	328.40
		165.50	310	314	198.60	331.70
		166.90	315	319	200.30	337.00
		168.30	320	323	202.00	341.20
		170.00	324	328	204.00	346.50
		171.50	329	333	205.80	351.80
		173.20	334	337	207.90	356.00
		174.50	338	342	209.40	361.20
		176.00	343	347	211.20	366.50
		177.70	348	351	213.30	370.70
		179.10	352	356	215.00	376.00
		180.80	357	361	217.00	381.30
		182.20	362	365	218.70	385.50
		183.60	366	370	220.40	390.80
		185.30	371	375	222.40	396.00
		186.80	376	379	224.20	400.40
		188.50	380	384	226.20	405.60
		189.80	385	389	227.80	410.90
		191.30	390	393	229.60	415.10
		193.00	394	398	231.60	420.40
		194.40	399	403	233.30	425.70
		196.10	404	407	235.40	429.90
		197.40	408	412	236.90	435.20
		198.80	413	417	238.60	440.40
		200.20	418	421	240.30	444.60
		201.80	422	426	242.20	449.90
		203.10	427	431	243.80	455.20
		204.50	432	436	245.40	460.50
		206.10	437	440	247.40	462.60
		207.40	441	445	248.90	465.30
		208.80	446	450	250.60	467.90
		210.40	451	454	252.50	470.00
		211.70	455	459	254.10	472.60
		213.10	460	464	255.80	475.20
		214.50	465	468	257.40	477.40
		216.10	469	473	259.40	480.00
		217.40	474	478	260.90	482.70
		218.80	479	482	262.60	484.80
		220.40	483	487	264.50	487.50
		221.70	488	492	266.10	490.10
		223.10	493	496	267.80	492.20
		224.70	497	501	269.70	494.80
		226.00	502	506	271.20	497.40
		227.40	507	510	272.90	499.60
		228.80	511	515	274.60	502.20
		230.30	516	520	276.40	504.90
		231.70	521	524	278.10	506.90

TABLE FOR DETERMINING PRIMARY INSURANCE AMOUNT AND MAXIMUM FAMILY BENEFITS—Continued

I (Primary insurance benefit under 1939 Act, as modified)		II (Primary insurance amount under 1971 Act)	JO (Average monthly wage)		IV (Primary insurance amount)	V (Maximum family benefits)
If an individual's primary insurance benefit (as determined under subsec. (d)) is—		Or his primary insurance amount (as determined under subsec. (c)) is—	Or his average monthly wage (as determined under subsec. (b)) is—		The amount referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this subsection shall be—	And the maximum amount of benefits payable (as provided in sec. 203(a)) on the basis of his wages and self-employment income shall be—
At least—	But not more than—		At least—	But not more than—		
		\$233.10	\$525	\$529	\$279.80	\$509.60
		234.70	530	534	281.70	412.20
		236.00	535	538	283.20	514.40
		237.40	539	542	284.90	517.00
		239.00	544	548	286.80	519.60
		240.30	549	553	288.40	522.30
		241.70	554	558	290.10	523.80
		242.90	557	560	291.60	526.00
		244.20	561	563	293.10	527.60
		245.50	564	567	294.60	529.70
		246.80	568	570	296.20	531.30
		248.00	571	574	297.60	533.30
		249.30	575	577	299.20	535.00
		250.60	578	581	300.60	537.00
		251.80	582	584	302.20	538.60
		253.00	585	588	303.60	540.80
		251.40	589	591	305.30	542.30
		255.60	592	595	306.80	544.50
		256.90	596	598	308.30	546.00
		258.10	599	602	309.80	548.20
		259.40	603	605	311.30	549.80
		260.60	606	609	312.80	551.80
		262.00	610	612	314.40	553.60
		263.20	613	616	315.90	555.50
		264.50	617	620	317.40	557.70
		265.70	621	623	318.90	559.20
		267.00	624	627	320.40	561.40
		268.20	628	630	321.90	563.20
		269.50	631	634	323.40	566.10
		270.80	635	637	325.00	568.70
		272.10	638	641	326.60	571.50
		273.30	642	644	328.00	574.00
		274.60	645	648	329.60	576.80
		275.80	649	652	331.00	579.30
		276.00	653	656	332.00	581.00
		277.40	657	660	332.90	582.60
		278.40	661	665	334.10	584.70
		279.40	666	670	335.30	586.80
		280.40	671	675	336.50	588.90
		281.40	676	680	337.70	591.00
		282.40	681	685	338.90	593.10
		283.40	686	690	340.10	595.20
		284.40	691	695	341.30	597.30
		285.40	699	700	342.50	599.40
		286.40	701	705	343.70	601.50
		287.40	706	710	344.90	603.60
		288.40	711	715	346.10	605.70
		289.40	716	720	347.30	607.80
		290.40	721	725	348.50	609.90
		291.40	726	730	349.70	612.00
		292.40	731	735	350.90	614.10
		293.40	736	740	352.10	616.20

TABLE FOR DETERMINING PRIMARY INSURANCE AMOUNT AND MAXIMUM FAMILY BENEFITS—Continued

I (Primary insurance benefit under 1939 Act, as modified)		II (Primary insurance amount under 1971 Act)	III (Average monthly wage)		IV (Primary insurance amount)	V (Maximum family benefits)
If an individual's primary insurance benefit (as determined under subsec. (d)) is—		Or his primary insurance amount (as determined under subsec. (c)) is—	Or his average monthly wage (as determined under subsec. (b)) is—		The amount referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this subsection shall be—	And the maximum amount of benefits payable (as provided in sec. 203(a)) on the basis of his wages and self-employment income shall be—
At least—	But not more than—		At least—	But not more than—		
		\$294.40	\$741	\$745	\$353.30	\$613.30
		295.40	746	750	354.50	620.40
			751	755	355.50	622.20
			756	760	356.50	623.90
			761	765	357.50	625.70
			766	770	358.50	627.40
			771	775	359.50	629.20
			776	780	360.50	630.90
			781	785	361.50	632.70
			786	790	362.50	634.40
			791	795	363.50	636.20
			796	800	364.50	637.90
			801	805	365.50	639.70
			806	810	366.50	641.40
			811	815	367.50	643.20
			816	820	368.50	644.90
			821	825	369.50	646.70
			826	830	370.50	648.40
			831	835	371.50	650.20
			836	840	372.50	651.90
			841	845	373.50	653.70
			846	850	374.50	655.40
			851	855	375.50	657.20
			856	860	376.50	658.90
			861	865	377.50	660.70
			866	870	378.50	662.40
			871	875	379.50	664.20
			876	880	380.50	665.90
			881	885	381.50	667.70
			886	890	382.50	669.40
			891	895	383.50	671.20
			896	900	384.50	672.90
			901	905	385.50	674.70
			906	910	386.50	676.40
			911	915	387.50	678.20
			916	920	388.50	679.90
			921	925	389.50	681.70
			926	930	390.50	683.40
			931	935	391.50	685.20
			936	940	392.50	686.90
			941	945	393.50	688.70
			946	950	394.50	690.40
			951	955	395.50	692.20
			956	960	396.50	693.90
			961	965	397.50	695.70
			966	970	398.50	697.40
			971	975	399.50	699.20
			976	980	400.50	700.90
			981	985	401.50	702.70
			986	990	402.50	704.40
			991	995	403.50	706.20
			996	1,000	404.50	707.90."

(b) Section 203(a) of such Act is amended by striking out paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) when two or more persons were entitled (without the application of section 202(j)(1) and section 223(b)) to monthly benefits under section 202 or 223 for August 1972 on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of such insured individual and the provisions of this subsection were applicable in January 1971 or any prior month in determining the total of the benefits for persons entitled for any such month on the basis of such wages and self-employment income, such total of benefits for September 1972 or any subsequent month shall not be reduced to less than the larger of—

"(A) the amount determined under this subsection without regard to this paragraph, or

"(B) an amount equal to the sum of the amounts derived by multiplying the benefit amount determined under this title for August 1972 (including this subsection, but without the application of section 222(b), section 202(q), and subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section), for each person for such month, by 120 percent and raising such increased amount, if it is not a multiple of \$0.10, to the next higher multiple of \$0.10; but in any such case (i) paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not be applied to such total of benefits after the application of subparagraph (B), and (ii) if section 202(k)(2) (A) was applicable in the case of any such benefits for September 1972, and ceases to apply after such month, the provisions of subparagraph (B) shall be applied, for and after the month in which section 202(k)(2) (A) ceases to apply, as though paragraph (1) had not been applicable to such total of benefits for September 1972, or".

(c) Section 215(a) of such Act is amended by striking out the matter which precedes the table and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) The primary insurance amount of an insured individual shall be determined as follows:

"(1) Subject to the conditions specified in subsection (b), (c), and (d) of this section and except as provided in paragraph (6) of this subsection, such primary insurance amount shall be whichever of the following amounts is the largest:

"(A) the amount in column IV of the following table on the line on which in column III of such table appears his average monthly wage (as determined under subsection (b));

"(B) the amount in column IV of such table on the line on which in column II appears his primary insurance amount (as determined under subsection (c)); or

"(C) the amount in column IV of such table on the line on which in column I appears his primary insurance benefit (as determined under subsection (d)).

"(2) In the case of an individual who was entitled to a disability insurance benefit for the month before the month in which he died, became entitled to old-age insurance benefits, or attained age 65, such primary insurance amount shall be the amount in column IV of such table which is equal to the primary insurance amount upon which such disability insurance benefit is based; except that if such individual was entitled to a disability insurance benefit under section 223 for the month before the effective month of a new table and in the following month became entitled to an old-age insurance benefit, or he died in such following month then his primary insurance amount then his primary insurance amount for such following month shall be the amount in column IV of the new table on the line on which in column II of such table appears his primary insurance amount for the month before the effective month of the

table (as determined under subsection (c)) instead of the amount in column IV equal to the primary insurance amount on which his disability insurance benefit is based. For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'primary insurance amount' with respect to any individual means only a primary insurance amount determined under paragraph (1) (and such individual's benefits shall be deemed to be based upon the primary insurance amount as so determined)."

(d) Section 215(b)(4) of such Act is amended by striking out "December 1970" each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "August 1972".

(e) Section 215(c) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Primary Insurance Amount Under Act of March 17, 1971

"(c)(1) For the purposes of column II of the table appearing in subsection (a) of this section, an individual's primary insurance amount shall be computed on the basis of the law in effect prior to September 1972.

"(2) The provisions of this subsection shall be applicable only in the case of an individual who became entitled to benefits under section 202(a) or section 223 before September 1972, or who died before such month."

(f) Section 215(f)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "(a)(1) and (3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a)(1) (A) and (C)".

(g)(1)(A) Section 227(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "\$48.30" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$58.00", and by striking out "\$24.20" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$29.00".

(B) Section 227(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "\$48.30" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$58.00".

(2)(A) Section 228(b)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "\$48.30" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$58.00".

(B) Section 228(b)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "\$48.30" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$58.00", and by striking out "\$24.20" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$29.00".

(C) Section 228(c)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "\$24.20" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$29.00".

(D) Section 228(c)(3)(A) of such Act is amended by striking out "\$48.30" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$58.00".

(E) Section 228(c)(3)(B) of such Act is amended by striking out "\$24.20" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$29.00".

(h)(1) Section 203(a) of the Social Security Act (as amended by subsection (b) of this section) is further amended by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (2), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof ", or", and by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) notwithstanding any other provision of law, when—

"(A) two or more persons are entitled to monthly benefits for a particular month on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of an insured individual and (for such particular month) the provisions of this subsection and section 202(q) are applicable to such monthly benefits, and

"(B) such individual's primary insurance amount is increased for the following month under any provision of this title,

then the total of monthly benefits for all persons on the basis of such wages and self-employment income for such particular month, as determined under the provisions of this subsection, shall for purposes of determining the total monthly benefits for all persons on the basis of such wages and self-employment income for months subsequent to such particular month to be considered to have been increased by the smallest amount that would have been required in

order to assure that the total of monthly benefits payable on the basis of such wages and self-employment income for any such subsequent month will not be less (after the application of the other provisions of this subsection and section 202(q)) than the total of monthly benefits (after the application of the other provisions of this subsection and section 202(q)) payable on the basis of such wages and self-employment income for such particular month."

(2) In any case in which the provisions of section 1002(b)(2) of the Social Security Amendments of 1969 were applicable with respect to benefits for any month in 1970, the total of monthly benefits as determined under section 203(a) of the Social Security Act shall, for months after 1970, be increased to the amount that would be required in order to assure that the total of such monthly benefits (after the application of section 202 (q) of such Act) will not be less than the total of monthly benefits that was applicable (after the application of such sections 203 (a) and 202(q)) for the first month for which the provisions of such section 1002(b)(2) applied.

(1) The amendments made by this section (other than the amendments made by subsections (g) and (h)) shall apply with respect to monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months after August 1972 and with respect to lump-sum death payments under such title in the case of deaths occurring after such month. The amendments made by subsection (g) shall apply with respect to monthly benefits under title II of such Act for months after August 1972. The amendments made by subsection (h)(1) shall apply with respect to monthly benefits under title II of such Act for months after December 1971.

AUTOMATIC ADJUSTMENTS IN BENEFITS AND IN THE CONTRIBUTION AND BENEFIT BASE

Adjustments in Benefits

Sec. 202. (a)(1) Section 215 of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"Cost-of-Living Increases in Benefits

"(1)(1) For purposes of this subsection—
"(A) the term 'base quarter' means (i) the calendar quarter ending on June 30 in each year after 1972, or (ii) any other calendar quarter in which occurs the effective month of a general benefit increase under this title;

"(B) the term 'cost-of-living computation quarter' means a base quarter, as defined in subparagraph (A)(1), in which the Consumer Price Index prepared by the Department of Labor exceeds, by not less than 3 per centum, such index in the later of (i) the last prior cost-of-living computation quarter which was established under this subparagraph, or (ii) the most recent calendar quarter in which occurred the effective month of a general benefit increase under this title; except that there shall be no cost-of-living computation quarter in any calendar year in which a law has been enacted providing a general benefit increase under this title or in which such a benefit increase becomes effective; and

"(C) the Consumer Price Index for a base quarter, a cost-of-living computation quarter, or any other calendar quarter shall be the arithmetical means of such index for the 3 months in such quarter.

"(2)(A)(1) The Secretary shall determine each year beginning with 1974 (subject to the limitation in paragraph (1)(B) and to subparagraph (E) of this paragraph) whether the base quarter (as defined in paragraph (1)(A)(1)) in such year is a cost-of-living computation quarter.

"(ii) If the Secretary determines that such base quarter is a cost-of-living computation quarter, he shall, effective with the month of January of the next calendar year (sub-

ject to subparagraph (E)) as provided in subparagraph (B), increase the benefit amount of each individual who for such month is entitled to benefits under section 227 or 228, and the primary insurance amount of each other individual under this title, by an amount derived by multiplying each such amount (including each such individual's primary insurance amount or benefit amount under section 227 or 228 as previously increased under this subparagraph) by the same percentage (rounded to the nearest one-tenth of 1 percent) as the percentage by which the Consumer Price Index for such cost-of-living computation quarter exceeds such index for the most recent prior calendar quarter which was a base quarter under paragraph (1)(A)(ii) or, if later, the most recent cost-of-living computation quarter under paragraph (1)(B). Any such increased amount which is not a multiple of \$0.10 shall be increased to the next higher multiple of \$0.10.

"(B) The increase provided by subparagraph (A) with respect to a particular cost-of-living computation quarter shall apply (subject to subparagraph (E)) in the case of monthly benefits under this title for months after December of the calendar year in which occurred such cost-of-living computation quarter, and in the case of lump-sum death payments with respect to deaths occurring after December of such calendar year.

"(C)(i) When ever the level of the Consumer Price Index as published for any month exceeds by 2.5 percent or more the level of such index for the most recent base quarter (as defined in paragraph (1)(A)(ii)) or, if later, the most recent cost-of-living computation quarter, the Secretary shall (within 5 days after such publication) report the amount of such excess to the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance.

"(ii) Whenever the Secretary determines that a base quarter in a calendar year is also a cost-of-living computation quarter, he shall notify the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance of such determination on or before August 15 of such calendar year, indicating the amount of the benefit increase to be provided, his estimate of the extent to which the cost of such increase would be met by an increase in the contribution and benefit base under section 230 and the estimated amount of the increase in such base, the actuarial estimates of the effect of such increase, and the actuarial assumptions and methodology used in preparing such estimates.

"(D) If the Secretary determines that a base quarter in a calendar year is also a cost-of-living computation quarter, he shall publish in the Federal Register on or before November 1 of such calendar year a determination that a benefit increase is resultant required and the percentage thereof. He shall also publish in the Federal Register at that time (along with the increased benefit amounts which shall be deemed to be the amounts appearing in sections 227 and 228) a revision of the table of benefits contained in subsection (a) of this section (as it may have been most recently revised by another law or pursuant to this paragraph); and such revised table shall be deemed to be the table appearing in such subsection (a). Such revision shall be determined as follows:

"(i) The headings of the table shall be the same as the headings in the table immediately prior to its revision, except that the parenthetical phrase at the beginning of column II shall reflect the year in which the primary insurance amounts set forth in

column IV of the table immediately prior to its revision were effective.

"(ii) The amounts on each line of column I and column III, except as otherwise provided by clause (v) of this subparagraph, shall be the same as the amounts appearing in each such column in the table immediately prior to its revision.

"(iii) The amount on each line of column II shall be changed to the amount shown on the corresponding line of column IV of the table immediately prior to its revision.

"(iv) The amounts on each line of column IV and column V shall be increased from the amounts shown in the table immediately prior to its revision by increasing each such amount by the percentage specified in subparagraph (A)(ii) of this paragraph. The amount on each line of column V shall be increased, if necessary, so that such amount is at least equal to one and one-half times the amount shown on the corresponding line in column IV. Any such increased amount which is not a multiple of \$0.10 shall be increased to the next higher multiple of \$0.10.

"(v) If the contribution and benefit base (determined under section 230) for the calendar year in which the table of benefits is revised is lower than such base for the following calendar year, columns III, IV, and V of such table shall be extended. The amounts on each additional line of column III shall be the amounts on the preceding line increased by \$5 until in the last such line of column III the second figure is equal to one-twelfth of the new contribution and benefit base for the calendar year following the calendar year in which such table of benefits is revised. The amount on each additional line of column IV shall be the amount on the preceding line increased by \$1.00, until the amount on the last line of such column is equal to the last line of such column as determined under clause (iv) plus 20 percent of one-twelfth of the excess of the new contribution and benefit base for the calendar year following the calendar year in which such table of benefits is revised (as determined under section 230) over such base for the calendar year in which the table of benefits is revised. The amount in each additional line of column V shall be equal to 1.75 times the amount on the same line of column IV. Any such increased amount which is not a multiple of \$0.10 shall be increased to the next higher multiple of \$0.10.

"(E) Notwithstanding a determination by the Secretary under subparagraph (A) that a base quarter in any calendar year is a cost-of-living computation quarter (and notwithstanding any notification or publication thereof under subparagraph (C) or (D)), no increase in benefits shall take effect pursuant thereto, and such quarter shall be deemed not to be a cost-of-living computation quarter, if during the calendar year in which such determination is made a law providing a general benefit increase under this title is enacted or becomes effective.

"(3) As used in this subsection, the term 'general benefit increase under this title' means an increase (other than an increase under this subsection) in all primary insurance amounts on which monthly insurance benefits under this title are based."

(2)(A) Effective January 1, 1974, section 203(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "the table in section 215(a)" in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "the table in or deemed to be in section 215(a)".

(B) Effective January 1, 1974, section 203(a) of such Act (as amended by section 201(b) of this Act) is further amended to read as follows:

"(2) when two or more persons were en-

titled (without the application of section 202(j)(1) and section 223(b)) to monthly benefits under section 202 or 223 for January 1971 or any prior month on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of such insured individual and the provisions of this subsection as in effect for any such month were applicable in determining the benefit amount of any persons on the basis of such wages and self-employment income, the total of benefits for any month after January 1971 shall not be reduced to less than the largest of—

"(A) the amount determined under this subsection without regard to this paragraph,

"(B) the largest amount which has been determined for any month under this subsection for persons entitled to monthly benefits on the basis of such insured individual's wages and self-employment income, or

"(C) if any persons are entitled to benefits on the basis of such wages and self-employment income for the month before the effective month (after September 1972) of a general benefit increase under this title (as defined in section 215(1)(3)) or a benefit increase under the provisions of section 215(1), an amount equal to the sum of amounts derived by multiplying the benefit amount determined under this title for the month before such effective month including this subsection, but without the application of section 222(b), section 202(q), and subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section), for each such person for such month, by a percentage equal to the percentage of the increase provided under such benefit increase (with any such increased amount which is not a multiple of \$0.10 being rounded to the next higher multiple of \$0.10);

but in any such case (1) paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not be applied to such total of benefits after the application of subparagraph (B) or (C), and (ii) if section 202(k)(2)(A) was applicable in the case of any such benefits for a month, and ceases to apply for a month after such month, the provisions of subparagraph (B) or (C) shall be applied, for and after the month in which section 202(k)(2)(A) ceases to apply, as though paragraph (1) had not been applicable to such total of benefits for the last month for which subparagraph (B) or (C) was applicable, or."

(3)(A) Effective January 1, 1975, section 215(a) of such Act (as amended by section 201(c) of this Act) is further amended—

(i) by inserting "(or, if larger, the amount in column IV of the latest table deemed to be such table under subsection (1)(2)(D))" after "the following table" in paragraph (1)(A); and

(ii) by inserting "(whether enacted by another law or deemed to be such table under subsection (1)(2)(D))" after "effective month of a new table" in paragraph (2).

(B) Effective January 1, 1975, section 215(b)(4) of such Act (as amended by section 201(d) of this Act) is further amended to read as follows:

"(4) The provisions of this subsection shall be applicable only in the case of an individual—

"(A) who becomes entitled to benefits under section 202(a) or section 223 in or after the month in which a new table that appears in (or is deemed by subsection (1)(2)(D) to appear in) subsection (a) becomes effective; or

"(B) who dies in or after the month in which such table becomes effective without being entitled to benefits under section 202(a) or section 223; or

"(C) whose primary insurance amount is required to be recomputed under subsection (1)(2)."

(C) Effective January 1, 1975, section 215(c) of such Act (as amended by section 201

(e) of this Act) is further amended to read as follows:

"Primary Insurance Amount Under Prior Provisions

"(c) (1) For the purposes of column II of the latest table that appears in (or is deemed to appear in) subsection (a) of this section, an individual's primary insurance amount shall be computed on the basis of the law in effect prior to the month in which the latest such table became effective.

"(2) The provisions of this subsection shall be applicable only in the case of an individual who became entitled to benefits under section 202(a) or section 223, or who died, before such effective month."

(4) Effective January 1, 1975, sections 227 and 228 of such Act (as amended by section 201(g) of this Act) are further amended by striking out "\$58.00" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "the larger of \$58.00 or the amount most recently established in lieu thereof under section 215(1)", and by striking out "\$29.00" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "the larger of \$29.00 or the amount most recently established in lieu thereof under section 215(1)".

Adjustments in Contribution and Benefit Base

(b) (1) Title II of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"ADJUSTMENT OF THE CONTRIBUTION AND BENEFIT BASE

"SEC. 230. (a) Whenever the Secretary pursuant to section 215(1) increases benefits effective with the first month of the calendar year following a cost-of-living computation quarter, he shall also determine and publish in the Federal Register on or before November 1 of the calendar year in which such quarter occurs (along with the publication of such benefit increase as required by section 215(1)(2)(D)) the contribution and benefit base determined under subsection (b) which shall be effective (unless such increase in benefits is prevented from becoming effective by section 215(1)(2)(E)) with respect to remuneration paid after the calendar year in which such quarter occurs and taxable years beginning after such year.

"(b) The amount of such contribution and benefit base shall be the amount of the contribution and benefit base in effect in the year in which the determination is made or, if larger, the product of—

"(1) the contribution and benefit base which was in effect with respect to remuneration paid in (and taxable years beginning in) the calendar year in which the determination under subsection (a) with respect to such particular calendar year was made, and

"(2) the ratio of (A) the average of the taxable wages of all employees as reported to the Secretary for the first calendar quarter of the calendar year in which the determination under subsection (a) with respect to such particular calendar year was made to the latest or (B) the average of the taxable wages of all employees as reported to the Secretary for the first calendar quarter of 1973 or the first calendar quarter of the most recent calendar year in which an increase in the contribution and benefit base was enacted or a determination resulting in such an increase was made under subsection (a), with such product, if not a multiple of \$300, being rounded to the next higher multiple of \$300 where such product is a multiple of \$150 but not of \$300 and to the nearest multiple of \$300 in any other case.

"(c) For purposes of this section, and for purposes of determining wages and self-em-

ployment income under sections 209, 211, 213, and 215 of this Act and sections 1402, 3121, 3122, 3125, 6413, and 6654 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the 'contribution and benefit base' with respect to remuneration paid in (and taxable years beginning in) any calendar year after 1973 and prior to the calendar year with the first month of which the first increase in benefits pursuant to section 215(1) of this Act becomes effective shall be \$12,000 or (if applicable) such other amount as may be specified in a law enacted subsequent to the law which added this section."

INCREASE OF EARNINGS COUNTED FOR BENEFIT AND TAX PURPOSES

SEC. 203. (a) (1) (A) Section 209(a) (6) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting "and prior to 1973" after "1971".

(B) Section 209(a) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(7) That part of remuneration which, after remuneration (other than remuneration referred to in the succeeding subsections of this section) equal to \$10,800 with respect to employment has been paid to an individual during any calendar year after 1972 and prior to 1974, is paid to such individual during such calendar year;

"(8) That part of remuneration which, after remuneration (other than remuneration referred to in the succeeding subsections of this section) equal to \$12,000 with respect to employment has been paid to an individual during any calendar year after 1973 and prior to 1975, is paid to such individual during such calendar year;

"(9) That part of remuneration which, after remuneration (other than remuneration referred to in the succeeding subsections of this section) equal to the contribution and benefit base (determined under section 230) with respect to employment has been paid to an individual during any calendar year after 1974 with respect to which such contribution and benefit base is effective, is paid to such individual during such calendar year."

(2) (A) Section 211(b) (1) (F) of such Act is amended by inserting "and prior to 1973" after "1971", and by striking out "; or" and inserting in lieu thereof "; and".

(B) Section 211(b) (1) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraphs:

"(G) For any taxable year beginning after 1972 and prior to 1974, (i) \$10,800, minus (ii) the amount of the wages paid to such individual during the taxable year; and

"(H) For any taxable year beginning after 1973 and prior to 1975, (i) \$12,000, minus (ii) the amount of the wages paid to such individual during the taxable year; and

"(I) For any taxable year beginning in any calendar year after 1974, (i) an amount equal to the contribution and benefit base (as effective for such calendar year, minus (ii) the amount of the wages paid to such individual during such taxable year; or".

(3) (A) Section 213(a) (2) (ii) of such Act is amended by striking out "after 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "after 1971 and before 1973, or \$10,800 in the case of a calendar year after 1972 and before 1974, or \$12,000 in the case of a calendar year after 1973 and before 1975, or an amount equal to the contribution and benefit base (as determined under section 230) in the case of any calendar year after 1974 with respect to which such contribution and benefit base is effective".

(B) Section 213(a) (2) (iii) of such Act is amended by striking out "after 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "after 1971 and before 1973, or \$10,800 in the case of a taxable year beginning after 1972 and before 1974,

or \$12,000 in the case of a taxable year beginning after 1973 and before 1975, or an amount equal to the contribution and benefit base (as determined under section 230) which is effective for the calendar year in the case of any taxable year beginning in any calendar year after 1974".

(4) Section 215(a) (1) of such Act is amended by striking out "and the excess over \$9,000 in the case of any calendar year after 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "the excess over \$9,000 in the case of any calendar year after 1971 and before 1973, the excess over \$10,800 in the case of any calendar year after 1972 and before 1974, the excess over \$12,000 in the case of any calendar year after 1973 and before 1975, and the excess over an amount equal to the contribution and benefit base (as determined under section 230) in the case of any calendar year after 1974 with respect to which such contribution and benefit base is effective".

(b) (1) (A) Section 1402(b) (1) (F) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of self-employment income) is amended by inserting "and before 1973" after "1971", and by striking out "; or" and inserting in lieu thereof "; and".

(B) Section 1402(b) (1) of such Code is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraphs:

"(G) for any taxable year beginning after 1972 and before 1974, (i) \$10,800, minus (ii) the amount of the wages paid to such individual during the taxable year;

"(H) for any taxable year beginning after 1973 and before 1975, (i) \$12,000, minus (ii) the amount of the wages paid to such individual during the taxable year; and

"(I) for any taxable year beginning in any calendar year after 1974, (i) an amount equal to the contribution and benefit base (as determined under section 230 of the Social Security Act) which is effective for such calendar year, minus (ii) the amount of the wages paid to such individual during such taxable year; or".

(2) (A) Section 3121(a) (1) of such Code (relating to definition of wages) is amended by striking out "\$9,000" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "\$10,800".

(B) Effective with respect to remuneration paid after 1973, section 3121(a) (1) of such Code is amended by striking out "\$10,800" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,000".

(C) Effective with respect to remuneration paid after 1974, section 3121(a) (1) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking out "\$12,000" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "the contribution and benefit base (as determined under section 230 of the Social Security Act)", and

(ii) by striking out "by an employer during any calendar year", and inserting in lieu thereof "by an employer during the calendar year with respect to which such contribution and benefit base is effective".

(3) (A) The second sentence of section 3122 of such Code (relating to Federal service) is amended by striking out "\$9,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$10,800".

(B) Effective with respect to remuneration paid after 1973, the second sentence of section 3122 of such Code is amended by striking out "\$10,800" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,000".

(C) Effective with respect to remuneration paid after 1974, the second sentence of section 3122 of such Code is amended by striking out "the \$12,000 limitation" and inserting in lieu thereof "the contribution and benefit base limitation".

(4) (A) Section 3125 of such Code (relating to returns in the case of governmental employees in Guam, American Samoa, and

the District of Columbia) is amended by striking out "\$9,000" where it appears in subsections (a), (b), and (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$10,800".

(B) Effective with respect to remuneration paid after 1973, section 3125 of such Code is amended by striking out "\$10,800" where it appears in subsections (a), (b), and (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,000".

(C) Effective with respect to remuneration paid after 1974, section 3125 of such Code is amended by striking out "the \$12,000 limitation" where it appears in subsections (a), (b), and (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "the contribution and benefit base limitation".

(5) Section 6413(c)(1) of such Code (relating to special refunds of employment taxes) is amended—

(A) by inserting "and prior to the calendar year 1973" after "the calendar year 1971";

(B) by inserting after "exceed \$9,000," the following: "or (F) during any calendar year after the calendar year 1972 and prior to the calendar year 1974, the wages received by him during such year exceed \$10,800, or (G) during any calendar year after the calendar year 1973 and prior to the calendar year 1975, the wages received by him during such year exceed \$12,000, or (H) during any calendar year after 1974, the wages received by him during such year exceed the contribution and benefit base (as determined under section 230 of the Social Security Act) which is effective with respect to such year,"; and

(C) by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "and before 1973, or which exceeds the tax with respect to the first \$10,800 of such wages received in such calendar year after 1972 and before 1974, or which exceeds the tax with respect to the first \$12,000 of such wages received in such calendar year after 1973 and before 1975, or which exceeds the tax with respect to an amount of such wages received in such calendar year after 1974 equal to the contribution and benefit base (as determined under section 230 of the Social Security Act) which is effective with respect to such year".

(6) Section 6413(a)(2)(A) of such Code (relating to refunds of employment taxes in the case of Federal employees) is amended by striking out "or \$9,000 for any calendar year after 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$9,000 for the calendar year 1972, \$10,800 for the calendar year 1973, \$12,000 for the calendar year 1974, or an amount equal to the contribution and benefit base (as determined under section 230 of the Social Security Act) for any calendar year after 1974 with respect to which such contribution and benefit base is effective".

(7) (A) Section 6654(d)(2)(B)(ii) of such Code (relating to failure by individual to pay estimated income tax) is amended by striking out "\$9,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$10,800".

(B) Effective with respect to taxable years beginning after 1973, section 6654(d)(2)(B)(ii) of such Code is amended by striking out "\$10,800" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,000".

(C) Effective with respect to taxable years beginning after 1974, section 6654(d)(2)(B)(ii) of such Code is amended by striking out "the excess of \$12,000 over the amount" and inserting in lieu thereof "the excess of (I) an amount equal to the contribution and benefit base (as determined under section 230 of the Social Security Act) which is effective for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, over (II) the amount".

(c) The amendments made by subsections (a)(1) and (a)(3)(A), and the amendments made by subsection (b) (except paragraphs (1) and (7) thereof), shall apply only with

respect to remuneration paid after December 1972. The amendments made by subsections (a)(2), (a)(3)(B), (b)(1), and (b)(7) shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after 1972. The amendment made by subsection (a)(4) shall apply only with respect to calendar years after 1972.

CHANGES IN TAX SCHEDULES

SEC. 204. (a)(1) Section 1401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to rate of tax on self-employment income for purposes of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance) is amended—

(A) by striking out "and before January 1, 1973" in paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "and before January 1, 1978";

(B) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (3); and

(C) by striking out paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(4) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1977, and before January 1, 2011, the tax shall be equal to 6.7 percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year; and

"(5) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 2010, the tax shall be equal to 7.0 percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year."

(2) Section 3101(a) of such Code (relating to rate of tax on employees for purposes of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance) is amended—

(A) by striking out "the calendar years 1971 and 1972" in paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "any of the calendar years 1971 through 1977" and;

(B) by striking out paragraphs (4) and (5) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(4) with respect to wages received during any of the calendar years 1978 through 2010, the rate shall be 4.5 percent; and

"(5) with respect to wages received after December 31, 2010, the rate shall be 5.35 percent."

(3) Section 3111(a) of such Code (relating to rate of tax on employers for purposes of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance) is amended—

(A) by striking out "the calendar years 1971 and 1972" in paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "any of the calendar years 1971 through 1977"; and

(B) by striking out paragraphs (4) and (5) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(4) with respect to wages paid during any of the calendar year 1978 through 2010, the rate shall be 4.5 percent; and

"(5) with respect to wages paid after December 31, 2010, the rate shall be 5.35 percent."

(b)(1) Section 1401(b) of such Code (relating to rate of tax on self-employment income for purposes of hospital insurance) is amended by striking out paragraphs (2) through (5) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1972, and before January 1, 1978, the tax shall be equal to 0.9 percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year;

"(3) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1977, and before January 1, 1986, the tax shall be equal to 1.0 percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year;

"(4) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1985, and before January 1, 1993, the tax shall be equal to 1.1 percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year; and

"(5) in the case of any taxable year be-

ginning after December 31, 1992, the tax shall be equal to 1.2 percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year."

(2) Section 3101(b) of such Code (relating to rate of tax on employees for purposes of hospital insurance) is amended by striking out paragraphs (2) through (5) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) with respect to wages received during the calendar years 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976, and 1977, the rate shall be 0.9 percent;

"(3) with respect to wages received during the calendar years 1978, 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, and 1985, the rate shall be 1.0 percent;

"(4) with respect to wages received during the calendar years 1986, 1987, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991, and 1992, the rate shall be 1.1 percent; and

"(5) with respect to wages received after December 31, 1992, the rate shall be 1.2 percent."

(3) Section 3111(b) of such Code (relating to rate of tax on employers for purposes of hospital insurance) is amended by striking out paragraphs (2) through (5) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) with respect to wages paid during the calendar years 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976, and 1977, the rate shall be 0.9 percent;

"(3) with respect to wages paid during the calendar years 1978, 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, and 1985, the rate shall be 1.0 percent;

"(4) with respect to wages paid during the calendar years 1986, 1987, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991, and 1992, the rate shall be 1.1 percent; and

"(5) with respect to wages paid after December 31, 1992, the rate shall be 1.2 percent."

(c) The amendments made by subsections (a)(1) and (b)(1) shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1972. The remaining amendments made by this section shall apply only with respect to remuneration paid after December 31, 1972.

ALLOCATION TO DISABILITY INSURANCE TRUST FUND

SEC. 205. (a) Section 201(b)(1) of the Social Security Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and (D)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(D)", and

(2) by striking out "1969, and so reported," and inserting in lieu thereof "1969, and before January 1, 1973, and so reported, (E) 1.0 per centum of the wages (as so defined) paid after December 31, 1972, and before January 1, 1978, and so reported, (F) 1.1 per centum of the wages (as so defined) paid after December 31, 1977, and before January 1, 2011, and so reported, and (G) 1.4 per centum of the wages (as so defined) paid after December 31, 2010, and so reported,". (b) Section 201(b)(2) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and (D)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(D)", and

(2) by striking out "beginning after December 31, 1969," and inserting in lieu thereof "beginning after December 31, 1969, and before January 1, 1973, (E) 0.75 of 1 per centum of the amount of self-employment income (as so defined) so reported for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1972, and before January 1, 1978, (F) 0.825 per centum of the amount of self-employment income (as so defined) so reported for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1977, and before January 1, 2011, and (G) 0.915 per centum of the amount of self-employment income (as so defined) so reported for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 2010,".

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to provide for a four-month extension of the present temporary level in the public debt limitation, and for other purposes."

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Members want to hear this amendment read. I think they all know what it is.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the amendment. I will explain it in detail.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Arkansas prepared to make the motion?

The gentleman should make the motion now.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MILLS OF ARKANSAS

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur, and pending that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recognized.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the motion be divided.

The SPEAKER. That will be in order after the Clerk reports the motion.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Mr. MILLS moves to recede and concur in Senate amendment numbered 2.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the question, that it be divided.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks for a division of the question.

The question is, will the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BYRNES OF WISCONSIN

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin moves to concur in Senate amendment No. 2 to H.R. 15390 with the following amendment.

In lieu of the matter to be proposed by Senate amendment No. 2 insert the following:

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

INCREASE IN OLD-AGE, SURVIVORS AND DISABILITY INSURANCE BENEFITS

SEC. 201. (a) Section 215(a) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out the table and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"TABLE FOR DETERMINING PRIMARY INSURANCE AMOUNT AND MAXIMUM FAMILY BENEFITS

I (Primary insurance benefit under 1939 Act, as modified)		II (Primary insurance amount effective for January 1971)	III (Average monthly wage)	IV (Primary insurance amount)	V (Maximum family benefits)
If an individual's primary insurance benefit (as determined under subsec. (d)) is—		Or his primary insurance amount (as determined under subsec. (c)) is—	Or his average monthly wage (as determined under subsec. (b)) is—		And the maximum amount of benefits payable (as provided in sec. 203(a)) on the basis of his wages and self-employment income shall be—
At least—	But not more than—		At least—	But not more than—	
16.21	16.20	70.40	76	77.50	116.30
16.85	16.84	71.60	77	78.70	118.10
17.61	17.60	73.10	79	80.50	120.80
18.41	18.40	74.60	81	82.00	123.00
19.25	19.24	75.80	82	83.40	125.10
20.01	20.00	77.40	84	85.20	127.80
20.81	20.80	78.80	86	87.00	130.10
20.65	21.28	80.10	88	88.20	132.30
21.29	21.88	81.70	90	89.90	134.90
21.89	22.28	83.10	91	91.50	137.30
22.29	22.68	84.60	93	93.00	139.50
22.69	23.08	85.80	95	94.40	141.60
23.09	23.44	87.40	97	96.20	144.30
23.45	23.76	88.90	98	97.80	146.80
23.77	24.20	90.60	100	99.70	149.60
24.21	24.60	91.90	102	101.10	151.70
24.61	25.00	93.40	103	102.80	154.20
25.01	25.48	95.10	105	104.70	157.10
25.49	25.92	96.60	107	106.30	159.50
25.93	26.40	98.20	108	108.10	162.20
26.41	26.94	99.70	110	109.70	164.60
26.95	27.46	101.10	114	111.30	167.00
27.47	28.00	102.70	119	113.00	169.60
28.01	28.68	104.20	123	114.70	172.10
28.69	29.25	105.90	128	116.50	174.80
29.26	29.68	107.30	133	118.10	177.20
29.69	30.36	108.70	137	119.60	179.50
30.37	30.92	110.40	142	121.60	182.30
30.93	31.36	111.90	147	123.10	184.70
31.37	32.00	113.30	151	124.70	187.10
32.01	32.60	115.00	156	126.50	189.80
32.61	33.20	116.40	161	128.10	192.20

"TABLE FOR DETERMINING PRIMARY INSURANCE AMOUNT AND MAXIMUM FAMILY BENEFITS—Continued

I (Primary insurance benefit under 1939 Act, as modified)		II (Primary insurance amount effective for January 1971)	III (Average monthly wage)	IV (Primary insurance amount)	V (Maximum family benefits)
If an individual's primary insurance benefit (as determined under subsec. (d)) is—		Or his primary insurance amount (as determined under subsec. (c)) is—	Or his average monthly wage (as determined under subsec. (b)) is—		And the maximum amount of benefits payable (as provided in sec. 203(a)) on the basis of his wages and self-employment income shall be—
At least—	But not more than—		At least—	But not more than—	
33.21	33.88	118.00	165	169	194.70
33.89	34.50	119.50	170	174	197.30
34.51	35.00	121.00	175	178	199.70
35.01	35.80	122.60	179	183	202.40
35.81	36.40	124.00	184	188	204.60
36.41	37.08	125.70	189	193	207.50
37.09	37.60	127.20	194	197	210.00
37.61	38.20	128.60	198	202	212.30
38.21	39.12	130.30	203	207	215.10
39.13	39.68	131.80	208	211	217.50
39.69	40.33	133.10	212	216	219.80
40.34	41.12	134.80	217	221	222.50
41.13	41.76	136.30	222	225	225.00
41.77	42.44	137.90	226	230	227.60
42.45	43.20	139.40	231	235	230.10
43.21	43.76	141.10	236	239	233.00
43.77	44.44	142.50	240	244	236.30
44.45	44.88	143.90	245	249	241.20
44.89	45.60	145.60	250	253	245.00
		147.10	254	258	249.90
		148.40	259	263	254.70
		150.10	264	267	258.50
		151.60	268	272	263.40
		153.20	273	277	268.20
		154.70	278	281	272.10
		156.20	282	286	276.90
		157.90	287	291	281.80
		159.20	292	295	285.60
		160.90	296	300	290.40
		162.40	301	305	295.30
		163.80	306	309	299.20
		165.50	310	314	304.10
		166.90	315	319	308.90
		168.30	320	323	312.80
		170.00	324	328	317.60

"TABLE FOR DETERMINING PRIMARY INSURANCE AMOUNT AND
MAXIMUM FAMILY BENEFITS—Continued

I (Primary insurance benefit under 1939 Act, as modified)		II (Primary insurance amount effective for January 1971)		III (Average monthly wage)		IV (Primary insurance amount)	V (Maximum family benefits)
If an individual's primary insurance benefit (as determined under subsec. (d)) is—		Or his average monthly wage (as determined under subsec. (b)) is—		The amount referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this subsection shall be—		And the maximum amount of benefits pay- able (as pro- vided in sec. 203(a)) on the basis of his wages and self- employment income shall be—	
At least—	But not more than—	At least—	But not more than—	At least—	But not more than—	At least—	But not more than—
		171.50	329	333	188.70	322.50	
		173.20	334	337	190.00	326.30	
		174.50	338	342	192.00	331.10	
		176.00	343	347	193.60	336.00	
		177.70	348	351	195.50	339.80	
		179.10	352	356	197.10	344.70	
		180.80	357	361	198.90	349.50	
		182.20	362	365	200.60	353.40	
		183.60	366	370	202.00	358.20	
		185.30	371	375	203.90	363.00	
		186.80	376	379	205.50	367.00	
		188.50	380	384	207.40	371.80	
		189.80	385	389	208.80	376.70	
		191.30	390	393	210.50	380.50	
		193.00	394	398	212.30	385.40	
		194.40	399	403	213.90	390.20	
		196.10	404	407	216.80	394.10	
		197.40	408	412	217.20	398.90	
		198.80	413	417	218.70	403.70	
		200.20	418	421	220.30	407.60	
		201.80	422	426	222.00	412.40	
		203.10	427	431	223.50	417.30	
		204.50	432	436	225.00	422.10	
		206.10	437	440	226.80	424.10	
		207.40	441	445	228.20	428.50	
		208.80	446	450	229.70	433.20	
		210.40	451	454	231.50	437.60	
		211.70	455	459	232.90	442.50	
		213.10	460	464	234.50	446.90	
		214.50	465	468	236.00	451.20	
		216.10	469	473	237.80	455.60	
		217.40	474	478	239.20	460.40	
		218.80	479	482	240.70	464.70	
		220.40	483	487	242.50	469.50	
		221.70	488	492	243.90	473.90	
		223.10	493	496	245.50	478.80	
		224.70	497	501	247.20	483.20	
		226.00	502	506	248.60	488.90	
		227.40	507	510	250.20	493.00	
		228.80	511	515	251.70	497.30	
		230.30	516	520	253.40	501.60	
		231.70	521	524	254.90	506.80	
		233.10	525	529	256.50	511.20	
		234.70	530	534	258.20	515.60	
		236.00	535	538	259.60	520.00	
		237.40	539	543	261.20	524.40	
		239.00	544	548	262.90	528.80	
		240.30	549	553	264.40	533.20	
		241.70	554	556	265.90	537.60	
		242.90	557	560	267.20	542.00	
		244.20	561	563	268.70	546.40	
		245.50	564	567	270.10	550.80	
		246.80	568	570	271.50	555.20	
		248.00	571	574	272.80	559.60	
		249.30	575	577	274.30	564.00	
		250.50	578	581	275.60	568.40	
		251.80	582	584	277.00	572.80	
		253.00	585	588	278.30	577.20	
		254.40	589	591	279.90	581.60	

"TABLE FOR DETERMINING PRIMARY INSURANCE AMOUNT AND
MAXIMUM FAMILY BENEFITS—Continued

I (Primary insurance benefit under 1939 Act, as modified)		II (Primary insurance amount effective for January 1971)		III (Average monthly wage)		IV (Primary insurance amount)	V (Maximum family benefits)
If an individual's primary insurance benefit (as determined under subsec. (d)) is—		Or his average monthly wage (as determined under subsec. (b)) is—		The amount referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this subsection shall be—		And the maximum amount of benefits pay- able (as pro- vided in sec. 203(a)) on the basis of his wages and self- employment income shall be—	
At least—	But not more than—	At least—	But not more than—	At least—	But not more than—	At least—	But not more than—
		255.60	592	595	281.20	499.10	
		256.90	596	598	282.60	500.50	
		258.10	599	602	284.00	502.50	
		259.40	603	605	285.40	504.00	
		260.60	606	609	286.70	505.80	
		262.00	610	612	288.20	507.40	
		263.20	613	616	289.60	509.20	
		264.50	617	620	291.00	511.20	
		265.70	621	623	292.30	512.60	
		267.00	624	627	293.70	514.60	
		268.20	628	630	295.10	516.40	
		269.50	631	634	296.50	518.90	
		270.80	635	637	297.90	521.30	
		272.10	638	641	299.40	523.90	
		273.30	642	644	300.70	526.20	
		274.60	645	648	302.10	528.70	
		275.80	649	652	303.40	531.00	
		276.60	653	656	304.30	532.60	
		277.40	657	660	305.20	534.10	
		278.40	661	665	306.30	536.00	
		279.40	666	670	307.40	537.90	
		280.40	671	675	308.50	539.80	
		281.40	676	680	309.60	541.80	
		282.40	681	685	310.70	543.70	
		283.40	686	690	311.80	545.60	
		284.40	691	695	312.90	547.50	
		285.40	696	700	314.00	549.50	
		286.40	701	705	315.10	551.40	
		287.40	706	710	316.20	553.30	
		288.40	711	715	317.30	555.20	
		289.40	716	720	318.40	557.20	
		290.40	721	725	319.50	559.10	
		291.40	726	730	320.60	561.00	
		292.40	731	735	321.70	562.90	
		293.40	736	740	322.80	564.90	
		294.40	741	745	323.90	566.80	
		295.40	746	750	325.00	568.70	
			751	755	326.00	570.50	
			756	760	327.00	572.30	
			761	765	328.00	574.00	
			766	770	329.00	575.80	
			771	775	330.00	577.50	
			776	780	331.00	579.30	
			781	785	332.00	581.00	
			786	790	333.00	582.80	
			791	795	334.00	584.50	
			796	800	335.00	586.30	
			801	805	336.00	588.00	
			806	810	337.00	589.80	
			811	815	338.00	591.60	
			816	820	339.00	593.30	
			821	825	340.00	595.00	
			826	830	341.00	596.80	
			831	835	342.00	598.50	
			836	840	343.00	600.30	
			841	845	344.00	602.00	
			846	850	345.00	603.80"	

(b) Section 203(a) of such Act is amended by striking out paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) when two or more persons are entitled (without the application of section 202(j)(1) and section 223(b)) to monthly benefits under section 202 or 223 for August 1972 on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of such insured individual and the provisions of this subsection were applicable in January 1971 or any prior month in determining the total of the benefits for persons entitled for any such month on the basis of such wages and self-employment income, such total of benefits for September 1972 or any subsequent month shall not be reduced to less than the larger of—

"(A) the amount determined under this subsection without regard to this paragraph, or

"(B) an amount derived by multiplying the sum of the benefit amounts determined under this title for August 1972 (including this subsection, but without the application of section 222(b), section 202(q), and subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section), by 110 percent and raising such increased amount, if it is not a multiple of \$0.10, to the next higher multiple of \$0.10;

but in any such case (i) paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not be applied to such total of benefits after the application of subparagraph (B), and (ii) if section 202(k)(2)(A) was applicable in the case of any such benefits for September 1972, and ceases to apply after such month, the provisions of subparagraph (B) shall be applied, for and after the month in which section 202(k)(2)(A) ceases to apply, as though paragraph (1) had not been applicable to such total of benefits for June 1972, or".

(c) Section 215(a) of such Act is amended by striking out the matter which precedes the table and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) The primary insurance amount of an insured individual shall be determined as follows:

"(1) Subject to the conditions specified in subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section and except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, such primary insurance amount shall be whichever of the following amounts is the largest:

"(A) the amount in column IV of the following table on the line on which in column III of such table appears his average monthly wage (as determined under subsection (b));

"(B) the amount in column IV of such table on the line on which in column II appears his primary insurance amount (as determined under subsection (c)); or

"(C) the amount in column IV of such table on the line on which in column I appears his primary insurance benefit (as determined under subsection (d)).

"(2) In the case of an individual who was entitled to a disability insurance benefit for the month before the month in which he died, became entitled to old-age insurance benefits, or attained age 65, such primary insurance amount shall be the amount in column IV of such table which is equal to the primary insurance amount upon which such disability insurance benefit is based; except that if such individual was entitled to a disability insurance benefit under section 223 for the month before the effective month of a new table and in the following month became entitled to an old-age insurance benefit or he died in such following month, then his primary insurance amount for such following month shall be the amount in column IV of the new table on the line on which in column II of such table appears his primary insurance amount for the month before the effective month of the table (as determined under subsection (c)) instead of the amount in column IV equal

to the primary insurance amount on which his disability insurance benefit is based. For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'primary insurance amount' with respect to any individual means only a primary insurance amount determined under paragraph (1) (and such individual's benefits shall be deemed to be based upon the primary insurance amount as so determined)." (d) Section 215(b)(4) of such Act is amended by striking out "December 1970" each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof August 1972".

(e) Section 215(c) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Primary Insurance Amount Under Act of March 17, 1971

"(c) (1) For the purposes of column II of the table appearing in subsection (a) of this section, an individual's primary insurance amount shall be computed on the basis of the law in effect prior to June 1972.

"(2) The provisions of this subsection shall be applicable only in the case of an individual who became entitled to benefits under section 202(a) or section 223 before September 1972, or who died before such month."

(f) Section 215(f)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "(a)(1) and (3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a)(1)(A) and (C)".

(g) (1) Section 203(a) of the Social Security Act (as amended by subsection (b) of this section) is further amended by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (2), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof ", or", and by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) notwithstanding any other provision of law, when—

"(A) two or more persons are entitled to monthly benefits for a particular month on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of an insured individual and (for such particular month) the provisions of this subsection and section 202(q) are applicable to such monthly benefits, and

"(B) such individual's primary insurance amount is increased for the following month under any provision of this title,

then the total of monthly benefits for all persons on the basis of such wages and self-employment income for such particular month, as determined under the provisions of this subsection, shall for purposes of determining the total of monthly benefits for all persons on the basis of such wages and self-employment income for months subsequent to such particular month be considered to have been increased by the smallest amount that would have been required in order to assure that the total of monthly benefits payable on the basis of such wages and self-employment income for any such subsequent month will not be less (after the application of the other provisions of this subsection and section 202(q) than the total of monthly benefits (after the application of the other provisions of this subsection and section 202(q)) payable on the basis of such wages and self-employment income for such particular month."

(2) In any case in which the provisions of section 1002(b)(2) of the Social Security Amendments of 1969 were applicable with respect to benefits for any month in 1970, the total of monthly benefits as determined under section 203(a) of the Social Security Act shall, for months after 1970, be increased to the amount that would be required in order to assure that the total of such monthly benefits (after the application of section 202(q) of such Act) will not be less than the total of monthly benefits that was applicable (after the application of such sections 203(a) and 202(q)) for the first month for which the provisions of such section 1002(b)(2) applied.

(h) (1) (A) Section 227(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "\$48.30" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$53.20", and by striking out "\$24.20" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$26.70".

(B) Section 227(f) of such Act is amended by striking out "\$48.30" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$53.20".

(2) (A) Section 228(b)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "\$48.30" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$53.20".

(B) Section 228(b)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "\$48.30" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$53.20", and by striking out "\$24.20" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$26.70".

(C) Section 228(c)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "\$24.20" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$26.70".

(D) Section 228(c)(3)(A) of such Act is amended by striking out "\$48.30" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$53.20".

(E) Section 228(c)(3)(B) of such Act is amended by striking out "\$24.20" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$26.70".

(i) The amendments made by this section (other than the amendments made by subsection (g) and (h)) shall apply with respect to monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months after May 1972 and with respect to lump-sum death payments under such title in the case of deaths occurring after such month. The amendments made by subsection (g) shall apply with respect to monthly benefits under title II of such Act for months after May 1972.

AUTOMATIC ADJUSTMENTS IN BENEFITS AND THE CONTRIBUTION AND BENEFIT BASE

Adjustments in Benefits

Sec. 202. (a) (1) Section 215 of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"Cost-of-Living Increases in Benefits

"(1) (1) For purposes of this subsection—
"(A) the term 'base quarter' means (i) the calendar quarter ending on June 30 in each year after 1972, or (ii) any other calendar quarter in which occurs the effective month of a general benefit increase under this title;

"(B) the term 'cost-of-living computation quarter' means a base quarter, as defined in subparagraph (A) (i), in which the Consumer Price Index prepared by the Department of Labor exceeds, by not less than 3 per centum, such Index in the later of (i) the last prior cost-of-living computation quarter which was established under this subparagraph, or (ii) the most recent calendar quarter in which occurred the effective month of a general benefit increase under this title; except that there shall be no cost-of-living computation quarter in any calendar year in which a law has been enacted providing a general benefit increase under this title or in which such a benefit increase becomes effective; and

"(C) the Consumer Price Index for a base quarter, a cost-of-living computation quarter, or any other calendar quarter shall be the arithmetical means of such index for the 3 months in such quarter.

"(2) (A) (i) The Secretary shall determine each year beginning with 1974 (subject to the limitation in paragraph (1)(B) and to subparagraph (E) of this paragraph) whether the base quarter (as defined in paragraph (1)(A)(i)) in such year is a cost-of-living computation quarter.

"(ii) If the Secretary determines that such base quarter is a cost-of-living computation quarter, he shall, effective with the month of January of the next calendar year (subject to subparagraph (E) as provided in subparagraph (B), increase the benefit amount of each individual who for such month is entitled to benefits under section 227 or 228, and the primary insurance amount of each other individual under this title (but not in-

cluding a primary insurance amount determined under subsection (a) (3) of this section, by an amount derived by multiplying each such amount (including each such individual's primary insurance amount or benefit amount under section 227 or 228 as previously increased under this subparagraph) by the same percentage (rounded to the nearest one-tenth of 1 percent) as the percentage by which the Consumer Price Index for such cost-of-living computation quarter exceeds such index for the most recent prior calendar quarter which was a base quarter under paragraph (1) (A) (ii) or, if later, the most recent cost-of-living computation quarter under paragraph (1) (B). Any such increased amount which is not a multiple of \$0.10 shall be increased to the next higher multiple of \$0.10.

"(B) The increase provided by subparagraph (A) with respect to a particular cost-of-living computation quarter shall apply (subject to subparagraph (E)) in the case of monthly benefits under this title for months after December of the calendar year in which occurred such cost-of-living computation quarter, and in the case of lump-sum death payments with respect to deaths occurring after December of such calendar year.

"(C) (i) Whenever the level of the Consumer Price Index as published for any month exceeds by 2.5 percent or more the level of such index for the most recent base quarter (as defined in paragraph (1) (A) (ii)) or, if later, the most recent cost-of-living computation quarter, the Secretary shall (within 5 days after such publication) report the amount of such excess to the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance.

"(ii) Whenever the Secretary determines that a base quarter in a calendar year is also a cost-of-living computation quarter, he shall notify the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance of such determination on or before August 15 of such calendar year, indicating the amount of the benefit increase to be provided, his estimate of the extent to which the cost of such increase would be met by an increase in the contribution and benefit base under section 230 and the estimated amount of the increase in such base, the actuarial estimates of the effect of such increase, and the actuarial assumptions and methodology used in preparing such estimates.

"(D) If the Secretary determines that a base quarter in a calendar year is also a cost-of-living computation quarter, he shall publish in the Federal Register on or before November 1 of such calendar year a determination that a benefit increase is resultantly required and the percentage thereof. He shall also publish in the Federal Register at that time (along with the increased benefit amounts which shall be deemed to be the amounts appearing in sections 227 and 228) a revision of the table of benefits contained in subsection (a) of this section (as it may have been most recently revised by another law or pursuant to this paragraph); and such revised table shall be deemed to be the table appearing in such subsection (a). Such revision shall be determined as follows:

"(i) The headings of the table shall be the same as the headings in the table immediately prior to its revision, except that the parenthetical phrase at the beginning of column II shall reflect the year in which the primary insurance amounts set forth in column IV of the table immediately prior to its revision were effective.

"(ii) The amounts on each line of column I and column III, except as otherwise provided by clause (v) of this subparagraph, shall be the same as the amounts appearing in each such column in the table immediately prior to its revision.

"(iii) The amount on each line of column II shall be changed to the amount shown on the corresponding line of column IV of the table immediately prior to its revision.

"(iv) The amounts on each line of column IV and column V shall be increased from the amounts shown in the table immediately prior to its revision by increasing each such amount by the percentage specified in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2). The amount on each line of column V shall be increased, if necessary, so that such amount is at least equal to one and one-half times the amount shown on the corresponding line in column IV. Any such increased amount which is not a multiple of \$0.10 shall be increased to the next higher multiple of \$0.10.

"(v) If the contribution and benefit base (determined under section 230) for the calendar year in which the table of benefits is revised is lower than such base for the following calendar year, columns III, IV, and V of such table shall be extended. The amounts on each additional line of column III shall be the amounts on the preceding line increased by \$5 until in the last such line of column III the second figure is equal to one-twelfth of the new contribution and benefit base for the calendar year following the calendar year in which such table of benefits is revised. The amount on each additional line of column IV shall be the amount on the preceding line increased by \$1.00, until the amount on the last line of such column is equal to the last line of such column as determined under clause (iv) plus 20 percent of one-twelfth of the excess of the new contribution and benefit base for the calendar year following the calendar year in which such table of benefits is revised (as determined under section 230) over such base for the calendar year in which the table of benefits is revised. The amount on each additional line of column V shall be equal to 1.75 times the amount on the same line of column IV. Any such increased amount which is not a multiple of \$0.10 shall be increased to the next higher multiple of \$0.10.

"(E) Notwithstanding a determination by the Secretary under subparagraph (A) that a base quarter in any calendar year is a cost-of-living computation quarter (and notwithstanding any notification or publication thereof under subparagraph (C) or (D)), no increase in benefits shall take effect pursuant thereto, and such quarter shall be deemed not to be a cost-of-living computation quarter, if during the calendar year in which such determination is made a law providing a general benefit increase under this title is enacted or becomes effective.

"(3) As used in this subsection, the term 'general benefit increase under this title' means an increase (other than an increase under this subsection) in all primary insurance amounts (but not including those determined under subsection (a) (3) of this section) on which monthly insurance benefits under this title are based."

(2) (A) Effective January 1, 1974, section 203(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "the table in section 215(a)" in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "the table in (or deemed to be in) section 215(a)".

(B) Effective January 1, 1974, section 203(a) (2) of such Act (as amended by section 201(b) of this Act) is further amended to read as follows:

"(2) when two or more persons were entitled (without the application of section 202(j) (1) and section 223(b)) to monthly benefits under section 202 or 223 for January 1972 or any prior month on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of such insured individual and the provisions of this subsection as in effect for any such month were applicable in determining the benefit amount of any persons on the basis

of such wages and self-employment income, the total of benefits for any month after January 1972 shall not be reduced to less than the largest of—

"(A) the amount determined under this subsection without regard to this paragraph.

"(B) the largest amount which has been determined for any month under this subsection for persons entitled to monthly benefits on the basis of such insured individual's wages and self-employment income, or

"(C) if any persons are entitled to benefits on the basis of such wages and self-employment income for the month before the effective month (after September 1972) of a general benefit increase under this title (as defined in section 215(1) (3)) or a benefit increase under the provisions of section 215(1), an amount equal to the sum of the amounts derived by multiplying the benefit amount determined under this title for the month before such effective month (including this subsection, but without the application of section 222(b), section 202(q), and subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section), for each such person for such month by a percentage equal to the percentage of the increase provided under such benefit increase (with any such increased amount which is not a multiple of \$0.10 being rounded to the next higher multiple of \$0.10);

but in any such case (i) paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not be applied to such total of benefits after the application of subparagraph (B) or (C), and (ii) if section 202(k) (2) (A) was applicable in the case of any such benefits for a month, and ceases to apply for a month after such month, the provisions of subparagraph (B) or (C) shall be applied, for and after the month in which section 202(k) (2) (A) ceases to apply, as though paragraph (1) had not been applicable to such total of benefits for the last month for which subparagraph (B) or (C) was applicable, or".

(3) (A) Effective January 1, 1975, section 215(a) of such Act (as amended by section 201(c) of this Act) is further amended—

(i) by inserting "(or, if larger, the amount in column IV of the latest table deemed to be such table under subsection (1) (2) (D))" after "the following table" in paragraph (1) (A); and

(ii) by inserting "(whether enacted by another law or deemed to be such table under subsection (1) (2) (D))" after "effective month of a new table" in paragraph (2).

(B) Effective January 1, 1975, section 215(b) (4) of such Act (as amended by section 201(d) of this Act) is further amended to read as follows:

"(4) The provisions of this subsection shall be applicable only in the case of an individual—

"(A) who becomes entitled to benefits under section 202(a) or section 223 in or after the month in which a new table that appears in (or is deemed by subsection (1) (2) (D) to appear in) subsection (a) becomes effective; or

"(B) who dies in or after the month in which such table becomes effective without being entitled to benefits under section 202 (a) or section 223; or

"(C) whose primary insurance amount is required to be recomputed under subsection (f) (2);"

(C) Effective January 1, 1975, section 215(c) of such Act (as amended by section 201(e) of this Act) is further amended to read as follows:

"Primary Insurance Amount Under Prior Provisions

"(c) (1) For the purposes of column II of the latest table that appears in (or is deemed to appear in) subsection (a) of this section, an individual's primary insurance

amount shall be computed on the basis of the law in effect prior to the month in which the latest such table became effective.

"(2) The provisions of this subsection shall be applicable only in the case of an individual who became entitled to benefits under section 202(a) or section 223, or who died, before such effective month."

(4) Effective January 1, 1975, sections 227 and 228 of such Act (as amended by section 201(g) of this Act) are further amended by striking out "\$53.20" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "the larger of \$53.20 or the amount most recently established in lieu thereof under section 215(1)", and by striking out "\$26.70" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "the larger of \$26.70 or the amount most recently established in lieu thereof under section 215(1)".

ADJUSTMENT OF THE TAX AND BENEFIT BASE

(b) (1) Title II of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"ADJUSTMENT OF THE TAX AND BENEFIT BASE

"Sec. 230. (a) If the Secretary determines pursuant to subsection (1) of section 215 that an increase in benefits provided by subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2) of such subsection applies in the case of monthly benefits under sections 202 and 223 for months of a calendar year immediately following a cost-of-living computation quarter he shall also estimate the long-range additional level-cost (without regard to any estimated actuarial surplus which may exist at such time) of such benefits. He shall also determine the increase that is necessary in (1) the amount of earnings and self-employment income that may be taxed under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance and (2) the rate of tax specified in sections 1401(a), 3101(a), and 3111(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to meet the total of such level cost and the cost (not previously taken into account under this subsection) of increasing the exempt amount pursuant to section 203(f) (8) for years prior to the year in which such increase in benefits becomes effective so that one-half (or approximately one-half) of such total is to be met by the increase specified in clause (1) and the remainder is to be met by the increase specified in clause (2).

"(b) The tax and benefit base for the calendar year referred to in subsection (a) and all succeeding calendar years, prior to the first calendar year thereafter in which an increase in benefits authorized by subsection (1) of section 215 becomes effective, shall be the sum of the amount of earnings of individuals that may be counted for benefits under this title and that may be taxed under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance with respect to the calendar year immediately preceding the calendar year referred to in subsection (a) and the increase referred to in subsection (a), with such sum if not a multiple of \$150, being rounded to the nearest multiple of \$150; except that—

"(1) If prior to such first calendar year a law is enacted which provides that for any calendar year a different amount of earnings may be so counted and may be so taxed, such different amount shall be the contribution and benefit base for the calendar years specified in such law but only until the first calendar year thereafter for which an increase in benefits is authorized by subsection (1) of section 215; and

"(2) the contribution and benefit base for any year after 1973 and prior to the first calendar year in which the first increase in benefits pursuant to section 215(1) becomes effective shall be \$10,200 or (if applicable) such other amount as may be specified in a law enacted subsequent to the date of this Act is enacted.

"(c) The Secretary shall allocate the increase in tax rates specified in clause (2) of subsection (a) of this section among the

rates of tax specified in sections 1401(a), 3101(a), and 3111(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so that—

"(A) the rate of tax under section 3101 (a) of such Code with respect to wages (as defined in section 3121(a) of such Code) received during a calendar year is equal to the rate of tax under section 3111(a) of such Code with respect to wages (as defined in section 3121(a) of such Code) paid during such calendar year;

"(B) the rate of tax under section 1401(a) of such Code with respect to self-employment income (as defined in section 1402(b) of such Code) for any taxable year beginning during a period specified in such section 1401 (a) shall be equal to 150 percent of the rate of tax under section 3101(a) of such Code with respect to wages (as defined in section 3121(a) of such Code) received during any calendar year occurring in such period.

After such allocation, the Secretary shall round any such tax rate, increased by reason of such allocation, to the nearest one-tenth of 1 percent.

"(d) At the time the Secretary publishes in the Federal Register the table required by section 215(1) (2) (D), he shall also publish in such Register—

"(1) the actuarial assumptions and methodology used in estimating the additional long-range level-cost referred to subsection (a), and

"(2) the tax and benefit base resulting pursuant to subsection (b), and

"(3) the amount of the increase in tax rates required pursuant to such subsection (a) and the allocation of such increase determined under subsection (b) (including any rounding authorized by such subsection).

"(e) For purposes of this section, and for purposes of determining wages and self-employment income under sections 209, 211, 213, and 215 of this Act and sections 1402, 3121, 3122, 3125, 6413, and 6654 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the 'tax and benefit base' with respect to remuneration paid in (and taxable years beginning in) any calendar year after 1972 and prior to the calendar year with the first month of which the first increase in benefits pursuant to section 215(1) of this Act becomes effective shall be \$10,200 or (if applicable) such other amount as may be specified in a law enacted subsequent to the Social Security Amendments of 1972."

SPECIAL MINIMUM PRIMARY INSURANCE AMOUNT

Sec. 203. (a) Section 215(a) of the Social Security Act (as amended by section 201(c) of this Act) is further amended—

(1) by striking out "paragraph (2)" in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraphs (2) and (3)"; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

"(3) Such primary insurance amount shall be an amount equal to \$10 multiplied by the individual's years of coverage in excess of 10 in any case in which such amount is higher than the individual's primary insurance amount as determined under paragraph (1) or (2).

For purposes of paragraph (3), an individual's 'years of coverage' is the number (not exceeding 30) equal to the sum of (i) the number (not exceeding 14 and disregarding any fraction) determined by dividing the total of the wages credited to him for years after 1936 and before 1951 by \$900, plus (ii) the number equal to the number of years after 1950 each of which is a computation base year (within the meaning of subsection (b) (2) (C)) and in each of which he is credited with wages and self-employment income of not less than 25 percent of the maximum amount which, pursuant to subsection (e), may be counted for such year."

(b) Section 203(a) of such Act (as amend-

ed by sections 201(b) and 202(a) (2) of this Act) is further amended by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (2), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof ", or", and by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) whenever the monthly benefits of such individuals are based on an insured individual's primary insurance amount which is determined under section 215(a) (3) and such primary insurance amount does not appear in column IV of the table in (or deemed to be in) section 215(a), the applicable maximum amount in column V of such table shall be the amount in such column that appears on the line on which the next higher primary insurance amount appears in column IV, or, if larger, the largest amount determined for such persons under this subsection for any month prior to February 1971."

(c) Section 215(a) (2) of such Act (as amended by section 201(c) of this Act) is further amended by striking out "such primary insurance amount shall be" and all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"such primary insurance amount shall be—

"(A) the amount in column IV of such table which is equal to the primary insurance amount upon which such disability insurance benefit is based; except that if such individual was entitled to a disability insurance benefit under section 223 for the month before the effective month of a new table (whether enacted by another law or deemed to be such table under subsections (1) (2) (D)) and in the following month became entitled to an old-age insurance benefit, or he died in such following month, then his primary insurance amount for such following month shall be the amount in column IV of the new table on the line on which in column II of such table appears his primary insurance amount for the month before the effective month of the table (as determined under subsection (c)) instead of the amount in column IV equal to the primary insurance amount on which his disability insurance benefit is based. For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'primary insurance amount' with respect to any individual means only a primary insurance amount determined under paragraph (1) (and such individual's benefits shall be deemed to be based upon the primary insurance amount as so determined); or

"(B) an amount equal to the primary insurance amount upon which such disability insurance benefit is based if such primary insurance amount was determined under paragraph (3)."

(d) Section 215(f) (2) of such Act (as amended by section 201(f) of this Act) is further amended by striking out "subsection (a) (1) (A) and (C)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsections (a) (1) (A) and (C) and (a) (3)".

(e) Whenever an insured individual is entitled to benefits for a month which are based on a primary insurance amount under paragraph (1) or paragraph (3) of section 215(a) of the Social Security Act and for the following month such primary insurance amount is increased or such individual becomes entitled to benefits on a higher primary insurance amount under a different paragraph of such section 215(a), such individual's old-age or disability insurance benefit (beginning with the effective month of the increased primary insurance amount, shall be increased by an amount equal to the difference between the higher primary increase amount and the primary insurance amount on which such benefit was based for the month prior to such effective month, after the application of section 202(q) of such Act where applicable to such difference.

(f) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to monthly insur-

ance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months after December 1971 (without regard to when the insured individual became entitled to such benefits or when he died) and with respect to lump-sum death payments under such title in the case of deaths occurring after such month.

AUTOMATIC INCREASES OF EARNINGS COUNTED FOR BENEFIT AND TAX PURPOSES

SEC. 204. (a) (1) Section 209(a) of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(7) That part of remuneration which, after remuneration (other than remuneration referred to in the succeeding subsections of this section) equal to the contribution 4230) with respect to employment has been paid to an individual during any calendar year after 1973 with respect to which such contribution and benefit base is effective, is paid to such individual during such calendar year;"

(2) Section 211(b)(1) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(G) For any taxable year beginning in any calendar year after 1973, (1) an amount equal to the contribution and benefit base (as determined under section 230) which is effective for such calendar year, minus (II) the amount of the wages paid to such individual during such taxable year; or"

(3) (A) Section 213(a)(2)(II) of such Act is amended by inserting immediately after "calendar year after 1971" the following: "and before 1974, or an amount equal to the contribution and benefit base (as determined under section 230) in the case of any calendar year after 1973 with respect to which such contribution and benefit base is effective".

(B) Section 213(a)(2)(III) of such Act is amended by inserting immediately after "calendar year after 1971" the following: "and before 1974, or an amount equal to the contribution and benefit base (as determined under section 230) which is effective for the calendar year in the case of any taxable year beginning in any calendar year after 1973".

(4) Section 215(e)(1) of such Act is amended by inserting immediately after "calendar year after 1971" the following: "and before 1974, and the excess over an amount equal to the contribution and benefit base (as determined under section 230) in the case of any calendar year after 1973 with respect to which such contribution and benefit base is effective".

(b) (1) Section 1402(b)(1) of such Code is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(G) for any taxable year beginning in any calendar year after 1973, (i) an amount equal to the contribution and benefit base (as determined under section 230 of the Social Security Act) which is effective for such calendar year, minus (II) the amount of the wages paid to such individual during such taxable year; or"

(2) Effective with respect to remuneration paid after 1973, section 3121(a)(1) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking out "\$9,000" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "the contribution and benefit base (as determined under section 230 of the Social Security Act)", and

(ii) by striking out "by an employer during any calendar year", and inserting in lieu thereof "by an employer during the calendar year with respect to which such contribution and benefit base is effective".

(B) Effective with respect to remuneration paid after 1973, the second sentence of section 3122 of such Code is amended by striking out "the \$9,000 limitation" and inserting

in lieu thereof "the contribution and benefit base limitation".

(4) Effective with respect to remuneration paid after 1973, section 3125 of such Code is amended by striking out "the \$9,000 limitation" where it appears in subsections (a), (b), and (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "the contribution and benefit base limitation".

(5) Section 6413(c)(1) of such Code (relating to special funds of employment taxes) is amended—

(A) by inserting "and before 1973" after "after the calendar year 1971";

(B) by inserting after "exceed \$9,000," the following:

"or (F) during any calendar year after the calendar year 1973, the wages received by him during such year exceed the contribution and benefit base (as determined under section 230 of the Social Security Act) which is effective with respect to such year"; and

(C) by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof "and before 1974, or which exceeds the tax with respect to an amount of such wages received and such calendar year after 1973 equal to the contribution and benefit base (as determined under section 230 of the Social Security Act) which is effective with respect to such year".

(6) Section 6413(c)(2)(A) of such Code (relating to refunds of employment taxes in the case of Federal employees) is amended by inserting after "or \$9,000 for any calendar year after 1971" the following: "or an amount equal to the contribution and benefit base (as determined under section 230 of the Social Security Act) for any calendar year after 1973 with respect to which such contribution and benefit base is effective".

(7) Effective with respect to taxable years beginning after 1973, section 6654(d)(2)(B) (ii) of such Code is amended by striking out an amount equal to the contribution and inserting in lieu thereof "the excess of (I) an amount equal to the contribution and benefit base (as determined under section 230 of the Social Security Act) which is effective for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, over (II) the amount".

(c) The amendments made by subsections (a)(1) and (a)(3)(A), and the amendments made by subsection (b) (except paragraphs (1) and (7) thereof), shall apply only with respect to remuneration paid after December 1972. The amendments made by subsections (a)(2), (a)(3)(B), (b)(1), and (b)(7) shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after 1972. The amendment made by subsection (a)(4) shall apply only with respect to calendar years after 1972.

CHANGES IN TAX SCHEDULES

SEC. 205. (a) (1) Section 1401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to rate of tax on self-employment income for purposes of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance) is amended—

(A) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (3); and

(B) by striking out paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(4) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1972, and before January 1, 1978, the tax shall be equal to 6.7 percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year;

"(5) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1977, and before January 1, 2011, the tax shall be equal to 6.6 percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year; and

"(6) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 2010, the tax shall be equal to 7.0 percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year.

Such tax with respect to self-employment income for any taxable year shall be increased

to accordance with the allocation made by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under section 230(c) of the Social Security Act."

(2) Section 3101(a) of such Code (relating to rate of tax on employees for purposes of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance is amended by striking out paragraphs (4) and (5) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(4) with respect to wages received during the calendar years 1973 through 1977 the rate shall be 4.45 percent;

"(5) with respect to wages received during the calendar years 1970 through 2010, the rate shall be 4.4 percent; and

"(6) with respect to wages received after December 31, 2010, the rate shall be 5.3 percent.

Such tax with respect to wages received during any calendar year shall be increased in accordance with the allocation made by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under section 230(c) of the Social Security Act."

(3) Section 3111(a) of the such Code (relating to rate of tax on employers for purposes of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance) is amended by striking out paragraphs (4) and (5) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(4) with respect to wages paid during the calendar years 1973 through 1977 the rate shall be 4.45 percent;

"(5) with respect to wages paid during the calendar years 1978 through 2010, the rate shall be 4.45 percent

"(6) with respect to wages paid after December 31, 2010, the rate shall be 5.3 percent.

Such tax with respect to wages reached during any calendar year shall be increased in accordance with the allocation made by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under section 230(c) of the Social Security Act."

(b) (1) Section 1401(b) of such Code (relating to rate of tax on self-employment incomes for purposes of hospital insurance) is amended by striking out paragraphs (2) through (5) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1972, and before January 1, 1978, the tax shall be equal to 0.9 percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year;

"(3) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1977, and before January 1, 1982, the tax shall be equal to 1.1 percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year;

"(4) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1981, and before January 1, 1991, the tax shall be equal to 1.2 percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year;

"(5) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1990, the tax shall be equal to 1.3 percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year."

(2) Section 3101(b) of such Code (relating to rate of tax on employees for purposes of hospital insurance) is amended by striking out paragraphs (2) through (5) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) with respect to wages received during the calendar years 1973 through 1977, the rate shall be 0.9 percent;

"(3) with respect to wages received during the calendar years 1978 through 1981, the rate shall be 1.1 percent;

"(4) with respect to wages received during the calendar years 1982 through 1990 the rate shall be 1.2 percent;

"(5) with respect to wages received after December 31, 1990, the rate shall be 1.3 percent."

(3) Section 3111(b) of such Code (relating to rate of tax on employers for purposes of hospital insurance) is amended by striking out paragraphs (2) through (5) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) with respect to wages paid during the calendar years 1973 through 1977, the rate shall be 0.9 percent;

"(3) with respect to wages paid during the calendar years 1978 through 1981 the rate shall be 1.1 percent;

"(4) with respect to wages paid during the calendar years 1982 through 1990, the rate shall be 1.2 percent;

"(5) with respect to wages paid after December 31, 1990, the rate shall be 1.3 percent."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) (1) shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1972. The remaining amendments made by this section shall apply only with respect to remuneration paid after December 31, 1972.

ALLOCATION TO DISABILITY INSURANCE TRUST FUND

SEC. 206. (a) Section 201(b) (1) of the Social Security Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and (D)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(D)", and

(2) by striking out "1969, and so reported" and inserting in lieu thereof "1969, and before January 1, 1973, and so reported, (E) 0.95 of 1 per centum of the wages (as so defined) paid after December 31, 1971, and before January 1, 1978, and so reported, (F) 1.10 per centum of the wages (as so defined) paid after December 31, 1977, and before January 1, 2011, and so reported, and (G) 1.5 per centum of the wages (as so defined) paid after December 31, 2010, and so reported."

(b) Section 201(b) (2) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and (D)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(D)", and

(2) by striking out "beginning after December 31, 1969," and inserting in lieu thereof "beginning after December 31, 1969, and before January 1, 1973, (E) 0.715 of 1 per centum of the amount of self-employed income (as so defined) so reported for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1972, and before January 1, 1977, and (F) 0.825 of 1 per centum of the amount of self-employment income (as so defined) so reported for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1977, and before January 1, 2011, and (G) 0.990 of 1 per centum of the amount of self-employment income (as so defined) so reported for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 2010."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to provide for a four-month extension of the present temporary level in the public debt limitation, and for other purposes."

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I wonder if on this particular amendment we may not dispense with the reading?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent to do so?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the motion and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the second amendment in which I have

moved to recede and concur involves an increase in social security benefits of 20 percent across the board effective for the month of September 1972, payable in the check for early October and automatic benefit increases to protect against the cost-of-living rises in the future.

Before explaining the effect of the amendment, the financing which is involved—and financing is contained in the Senate amendment in sufficient amount—let me make clear my own position on this matter. I favor the 20 percent. I favor it for many, many reasons. One of the reasons is that under the provisions of existing law, and under the bill that we passed, H.R. 1, last year, we were establishing rates of tax at an early period in the future that were totally unnecessary, I concluded, on my further study of this whole matter, to finance the benefits that we were proposing to add to those in existing law. A 5-percent benefit increase was in H.R. 1. There were other increases that I thought were good for widows and others, but there was only a 5-percent across-the-board increase.

I suggested at that time that the Senate replace the 5-percent increase with the bill that I had introduced, providing for a 20-percent increase, because my bill contained in it a provision for taxes, taking into account adjustment of the level of wages sufficient to finance the 20 percent, plus all of the other features involving OASDI and HI that were contained in the House-passed version of H.R. 1.

I would be the last one, frankly, to want to get this program in a position where it was not actuarially sound. The actuarial soundness of OASDI, different from HI—that is the hospital insurance—is predicated upon assumptions of what will happen over a 75-year period. HI is predicated upon assumptions of what will happen over a 25-year period.

If we enact the 20-percent increase with the tax adjustments that are in my bill or in this amendment, I can assure the membership of this House that we will over that 75-year period take in each year more money than we will be paying out. We will not be taking in the excessive amounts over what we pay out, that we would under the provisions of existing law or under H.R. 1, if enacted.

Mr. Speaker, I am a little bit confused as to what the President has said, and the information that he has received about this matter, because I have a letter from the Secretary of HEW, who tells me that the bill that I introduced is actuarially sound. The administration opposes it because they preferred a lower level of percentage increase and a higher level of tax reduction. Both are contained in this amendment. If I have permission, I will include with my remarks these charts and tables at the conclusion of my remarks.

I ask unanimous consent to do so.

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

There was no objection.

The material referred to follows:

TABLE 4.—IMPACT OF 20 PERCENT BENEFIT INCREASE ON BENEFIT LEVELS

	Monthly benefits		Increased benefits on an annual basis above present levels
	Present	20 percent	
Retired worker (average).....	\$134.00	\$162.00	\$336
Retired couple (average) monthly..	224.00	271.00	564
Minimum.....	70.40	84.50	169
Worker with maximum earnings.....	216.00	259.00	516
Couple with maximum earnings.....	324.00	389.00	780
Widow (average).....	114.00	137.00	276

TABLE 3.—OLD-AGE, SURVIVORS, AND DISABILITY INSURANCE: PROGRESS OF THE OASDI AND HI TRUST FUNDS, COMBINED, UNDER THE SYSTEM AS MODIFIED BY A PROPOSED BENEFIT INCREASE OF 20 PERCENT ACROSS-BOARD, EFFECTIVE FOR SEPTEMBER 1972, CALENDAR YEARS 1972-77

Calendar year	Income		Assets at end of year, as percent of outgo in—		Following year
	Income	Outgo	Assets, end of year	Current year	
1972.....	\$46.2	\$43.2	\$43.4	100	84
1973.....	52.2	51.6	44.0	85	81
1974.....	58.1	54.2	48.0	89	81
1975.....	62.8	59.2	51.6	87	83
1976.....	66.2	62.1	55.7	90	82
1977.....	71.6	68.2	59.1	87	83

Note: The proposal provides for an OASDI contribution rate of 4.6 percent in calendar years 1972-77; automatic cost-of-living increases in cash benefits after September 1972; contribution and benefit base of \$10,800 in 1973, \$12,000 in 1974, with automatic adjustment to increases in earnings levels thereafter.

TABLE 2.—SOCIAL SECURITY TAXES PAID BY WORKERS AT VARIOUS EARNINGS LEVELS UNDER PRESENT LAW AND UNDER SENATE AMENDMENT

Worker earnings	Taxes for cash social security		Total taxes including medicare	
	Present law	Senate amendment	Present law	Senate amendment
1973:				
\$2,000.....	\$100	\$92.00	\$113.00	\$110
\$3,000.....	150	138.00	169.50	165
\$4,000.....	200	184.00	226.00	220
\$5,000.....	250	230.00	282.50	275
\$6,000.....	300	276.00	339.00	330
\$7,000.....	350	322.00	395.50	385
\$8,000.....	400	368.00	452.00	440
\$9,000.....	450	414.00	508.50	495
\$10,000.....	450	460.00	508.50	550
\$11,000.....	450	496.80	508.50	594
\$12,000.....	450	496.80	508.50	594
1974:				
\$2,000.....	100	92.00	113.00	110
\$3,000.....	150	138.00	169.50	165
\$4,000.....	200	184.00	226.00	220
\$5,000.....	250	230.00	282.50	275
\$6,000.....	300	276.00	339.00	330
\$7,000.....	350	322.00	395.50	385
\$8,000.....	400	368.00	452.00	440
\$9,000.....	450	414.00	508.50	495
\$10,000.....	450	460.00	508.50	550
\$11,000.....	450	506.00	508.50	605
\$12,000.....	450	552.00	508.50	660

TABLE 1.—SOCIAL SECURITY TAX RATES, PRESENT LAW AND PROPOSED SENATE AMENDMENT

	Employee-employer, each			Self-employed				Employee-employer, each			Self-employed		
	OASDI percent	HI percent	Total percent	OASDI percent	HI percent	Total percent		OASDI percent	HI percent	Total percent	OASDI percent	HI percent	Total percent
Present law: ¹													
1972	4.60	0.60	5.20	6.9	0.60	7.50							
1973-75	5.00	.65	5.65	7.0	.65	7.65							
1976-79	5.15	.70	5.85	7.0	.70	7.70							
1980-86	5.15	.80	5.95	7.0	.80	7.80							
1987 and after	5.15	.90	6.05	7.0	.90	7.90							
Proposed Senate amendment: ²													
1973-77	4.6	0.9	5.5	6.9	0.9	7.8							
1978-85	4.5	1.0	5.5	6.7	1.0	7.7							
1986-92	4.5	1.1	5.6	6.7	1.1	7.8							
1993-2010	4.5	1.2	5.7	6.7	1.2	7.9							
2011 and later	5.35	1.2	6.55	7.0	1.2	8.2							

¹ Tax rates apply to annual earnings up to \$9,000.² Tax rates apply to annual earnings up to \$10,800 in 1973, \$12,000 in 1974, subject to automatic adjustment beginning in 1975.

Under present law, a person with \$2,000 earnings pays \$113 social security tax. Under this amendment he will pay \$110. A person with \$3,000—and I am talking about the total tax including medicare—under present law pays \$169.50. Under this amendment it will be \$165. That continues to be less under the amendment than existing law in the year 1973 until you get to an income level of \$9,245. When you get to that level, because of the increase in the amount of one's earnings subject to the tax rate the individual begins to pay more. That individual now, under present law, would pay \$508.50 and under the Senate amendment would pay \$550, and so on.

In the year 1974 the same is true. Under the proposed amendment I am asking the House to recede and concur in, in the year 1974 in each category of income, that is, \$2,000, \$3,000, \$4,000, \$5,000, \$6,000, \$7,000, \$8,000, and \$9,000, the individual will pay less tax if we agree to the Senate amendment than he would pay under the provisions of existing law. At \$10,000 he would pay more. That is the effect of the change in the income that the individual may have which is subject to the rate of tax.

Let me show you again, Mr. Speaker, what the percent is—the tax rate itself is—under present law for OASDI and for HI in total. For the year 1972 it remains the same, 5.2; for the years 1973 through 1977 the total rate under the Senate amendment is 5.5. Under the present law the rate between 1973, 1974, and 1975 is 5.65, a higher rate. Then in 1976 the rate through 1979 is 5.85 under present law. From 1978 through 1985 this rate remains at 5.5 under the amendment. Then in 1986 through 1992 it goes to 5.6. But under the provisions of existing law that rate has already gone up in the year 1987 to 6.05, and it is only when you get to the year 2011 and later on that the tax rate under the amendment exceeds the rate under present law. Why that year? Because that is the year when a great number of your post-World War II babies will begin to retire and receive social security retirement benefits—that is when you need the higher rate. Then the rate will be higher by one-half of one percent than it was in 1987.

Not only have we reduced the rates for those at the lower levels of income, but we are also postponing under this amendment the rates of tax that are in effect now and the even higher rates that would go in effect if H.R. 1 were passed.

So I say I think that the President has received some misinformation about the

effect of the Senate amendment on the taxpayers of the United States, as I understood him in his press conference last night.

Mr. STRATTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STRATTON. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee do I understand that the Church amendment is also the gentleman's own proposal and similar to his own proposal and we have a different version from the conference in the original Church amendment?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The Church amendment is effective September 1. The bill I introduced back in February has an effective date of June 1.

There is about the same period of time, between June and September, as between February and June. The gentleman can look down the road a little bit, as I looked down the road.

The tax rates differ because the bill I introduced, provided for the raise in taxes necessary for the 20-percent increase in lieu of the 5, and for all of the other benefits which were included in H.R. 1, as passed by the House. There we provide for the taxes to finance what is proposed. The Senate amendment only provides a tax rate and a tax base sufficient to finance the provisions of the existing law plus the 20-percent benefit increase.

Mr. STRATTON. That is the proposal that the conferees bring back to the House?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. That is what I am urging that we recede and concur in.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, is it the intention of the gentleman from Arkansas to yield time over here, because I do have some requests for time.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I will yield the gentleman from Wisconsin such time as the gentleman wants within the limits of my time. Is the gentleman from Wisconsin prepared to use some of that time now?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman will state that he is so prepared.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BYRNES).

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, to appear here as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, to discuss a matter of this importance with so little information for the members

of the committee, of the House, or of the Congress, is something that I thought I would never have to experience in my service in this House.

This is no way to treat vitally important legislation.

Some may call what we are doing here today cute politics. I call it irresponsibility. Make no mistake, this procedure is playing fast and loose with the integrity of the social security system on which 27 million people depend today, and into which some 94 million people are today paying taxes in the expectation of receiving a floor of protection against a loss of earnings due to retirement, disability, or death.

This is an unfortunate way to treat that system for which we are responsible. We have hastily tied three complicated issues to the debt ceiling legislation which must become law by next Thursday or the machinery of government will come to an abrupt halt.

We will not be able to transact Government business unless we extend the present ceiling. All checks will stop. The sales of savings bonds will stop. Bond redemptions will stop unless an extension is provided.

If you insist on voting a 20-percent social security increase without any study by the Ways and Means Committee or the House of the soundness of the fundamental concepts involved in the financing provided it may well mark a turning point in the capacity of the social security system to respond with equity to the needs of our older people, and to the needs of those who are paying taxes today in anticipation of receiving benefits in the future.

We talk today about high taxes. But think of what is being attempted here today—holding the entire operation of Government hostage to an increase in social security taxes.

Yes, the whole machinery of Government would be held hostage to partisan politics. We might just as well admit it. There is no use glossing over the fact.

We insist on tying a social security increase to legislation that is absolutely essential to the operation of Government and then we immediately cut and run, because the motion or a resolution to recess this Congress and get out of town will be the next order of business.

Let me make this clear. I want to talk about the social security aspect of this. We all know what is involved in the debt ceiling legislation. That passed this House and it passed the Senate—there

was no disagreement on that. We did not have to go to conference on it.

The amendments that were added in the Senate have brought us here today.

At no point has there been a study by the Ways and Means Committee of the new method of financing that has produced the "windfall" that now is going to be used for the 20-percent benefit increase. Not one word of testimony in public or executive session has been received on this subject. This fundamental change in the criteria by which the soundness of the social security trust fund has been measured for one-third of a century is being adopted willy-nilly by the Congress without even a cursory review. And by enacting a 20-percent increase rather than the 10 percent I am proposing, you preempt tax resources that otherwise would be available for creating greater equity in our social security system.

A number of proposals for creating greater equity were approved overwhelmingly by this body more than a year ago. A good share of them were approved by the Senate Finance Committee, with some additions. These amendments provide greater equity to widows, the disabled, working women, and those supplementing their retirement by working. And these are going to come back to us, I hope, because they are certainly needed. But you are then going to have to impose increased taxes for every penny in increased benefits.

Despite the subterfuge and political chicanery underlying this discussion about tax increases, the American people will not be fooled. If we are going to pay out 20 percent more in benefit dollars, someone will have to pay 20 percent more in tax dollars than they otherwise would have to pay. It is that simple. The new methodology, while permitting some manipulation, does not change this fact. And let me point out that the hasty procedures employed here are completely inconsistent with the caution with which we should approach these new proposals.

It is very interesting that the actuary who was with this system from the beginning, Robert J. Myers, is no longer with the Social Security Administration. He is the greatest authority on the actuarial basis of the system and the man to whom our committee, the Senate Finance Committee, and the entire Congress have turned through the years for counsel and expert advice.

Mr. Myers has commented on the new cost estimates for cash benefits which we have based on the increased earnings assumption.

He is speaking as the man who knows more about our system than any other man in this country, and this is what he said about the new methodology using dynamic earnings:

This would be unsound actuarial procedure even if automatic adjustment provisions are adopted. What it would mean, in essence, is that actuarial soundness would be wholly dependent on a perpetually continuing inflation of a certain prescribed nature—and a borrowing from the next generation to pay the current generations' benefits, in the hope that inflation of wages would make this possible.

That is the system of financing that

this 20-percent increase is predicated on. And we have not studied this at all in the Ways and Means Committee.

By adopting this proposal, we would be saying to the President, "You either sign what we are sending to you, take a bad and unknown course, or else we are going to stop the whole function of government."

What could be more irresponsible?

Today we wonder why we hear expressions of disenchantment with the Congress of the United States. I do not think we need wonder any longer when we sit here and conduct our business in this fashion. How can we help but bring about a disrespect for our actions when we treat such serious questions in such a cursory fashion? We are contemplating taking steps that can lead us into very serious problems as far as this system and the many people involved in it are concerned.

This is not merely a matter of a 10-percent benefit rise or a 20-percent benefit rise. This is a matter of what you are going to be able to do for widows who, under existing law, are in an unfortunate situation, because when they apply for benefits at age 65, they are entitled to only 82½ percent of the benefit their husbands would have received had they lived. In H.R. 1 we raised that amount so a widow would receive 100 percent of the amount her husband would have received.

And what happens to the retirement test liberalization that we voted last year so that an older person can earn at least \$2,000 a year before his social security benefits are reduced? How many people have you heard complaining about the existing earnings limit of \$1,680 a year? Yet that is one of the things which, in my judgment, would be killed by taking all the money that may be available and putting it into a one-shot across-the-board benefit boost.

Let me remind some of the ladies, especially my friend from Michigan (Mrs. GRIFFITHS) that we provided in H.R. 1 for a system under which certain married couples could have their benefits computed on the basis of their combined earnings.

But you would jeopardize that provision by the proposal before us. You would use up tax resources resulting from increases you have placed in here. Are you going to want to come in and raise them further? That is what you will have to do to provide any of these benefits.

I could go on to cite some \$5 billion of benefits that you are surrendering, that we all agreed are advisable and essential to bring greater equity into the system.

What about medical care for the disabled? Last year we instituted—at the behest of the chairman primarily, and I concurred—a provision that would expand medicare to those who have been eligible for social security disability payments for at least 2 years, on the ground that these people need medicare coverage as much as those who have retired under social security. But this, too, would be placed in jeopardy by the action proposed today.

Mr. Speaker, I have proposed that we provide an increase in social security benefits of 10 percent at this time. We would not then preempt all of the tax resources available.

We could then see what we do with the other 10 percent, when we have the time, as we will have, and as the Senate considers further the legislation (H.R. 1), which we have sent to them to amend the Social Security Act.

Let us see what is more important, to use the full 20 percent for a one-time-only, across-the-board increase or perhaps correct some of the inequities that exist in the system along with at least a 10-percent benefit increase.

We should do this in a calmer moment and not just engage in partisan politics. Would it not be more responsible to say yes, we agreed a year ago to give these beneficiaries 5 percent by June 1? It is only because the Senate did not act that they do not have at least that 5 percent added to the checks they will be getting next week. They could have had it if the Senate had acted. And perhaps we should raise benefits now another 5 percent—bringing it to 10 percent—because there has been a continuing increase in the cost of living. But let us save the other 10 percent and balance it against equity considerations. We can do that if the Members will vote for the amendment I have offered.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 15390, EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY LEVEL OF PUBLIC DEBT LIMITATION

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Arkansas yield?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding. The chairman and I had a short conversation in which the chairman tried to explain a situation which occurred to me in reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which I studied today in preparation for today's vote. If the chairman will yield for a moment, I would like to read a short colloquy between Senator CHURCH and Senator CURTIS with relation to the tax rates. As I understood the chairman tonight, the situation is that next year the tax bite out of each earning category would be less.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Not out of each, but just up to \$9,245.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Up to \$9,245?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. For \$9,245 in earnings, the rate under the Senate amendment is lower. That is done up through even \$9,245. Each individual who earns less than that amount will pay less tax for social security, including medicare, than he will under the provisions of the present law.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, if I can quote just a short portion from that page.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I have gone over that myself, and I am not persuaded by anything that is said on the Senate floor that my tables are wrong. Senator CHURCH said he did not have the information. I do have the information, and I have it here in the form of a table I have just inserted in the RECORD, so I can assure the gentleman the table is correct.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, will be gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, a moment ago, the gentleman spoke of the rates that would be charged the employees under the Church amendment.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. And the employers.

Mr. KYL. And the employers' rates will remain exactly as they are?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. No, the rates I gave the gentleman are the rates that are paid by the employee and by the employer.

Mr. KYL. They are consistent in each instance?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Oh, yes. They are exactly the same in each instance.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me a few minutes?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I am glad to yield the gentleman 5 minutes.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin, who is indeed the conscience of this House. We regret his imminent departure. I believe we are going to miss him a great deal.

Mr. Speaker, the way in which this bill has been handled represents shabby politics, demeaning to the Congress. Cynically relying on an assumed Pavlovian reaction of Representatives who naturally and instinctively sympathize with the older and more dependent elements among their constituencies, our leaders have presented us with a blind 20-percent increase vote which could mark the beginning of the end for a system on which 90 million workers and 27 million beneficiaries have relied. Social security is too important to be casually stripped of its vitality. Too many people depend on it.

In effect the chairman says, in recommending this increase on the basis of the new dynamic actuarial assumptions that "all the experts agree." I will not dwell on the question of whether the experts in HEW are entitled to our confidence. I say only that we in the Congress are not entitled to the confidence of the American people if we allow ourselves to be stampeded into this vote without any prior consideration of these two questions:

One. Should we without hearings change the actuarial assumptions of the past 37 years, mortgaging future earnings increases to pay current benefits?

If the answer to the first question is in the affirmative, the second question

should be: Should we use the resulting actuarial windfall to give an across-the-board 20-percent benefit increase, or should we also consider a mix of potential benefits, including such things as higher minimum payments, a different weighting of the benefit schedule, a higher earned income limitation, more equity for working wives, better widows' benefits, a lower retirement age in this time of high unemployment, or even a lower payroll tax?

Perhaps the 20-percent increase is the best thing we can do with such an alleged windfall. Nobody knows. No committee of the Congress has considered it.

These other reforms will not be possible for a long time if we act now because we fear the short-term political consequences of holding off until some responsible congressional committee, somewhere, can look at them.

We have voted for a 25-percent total increase in benefits during the past 3 years, yet I am dismayed to have to vote against a 20-percent increase for my elderly friends at home tonight. I respect them and their problems too much not to be dismayed.

I regret having to resist this specific measure which would give them temporary relief, but the way in which it had been manipulated leaves me no choice.

I will not vote against the 90 million people whose dependence has properly been placed in a sound social security system until now. I respect their investment and the dignity of their labor too much for that.

I will not vote against my own self-respect as a legislator by being a part of this charade beyond what is necessary to register my protest at being used by political cynics.

I urge any of the rest of my colleagues who feel as I do to vote "no" on the 20-percent benefit increase, to follow the lead of the gentleman from Wisconsin, when the time comes.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the 20-percent increase in social security benefits which is included in the conference report before us today.

This increase is long overdue and urgently needed by the millions of Americans who have spent too long in poverty as a result of inactivity by both the administration and the Congress. The elderly in our society have earned the right to a decent and dignified retirement.

The increase which will pass today guarantees minimum income of \$84.50 per month. Mr. MILLS estimated in February when he first introduced the increase—which I endorsed—that the 20-percent increase along with other benefits of H.R. 1 would increase the average benefits from \$133 to \$162 per month for the retired worker, from \$222 to \$269 for aged couples and from \$144 to \$153 for aged widows.

I cannot say these amounts are adequate; but they are substantially better than what has gone before.

Our task now is to consider the real intent behind our social security system, the function it now serves and the

function it should serve in the future. Originally, social security was conceived as a means of supplementing retirement income based on pensions or savings. With inflation and unemployment, however, the system weakens and social security is now the only source of income for millions of retired persons.

Last February, Mr. MILLS spoke to that point saying—

Although about half of the workers in the country are covered by private pension plans very few of the retired workers are actually getting private pension payments. Only 21 percent of the couples receiving social security and 8 percent of the nonmarried beneficiaries also received private pensions.

Even with other Federal benefits, only 30 percent of the couples and 14 percent of the other beneficiaries have a second pension.

This means about 70 percent of social security recipients nationwide depend on social security as their single source of income.

As a result there are 5 million Americans 65 and over living in poverty—20 percent of the poor of this Nation.

Over five times as many Americans—27 million or one out of every eight—receive social security. There are 731,163 recipients in my State of Massachusetts alone.

Ninety-three percent of those people 65 and over are eligible for benefits.

Though the need is very great, the solutions are often obscured.

In his televised press conference last night, the President claimed that the expense of the new ceiling increase in payroll taxes to \$12,000 would make the 20-percent increase in benefits insignificant because it would consume the increased income received by the taxpayer as a result of the 1969 tax cuts and would cause inflation which would, in turn, increase prices and thus absorb any benefits of the extra money.

First, it is the contention of WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee as well as the Social Security Advisory Committee, and I agree with them, that first, the system can absorb the additional costs without any detriment to the social security trust fund, and second, it is my belief that the President is merely glossing over the larger questions of whether or not there should be a payroll tax at all—whether the system should be organized along other lines.

Under the Mills-Church amendment, 70 million of the 94 million wage earners in the United States will pay lower social security taxes in 1973 than they would under the presently scheduled H.R. 1 tax levels for 1973. In 1972, there would be only a slight increase. Moreover, benefits will increase to 8.5 billion for the 27.8 million social security beneficiaries. The Mills statement of February 23, 1972, details the tax scales at which this is possible.

More importantly, however, Joint Economic Committee sources claim that it is perfectly possible for the Government to pay out a 20 percent increase in social security cash benefits without exceeding the money in the social security trust fund, even without payroll tax in-

crease. The question then becomes why has the Government proposed a 5 percent increase when the money is available under a 20 percent increase? The answer is simple: The Treasury wants to use the 15 percent for something else. A major problem of social security therefore, revolves around the trust fund system itself.

Social security funds are collected by the Treasury and earmarked for the social security trust fund. Social security trust funds, however, are not distinguished from all Government funds and revenues commonly called the unified budgeting accounting system. It is very easy for the Government to use trust fund money for other purposes.

Ideally, the trust fund should be abolished and social security collected and distributed as are general revenues. That way, contribution would reflect ability to pay and distribution would reflect need. Unfortunately, because the traditional attitude toward the system is that of a sacred cow, the system has been neglected as a vital income reserve for millions of needy Americans. Instead, it is something of a piggy bank.

The 20 percent increase would utilize the money in the trust fund allotted to social security contributors and, because the bill would never pass without it, raise the payroll tax ceiling to \$12,000 and thereby make it more difficult for outside sources to use trust fund money.

The amendment would make it possible for our elderly to receive what they originally contributed.

Last October 1971, I introduced legislation which would have removed the \$7,800 ceiling on taxable income while granting workers personal exemptions and a low income allowance equal to those allowed on the Federal income tax. This proposed reform would lower taxes for 63 million wage earners, while raising taxes for 8 million high-income wage earners. Every family of four with an income under \$14,500 would have paid less social security taxes as would every single worker who earns under \$12,000.

At that time, I emphasized as I do today, that there is no relationship between the social security tax and the ability to pay. The poor pay a higher percentage of their income than do the wealthy.

The tax is regressive, the trust fund is discriminatory, and the entire social security system needs to be reformed.

The legislation we are voting on today marks the culmination of many months of effort within the Congress toward an increase in social security funds. There are, however, other aspects of the social security system which need to be changed.

For example, in this Congress alone, I have cosponsored several bills which would have provided between a 5-percent and a 50-percent increase in social security, would increase the earned income ceiling to \$2,400 per year, and would include prescription drugs and other items and services under the hospital insurance program. These problems must be faced by the Congress this year, and I hope that they will be dealt with quickly.

Earlier this week, I voted against the debt-limit ceiling because of my opposition to the huge expenditures of the Vietnam war which have helped to increase our debt so greatly. The social security increase, however, is part of the debt limit conference before us, and I will vote for it. Incidentally, it is particularly ironic that the Government, which spends the most, and social security recipients, who receive the least, should come together for funding in the same bill.

The social security increase is necessary and fair and it must be enacted. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this increase.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, in the rush to hike social security benefits by 20 percent, the House should realize that we are leaving literally millions of persons in the dust, people who will see little or none of the increase we are now considering.

There are, for example, some 1.1 million persons in the United States who are receiving both social security and old-age assistance benefits. As the social security payments to these individuals go up, their old-age assistance payments go down. Thus while other social security recipients will see a 20-percent increase in their monthly checks others will see no net gain at all. The same is true for those now receiving veterans' benefits and many other forms of State and Federal aid.

Thus, while we pat ourselves on the back for substantially increasing social security payments to the elderly we ought to keep in mind that millions of persons will never receive these benefits unless we act quickly to see that the other forms of assistance which these individuals receive are not cut accordingly.

I call the Members' attention to H.R. 10842 a bill which I have introduced previously and which has been awaiting action by the Committee on Ways and Means for over 9 months.

This bill would prevent future increases in retirement or disability benefits under Federal programs from being taken into consideration in determining a person's need for aid or assistance under any Federal-State public assistance programs. A similar bill is pending in the Senate, S. 3328. This bill, or one like it, must be given early consideration if we are to make sure that this and future social security increases are received by all who need it.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, having long championed improvements in the social security system that would make it worthy of its name, I am grateful that the debt ceiling extension bill now before the House contains a Senate-approved amendment providing a long overdue 20-percent increase in social security benefits. This is the minimum acceptable increase; a lesser amount would be grossly inadequate in alleviating the plight of our Nation's elderly, one-third of whom exist below the poverty level.

I am dismayed at the President's statement in his press conference last evening that he fears a 20-percent boost in so-

cial security benefits could be inflationary. I urge the House to dismiss these unfounded fears and to approve this increase without further delay. The vast majority of our pensioned citizens have been hard hit by the administration's unwise economic policies that are responsible for the continued inflationary pressures. They are the victims, not the beneficiaries, of those policies. A 20-percent increase would raise the average monthly benefits for a single retired person from \$133 to \$161 monthly; for a couple, from \$233 to \$270. This modest boost in their incomes would scarcely enable our retirees to indulge in an orgy of spending or even to enjoy a suitable standard of living in our affluent society. It would, however, provide a modicum of relief from the gnawing financial anxiety that accompanies what we euphemistically refer to as the golden years. It would help tenants meet the excessive rental increases permitted under the rent control program, and homeowners meet their ever increasing property taxes.

The administration has acted with commendable swiftness in meeting the tragic conditions caused by the recent hurricanes. But I would remind the administration that other types of catastrophes likewise warrant prompt action—the long, quiet tragedy of the elderly who find themselves after years of hard work with inadequate resources to meet their minimum needs.

Their productive years helped make possible the opportunities and advantages available to the younger members of our society. They have the right to the concern and compassion of the society to which they have contributed so much and from which they are so largely excluded in their later years. We must ease the infirmities of age; we must provide safeguards against the hazards leading to destitution or dependency. A boost in benefits, so vigorously opposed by the administration, is only the first step in updating the social security system. Much more is required to assure our people that they may look forward after a lifetime of work to retirement in comfort and dignity. Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to press for enactment of major reforms in the social security and medicare programs. I am pleased that the amendment before us, in addition to the increase, provides for an automatic cost-of-living adjustment. This is vitally important if social security beneficiaries are not to continue to fall behind in the race with living costs. Of course, they are entitled to more—they should be able to participate in the Nation's increased standard of living. Effective means of keeping benefit levels more in line with other incomes must be considered.

I also strongly recommend that the "retirement test" be liberalized so that individuals may earn at least \$2,500 without loss of benefits. Another essential need is coverage of prescription drugs under medicare.

These and other reforms would be a long step toward the kind of social security system that American people should have. Solicitude for the problems of the elderly expressed at the White House

Conference on Aging must be translated into action. I trust the House will pass the increase before us today, and that the Senate will take up shortly the social security amendment approved by the House last year. We can and must make life better for our retirees.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, a 20-percent increase in social security benefits presents many problems to the Federal Government and especially the overburdened American taxpayer. These problems must be balanced against the needs of our senior citizens, to whom we owe so much.

The increase could help revive the inflationary fires which the President is endeavoring to extinguish.

Federal income taxes, property taxes on homes and automobiles, State income taxes, sales taxes, and the present social security taxes have become such a burden that we face a taxpayers revolt, and a demand for responsible spending. Certain segments of the population are especially hard hit by increases. The increased benefits would be one-third financed by application of the scheduled contribution rate to those in the upper income brackets, that is, those of middle income—the working man, the families who are already strained. Social security taxes will be raised for everyone in 1973.

The social security trust fund would be reduced by one-fourth and the reserves cut from their present 1 year to 9 months. Once we had a 3-year reserve; it was reduced to 1 year, and now to 9 months. The reserve cannot be forever used to help finance increases.

Nevertheless, the 7 million senior citizens who are under or within 25 percent of the Federal designated poverty level cry out for relief. We cannot ignore the fact that one in three of our citizens over 65 fall within this category.

A 20-percent increase in benefits would raise 1.4 million of those citizens from the ranks of poverty, plus an additional one-half million under 65 who receive social security benefits due to disablement or other causes.

H.R. 1, which passed the House last June, would have raised benefits in addition to providing for sweeping welfare reform, but the bill has still not reached the Senate floor. When it does reach the floor, the controversy which surrounds it may delay it still longer, perhaps preventing passage during this Congress. In the meantime, those on social security await relief which never arrives. Inflation has worsened their lot, since those hardest hit by inflation are those with fixed income—the elderly and disabled on social security.

The increase also contains a mechanism for keeping benefits in line with increases in prices, financed by the maximum amount of earnings taxed rising as overall earnings rise over time.

I cannot ignore my responsibility to the aging citizens of our country. Therefore, I support the 20-percent increase in benefits despite the difficulties which I have stated.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Senate is to be commended for reporting out

the long-awaited 20-percent increase in social security.

The executive department and the Congress have indeed been negligent in not keeping pace with inflation and the high cost of living which has brazenly increased in the last 3½ years. On a general basis it is estimated that the increased cost-of-living average in that period of time has been 16.5 percent. This increase is a general yardstick which comprises all necessities which the public needs in annual purchases. Every American housewife will testify that necessities and the price of food in the supermarkets have gone higher than the average 16.5-percent inflation.

As the years pass the population increases, and naturally the percentage of the elderly people throughout the Nation, on account of medical science, has increased far more than existed 25 to 30 years ago. Approximately 20 million old folks above the age of 65 are fighting a losing battle against the high cost of living in America today. Over one-third of these elderly are in poverty or near the poverty line. It has been testified at congressional hearings that over 5 million elderly over 65 are below the poverty line. The poverty line for single persons is designated at \$1,700 per year and for couples \$2,100 per year. During recent years the spreading inflation has reduced the poverty line at approximately 6 percent each year.

Millions of unemployed and part-time employed, along with the elderly population are facing increased shortage in housing, nursing homes, and hospital facilities, et cetera.

The Congress has been diligent in the past in its effort to relieve the financial burdens which have fallen on the backs of a large segment of our population. I might mention that the tax reform bill of 1969 helped millions in the lower brackets from the tax rolls—the housing and urban act aided the middle and low income older Americans—legislation barring age discrimination in employment—programs for the elderly at Federal and State levels—increased railroad retirement legislation—medicare and medicaid, et cetera, all have been helpful for the lower income brackets. It has been 4 years since an increase in social security by the Congress in spite of the 16.5-percent cost of living. If the 20-percent increase in social security is enacted today it will remove approximately 2 million of our citizens from welfare aid.

Chairman MILLS of the Ways and Means Committee has stated that a 20-percent increase could be financed on a conservative and sound actuarial basis. Chairman Nelson Cruikshank, president of the National Elders Council, testified that citizens over 65 years of age comprise 25 percent of the Nation's population today.

Millions of citizens, including our elderly, have waited 10 months for action on H.R. 1 which passed the House of Representatives last July—1 year ago. This legislation is still awaiting action

in the Senate. During this time Congress voted tax cuts for industry, corporations, and conglomerates to the extent of approximately \$8 billion, we are still dormant on repealing fabulous and in some cases, fraudulent tax loopholes. I do hope before we recess pending the Fourth of July period we can relieve the needy citizens from the high cost of living and the inflationary scourge. Forty-eight Senators have cosponsored this legislation for a 20-percent social security increase and several more who are not cosponsors of the bill have voted for its passage. I do hope the House of Representatives acts favorably on this long-awaited social security increase by a large majority.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, today's action of the Congress raising social security benefits by 20 percent, will go a long way in providing our elderly with a chance to catch up to the runaway cost of living.

The cost-of-living increase is particularly burdensome to the elderly who are more dependent on special foods—usually at higher cost. The cruel impact of inflation is most serious to those of low income. A cost-of-living increase has a multiplied effect on the elderly.

The increase in social security is actually sound and can be made with very little impact upon payroll taxes.

The new actuarial assumptions will permit financing a 20-percent increase and with tax rates only slightly above the existing OASDI/HI rate of 5.2 percent. The highest tax rate under this schedule during this century would be 5.7 percent, and this would occur in 1993.

Compared with the scheduled increases under present law, workers earning up to \$9,245 would pay less in payroll taxes from 1973 through the end of the century. For 1972 the tax rates for all covered workers would be the same under the Church amendment and present law. In fact, from 1980 to 1985, workers earning up to \$9,736 would pay less in social security taxes.

Approximately 94 million workers are now covered under social security. About 72 percent—or 68.1 million—have covered earnings of \$9,000 or below. The net impact is that the vast majority of workers would pay lower payroll taxes than the tax rates scheduled under present law.

The 20-percent increase in social security benefits will serve to reduce the cost of welfare to the elderly by over \$300,000,000.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has just reported that the number of elderly persons on welfare dropped to a 32-year low this year because of improvements in social security. Our action of today may very well eliminate the elderly from welfare or reduce those needing welfare supplements to less than 1 million persons.

The approval by Congress today of a 20-percent increase in social security benefits will have a major impact on Cuyahoga County's retirees. This benefit increase will mean that the average monthly benefits for a single retired per-

son will rise from \$133 a month to \$161 per month. The average monthly payment for a retired couple will rise from \$233 to \$270.

From the latest figures available, the impact on Cuyahoga County will be as follows:

Type of beneficiary	Number as of Dec. 31, 1971	Yearly present monthly benefits	After 20-percent increase
All categories.....	213,774	\$323,496,000	\$388,195,200
Retired workers.....	113,301	197,412,000	236,894,400
Disabled workers.....	11,434	21,552,000	25,862,400
All others (dependents, survivor, special age 72).....	89,039	104,532,000	125,438,400

As these figures indicate, the total increased benefits to the county 218,000 social security beneficiaries will amount to nearly \$65 million per year.

In Cuyahoga County, social security now provides an annual impact of almost \$400,000,000 per year. Not only does this distribution provide for our elderly, but it constitutes the largest, single source of economic impact in our area.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to again express publicly my strong support for a 20-percent increase in social security benefits.

No group in our society is in greater financial difficulty than many of our retirees and senior citizens struggling to get by on their social security income.

We have an obligation to see to it that our older citizens are not trapped in the grinding cycle of poverty—with prices rising and no other means of personal income.

Our senior citizens should come first—ahead of the Vietnam war—and the other massive federal projects that continue to drain away billions of our tax dollars.

The proposed 20-percent increase is needed—is in the interests of the country—and has my full support.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased we are now able to consider H.R. 9410 which I have introduced to provide a year's continuation in the funding of over 200 special clinics authorized under title V of the Social Security Act. These projects are serving over half a million children from poverty areas throughout the country giving them comprehensive, personalized medical services they would not otherwise receive. Three of these projects are in Chicago: Woodlawn Child Health Center, Near North Children's Center, and Martin Luther King Neighborhood Health Center.

If Congress fails to pass H.R. 9410, these projects will lose their funding tomorrow and many will have no alternative than to discontinue their services. Once again, a hope of the poor will be extinguished.

Great credit is due our distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. Koch) for his unstinting efforts in bringing to this Congress' attention the success of these projects. He introduced the first bill providing for their extension and I know that during the past year he has

spoken to many of our colleagues marshalling their support for the program's continuation. And in November 1971, he testified before our committee during our consideration of health care legislation.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the pending conference report, which contains provision for a 20-percent increase in social security benefits, with subsequent increases based upon changes in the cost of living.

Seventy percent of all single women and 32 percent of all single men over the age of 65 have incomes of less than \$2,670 per year. Low income and poverty in old age are problems crying out for immediate national attention and solution.

Almost 90 percent of our senior citizen population receive social security benefits; for most, this is the major or only source of income. Despite some past increases in benefit levels, inflationary trends have made it increasingly difficult for the elderly to make ends meet. Eight out of every \$10 is allocated to housing, food, transportation, and medical care. These items are requisites of survival which cannot be postponed or avoided.

I have introduced legislation, H.R. 13371, which would provide for a 25-percent benefit increase and for a minimum benefit of \$4,500 annually for a couple and \$3,375 annually for a single individual receiving social security benefits. While this conference report does not go as far as my bill, it is a great step forward and I urge its adoption.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I want to make clear that my vote for this conference report increasing the ceiling on the national debt is for one reason only—the fact that the conference report includes an urgently needed increase in social security benefits. Having recently voted against the legislation to raise the debt limit ceiling, only the social security increase could have warranted my voting for this conference report.

In my judgment, the social security increase is a matter of simple economic justice. Millions of older Americans, living on fixed incomes, have been the innocent victims of our economic chaos. They are the hardest hit by inflation and we have delayed too long in providing increases in their social security benefits. Even the increase approved today will be inadequate if this administration does not get a handle on the economy before much longer and every passing day demonstrates how necessary it is that we tie the entire social security program to increases in the cost of living, so that adjustments can be made automatically, and without the narrow partisan debate that has taken place over the past few days.

As far as the debt limit is concerned, the increase approved by Congress this week merely gives the administration the go-ahead to continue its distorted spending priorities. It just is not enough to say that the ceiling must be increased because the Government has to pay its bills. Many of those bills are not in the national interest and never should have been incurred. The administration's current budget is a blueprint for economic disaster. It is long past time that Con-

gress established a set of national spending priorities that are in line with the real needs of this Nation.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, before I move the previous question on the motions, let me say to the membership of the House that I disagree wholeheartedly with the conclusion my friend from Wisconsin reaches that the passage of a 20-percent across-the-board increase jeopardizes the benefits which are in H.R. 1.

They do not jeopardize those benefits, in my opinion, one iota. I said yesterday the Senate had had H.R. 1 since June 23 of either 1970 or 1971—I do not know which—but at the rate they are going we will all be much older before we have a chance to bring any of those provisions back to the House.

If we want those provisions—and I certainly want them as does my friend from Wisconsin—it will be necessary for us to increase the rate which will be paid by the employer and employee. That would have been necessary, anyway.

The fact remains that the statement I have made that this is sound is not only shared by the Secretary of HEW but in his letter to me the Secretary of HEW said that various agencies in the administration, including fiscal experts in the Office of Management and Budget and the Council of Economic Advisers, the actuaries and other staff in the Social Security Administration, and the Department of HEW, had carefully studied the recommendations that we are making in the Senate amendment and had concluded that these recommendations are sound.

I want to add that despite the fact that they reached that conclusion they did not endorse the 20-percent increase. They preferred a lesser increase such as the gentleman from Wisconsin is offering.

Mr. HALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. In the studies in the committee, realizing this is coming as a surprise to me, has there been any consideration at all given to what this sudden diversion from the trust fund would do, putting it into the hands of senior citizens and others such as disabled people who would benefit—what effect this would have on the wage-price stabilization? What will this do to inflation if we take on this nongermane amendment?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. When any amount of money is spent by the Government and when it is spending in total more than it takes in, as it is right now, it is somewhat inflationary. I must admit that. However, I am not going to take out the effort to contain inflation on these people who are hurt so seriously by that very inflation.

The gentleman knows since we increased benefits there has been an increase in the cost of living. Apparently the administration is willing to go 10 percent. That, too, would be inflationary.

Mr. HALL. Yes; but outside of what one group is in favor of, has the gentleman's committee, which is a hard-working committee under ordinary circumstances and which has done much for the country, considered revoking a re-

gressive tax and its effect on the workers? I am beginning to hear from them.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I have, too. We have not considered a different system of financing social security benefits. As the gentleman knows, the Committee on Ways and Means has not had an opportunity to consider this amendment as a committee. I have looked into it myself, but the committee has not.

I will agree with the gentleman that any time we spend more money it does have inflationary complications. I agree this would. Any increase anywhere does that. But I do not want to stop this before we stop something else, too.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to vote down the substitute offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BYRNES) and agree to the Senate amendment.

I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BYRNES).

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 83, nays 253, answered "present" 1, not voting 95, as follows:

[Roll No. 259]

YEAS—83

Andrews, Ala.	Dickinson	Powell
Archer	Edwards, Ala.	Price, Tex.
Arends	Fisher	Purcell
Ashbrook	Goldwater	Rhodes
Baker	Goodling	Robinson, Va.
Belcher	Griffin	Robison, N.Y.
Betts	Gross	Satterfield
Blackburn	Hall	Scherle
Bow	Hansen, Idaho	Schneebell
Bray	Hull	Skubitz
Brown, Mich.	Jarman	Smith, Calif.
Brown, Ohio	Jonas	Smith, N.Y.
Burleson, Tex.	Jones, N.C.	Spence
Byrnes, Wis.	Kemp	Springer
Cabell	Kuykendall	Steiger, Wis.
Camp	Kyl	Talcott
Carlson	Landgrebe	Teague, Tex.
Casey, Tex.	McClory	Waggonner
Collins, Tex.	McEwen	Ware
Conable	Mahon	Whalley
Conover	Mallory	Whitten
Crane	Mann	Wiggins
Daniel, Va.	Mathias, Ga.	Williams
Davis, Wis.	Mayne	Wilson, Bob
Dellenback	Montgomery	Winn
Dennis	Nelsen	Wyatt
Derwinski	Pickle	Zion
Devine	Pirnie	

NAYS—253

Abourezk	Broomfield	Delaney
Abzug	Brotzman	Dellums
Addabbo	Buchanan	Denholm
Alexander	Burke, Mass.	Diggs
Anderson, Calif.	Burlison, Mo.	Dingell
Anderson, Ill.	Burton	Donohue
Annunzio	Byrne, Pa.	Dorn
Ashley	Byron	Dow
Aspin	Carney	Downing
Aspinall	Carter	Drinan
Badillo	Cederberg	Duncan
Barrett	Chamberlain	du Pont
Begich	Chappell	Edwards, Calif.
Bennett	Clancy	Ellberg
Bergland	Cleveland	Esch
Bevill	Collier	Eshleman
Biaggi	Collins, Ill.	Fascell
Bieber	Conte	Fish
Bingham	Conyers	Flood
Blanton	Corman	Flowers
Blatnik	Cotter	Forsythe
Boland	Coughlin	Fountain
Brademas	Culver	Fraser
Brasco	Daniels, N.J.	Frenzel
Brinkley	Danielson	Frey
Braks	Davis, Ga.	Fulton
	de la Garza	Gallfianakis

Garmatz	McKevitt	Roush
Gaydos	McKinney	Roy
Gettys	McMillan	Roybal
Gialmo	Macdonald, Mass.	Runnels
Gibbons	Madden	Ryan
Gonzalez	Mailliard	St Germain
Grasso	Matsunaga	Sandman
Gray	Mazzoli	Sarbanes
Green, Oreg.	Meeds	Saylor
Green, Pa.	Melcher	Scheuer
Gubser	Mikva	Scott
Gude	Miller, Ohio	Seiberling
Hagan	Mills, Ark.	Shibley
Halpern	Mills, Md.	Sisk
Hamilton	Minish	Slack
Hammer-schmidt	Mink	Smith, Iowa
Hanley	Minshall	Snyder
Harrington	Mitchell	Stagers
Harvey	Mizell	Stanton
Hathaway	Mollohan	J. William
Hechler, W. Va.	Monagan	Stanton,
Heckler, Mass.	Moorhead	James V.
Heinz	Morgan	Steed
Helstoski	Murphy, Ill.	Steele
Henderson	Murphy, N.Y.	Stokes
Hicks, Mass.	Myers	Stratton
Hillis	Natcher	Stubblefield
Hogan	Nedzi	Stuckey
Hollifield	Nichols	Sullivan
Horton	Nix	Symington
Howard	Obey	Taylor
Hungate	O'Konski	Teague, Calif.
Hunt	O'Neill	Terry
Hutchinson	Passman	Thompson, Ga.
Ichord	Patman	Thompson, N.J.
Jacobs	Patten	Thomson, Wis.
Johnson, Calif.	Pepper	Thone
Johnson, Pa.	Perkins	Tiernan
Jones, Ala.	Pettis	Ullman
Jones, Tenn.	Peyser	Van Deerlin
Karh	Podell	Vanik
Kastenmeier	Preyer, N.C.	Veysey
Kazen	Price, Ill.	Vigorito
Keating	Pucinski	Waldie
Kee	Quillen	Wampler
King	Rallsback	Whalen
Koch	Randall	Whitehurst
Kyros	Rangel	Widnall
Latta	Rees	Wilson,
Leggett	Reid	Charles H.
Lent	Reuss	Wolf
Long, La.	Rodino	Wyman
Long, Md.	Roe	Yates
McCloskey	Rogers	Yatron
McCollister	Roncalio	Young, Fla.
McCormack	Rooney, N.Y.	Young, Tex.
McCulloch	Rooney, Pa.	Zablocki
McFall	Rosenthal	Zwach
McKay	Rostenkowski	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Foley

NOT VOTING—95

Abbitt	Evins, Tenn.	Metcalfe
Abernethy	Findley	Michel
Adams	Flynt	Miller, Calif.
Anderson,	Ford, Gerald R.	Mosher
Tenn.	Ford,	Moss
Andrews,	William D. O'Hara	Pelly
N. Dak.	Frelinghuysen	Pike
Baring	Fuqua	Poage
Bell	Gallagher	Poff
Boggs	Griffiths	Pryor, Ark.
Boiling	Grover	Quie
Broyhill, N.C.	Haley	Rarick
Broyhill, Va.	Hanna	Riegle
Burke, Fla.	Hansen, Wash.	Roberts
Caffery	Harsha	Rousselot
Carey, N.Y.	Hastings	Ruppe
Celler	Hawkins	Ruth
Chisholm	Hays	Schmitz
Clark	Hébert	Schwengel
Clausen,	Hicks, Wash.	Sebelius
Don H.	Hosmer	Shoup
Clawson, Del	Keith	Shriver
Clay	Kluczynski	Sikes
Colmer	Landrum	Steiger, Ariz.
Curlin	Lennon	Stephens
Davis, S.C.	Link	Udall
Dent	Lloyd	Vander Jagt
Dowdy	Lujan	White
Dulski	McClure	Wright
Dwyer	McDade	Wydlar
Eckhardt	McDonald,	Wylie
Edmondson	Mich.	
Erlenborn	Martin	
Evans, Colo.	Mathias, Calif.	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Foley for, with Mr. O'Hara against.
Mr. Schmitz for, with Mr. McDonald of Michigan against.

Mr. Lujan for, with Mr. Frelinghuysen against.

Mr. McClure for, with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Wydlar.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Dent with Mr. McDade.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Davis of South Carolina with Mr. Pelly.

Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Mathias of California.

Mr. Clark with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Del Clawson.

Mr. Adams with Mr. Metcalfe.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Lloyd.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Ruth.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Poff.
Mr. Link with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Pike with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Haley with Mr. Shriver.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Quie.
Mr. Clay with Mr. Miller of California.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Baring with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Wylie.

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina.

Mr. Udall with Mr. Sebelius.
Mr. White with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Keith.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Rousselot.
Mr. Hicks of Washington with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.

Mr. Curlin with Mr. Shoup.
Mr. Caffery with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Pryor of Arkansas.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Hastings.

Messrs. COLLIER, RANGEL, and HALPERN changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA). If he had been present, he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) that the House concur in the Senate amendment No. 2.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.
The question was taken; and there were—yeas 302, nays 35, not voting 95, as follows:

[Roll No. 260]

YEAS—302

Abourezk	Andrews, Ala.	Baker
Abzug	Annunzio	Barrett
Addabbo	Arends	Begich
Alexander	Ashley	Belcher
Anderson,	Aspin	Bennett
Calif.	Aspinall	Bergland
Anderson, Ill.	Badillo	Bevill

Blaggi Harrington Preyer, N.C.
 Blester Harvey Price, Ill.
 Bingham Hathaway Price, Tex.
 Blanton Hechler, W. Va. Pucinski
 Blatnik Heckler, Mass. Purcell
 Boland Heinz Quillen
 Brademas Helstoski Rallsback
 Brasco Henderson Randall
 Bray Hicks, Mass. Rangel
 Brinkley Hillis Rees
 Brooks Hogan Reid
 Broomfield Hollifield Reuss
 Brotzman Horton Rhodes
 Brown, Ohio Howard Robison, N.Y.
 Buchanan Hungate Rodino
 Burke, Mass. Hunt Roe
 Burlison, Mo. Hutchinson Rogers
 Burton Ichord Roncallo
 Byrnes, Pa. Jacobs Rooney, N.Y.
 Byron Jarman Rooney, Pa.
 Cabell Johnson, Calif. Rosenthal
 Carlson Johnson, Pa. Rostenkowski
 Carney Jones, Ala. Roush
 Carter Jones, N.C. Roy
 Casey, Tex. Jones, Tenn. Roybal
 Cederberg Kastenmeier Runnels
 Chamberlain Kazen Ryan
 Chappell Keating St Germain
 Clancy Kee Sandman
 Clark Kemp Sarbanes
 Cleveland King Saylor
 Collier Koch Scherle
 Collins, Ill. Kyl Scheuer
 Conover Kyros Scott
 Oonte Latta Seiberling
 Conyers Leggett Shipley
 Cornman Lent Sisk
 Cotter Long, La. Skubitz
 Coughlin Long, Md. Slack
 Culver McClory Smith, Iowa
 Daniels, N.J. McCloskey Smith, N.Y.
 Danielson McCollister Snyder
 Davis, Ga. McCormack Spence
 de la Garza McCulloch Staggers
 Delaney McFall Stanton
 Dellums McKay J. William
 Denholm McKevitt Stanton
 Derwinski McKinney James V.
 Devine McMillan Steed
 Dickinson Macdonald, Steele
 Diggs Mass. Steiger, Wis.
 Dingell Madden Stokes
 Donohue Malliard Stratton
 Dorn Mallory Stubblefield
 Dow Mann Stuckey
 Downing Mathis, Ga. Sullivan
 Drinan Matsunaga Symington
 Duncan Mayne Talcott
 du Pont Mazzoli Taylor
 Edwards, Calif. Meeds Teague, Calif.
 Eilberg Melcher Teague, Tex.
 Esch Mikva Thompson, Ga.
 Eshleman Miller, Ohio Thompson, N.J.
 Fascell Mills, Ark. Thomson, Wis.
 Fish Mills, Md. Thone
 Flood Minish Tiernan
 Flowers Mink Ullman
 Foley Minshall Van Deerlin
 Forsythe Mitchell Vanik
 Fountain Mizell Veysey
 Fraser Mollohan Vigorito
 Frenzel Monagan Waldie
 Frey Montgomery Wampler
 Fulton Moorhead Ware
 Galifianakis Morgan Whalen
 Garmatz Murphy, Ill. Whalley
 Gaydos Murphy, N.Y. Whitehurst
 Gettys Myers Whitten
 Gialmo Natcher Widnall
 Gibbons Nedzi Williams
 Goldwater Nelsen Wilson, Bob
 Gonzalez Nichols Wilson,
 Grasso Nix Charles H.
 Gray Obey Winn
 Green, Oreg. O'Konski Wolff
 Green, Pa. O'Neill Wyatt
 Griffin Passman Wydler
 Gubser Patman Wyman
 Gude Patten Yates
 Hagan Pepper Yatron
 Halpern Perkins Young, Fla.
 Hamilton Pettis Young, Tex.
 Hammer- Peyser Zablocki
 Schmidt Pickle Zion
 Hanley Pirnie Zwach
 Hansen, Idaho Podell

NAYS—35

Archer Camp Edwards, Ala.
 Ashbrook Collins, Tex. Fisher
 Betts Conable Goodling
 Blackburn Crane Gross
 Bow Daniel, Va. Hall
 Brown, Mich. Davis, Wis. Hull
 Burlison, Tex. Dellenback Jonas
 Byrnes, Wis. Dennis Kuykendall

Landgrebe Robinson, Va. Terry
 McEwen Satterfield Waggonner
 Mahon Schneebell Wiggins
 Powell Smith, Calif.

NOT VOTING—95

Abbtitt Findley Metcalfe
 Abernethy Flynt Michel
 Adams Ford, Gerald R. Miller, Calif.
 Anderson, Ford. Mosher
 Tenn. William D. Moss
 Andrews, Frelinghuysen O'Hara
 N. Dak. Fuqua Pelly
 Baring Gallagher Pike
 Bell Griffiths Poage
 Boggs Grover Poff
 Boiling Haley Pryor, Ark.
 Broyhill, N.C. Hanna Quile
 Broyhill, Va. Hansen, Wash. Rarick
 Burke, Fla. Harsha Riegler
 Caffery Hastings Roberts
 Carey, N.Y. Hawkins Rousselot
 Celler Hays Ruppe
 Chisholm Hébert Ruth
 Clausen, Hicks, Wash. Schmitz
 Don H. Hosmer Schwengel
 Clawson, Del. Karth Sebelius
 Clay Keith Shoup
 Colmer Kluczynski Shriver
 Curlin Landrum Sikes
 Davis, S.C. Lennor Springer
 Dent Link Steiger, Ariz.
 Dowdy Lloyd Stephens
 Dulski Lujan Udall
 Dwyer McClure Vander Jagt
 Eckhardt McDade White
 Edmondson McDonald, Wright
 Erlenborn Mich. Wylie
 Evans, Colo. Martin
 Evins, Tenn. Mathias, Calif.

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

On this vote:
 Mr. Andrews of North Dakota for, with Mr. Schmitz against.
 Mr. McDade for with Mr. McClure against.
 Mr. McDonald of Michigan for, with Mr. Lujan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Mrs. Dwyer.
 Mr. Boggs with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
 Mr. Hays with Mr. Mosher.
 Mr. Sikes with Mr. Rousselot.
 Mr. Dent with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
 Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina.
 Mr. Roberts with Mr. Bell.
 Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Ruppe.
 Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Ruth.
 Mr. Dulski with Mr. Harsha.
 Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
 Mr. Pike with Mr. Grover.
 Mr. Karth with Mr. Pelly.
 Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Schwengel.
 Mr. Haley with Mr. Martin.
 Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Sebelius.
 Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Vander Jagt.
 Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Hosmer.
 Mr. Clay with Mr. White.
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Hastings.
 Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Gallagher.
 Mr. Davis of South Carolina with Mr. Shriver.

Mr. Moss with Mr. Mathias of California.
 Mr. Flynt with Mr. Poff.
 Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Michel.
 Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Quile.
 Mr. Link with Mr. Springer.
 Mr. Wright with Mr. Erlenborn.
 Mr. Hicks of Washington with Mr. Lloyd.
 Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Del Clawson.
 Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Shoup.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Keith.
 Mr. Adams with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.
 Mr. Hanna with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Wylie.
 Mr. Udall with Mr. Riegler.
 Mr. Stephens with Mr. Findley.
 Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Burke of Florida.

Mr. Caffery with Mr. Colmer.
 Mr. Curlin with Mr. Rarick.
 Mr. Metcalfe with Mr. Miller of California.
 Mr. Abbtitt with Mr. Lennor.
 Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Pryor of Arkansas.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to provide for a 4-month extension of the present temporary level in the public debt limitation, and for other purposes."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MILLS OF ARKANSAS

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas moves to recede and concur in the amendment.

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. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the two motions that were offered.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4679. An act for the relief of Amparo Coronado Vleuda de Pena and her three minor children: Yolanda Pena, Marisela Pena, and Lorenzo Pena;

H.R. 9410. An act to amend title V of the Social Security Act to extend for 1 year (until June 30, 1973) the period within which certain special project grants may be made thereunder; and

H.R. 11774. An act to authorize a study of the feasibility and desirability of establishing a unit of the national park system in order to preserve and interpret the site of Honokohau National Historical Landmark in the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes.

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

S. Con. Res. 88. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the two Houses from June 30, 1972, to July 17, 1972.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 250. Joint resolution to extend the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to interest rates on insured mortgages and to extend laws relating to housing and urban development.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS AND THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1971—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Speaker laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

To the Congress of the United States:

It is with profound pleasure and pride that I transmit to the Congress the Annual Report of the National Council on the Arts and the National Endowment for the Arts for the Fiscal Year 1971.

The report mirrors the vitality of musicians, actors, dancers, painters, sculptors, architects, writers, poets—extending our cultural renaissance into all of our communities. It reports and reflects the dedicated work of the producers and planners, the budgeters and the backstage hands, even the special grace of such as the museum guides who turn routine tours into lifetime experiences with their flashes of expertise and insight.

I invite the members of the Congress to share my pleasure and pride in the truly remarkable work of the National Council on the Arts and the National Endowment for the Arts. This work has been possible because you have recognized the importance of the arts, and because you have joined in voting across party lines to approve dramatic increases in our appropriations for the arts.

You have seen that individual, creative effort is an essential element of the American character. You have understood that the enrichment of the human spirit, and the sudden lifting of the soul, are legitimate objectives of government in the finest sense.

Just as 18th century America was dedicated in large part to the achievement of political liberty, and 19th century America to the attainment of economic opportunity, historians of the future may cite 20th century America for its dedication to the definition of the quality of justice of life. In all of these things our national point of view about the arts is fundamental. And right now, we are becoming increasingly a nation of participants in the arts.

There now are 44 million amateur musicians in the United States, more than one in five of our population. To take a second example, there are more than 5,000 amateur theatrical companies. And these are more than mere statistics: I am saying that the arts are *not* for a privileged few, but for everybody. And the arts are not merely sights and sounds: I believe the arts can teach us to hear when we listen, to understand when we see, to enjoy when we perform.

Individual, corporate, foundation, State and local support for the arts remains central to the national interaction that gives our culture its unique vitality. But I do believe that, as I said in September 1969, "the Federal Government has a vital role as catalyst, innovator and

supporter of public and private efforts for cultural development." And I am sure that in the National Council on the Arts and the National Endowment for the Arts we have a national asset of worth and luster.

I take a very special satisfaction in this annual report. I hope you will enjoy reading it. And I urge you to make it possible for this good and bountiful work to go on.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 30, 1972.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, JUNE 30, TO MONDAY, JULY 17, 1972

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 88 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution as follows:

S. CON. RES. 88

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Friday, June 30, 1972, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, July 17, 1972.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, is this resolution subject to a rollcall vote?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that all resolutions are subject to a rollcall vote; however, that does not mean they have to be.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the Speaker.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE, AND FOR SPEAKER OF HOUSE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS FOUND TRULY ENROLLED

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Monday, July 17, 1972, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING BY THE CLERK OF REPORTS FILED BY COMMITTEES AUTHORIZED TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that reports filed with the Clerk following the adjournment of the House until July 17, 1972, by committees authorized by the House to conduct investigations, may be printed by the Clerk as reports of the 92d Congress.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS, APPOINT COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until July 17, 1972, the Speaker be authorized to accept resignations and to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS IN ORDER ON WEDNESDAY, JULY 19, 1972

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday, July 19, 1972, may be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO REVISE AND EXTEND NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until July 17, all Members of the House shall have the privilege to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and also to include therein, such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extensions of remarks, but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of the House.

I also advise the membership that such extensions may be deposited in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD boxes to be picked up in the customary manner.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to ask the acting majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) if he will kindly advise us as to the program beginning on July 17 upon our return.

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

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished mi-

nority whip, the program for the House of Representatives for the week of July 17, 1972, is as follows:

Monday is the Consent Calendar, and then we will consider five suspensions:

H.R. 15635, Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act;

H.R. 15657, Comprehensive Older Americans Services Amendments of 1972;

H.R. 10502, act for the protection of public and foreign officials;

S. 1152, Conveyance of surplus property for use as historic monuments; and

H.R. 13152, control and conservation of predatory animals.

Tuesday is Private Calendar day, and then we will consider H.R. 14455, control and prevention of communicable diseases, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate,

H.R. 15081, National Health, Blood Vessel, Lung, and Blood Act of 1972, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate, and

H.R. 14424, National Institute of Aging, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week, we will have H.R. 13853, Emergency Community Facilities and Public Investment Act of 1972, with an open rule and 3 hours of debate;

H.R. 15641, military construction authorization, subject to a rule being granted; and

H.R. 15580, to amend the District of Columbia Police and Fireman's Salary Act of 1958, subject to a rule being granted.

Of course, conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

It is anticipated that we will work all Friday sessions between now and the adjournment for the Republican Convention.

Mr. ARENDS. I want to thank the gentleman. I just hope that he has a pleasant 2 weeks while he is gone and I hope he is in good shape to complete the extraordinary business that he has to go through and I hope he is in good shape to get this program finished.

Mr. O'NEILL. I thank the gentleman, and I wish the same for him. And the gentleman can be sure that all rooms in Miami will be filled.

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

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Does the distinguished acting majority leader think that this "Blood Act of 1972" is rather moot and somewhat superfluous in view of what has taken place by way of bloodletting—and not only that, but I doubt that the taxpayers of this country have any blood left as a result of the last 2 weeks.

Mr. O'NEILL. No comment.

THE PROBLEMS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, on June 7 and June 8, I placed in the RECORD a cross-section of some of the

hundreds of letters and telegrams I had received from higher education leaders and associations that were in opposition to the conference report on the higher education bill.

At that time I commented that these messages represented the deeply felt concerns of people who had dedicated their entire lives to higher education in America. Many of them represented institutions that were in desperate financial conditions and could naturally and humanly be expected to accept any reasonable bill that would offer them some much-needed financial assistance. Yet in one message after another these men and women were expressing their opposition to the conference report and asking that we extend existing programs for 1 year and then try once more to come forth with a higher education bill that would contain the same of the most essential provisions higher education bill passed by the House.

Through the rest of that day, on the day of the vote, and even in the days since, I received hundreds of additional letters and telegrams from other higher education leaders and from numerous State associations voicing their concerns about and opposition to the higher education conference report.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I am including in the RECORD a sample of some of the letters I received on this subject since the morning of June 7. I do so not to reopen the subject for extensive debate once again, but simply to allow my colleagues to read these expressions of opposition to the conference report from higher education leaders from every section of our Nation and from both the public and private sectors of higher education; people who are recognized experts in their field and were trying to warn us of some of the very serious deficiencies in the conference report. Deficiencies that I fear, Mr. Speaker, will make this legislation as difficult to administer as it will be difficult for the colleges to live with and retain their role as the educator of all our youth:

JUNE 6, 1972.

The Higher Education Bill of 1972 is a monstrous creation rather than a reasonable compromise. Good and needed features are offset by hastily contrived provisions that will do irreparable damage to the structure of American higher education, to say nothing of major omissions of items that need to be included. As one who has devoted his whole career to strengthening American higher education at both the institutional and legislative level, I respectfully urge you to oppose this bill in order to seek more time to do better. But no new legislation is preferable to this.

MILLER UPTON,
President, Beloit College.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI,
Columbia, Mo., June 6, 1972.

HON. EDITH GREEN,
U.S. Representative House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: I have delayed responding to your letter of May 20 until I had a chance to read the material attached to it and also the Bill.

I can only say we have a "can of worms."
Yours very truly,

C. BRICE RATCHFORD,
President.

[Telegram]

BRONX, N.Y., June 7, 1972.

Representative EDITH GREEN,
Chairman, Higher Education Subcommittee,
U.S. House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, D.C.

I am strongly opposed to the conference bill, June 7, 1972. I endorse your views.

MICHAEL P. WALSH,
President, Fordham University.

MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE,
South Hadley, Mass., June 5, 1972.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: I share your disappointment in the Conference report and am prepared to associate myself with the misgivings so effectively expressed by Terry Sanford, President of Duke University. In particular, I am as disturbed as he is by the serious squeeze being placed on students from the middle income group and am not persuaded that the present proposal would persuade that the present proposal would, even indirectly, be of any substantial assistance in meeting the critical needs of students from this important sector of the society. I also concur with your view that focusing aid solely on students rather than on institutions is foolhardy. Those who argue that direct institutional aid may have the effect of keeping alive institutions that should not survive are in my judgment seriously mistaken. There is very little likelihood that the amount of Federal support will ever be sufficient if such institutions are not able to do significant things to strengthen themselves. Such support will, however, give those institutions the breathing time to reassess their other efforts and permit them to cope with the future. In the second place, those who favor focusing aid on students will, I think, find that this device is itself not proof against the charge that less deserving institutions are being assisted. My guess is that a public policy of this type will increase the sort of huckstering that is already going on too generally in higher education in a mad and almost unprincipled effort to attract students no matter what such efforts do to standards and coherent objectives.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID B. TRUMAN.

KENT, WASH.,
June 7, 1972.

HON. EDITH GRANGE,
U.S. State Representative,
Washington, D.C.:

We want there to be no misunderstanding about the position of the private higher institutions who are members of Washington Friends of Higher Education that we are absolutely in opposition and you can be assured that we are on record as opposing S659 by all means we urge its defeat.

DON S. PATTERSON,
Executive Director, Washington Friends
of Higher Education.

URBANA, OHIO, June 7, 1972.

HON. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

After careful examination of the present education bill, which is up for vote by the House, June 8th, 1972, we at Urbana College strongly urge that you, as our representative, cast a no vote. Among other important consideration, this bill, if passed, will first: drastically affect the balance now existing between our lower and middle income students, and, secondly; due to the plethora of appended provisions, if not funded fully (which is likely), our institution, as well as others, stands the real risk of losing a good share of our present aid again.

Thank you,
THOMAS E. BELLAVANCE,
Dean of Faculty Affairs, Urbana College.

RICHMOND, IND., June 8, 1972.

HON. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Despite numerous good features in higher education bill now before Congress, it fails to deal with certain central problems in higher education while creating an illusion of providing a comprehensive solution. Moreover, it perpetuates and worsens some glaring inequities in financing of higher education. I urge the rejection of this bill in favor of a continuation of present programs more adequately funded and a renewed effort next year to develop a better, more comprehensive omnibus bill.

LANDRUM R. BOLLING,
President, Earlham College.

SAN JOSE, CALIF., June 8, 1972.

CONGRESSWOMAN EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge opposition to proposed higher education bill and ask support for one year extension of existing program.

THOMAS D. TERRY,
President, University of Santa Clara.

MEREDITH COLLEGE,
Raleigh, N.C., June 6, 1972.

HON. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MRS. GREEN: Thank you for your letter and enclosed information about the Higher Education Bill and recent action by the Conference Committee. I agree wholeheartedly that it is better to have a one-year extension of existing programs than to pass the bill in its present form. All of us associated with small private colleges and universities are grateful to have you as our champion in Washington.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. WFEMS.

ABILENE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE,
Abilene, Tex., June 8, 1972.

HON. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN GREEN: I appreciate very much your communication of May 27 concerning the Higher Education Bill.

Our position at Abilene Christian College is that we have a great deal of confidence in you and Omar Burleson and other members of Congress who are resisting the effort to use the Higher Education Bill to take control of their programs away from educational institutions in the name of educational aid.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. STEVENS.

SOUTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Brookings, S. Dak., June 2, 1972.

Representative EDITH GREEN,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GREEN: I applaud the stand you have taken. I think you are correct in stating that we would be better off with a one year extension of the existing program than with this approach that has been reached as an alternative to a much sounder legislation.

Sincerely yours,

H. M. BRIGGS,
President.

ATHENS, ALA.,
June 4, 1972.

HON. EDITH GREEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Your vote against higher education bill S. 659 strongly urged. Legislation represented in this bill very detrimental to a large sector of education in America; namely, private colleges. More thought must be given to meeting needs of the entire field of higher

education. Urge that bill S. 659 be defeated and that present legislation concerning Federal support of higher education be extended to allow time for further consideration and for the preparation of a more adequate bill during the next year. We are grateful for your interest in and support of the total program of education in America.

SIDNEY E. SANDRIDGE,
President of Athens College.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
June 8, 1972.

Representative EDITH GREEN,
Washington, D.C.:

General agreement of member college presidents seems to be that compromise bill does not accomplish what the original House bill was designed to do. My personal feeling is that support for S. 659 is a disastrous step in the wrong direction.

CHARLES V. GALLAGHER,
Executive, Independent Colleges and University of Missouri.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 7, 1972.

Representative EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I support your position in opposition to the pending higher education bill. Does not help small private colleges. Thank you for whatever you can do.

Sister MARGARET CLAYDON,
President, Trinity College.

WINOOSKI, VT.,
June 7, 1972.

EDITH GREEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I am very disappointed with S659 particularly with provisions for institutional aid for higher education I hope you will vote 'No.'

BERNARD L. BOUTIN,
President, St. Michael College.

NEWTON COLLEGE OF THE SACRED HEART,
Newton, Mass., June 5, 1972.

HON. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN GREEN: Having been executive vice president at Ohio University and now president of Newton College, I know something of the large public scene as well as the small private one in education. It would seem to me, in the long run, that this bill does not really get at the problems of support for higher education.

I think Terry Sanford is to be congratulated for the unselfish and farsighted point of view he has taken relative to higher education. It would have been easy for him to take a myopic look from his chair at Duke University. I am pleased that he did not.

I do not think this bill accomplishes the national purposes that we should seek. We will not accomplish these ends with "a little something for everybody" approach.

Higher education in the United States must have a national priority. It would seem to me there are resources in this country in both Congress and in our educational associations to plan a better program than the one presently offered. We must have the inclination and take the time to do this or colleges and universities will get exactly what they deserve and higher education in this country will get exactly what it does not deserve.

Very truly yours,

JAMES J. WHALEN, Ph. D.,
President.

CAZENOVIA COLLEGE,
Cazenovia, N.Y., June 5, 1972.

HON. EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN GREEN: The compromise legislation does little to aid colleges like Cazenovia. Therefore, I feel it better to press for an extension of existing pro-

grams and work for more suitable legislation in the next session of Congress.

Sincerely,

VINCENT C. DE BAUN,
President.

WENTWORTH COLLEGE
OF TECHNOLOGY,
Boston, Mass., June 6, 1972.

Mrs. EDITH GREEN,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: The present Higher Education bill is so complex and will be so difficult to administer that I am afraid the financial aid for higher education students will be put in jeopardy for the 1972-1973 academic year. I believe, as you do, that it would be better to quickly extend the present Higher Education program for one year and to really develop a new higher education program which will be meaningful in assisting both colleges and students.

Your very sincerely,

H. RUSSELL BEATTY,
President.

ALBANY JUNIOR COLLEGE,
Albany, Ga., June 7, 1972.

HON. EDITH GREEN,
U.S. House of Representatives, Special Subcommittee on Education, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GREEN: I support your proposal to continue the Higher Education Bill at its present level of funding to allow more time to study provisions of the new bill. Further, I agree with you that the formula in the new bill for institutional grants misses the point concerning the needs of higher education.

Sincerely,

EDWARD A. TARRATUS, Jr.,
Dean of Instruction.

SWEET BRIAR COLLEGE,
Sweet Briar, Va., May 31, 1972.

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ABBITT: We at Sweet Briar are not unaware of the necessity of compromise that makes politics "the art of the possible," nor are we deaf to the argument that half-a-loaf is better than none. Still, after a weekend of study and reflection we feel that the Conference Committee Report on the Higher Education Bill represents too unsatisfactory a compromise for us to wish to support it.

Our chief objection centers on the mixed formula for individual and institutional aid, which in the long run threatens further to weaken quality education at the higher level.

We urge you to oppose the current draft, approved by the Senate, in the belief that extension of existing programs and a hopefully wiser new proposal would provide a more desirable alternative.

Yours very sincerely,

HAROLD B. WHITEMAN, Jr.,
President.

WISCONSIN STATE UNIVERSITY,
Oshkosh, Wis., June 2, 1972.

HON. EDITH GREEN,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Education, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: I have the same deep misgivings about the Conference Committee Bill which follows the S. 659 pattern that prompted Terry Sanford, President of Duke University, to write you. I, therefore, urge you to oppose the Conference Bill in its present form and to seek a one year extension of existing programs.

Sincerely,

R. E. GUILLES,
Chancellor.

MADISON, N.J., May 31, 1972.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support your position fully as set forth in your letter and summary of May 20. I am grateful for your statesmanship.

ROBERT F. OXMAN,
President, Drew University.

PINE MANOR JUNIOR COLLEGE,
Chestnut Hill, Mass., June 2, 1972.

Representative EDITH GREEN,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: I really want to thank you for your letter of May 27 and the accompanying Higher Education bill. I have received pressures from various organizations to urge the passing of the bill. I have not been convinced it was well designed, and thoroughly endorse your idea of a one-year extension of existing programs or a one-year continuing resolution at the 1972 level of funding as better solutions than the proposed legislation.

I commend you for your refusal to sign the Conference Report under the circumstances. You have excellent backing when people like Terry Sanford feel as you do.

Sincerely yours,
FREDERICK C. FERRY, Jr.,
President.

PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY,
June 1, 1972.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Education, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: It is most distressing to all of us at Pepperdine that this bill does so little for the four-year colleges. We favor aid to needy students on federal assistance, but we also have a great many needy students who have been helped by our own scholarships, and by scholarships from clubs and private groups who have been willing to give at our request. We think it grossly unfair that such students will not share in the aid provided in the higher education bill.

Sincerely yours,
HOWARD A. WHITE,
Executive Vice President.

UNIVERSITY OF EVANSVILLE,
Evansville, Ind., June 5, 1972.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR EDITH: I join you in deep disappointment that the Conference Report does not contain substantial assistance for the liberal arts colleges which are in such desperate need.

Sincerely yours,
WALLACE B. GRAVES.

TRENTON JUNIOR COLLEGE,
Trenton, Mo., June 8, 1972.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GREEN: I greatly appreciate the time and effort expended by you and your staff to make your views known and to share them with others regarding the Higher Education Bill.

I for one (though we are desperately in need) shall be content to postpone the passage of S. 659 in its present form as long as necessary in order to secure a bill that will provide general aid.

I think we have given up so much of our local autonomy in hope of securing some of our own dollars back that we are rapidly selling education down the pipes. By inviting more red tape, more reports, more applications, more evaluations, more staff to take

care of the previous requests that few of the "federal dollars" gained get to do the job for which they should be intended.

Respectfully,

WM. K. RAY,
President.

BELLEVUE COLLEGE,
Bellevue, Nebr., June 8, 1972.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN GREEN: I appreciate the information which you have sent me concerning the Higher Education Bill. The summary sheets are most informative. I enjoyed reading the comments of Governor Terry Sanford, President of Duke University, and find I am in agreement with his position.

In its present form, this Bill equates needy with educationally disadvantaged or retarded. It suggests that needy students will all need remedial courses. We have not found this to be true. However, the Bill is designed to aid colleges only if the colleges focus their attention on the enrollment of needy, by the Bill's definition, students. For our college to accept non-qualified students, as a matter of policy or necessity, would be courting financial disaster. Adding faculty and tying up space (i.e. for a reading laboratory) for remedial education would be foolhardy when tax-supported institutions already have such facilities.

The provisions in this Bill for veterans require the creation of an office for which we have felt no need despite the fact that many students using Veteran's benefits are attending Bellevue College. Our present counseling and advising services provide all students with information needed to reach their educational objectives.

Bellevue College could best be aided financially by full funding of the EOG, work study, and NDEA projects and by means of direct grants so we can meet the rising cost of education without a great increase in tuition. Such grants would enable us to serve better the lower middle class student whose plight is ignored by most programs.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this very important Bill. I strongly support your position. It is my belief that this Bill is unduly complicated and will not provide the aid where needed. In addition, I am opposed to measures which increase the administrative complexities of our educational institutions.

Sincerely yours,
RICHARD D. WINCHELL,
President.

SHERMAN, TEX.,
June 7, 1972.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
U.S. Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Apart from the bussing issue I personally do not think the conference report on the higher education bill is on balance desirable legislation.

JOHN D. MOSELEY,
President, Austin College.

NAVARRO JUNIOR COLLEGE,
Corsicana, Tex., June 7, 1972.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
U.S. Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN: After reading the letter from President Sanford of Duke I am inclined to agree with the majority of his observations. Therefore, I think, as he so well states "that it is better to wait another six months than to start out in the wrong direction."

I fully support his observation the "institu-

tional aid should be based on students, not on just a class of students".

Sincerely yours,
BEN W. JONES,
President.

FILING OF REPORTS BY COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have until midnight Saturday night, July 1, 1972, to file a report on H.R. 13152, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to assist the States in controlling damage caused by predatory animals; to establish a program of research concerning the control and conservation of predatory animals; to restrict the use of toxic chemicals as a method of predator control, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. McKEVITT. Mr. Speaker, because of problems in my office I was unable to be present during the vote on the conference report on the bill H.R. 15585, the Treasury and Post Office bill.

Mr. Speaker, had I been present the RECORD would show that I would have voted "aye."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's statement will appear in the RECORD.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today, I am recorded as casting a "nay" vote with regard to House Joint Resolution 1238, supplemental appropriations for disaster relief.

On my way to the floor, I was erroneously advised that this bill provided appropriations for the Small Business Administration disaster loan program, which we established last night in the bill H.R. 15690.

I disagree with the formula under which the forgiveness portion of these loans is granted. I have no objections to providing the Office of Emergency Preparedness with needed disaster relief funds and if I had not misunderstood the matter I would have voted in favor of this appropriation.

REVENUE SHARING AND MILITARY PROCUREMENT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Esch) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, last week while the House was considering the revenue-sharing proposal, I was on official leave from the House attending the International Labor Organization's meeting in Geneva, as a delegate from the House of Representatives designated by the Speaker. I have been a supporter of the original revenue-sharing proposal since the first day the President proposed it. I supported the revised version of this

proposal when it was reported from the Committee on Ways and Means. I went to the International Labor Organization's meeting only after I had been given assurances from the White House and from managers of the bill that the proposal was assured passage, and after I had been paired with Mr. ERLBORN on this measure. I urge the Senate to immediately consider this important measure as I am convinced that it will provide genuine relief for our State and local communities.

While I was also on official leave, on Tuesday, June 27, the House was considering the military procurement bill. During the course of that discussion, the so-called Harrington amendment was presented which established a date certain of September 1 for withdrawal of all forces from Indochina. This amendment in most respects parallels my own initiative and had I been on the floor, I would have voted for this amendment. It is unfortunate that the House to this date has not had a clean-cut resolution on the war in Indochina. I have urged the Rules Committee to report the resolution from the Foreign Affairs Committee upon return from recess. Congress must reassert its proper role in the development on foreign policy and Members of the House, as elected Representatives of the people, have the right to decide this issue on its merits in open and free debate.

A ROLLCALL DILEMMA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SKUBITZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I am beginning to think this House is plotting against JOE SKUBITZ.

Last November I recounted how I thought this body did me in when I went home to attend a fund-raising dinner in my behalf. Six rollcall votes were taken during my absence on a single day; on a Monday when normally the only business transacted is under a Suspension of the Rules.

Yesterday, a Thursday, I felt obligated to keep my promise to attend another affair in Kansas; an event I had committed myself to many weeks before. I had to be a personal courier to carry out a sampling of moon rocks for exhibit in a county that was becoming part of my congressional district for the first time.

Before I left Washington, no indication existed that this House would have 11 rollcalls; more than in any other single day thus far this year. Why so much business when JOE SKUBITZ gets on a plane for Kansas? There must be a conspiracy to embarrass me.

I have a slight consolation. Prior to yesterday, I had missed only five of 166 votes on legislative matters this year. I had missed only nine of 77 quorum calls since January. My overall attendance record stood at 94.2 percent while I scored 97 percent on yeas and nays and teller votes.

But yesterday, my batting average took a fall. Eleven calls of the roll knocked my

attendance percentage down to 90.2 percent and my yeas and nays and teller percentage to 91 percent.

The irony of the situation is that if I had been absent the entire month of January, I would have missed no more than I did in one day—yesterday.

BLACK POLITICAL POWER COMES OF AGE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, last week three members of the Congressional Black Caucus made an announcement that will have repercussions throughout the future of American politics. Congressmen LOUIS STOKES of Ohio, WILLIAM L. CLAY of Missouri, and WALTER E. FAUNTROY of the District of Columbia stated, on the morning of June 26, that they had organized a large bloc of previously uncommitted black delegates to the Democratic National Convention. They made a pledge, on behalf of that bloc, to the presidential candidacy of Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN.

Their announcement came as a surprise, and may have been the tactical move of 1972. It sent ripples through American politics—ripples that could become a tidal wave by November. It provoked both criticism and praise but, more importantly, it triggered this country's sudden realization that black politics will be a force to reckon with from now on.

On June 29, 1972, the Washington Post's lead editorial, "Black Power Comes of Age," captured the essence of this realization. The paper's editors went back to 1965, and surveyed the events of the years that follow. What began as a civil rights movement has become, according to their analysis, a full-scale political force. The editors cited a few of the major political gains in the past 7 years, and went on to foresee future gains.

Their conclusion was that the meaning of the past 7 years became clear last week, when Congressmen STOKES, CLAY, and FAUNTROY revealed their political plans. It heralds the full participation of black political power in the Democratic Party's policymaking process and recognizes that it is and will be a decisive element in the highest councils of the Democratic Party.

This vital support, along with that of Congressman AUGUSTUS HAWKINS of California, vice chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, Congressman JOHN CONYERS of Michigan, and Congressman RALPH METCALFE of Illinois adds strength to the presidential candidacy of Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN.

[From the Washington Post, June 29, 1972]

BLACK POWER COMES OF AGE

A number of black politicians declared at a news conference with George McGovern the other day that they had amassed 963/4 hitherto uncommitted delegate votes to support his candidacy for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency. Sen. McGovern promptly announced that this accretion had swollen his vote total sufficiently to assure

him a first ballot victory at Miami. The black vote tally from this exercise shrank at 4 p.m. that day to 74% but it may rise again undoubtedly will the overall McGovern total. Whether, however, the black votes delivered in this maneuver finally come out to be 74% or 80 or even 96% or whether this was the exact block of votes that actually put McGovern over the top, the event and the symbolism are both real and important. Black political power has come of age.

Back in June, 1966, during the heyday of the civil rights movement when Stokely Carmichael first shouted, "black power," many whites were frightened and a lot of blacks were puzzled. What did it mean? Who would it hurt? Could it help anyone? At first it looked as if the ominous overtones were destined to be dominant. Blacks began to withdraw in substantial ways from the frail and laboriously built integrated mechanisms which had seemed to many to be the solution to the racial problems in the country. Then there were the urban rebellions which suddenly stopped with an apparent slow black slide into quiescence and regression. Depression spread through the black community and also touched white civil rights allies.

But underneath it all, a quiet revolution seems to have been taking place. The black withdrawal marked not merely hostility and isolation, but also a time of quiet appraisal of black needs and a rise in the determination of blacks to develop greater, self sufficiency and their own solutions to their own problems. They wanted the nation to heed needs as they perceived them rather than to continue tagging along picking up whatever happened to fall off the back of the liberal bandwagon. At the same time, a real revolution was taking place in black political participation. The Voting Rights Act was passed in 1965 and by 1967 there were 475 black office holders. By this year, the number had grown to 2,264. Between 1965 and 1972, the number of blacks in Congress had grown from 6 to 14.

With numbers sufficient to form a critical mass, black politicians began taking themselves and the political process seriously. They concluded that black votes, delivered in great lumps in recent years to the Democratic Party, hadn't been paid for in real political terms and that the Republican Party wasn't even listening. Early in 1971, a growing determination among black politicians to participate in a more significant and more sophisticated way in the 1972 electoral process developed into a series of quiet strategy meetings around the country. The Black Congressional Caucus became one of the most serious segments of black activist America.

The politicians argued a variety of strategies for '72 in their meetings and then held a convention in Gary. There, black people mapped their own demands and later the Congressional Caucus developed a Black Bill of Rights which was shorter, but substantially similar. Then, as the McGovern train picked up speed on the way to Miami, a number of politicians, notably Del. Walter Fauntroy decided it was time for blacks to move and to move decisively. Fauntroy and others began serious political negotiations with the McGovern people, not in the old framework of asking the candidate to say something good about brotherhood, but in the new mold of presenting black-developed demands and then bargaining for political *quid pro quos*. The McGovern camp wanted the votes and went along with much of the Black Congressional Caucus' Bill of Rights and other demands. Hard political bargaining ensued which seemed to satisfy everyone, whereupon Fauntroy, Congressmen Louis Stokes and William Clay and others began rounding up some critical votes and then delivered them at a critical time.

Not everyone was happy. Mrs. Chisholm didn't think Fauntroy & Co. got enough for their votes and others thought it had been an exercise in ambition or elitism. The most telling argument was that the Fauntroy strategy had veered from the original black strategy of going to the convention with a large block of uncommitted votes and bargaining from that strength. But, politics, after all, is a matter of timing and of adjusting strategies to meet shifting situations. In a sense, all of the critics may have been right and all of the things they called the maneuver may have been correct.

But it is clear that it was also serious hardnosed American politics played with the thumping rhythms of soul, and not some pale limitation of life. And it was clearly the first time blacks had participated in as serious, critical and political a way in major American political party's decision-making process. In addition, no matter how McGovern fares, it did set on track a black mode of participation in the political process in this country which is not likely to be reversed in the near future. Can anyone imagine a future candidate scrounging for the last few votes and not investigating the possibility that one of his black friends in politics could deliver at least some of them to him?

Both for those who remember black people segregated behind a chicken wire fence at the 1928 Democratic National Convention in Kansas City and for those who were troubled in 1966 about what black power might come to mean, the events of this past week must have come as a welcome revelation.

ROONEY REQUESTS HALF BILLION FOR RELIEF OF FLOOD-RAVAGED STATES

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROONEY) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of probably the most destructive flood in America's history, today I have requested an additional half billion dollars in Federal funds for relief in the five States which have been declared disaster areas by President Nixon.

The \$92.5 million now available to the States in the President's disaster relief fund will not begin to compensate the losses suffered by the five States. If Pennsylvania were to receive the entire \$92.5 million it would cover the entire 10 percent of the cost of putting the State back together.

I have introduced legislation to provide relief funds in the amount of one-half billion dollars to the States which have been declared disaster areas by the President. This money would be disbursed by the Office of Emergency Preparedness whose primary function is the administration of the President's disaster relief fund. In past crises involving disaster areas in several States OEP has apportioned financial aid to the States according to the amount of damage sustained in the respective States. This is the only fair and realistic method of tackling the massive cleanup job ahead.

This would mean that Pennsylvania, hardest hit by the flooding by a wide margin, would receive the lion's share of the supplemental appropriation, and Florida, having the least amount of damage of the five States, would receive the smallest portion. The remaining money

would be distributed by OEP to Virginia, Maryland, and New York.

Members of the Pennsylvania delegation will meet with Governor Shapp on Tuesday to discuss the crippling effects of the flood.

I hope to explore all avenues of Federal assistance with the Governor and arrive at some concrete goals with regard to the needs of the stricken Pennsylvania communities. Yesterday I also introduced legislation to authorize up to \$60 million in emergency Federal assistance for railroads which have experienced severe equipment losses and other damages as a result of unprecedented floods in the wake of Tropical Storm Agnes.

Nine major railroads serving Eastern seaboard States have estimated damage at \$30 million, but the Federal Railroad Administration expects the final damage figure for all railroads to be considerably above the \$30 million mark.

There is no existing Federal program under which financial relief can be extended to the railroads.

Congress is responding to the needs of individuals in other economic sectors, but the success of many of these relief measures is dependent upon the ability of the railroads to transport essential materials to flood ravaged communities.

I should point out that even industries not affected by flooding will have to cut back on production because of severed rail lines.

This will precipitate payroll and tax revenue losses possibly amounting to several million dollars.

This bill authorizes funds to be used only for repairs to or replacements of tracks, rolling stock, and other essential railroad facilities required as a direct result of last week's flooding.

Two forms of financial assistance would be provided under this bill entitled Emergency Transportation Facilities Restoration Act. Federal grants would be authorized for railroads in reorganization and for railroads which have reported to the Interstate Commerce Commission a deficit net income for either of their past two fiscal years. Loans would be made available for other railroads under the terms and conditions authorized in the Disaster Relief Act of 1970.

In my own Congressional District the Lehigh Valley Railroad alone has lost 14,000 feet of track. It is obvious to me that substantial Federal relief must be forthcoming to get the railroads operating again and the economy of Pennsylvania back on its feet. I have 14 co-sponsors of this emergency legislation, and Senator HUGH SCOTT, Republican-Pennsylvania, has introduced an identical bill in the Senate.

AMENDING THE EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1969

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the bill I have introduced today, amending the Export Administration Act of 1969, takes a long and important stride toward

translating the ideals and intent expressed by this Congress on many occasions into a realistic plan of action.

Specifically, I refer to the often expressed desire of the majority of Congressmen to help alleviate the plight of Soviet Jews, who are denied the right to live as Jews or leave the Soviet Union, in gross and flagrant violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Not long ago, this body overwhelmingly passed the House Concurrent Resolution 471 requesting the President to take up the matter with Moscow.

Most of us have expressed our concern in one way or another over the past years—only 2 weeks ago, more than 100 of our colleagues joined me in sponsoring a traveling educational exhibit and more than 50 came to the steps of the Capitol to sign the sponsoring plaque. Colleagues are still coming to my office each day to sign their names to the plaque.

But I am sad to report this has not been enough. Yes, we can brag of some limited effect. We can boast in increases of emigration. We can celebrate the individual pardons we have obtained. But we cannot rest, for Soviets still have not abandoned their dastardly policy.

In fact, they have retrenched. They have scheduled new show trials all over Russia in the next weeks. Under the catchall of slandering the Soviet system, three brave Jews—Vladimir Markman in Sverdlovsky, Iliya Glezer in Moscow, and Yuli Brind in Karchov—will be tried severely for being Jews and applying for immigration visas to Israel. Harassment, prison, primitive draft callups—this is the daily lot of any Jew expressing the desire to leave Russia. They are fired from their jobs for applying for exit permits, and then they are denied exit permits because they have no jobs.

Congress must strike out a new initiative to help these people. The bill I introduced today provides a tool to do so.

Against a background of long years of using export controls to further our foreign policy, as provided in the Export Administration Act of 1969, this bill articulates a new congressional policy: Now we will use export controls to implement our morals.

We will no longer simply say business is business. We will use export controls to make our national protest at the denial of basic Human Rights all over the world.

Section 1 of my bill declares that in principle we will deal with only countries that honor and abide by the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Only in this way can we fill our international responsibilities to the oppressed and the persecuted, the world over.

Whenever the President determines that overriding national interest dictates that we compromise this principle, he must report his reasons in the quarterly Export Control report and outline the alternative measure he has taken to implement this policy. This, dear colleagues, is the second thrust of my bill.

As much as Congress demands actions on behalf of Russian Jews—it is the ex-

ecutive branch which must carry out this congressional mandate.

But whether indeed it does so is impossible to say. After all our efforts, after all our petitions, letters and resolutions, the White House still refuses to inform the Congress or the people of the United States what, if anything, he did do to help Russian Jews.

The White House rationalizes the secrecy in specious terms. My constituents puzzle over whether it is there only to veil inaction.

Some of my colleagues will oppose my proposal on the grounds that encouraging rather than discouraging trade and other contacts will help alleviate the plight of Russian Jews. To them I say this: Your assumption is correct, but only if implicit in all the improving relations is the threat that relations will deteriorate unless the Soviet Government changes its policy.

My bill articulates this necessary implicit threat. It clearly provides for an override by the President, as long as he details substitute alternative measures to accomplish the goals.

The Soviet Union must pay a price for the better trade relations it wants so desperately. How long can the United States sanction oppression and tyranny by removing trade restrictions on countries that violate the Universal Declaration of Human Rights?

STATUS OF THE APPROPRIATION BILLS

(Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, it would be timely to give the House a brief report on the status of the appropriation bills. Tomorrow is the beginning of the fiscal year 1973.

IN THE HOUSE

The House has passed 10 of the 13 regular annual appropriation bills for fiscal 1973. They involved \$81.9 billion of budget requests. They carry a total of \$82.4 billion in appropriations or new budget obligatory authority, a net increase of \$478 million over the related requests. Eight of the 10 bills were below the budget requests; two were above.

The House at this session has considered four supplemental measures relating to the fiscal year 1972 which ends today. Budget requests of \$7.4 billion were considered, and \$6.7 billion was approved, a reduction of about \$721 million. But there were adjustments as a result of actions in the other body and in conference, so that with respect to these supplementals for fiscal 1972 the enacted versions were about \$418 million below the budget.

Mr. Speaker, we have three more regular bills for 1973 to report when the House returns from the July recess. They are: defense, military construction, and foreign assistance. They have been delayed because they lack necessary authorizations, but we expect to be able to report them not long after the House returns. They involve budget requests of about \$87 billion.

IN THE SENATE

The Senate has passed nine of the 10 appropriation bills sent over by the House. Only the agriculture-environmental and consumer protection appropriation bill remains in the Senate, and

I believe it will be passed shortly after the July 17 return.

In the nine bills for fiscal 1973, the Senate considered budget requests of \$70.6 billion and approved \$73.7 billion, a net increase of about \$3.1 billion over the related budget requests.

I will include a table showing bill-by-bill comparisons.

ENACTED INTO LAW

Mr. Speaker, three of the 13 regular appropriation bills for fiscal 1973 have been cleared to the President. They are: legislative, District of Columbia, and Treasury-Postal Service-General Government. They total \$5,888,007,980, a reduction of \$41,248,919 below the related budget requests. The total of the three enacted bills is \$115,175,898 above the corresponding fiscal 1972 appropriation amounts.

Mr. Speaker, there is every reason to hope that in the period between July 17 and the August 18 break for the second national convention, we should be able to conclude most, if not in fact, all of the remaining regular appropriation bills. In the interim, beginning tomorrow, much of the Government will operate under the continuing resolution which cleared Congress today. That resolution runs to August 18.

I include a comparative table of the fiscal 1973 appropriation bills as they now stand. A more comprehensive "budget scorekeeping" report, encompassing not only the appropriation bills but also other bills having an impact on the 1973 budget requests and proposals, will be issued next week by the staff of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures.

NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY IN THE APPROPRIATION BILLS FOR 1973—AS OF JUNE 30, 1972

[Note.—As to fiscal year 1973 amounts only]

Bill	Budget request considered	Approved	Change, (+) or (-)	Bill	Budget request considered	Approved	Change, (+) or (-)
In the House:				In the Senate:			
1. Legislative.....	\$433,627,004	\$427,604,764	—\$6,022,240	1. Legislative.....	519,347,899	514,722,880	—4,625,019
2. State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary.....	4,687,988,600	4,587,104,350	—100,884,250	2. HUD-Space-Science-Veterans.....	20,258,183,000	20,583,370,000	+325,187,000
3. HUD-Space-Science-Veterans.....	20,173,185,000	19,718,490,000	—454,695,000	3. District of Columbia (Federal funds).....	343,306,000	313,706,000	—29,600,000
4. Transportation.....	2,909,181,095	2,791,614,095	—117,567,000	4. State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary.....	4,704,326,600	4,820,717,769	+116,391,169
Advance 1974 appropriation.....	(131,181,000)	(131,181,000)	5. Transportation.....	2,909,181,095	2,906,994,095	—2,187,000
5. District of Columbia (Federal funds).....	343,306,000	332,306,000	—11,000,000	Advance 1974 appropriation.....	(131,181,000)	(131,181,000)
6. Labor-HEW.....	27,327,323,500	28,603,179,500	+1,275,856,000	6. Treasury-Postal Service-General Government.....	5,066,603,000	5,057,186,000	—9,417,000
7. Interior.....	2,520,340,000	2,529,558,200	+9,218,200	7. Labor-HEW.....	28,776,633,500	31,354,930,500	+2,578,297,000
8. Treasury-Postal Service-General Government.....	5,066,603,000	5,057,145,000	—9,458,000	8. Interior.....	2,527,154,000	2,550,922,800	+23,768,800
9. Public Works—AEC.....	5,489,058,000	5,437,727,000	—51,331,000	9. Public Works—AEC.....	5,489,058,000	5,571,696,000	+82,638,000
10. Agriculture—Environmental and Consumer Protection.....	12,952,177,400	12,897,010,900	—55,166,500	10. Agriculture—Environmental and Consumer Protection.....
11. Foreign Assistance.....	Total, bills cleared Senate.....	70,593,793,094	73,674,246,044	+3,080,452,950
12. Defense.....	Enacted:			
13. Military construction.....	1. Legislative.....	519,347,899	513,787,980	—5,559,919
14. Supplemental, 1973.....	2. Treasury-Postal Service-General Government.....	5,066,603,000	5,057,827,000	—8,776,000
Total, House bills.....	81,902,789,599	82,381,739,809	+478,950,210	3. District of Columbia (Federal funds).....	343,306,000	316,393,000	—26,913,000
				Total, bills enacted.....	5,929,256,899	5,888,007,980	—41,248,919

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. McDADE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), today, 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:

Mr. PERKINS, for 10 minutes, today, and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CONOVER) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. QUIE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HOGAN, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. BLACKBURN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. WHALEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WYMAN, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McKAY) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. REUSS, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. DIGGS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. PODELL, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. LEGGETT, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HARRINGTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FLOOD, for 60 minutes, on July 19.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HANSEN of Idaho) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ESCH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SKUBITZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOGAN, for 30 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENHOLM) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BURTON, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ROUSH in two instances.

Mr. NEDZI and to include extraneous matter in two instances.

Mr. DORN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KOCH in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. STEED, to revise and extend his remarks during debate on the conference report.

Mr. VEYSEY to extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD, notwithstanding an estimated cost of \$350.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. MILLS of Arkansas) to extend his remarks in the RECORD on H.R. 9410.

Mr. LEGGETT notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and the cost thereof is estimated by the Public Printer to be \$630.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in five instances.

Mr. PERKINS to extend his remarks during consideration of the school lunch bill.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon to revise and extend her remarks, notwithstanding an estimated cost of \$315.

Mr. MAHON to revise and extend his remarks and include certain appropriations tables.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia to revise and extend his remarks.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CONOVER) and to revise and extend their remarks:)

Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.

Mr. RIEGLE.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. WIDNALL in two instances.

Mr. MCCLURE.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. KEMP in two instances.

Mr. SPENCE.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan.

Mr. VANDER JAGT.

Mr. MYERS in three instances.

Mr. CONOVER.

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mr. MIZELL in eight instances.

Mr. WHITEHURST.

Mr. KEATING.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McKAY) and to revise and extend their remarks:)

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas.

Mr. KAZEN.

Mr. SCHEUER in two instances.

Mr. DIGGS.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois in two instances.

Mr. FULTON in two instances.

Mr. WRIGHT in two instances.

Mr. HUNGATE in three instances.

Mr. ROY.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. ROGERS in five instances.

Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.

Mr. ST GERMAIN in two instances.

Mr. DOW.

Mr. ICHORD in three instances.

Mr. BADILLO.

Mr. BARING.

Mr. ASHLEY in two instances.

Mr. REES in three instances.

Mr. KAZEN.

Mr. JACOBS in two instances.

Mr. BERGLAND.

Mr. REID in two instances.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. HARRINGTON in five instances.

Mr. ROE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HANSEN of Idaho) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BETTS.

Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.

Mr. CLEVELAND.

Mr. QUIE.

Mr. MALLARY.

Mr. DU PONT.

Mr. GOLDWATER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENHOLM) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BINGHAM in three instances.

Mr. COLLINS of Illinois.

Mr. SYMINGTON.

Mr. BURTON.

Mr. DOW in two instances.

Mr. REID in two instances.

Mr. BINGHAM in four instances.

Mr. LEGGETT.

Mrs. SULLIVAN in three instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.

Mr. MAHON.

Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. MOORHEAD in five instances.

Mr. DORN in four instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. HAGAN in three instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2577. An act to amend the International Travel Act of 1961 to provide for Federal regulation of the travel agency industry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1074. An act to amend section 220(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act to permit motor carriers to file annual reports on the basis of a 13-period accounting year;

H.R. 5318. An act for the relief of Mrs. Fernande M. Allen;

H.R. 6479. An act to provide for the licensing of personnel on certain vessels;

H.R. 14734. An act to provide authorizations for certain agencies conducting the foreign relations of the United States, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15259. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15507. An act to amend the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969 to provide for Federal guarantees of obligations issued by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, to authorize an increased contribution by the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15585. An act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15587. An act to provide for a 6-month extension of the emergency employment compensation program;

H.J. Res. 1234. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1973, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 1238. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for disaster relief.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 979. An act to amend the act of September 30, 1965, relating to high-speed transportation, to enlarge the authority of the Secretary to undertake research and development, to remove the termination date thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 3338. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of compensation for disabled veterans, and for other purposes;

S. 3343. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum of the grant payable for specially adapted housing for disabled veterans.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that

committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1074. An act to amend 220(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act to permit motor carriers to file annual reports on the basis of a 13-period accounting year;

H.R. 5318. An act for the relief of Mrs. Fernando M. Allen;

H.R. 6479. An act for the licensing of personnel on certain vessels;

H.R. 13955. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15587. An act to provide for a 6-month extension of the emergency unemployment compensation program.

ADJOURNMENT TO JULY 17, 1972

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 88, 92d Congress, the Chair declares the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on July 17th next.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 88, the House adjourned until Monday, July 17, 1972, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2125. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the request for appropriations for fiscal year 1973 for the Department of Defense—Military (H. Doc. No. 92-321); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2126. A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting the final determination of the Commission in docket No. 110, *The Lummi Tribe of Indians, Plaintiff, v. The United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 70(t); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2127. A letter from the Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting the final determination of the Commission in docket No. 132, *The Suquamish Tribe of Indians, Plaintiffs, v. The United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 70(t); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2128. A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting the final determination of the Commission in docket No. 234, *The Chinook Tribe and Bands of Indians, Plaintiffs, v. The United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 70(t); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2129. A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting the final determination of the Commission in docket No. 284, *The Native Village of Gambell, in its Own Right and as Representative or Successor to the St. Lawrence Island Eskimos; Ben Booshu and John Apangalook as Representatives of the St. Lawrence Island Eskimos, Plaintiffs, v. The United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 70(t); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2130. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the sale of the

Washington National and Dulles International Airports; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2131. A letter from the president, Aviation Hall of Fame, Inc., transmitting the audit and financial reports of the organization for calendar year 1971, pursuant to Public Law 88-372; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2132. A letter from the General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a list of the nonprofit educational institutions and other nonprofit organizations in which title to equipment was vested by the Atomic Energy Commission during 1971 under section 2 of Public Law 85-934, pursuant to section 3 of the act; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

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. BRADEMAs: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 553. Concurrent resolution authorizing certain printing for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs (Rept. No. 92-1204). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRADEMAs: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 559. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of the report entitled "Papers Submitted to Subcommittee on Housing Panels on Housing Production, Housing Demand, and Developing a Suitable Living Environment" (Rept. No. 92-1205). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRADEMAs: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 560. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of the report entitled "Housing and the Urban Environment, Report and Recommendations of Three Study Panels of the Subcommittee on Housing" (Rept. No. 92-1206). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRADEMAs: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 605. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a House document the pamphlet entitled "Our Flag", and to provide for additional copies (Rept. No. 92-1207). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRADEMAs: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 60. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of hearings on the "Environmental Protection Act of 1971" (Rept. No. 92-1208). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRADEMAs: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 62. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Document No. 56, entitled "State Utility Commissions—Summary and Tabulation of Information Submitted by the Commissions" (Rept. No. 92-1209). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRADEMAs: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 70. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate hearings on the Consumer Product Safety Act of 1971 (Rept. No. 92-1210). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRADEMAs: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 74. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Report 92-634, entitled "Interim Report of Activities of the Private Welfare and Pension Plan Study, 1971" (Rept. No. 92-1211). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRADEMAs: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 79. Concurrent resolution authorizing

the printing of additional copies of Senate hearings entitled "Amphetamine Legislation 1971" (Rept. No. 92-1212). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JOHNSON of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 9198. A bill to amend the act of July 4, 1955, as amended, relating to the construction of irrigation distribution systems; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-1213). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 14542. A bill to amend the act of September 26, 1966, Public Law 89-606, to extend for 4 years the period during which the authorized numbers for the grades of major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel in the Air Force may be increased, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-1214). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 15390; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-1215). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 5741. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to transfer surplus Liberty ships to States for use in marine life conservation programs; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-1216). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 11300. A bill to amend section 509 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-1217). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. ABZUG:

H.R. 15823. A bill to prohibit any civil or military officer of the United States using the land or naval forces of the United States or the militia of any State to execute civil laws against civilians or to exercise surveillance of civilians except where such forces or militia are actually engaged in repelling invasion or suppressing rebellion, insurrection, or domestic violence pursuant to the Constitution or laws of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ASPINALL (for himself, Mr.

EVANS of Colorado, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. MCKAY, Mr. McKEVITT, Mr. RONCALIO, and Mr. RUNNELS):

H.R. 15824. A bill to facilitate the incorporation of the reclamation townsite of Page, Ariz., Glen Canyon unit, Colorado River storage project, as a municipality under the laws of the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOLAND (for himself, Mr.

BRAY, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DENT, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FISHER, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MADDEN, and Mr. MYERS):

H.R. 15825. A bill to amend the tariff and trade laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 15826. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that employees receiving lump sums from tax-free pension or annuity plans on account of separation from employment shall not be taxed at the time of distribution to the extent that an equivalent amount is reinvested in another such plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 15827. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangement shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 15828. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit rescue squads to obtain surplus property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H.R. 15829. A bill to assure an opportunity for employment to every American seeking work and to make available the education and training needed by any person to qualify for employment consistent with his highest potential and capability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 15830. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to promote additional protection for the rights of participants in private pension plans, to establish minimum standards for vesting, to establish an insurance corporation within the Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 15831. A bill to make Level III of the Executive Schedule applicable to the Administrator of the National Credit Union Administration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOGAN (for himself and Mr. GUDE):

H.R. 15832. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to create an additional judicial district in southern Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 15833. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide a system for the redress of law enforcement officers' grievances and to establish a law enforcement officers' bill of rights in each of the several States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. ADAMO, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. YATTON):

H.R. 15834. A bill to amend the Education of the Handicapped Act to provide for comprehensive education programs for severely and profoundly mentally retarded children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Mr. WHITE):

H.R. 15835. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish and administer a program of direct Federal employment to improve the quality of the environment, the public lands, Indian reservations, and commonly owned and shared resources through a program of recreational development, reforestation and conservation management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 15836. A bill to establish a National Human Resources Conservation Corps to rehabilitate persons convicted of violating certain narcotic drug laws and persons who volunteer for membership in such corps and to improve the quality of the environment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 15837. A bill to amend section 216 of the Internal Revenue Service of 1954 to include corporations and others within the definition of the term "tenant-stockholder"

for purposes of the provisions relating to cooperative housing corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS (by request):

H.R. 15838. A bill to encourage and assist States and localities to coordinate their various programs and resources available to provide human services in order to facilitate the improved provision and utilization of those services and increase their effectiveness in achieving the objectives of personal independence, economic self-sufficiency, and the maximum enjoyment of life, with dignity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 15839. A bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1969 in order to promote observance of the 1948 United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 15840. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to enable the Federal criminal justice system to deal more effectively with the problem of narcotic addiction, to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to enable the States and municipalities to deal more effectively with that problem, and for other related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 15841. 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. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 15842. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and title II of the Social Security Act to provide a full exemption (through credit or refund) from the employees' tax under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, and an equivalent reduction in the self-employment tax, in the case of individuals who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VEYSEY:

H.R. 15843. A bill to authorize appropriations for certain highway safety projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 15844. A bill to require any coupon, bonus, or direct mail offering for the sale of any product to disclose on its face the full name and address of the party making the offer and of the actual seller of the product, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 15845. A bill to provide continued rail transportation in rural America; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 15846. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to develop and carry out a forestry incentives program to encourage a higher level of forest resources protection, development, and management by small non-industrial private and non-Federal public forest land owners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 15847. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to certain charitable contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 15848. A bill to amend section 4940 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to change the name of the amount imposed thereby on certain investment income from

"excise tax" to "service charge", and to reduce such amount from 4 to 1½ percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 15849. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is mentally retarded; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 15850. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the surviving spouse of a deceased insured individual must have paid or assumed responsibility for such individual's burial expenses in order to qualify for the lump-sum death payment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 15851. A bill to establish a system of wild areas within the lands of the national forest system; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 15852. A bill to amend the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 to increase the U.S. share of allowable project costs under such act; to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to prohibit certain State taxation of persons in air transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MELCHER:

H.R. 15853. A bill to amend section 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to offer and pay rewards for information and services concerning the carrying of weapons aboard aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MYERS:

H.R. 15854. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to require that imported meat and meat food products made in whole or in part of imported meat be labeled "Imported" at all stages of distribution until delivery to the ultimate consumer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 15855. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property local governments; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. QUIE (for himself, Mr. GERALD

R. FORD, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. KEMP, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. MALLARY):

H.R. 15856. A bill to encourage and assist States and localities to coordinate their various programs and resources available to provide human services in order to facilitate the improved provision and utilization of those services and increase their effectiveness in achieving the objectives of personal independence, economic self-sufficiency, and the maximum enjoyment of life, with dignity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. QUIE (for himself, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. BRADEMANS, and Mr. ESHLEMAN):

H.R. 15857. A bill to encourage and assist States and localities to coordinate their various programs and resources available to provide human services in order to facilitate the improved provision and utilization of those services and increase their effectiveness in achieving the objectives of personal independence, economic self-sufficiency, and the maximum enjoyment of life, with dignity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. QUILLLEN:

H.R. 15858. A bill to authorize equalization of the retired or retainer pay of certain members and former members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS (for himself, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MAZZOLI, and Mr. Mr. ROBISON of New York):

H.R. 15859. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize assistance for planning, development and initial operation, research, and training projects for systems for the effective provision of health care services under emergency conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 15860. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

H.R. 15861. A bill to end the war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HEINZ:

H.R. 15862. A bill to reduce income tax withholdings by an average 5 percent and to strengthen the minimum income tax provision; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEELE:

H.R. 15863. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to prohibit tampering with any device or element of design installed in or on a motor vehicle or motor vehicle engine in compliance with regulations under section 202 of the Clean Air Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr.

BADILLO, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. VANIK, Mr. PIKE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. RYAN, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. OBEY, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. REES, Mr. METCALFE, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BINGHAM, and Mr. DELUMS):

H.J. Res. 1250. Joint resolution: Authorization of the President of the United States to approve an interim agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.J. Res. 1251. Joint resolution. Authorization of the President of the United States to approve an interim agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey):

H.J. Res. 1252. Joint resolution: Authorization of the President of the United States to approve an interim agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAZZOLI (for himself, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. RUNNELS):

H.J. Res. 1253. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the term of office of Members of the House of Representatives and the eligibility of such Members to be elected to the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAGGONER:

H.J. Res. 1254. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the busing or involuntary assignment of students; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN for himself and Mr. FUQUA):

H. Con. Res. 642. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of the report of the Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. NIX:

H. Con. Res. 643. Concurrent resolution relative to outstanding debts due the United States of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H. Con. Res. 644. Concurrent resolution calling upon all parties to the 1949 Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War to insure respect for that convention by persuading North Vietnam to fulfill its obligations under the convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (for himself, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. HANLEY):

H. Res. 1039. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

to conduct studies and investigations within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials, were presented and referred as follows:

403. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Federal lands adjacent to Point Mugu State Park; to the Committee on Armed Services.

404. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to creating a national park in Los Angeles County; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

405. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 15864. A bill for the relief of Robert Dona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 15865. A bill for the relief of Richard L. Krzyzanowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 15866. A bill for the relief of Beatrice Dascal Aquino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES V. STANTON:

H.R. 15867. A bill for the relief of Mikolaj Kormanicki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCURE:

H.R. 15868. A bill for the relief of Jose Ramon Santa Maria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE PENSACOLA STORY

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, horror stories make their way into the headlines without difficulty. Scare stories are a close second. Constructive stories seldom get more than a bare mention. There is a constructive story which I have noted and which I consider highly meritorious. It tells the history of the care and treatment of psychiatric patients in the Pensacola, Fla., area. A key line is, and I quote:

Pensacola had no psychiatrists, psychiatric beds, Guidance Clinic—really no mental health effort of any sort prior to 1948.

What has happened is largely the work of Dr. Philip B. Phillips, who tells the story. The accomplishments in Pensacola in this area constitute a fine model for every community. I am happy

to submit Dr. Phillips' story for printing in the RECORD:

THE PENSACOLA STORY

(By Philip B. Phillips, M.D.)

(Note: This article is a condensation of Dr. Phillips' history of the care and treatment of psychiatric patients in Pensacola and the Escambia County area.)

Pensacola had no psychiatrists, psychiatric beds, Guidance Clinic—really no mental health effort of any sort prior to 1948. That year members of the Escambia County Medical Society determined that their patients should not have to go 210 miles to New Orleans or 360 miles to Jacksonville for evaluation and treatment. Dr. W. C. Payne Sr., president-elect of the Florida Medical Association, Dr. Sidney G. Kennedy, president of the Escambia County Medical Society, and Dr. Herbert L. Bryans, president of the Florida State Board of Health, beloved Pensacola physicians, sought the services of a young psychiatrist assigned to the Naval Air Training Command there. He responded willingly and began seeing patients late in the afternoon, evenings and on weekends with approval of his commanding officer and the Navy's Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.

These events initiated the cooperation of

physicians, community leaders, hospital boards and administrators which has continued over more than two decades. The results have included one solution to the community's mental health problems.

A PSYCHIATRIST AND GUIDANCE CLINIC

When Baptist Hospital opened in October 1951, two rooms for psychiatric patients were made available on the medical floor. Escambia General Hospital had a small outbuilding, perhaps 25 feet square, where four disturbed patients could be treated if no one objected too much. When absolutely necessary, Pensacola Hospital, re-named Sacred Heart Hospital, permitted psychiatric admissions on the medical floor. In October 1952 the first civilian neuropsychiatrist began practice as a member of a group of other physicians. The local climate was not overly receptive. He was required to obtain the chief nurses' permission before his patients could be admitted and give assurance that they would not disturb the other patients.

Two years later the Child Guidance Clinic was established through efforts of parents, Junior Woman's Club, School Board and County Commissioners. A psychiatric social worker, clinical psychologist, secretary and volunteer neuropsychiatrist made up the initial staff which opened for service in the