

first letters of: American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association. Its members are men from all walks of life. Among its list of members are persons such as the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, former President Harry S. Truman, and the present Vice President Spiro T. Agnew. They are recognized in their own communities as men devoted to civic responsibility, as good neighbors, and as model family men. The organization is one which is devoted to the improvement and betterment of the social, moral, and family life.

During its past 50 years, this order has accomplished many worthy causes. These include many relief projects for victims of natural disasters, encouragement of education through scholarships and recognition to outstanding scholars, work in international relief in the Near and Middle East, assistance to religious orders; and recognition of Greek personages and events within this country.

This organization has many goals, among which are: The promotion and encouragement of loyalty to the United States; instruction of the tenets and principles of Government; instilling a due appreciation of the privileges of citizenship; encouragement of its members in participation in community affairs; active participation in working against political corruption; promotion of understanding of the attributes and ideals of Hellenism; and the Hellenic Culture, promotion of good fellowship; and a championism of education.

It is also my pleasure to recognize that there is a local organization of this order within my home State, the State of Montana. At this time, I would like to recognize Mr. Alex George, Mr. Angelo Veroulis, Dr. Dan Lambros, Mr. Gust Carkulis, and Mr. George Lambros. These men are the officers of the current Montana District Lodge. I would also like to congratulate the three active chapters in Montana. They are located in the cities of Butte, Great Falls, and Missoula.

It is indeed a pleasure to recognize a group which has done so much to help this country and other nations. It is hoped that by recognition and congratulation, this group may be encouraged to keep up its goals—goals which are truly gratifying to see in this day and age. I hope that the next 50 years will mean as much to those who belong to the

Order of Ahepa and those who come into contact with the order as the last 50 have.

TRICITY NEWS IS "WHERE IT COUNTS"

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I have long held that one of the best Federal programs in existence today is the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

In the several years of its existence, NYC has given valuable training and employment to thousands of young persons sorely in need of that training and the salaries provided by the Corps.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I found a recent editorial in the Tricity News of Rodeo, Crockett, and Pinole, Calif., to be most well taken.

The editorial, entitled "Where It Counts," is a ringing endorsement of the National Youth Corps, particularly its effectiveness in our country.

I would at this time, Mr. Speaker, congratulate Mr. Henry Leffert, managing editor of the News, for the excellent editorial which follows in the Record:

WHERE IT COUNTS

As one of many harassed taxpayers in this land of plenty we have long been appalled at the generosity with which public tax funds are distributed to myriad projects across the land and around the globe—often with apparently little accountability demanded.

We are impressed, therefore, with the very bountiful return that is taking shape for 130 youngsters in the area from Rodeo to Crockett who are assured of nine weeks summer employment at \$1.65 an hour for a total of approximately \$40,000 in Federal funds channeled through the Neighborhood Youth Corps program.

The kids need money of their own. They need the sense of independence and the lift to the spirit that comes from earning it on their own. And, there's a rich bonus in the work habits and job skills they acquire on the job. This type of federally funded program puts our tax monies to good use right at the local level where it is sorely needed.

In the far distant past, before taxes, liability, regulations and restrictions upon business became so onerous, energetic kids could find after-school jobs and summer jobs. However, that era passed into the musty pages of history and for a great many years it has been difficult for youngsters to obtain employment.

But, in most recent years, the picture has been changing favorably as business, industry and government have, joined forces to ease the problem for youth. This has been stimulated in part, by the mounting costs of juvenile delinquency, but it has been fostered also by the very real concern held by many adults for the plight of young people who desperately wanted jobs and found the cupboard bare.

Beyond the satisfaction of holding a job during the summer, earning one's own money, learning how to work and assimilating heavy dosages of realistic vocational counseling, there are other substantial gains.

A major value lies in the assistance job experience gives youth in making a decision as to the occupation or profession they will choose as a career. We suspect it doesn't take long for them to determine whether they prefer working with tools to working with people; if they prefer working indoors at a desk or outdoors on a job that permits greater mobility. And, after several summers, a student may decide that he better hit the books with greater diligence so he may qualify for college entrance and a professional career.

In our judgement the Neighborhood Youth Corps program is one of the better government programs, and one we are glad to see financed with out tax funds. In fact, we hope more jobs for youth can be found so the program can be expanded beyond the 1354 youngsters in the county which it now covers.

DR. HAMILTON MOWBRAY'S
VINEYARD

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1972

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, recently the Washington Star featured an article on area residents who have taken up the ancient art of growing vinifera for producing their own wines. Dr. Hamilton Mowbray of Westminster was singled out as one of the successful leaders in this movement.

Dr. Mowbray, who is a professor of psychology at Johns Hopkins University, has now made a commercial enterprise out of a former hobby. He has been planting vinifera for 9 years and is in the process of incorporating as Montbray Wine Cellars, Ltd. Last year, Dr. Mowbray reported a yield of 5 tons of Pinot Chardonnay per acre on his 5-acre vineyard. This is an outstanding accomplishment, and I join the Star in congratulating these pioneers in introducing fine grapes in this area.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, July 20, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Nathaniel Thomas Grady, Jr., Church of Our Savior, Yonkers, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everlasting God, in Thee do we live, move, and have our very being. We would pause at this moment to give thanks for all blessings that Thou hast provided our country and her people. Would Thou use the leadership of this Nation as instruments to heal the broken

hearted and set free those which are held in captivity; continue to give us men who dream dreams and give each of us the ability to make those dreams become a living reality. Grant us wisdom and strength to know and to do Thy will; give us hearts and minds so filled with the love of Thy laws, and of that which is righteous and lifegiving, that we may be worthy stewards of the confidence and trust Thou hast placed in our keeping. Now may the God of our weary years,

God of our silent tears, Thou who hast brought us safe thus far; Thou who hast by Thy might, led us into the light, keep us forever in the path. 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 bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 520. An act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the closed basin division, San Luis Valley project, Colorado, and for other purposes; and

S. 1798. An act to foster fuller U.S. participation in international trade by the promotion and support of representation of U.S. interests in international voluntary standards activities, and for other purposes.

THE REVEREND NATHANIEL THOMAS GRADY, SR.

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

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the opening prayer in the House was offered today by my good friend, the Reverend Nathaniel Thomas Grady, Sr., pastor of the Church of Our Saviour, located in my district in Yonkers.

Reverend Grady, in addition to tending to the needs of his own congregation, which he does inspirationally serves as chaplain of the Yonkers Police Department. He is devoting a good portion of his time maintaining the faith of our beleaguered policemen, while this is no small task, his inspiring efforts have been rewarded many times over by the spiritual and moral response of our police officers in Yonkers. I am grateful to Reverend Grady for his dedication to the men whose lives are constantly on the line protecting their fellow citizens.

Reverend Grady is also chaplain of the Ridgehill Rehabilitation Center, a facility for the treatment of narcotics addiction in Yonkers. It is one of the most admirable of all missions, to offer spiritual guidance to those who are seeking release from the dark world of drugs, and hopefully a return to a productive way of life.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly proud and happy that Reverend Grady has accepted my invitation to be here today, as well as 42 young members of his church who are here today and I extend to him and them my own grateful thanks and the warm welcome of the New York congressional delegation.

DEFERMENT OF CONSTRUCTION CHARGES BY WESTLANDS WATER DISTRICT

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1682) to provide for deferment of construction charges payable by Westlands Water District attributable to lands of the Naval Air Station, Lemoore, Calif., included in said district, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and consider the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, strike all after line 24 over to and including "laws." in line 1 on page 3.

Page 3, after line 8, insert:

SEC. 3. Lessees of lands owned by the United States Government within the Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, may receive water from the Central Valley reclamation project subject, insofar as practicable, to the same acreage limitation provisions of Federal reclamation law as private landowners.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so to direct a question to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House to ask him to explain what the amendments will do.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1682 as passed by the House in the first session of this Congress, was for the primary purpose of deferring service to lands owned by the Navy Department on the Lemoore, Calif., Naval Air Station.

This deferral will continue as long as these lands are in public ownership, after which the accumulated charges will be paid by those persons who acquire the lands from the Navy.

The bill, as we passed it, provided that the Navy Department would lease these lands and that the lessees would be, insofar as practicable, subject to the acreage limitation of the Federal reclamation law.

The Senate amended H.R. 1682 in such a way that farmers who now receive water from the Central Valley reclamation project would not be eligible lessees of the Navy lands. Such a restrictive amendment would, in all likelihood make it difficult, if not impossible, to find anyone willing to lease the Navy lands and therefore create a situation in which the irrigation facilities would not be used—and the economic rewards which stem from the irrigated land would be foregone.

The further amendments, which we here today propose to H.R. 1682, will have the effect of making existing Central Valley water users eligible as lessees, but will limit any water user to a single 160-acre tract.

I believe this preserves the spirit of the acreage limitation provisions of reclamation law, creates no undesirable precedents and will result in good, workable legislation from the standpoint of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Navy, and the Westlands Water District.

Accordingly, I renew my request for unanimous consent.

Mr. SAYLOR. Will the amendment which is to be offered by the gentleman from Colorado authorize leasing of more than 160-acre units in the Navy station?

Mr. ASPINALL. To any single individual, no.

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

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

There was no objection.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ASPINALL moves to concur in the Senate amendments with the following amendments:

Page 2. In lieu of Senate amendment numbered (1) strike all after line 24, over to and including "laws." in line 1 on page 3, and insert: "The leases shall also be offered, insofar as practicable, in tracts of 160 irrigable acres each."

Page 3. In lieu of Senate amendment numbered (2), after line 8, insert:

"Sec. 3. No individual lessee shall hold more than one lease, pursuant to this Act, at any given time."

The motion was agreed to.

So the amendments to the Senate amendments were agreed to.

The Senate amendments, as amended, were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Member desiring to do so may be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 15935, RELIEF TO VICTIMS OF HURRICANE AND TROPICAL STORM AGNES AND SOUTH DAKOTA FLOOD DISASTER

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a committee report on H.R. 15935, to provide additional relief to the victims of hurricane and tropical storm Agnes and to the victims of the South Dakota flood disaster, and for other purposes, which has been introduced by myself and the ranking minority member, Mr. WIDNALL. As the Members know, this bill, under a unanimous-consent request, is scheduled for floor action tomorrow, Friday, July 21, and it is the desire of your committee to have available copies of the reported bill and committee report on this legislation for the benefit of the Members.

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

There was no objection.

LESSONS IN WELFARE—CASE NO. 6

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

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, Johnny No Doe's mother received a letter from her Aunt Spinny and Uncle Binny

No Doe. They live in Fulton County, Ga., you know, and I know how interested all of you are in this family, so I would like to read the letter:

ATLANTA, GA.,
June 16, 1972.

LOU ELLA NO DOE,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR LOU ELLA: We can't afford the new social security raise. It's going to cost us so much. Our benefit now is \$1800, and you know we can't live down here on that. So, we applied for Old Age Assistance and they gave us \$300. As a bonus for getting welfare, we also got a medicaid card and surplus food commodities. The medicaid will not pay for the doctor in Georgia, but since we get medicaid, Georgia pays for Part B coverage under medicare and that pays for the doctor. So, we are completely covered. Medicaid pays our \$60 drug bill per month, which would not be covered by medicare. When all of this is added together, we are getting approximately \$3054, but now I understand that the President will be writing us informing us that we are getting a 20% increase in the social security, which would mean that we would get \$2160. We have to give up the Old Age Assistance, the medicaid card, Part B coverage, and the commodities, so in fact, we won't get an increase—we are getting a cut. I can't understand how those people in Washington figure this out. They won't even let us refuse the increase in social security. It seems to me that a better system should be set up.

Take care of Johnny. You know what he means to you.

Love,

AUNT SPINNY and UNCLE BINNY.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT

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

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

There was no objection.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO "FISHBAIT" MILLER

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am told "Fishbait" Miller was born on this date at Pascagoula, Miss., in 1909, but it seems a very short time for the accomplishments of so many good things by one individual.

There is no doubt he was born in Mississippi, Mr. Speaker. His courtly manner, his wit and charm, his friendliness, and his general demeanor mark him as a product of the Old South.

But it is a most remarkable thing that any man including William M. Miller could, in the short span of 63 years, collect so many friends, do so many good things, accomplish so much, elicit such respect and love, and become a legend in his own lifetime.

Nevertheless, that is the case. Indeed he has risen to great heights and it serves to prove once again that where there is concern for one's fellow man, genuine love for everyone, helpfulness in every

heart beat, and an overriding devotion to duty and country that where there is true belief in a Supreme Being anything can be accomplished.

"Fishbait" Miller, in observing yet another anniversary in the service of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress deserves the heartfelt congratulations and sincere thanks of us all and of all Americans.

Pascagoula and the Nation have every right to be proud of "Fishbait" who, in just 63 years, has rubbed elbows with the high and low and has been called friend by everyone with whom he has associated.

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

Mr. SIKES. I shall be happy to yield to my colleague from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my friend from Florida and to express best wishes to our good public servant and fellow associate here in the House of Representatives, and from the Rocky Mountain area of the West we say "happy birthday."

Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, being the only Member in this body who has served under "Fishbait" as a former Doorkeeper and a former employee of "Fishbait," I take this time also to speak on behalf of the doormen who work under him, and wish him many more birthdays.

Thank you.

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

Mr. SIKES. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from Florida and my neighbor in the remarks he just made about our Doorkeeper and my good friend, Mr. Miller.

TRIBUTE TO DR. WILLIAM T. PECORA

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to the memory of Dr. William T. Pecora, who passed away at George Washington University Hospital in this city on yesterday. Dr. Pecora was Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

I became acquainted with Dr. Pecora in the 1960's at which time he was an important employee of the Department of the Interior. I later had occasion to be associated with him during the time he was Director of the Geological Survey in the Department.

I was highly gratified when President Nixon appointed Dr. Pecora to the position of Under Secretary of Interior. Dr. Pecora did an outstanding job in this important assignment. As chairman of the Committee on Appropriations I had occasion to be associated with him on

official matters and as a friend and acquaintance.

Dr. Pecora had many friends in the district which I have the honor to represent in Congress. In May of 1971 he made the commencement address at Texas Tech University in my hometown of Lubbock, Tex.

Mr. Speaker, others will recite the many scientific and scholarly achievements of Dr. Pecora, but I wanted to pay tribute to this great American and express sympathy to Mrs. Pecora and the family left behind.

The Nation owes this man a debt of gratitude for his achievements in the public interest.

ARTISTS IN SCHOOLS PROGRAM

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

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, an enlarged program to put professional artists in schools throughout the country was recently announced by the National Endowment for the Arts and the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The expansion of this successful program will enable more children to communicate creatively by using tools and skills previously unavailable to them.

This program puts young people in contact with professional sculptors, painters, craftsmen, architects, filmmakers, musicians, and dancers through educational programs. At a time when art education is being deleted from many elementary and high school curriculums, this program provides an important supplement to the education of millions of American students. Almost 3,000 students attending Alvernia, Sienna, and Prosser Vocational High Schools in my district have participated in the artists in schools program. It is my hope that additional schools throughout Chicago will participate in this innovative vehicle for cultural appreciation and development as the program expands.

We cannot ignore the importance of art education as a building block for a country of sensitive and communicative individuals. Heightened understanding of the artistic process and its participants will enrich the lives and experiences of hundreds of thousands of American children. We can no longer permit the existence of impoverished minds and hearts because of a lack of commitment to the arts in America.

The impact of the artists in schools program extends beyond the present into a potentially vibrant future for the arts and for a new breed of artistic patrons. The children who participate in this program will constitute a new generation of mutual understanding and experiences in the arts. For, as John Kennedy said:

The poet, the artist, the musician, continue the quiet work of centuries, building bridges of experience between peoples, reminding man of the universality of his feelings and desires and despairs, and reminding him that the forces that unite are deeper than those that divide.

SPIRO AGNEW'S RECORD OF ACHIEVEMENT AS VICE PRESIDENT UNPARALLELED

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, some men, during their terms as Vice President, are remembered only for philosophizing about the lack of a good 5-cent cigar. Mr. Dooley once wrote that to be Vice President was not exactly a crime, but was more like a disgrace. In fact, most Vice Presidents are simply forgotten.

During this administration, however, SPIRO AGNEW has done far more than worry about cigar prices. He has shown that the Vice Presidency is indeed the second highest office in the land, and most certainly has insured that he will not soon be forgotten. His record of achievement during his term is unparalleled in this Nation's history.

It is particularly disturbing, therefore, to learn that Mr. AGNEW has this week been the subject of attack from a very small number of Members of the Senate. These attacks were not justified with any very clear explanations, and some of them have been simply petty criticisms of imagined character defects. My first inclination was simply to ignore them, because they most definitely do not warrant serious intellectual consideration. But I was worried that some individuals in the news media might seize upon them as excuses to create the appearance of a serious "dump AGNEW" movement where none exists.

Quite the contrary, the great majority of our party members strongly support the Vice President. They would be upset and disheartened to say the least if he were not on the Republican ticket in this year's election. Outside of our party, hundreds of thousands and probably millions of average citizens have been attracted by this man's courage and integrity. They have given the Republican Party strength it never before enjoyed. If we were to run in November without SPIRO AGNEW, we would be saying that we were not interested in either these new ideas or this new support. I know a good many of my colleagues will agree with me when I say that such a turn of events could be disastrous for our country and our party.

I want Vice President AGNEW to be renominated, and I want to see our party victorious in November.

VAST MAJORITY OF REPUBLICAN VOTERS SUPPORT SPIRO AGNEW

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

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and dismayed to learn of the attempt by a very, very small number of Republican Senators to have Vice President AGNEW's name removed from the ticket this November.

In speaking out against SPIRO AGNEW, these few Senators do not represent their own constituencies. For the vast major-

ity of Republican voters throughout the Nation—as the opinion polls have shown time and again—support the Vice President as vigorously and as enthusiastically as any man in office has ever been supported. In those polls, no other name has even come close to SPIRO AGNEW's as a running mate for President Nixon.

Of course, when a man is as forthright and candid as Vice President AGNEW has been, he is bound to make a few people unhappy, including some in his own party. But it is these very qualities of forthrightness and candor—so rare in politics today—that have made the Vice President the choice of tens of millions of Americans of both major parties.

At a time when many political leaders were afraid to offend the ultraliberal news media by speaking up for America, Vice President AGNEW spoke up for America. At a time when the national press and the airwaves were filled with reports on the rantings of the lunatic fringe, Vice President AGNEW articulated the views of the lucid center.

And he exposed the America haters in the national media for what they were: hopelessly biased against the institutions and principles that built this country and thoroughly prejudiced in favor of those who would tear down those institutions and abandon those principles.

Vice President AGNEW has put into words the unspoken but deeply felt opinions of most Americans. Some call them the silent majority. The fact that they are a majority—and a strong majority—will become apparent on November 7 when the Nixon-Agnew ticket is returned to office in one of the most lopsided votes ever recorded.

THE RIGHT MEN AT THE RIGHT TIME

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

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, two members of the Republican Party in the Senate have apparently decided that SPIRO AGNEW should be replaced as Vice President. Although I am not certain how they arrived at their opinions, I am certain that their beliefs represent a distinctly minority view, not only within the Republican Party, but among all of our citizens.

The Vice President's record in office has been exemplary. Few other public officials have had the courage for example, to examine the role of the news media in American life, or to challenge the previously sacrosanct positions of university professors and students. While some politicians were tailoring their programs and speeches to the pleasures of these powerful vested interest groups, SPIRO AGNEW was exposing their weaknesses and their inadequacies. It is no wonder that the academic-media complex, as some writers have called it, has responded so harshly. And it is no wonder that men less courageous than the Vice President would at some point seek an opportunity to remove him from the ticket.

SPIRO AGNEW has consistently argued the case for the average citizen, the middle American, the silent majority, call it what you will. In so doing, he has won support from segments of our population that never before considered themselves Republican. And he has most definitely angered those who never will become Republicans. I cannot understand how good Republicans can now ask our party to turn its back on this man. Not only has Mr. AGNEW been an outstanding partisan Republican, he has also had an exhilarating effect on the country as a whole.

I am convinced that the President will announce before our convention that Vice President AGNEW will be with him on the ticket again this November. And I am convinced also that any further attempts to replace AGNEW will be treated with all the scorn they deserve.

THE PRESIDENT ALONE SHOULD MAKE THE CHOICE

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

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, Some of my colleagues in the Senate have apparently decided to call for a "dump AGNEW" movement within the Republican Party. I had thought that a decision on the Vice Presidency was for President Nixon alone to make, and I was prepared to accept his choice. But since this issue has been raised, I refuse to stand by and watch a courageous statesman be bushwhacked by members of his own party.

Mr. AGNEW has contributed more to the success of our party in recent years than any other public figure other than the President himself. He has campaigned long and hard in nearly every State for Republican candidates. He has raised more money for our party than anyone else in history. He has brought into our party people who for years considered themselves Democrats or Independents. He has spoken according to his conscience, and he is deeply respected for his courage. He has demonstrated that men of high intellect and vision can communicate with citizens from all economic classes and ethnic groups.

In my view, there is not another Republican available who could better serve our country as its Vice President. I am so certain of Mr. AGNEW's reputation that I am willing to bet that the great majority of my fellow Congressmen and Senators would strongly favor his renomination. I am even more certain that the people who form the backbone of our party—the average citizens who volunteer their services during every election—want him on the ticket this November. And I am convinced that the President himself is far more aware of the Vice President's personal qualifications and national support than any of those who have raised their voices this week. I endorse Vice President AGNEW for renomination, and I am positive that the people of this country will demonstrate their approval of his conduct as Vice President this fall.

THE NATION WANTS AGNEW

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, many of my fellow Congressmen have spoken out in defense of Vice President AGNEW in the past few days, and I want to join with them. I was quite disturbed to hear reports that a minuscule minority of our colleagues in the Senate apparently want Mr. AGNEW's name removed from the ticket this November. I was especially worried about what kind of emphasis would be given to this movement—if such it can be called—in the mass media.

It has perhaps been SPIRO AGNEW's greatest accomplishment as Vice President that he has brought the political biases of those who report our news to the attention of the average citizen. The recent endorsement of Senator McGovern by the Newspaper Guild simply underscores the point the Vice President has been making for some time. Certain individuals in the media would seize any opportunity to discredit Mr. AGNEW, or attempt to foster a movement to remove him from the ticket.

The unfortunate fact is that any public figure who takes positions contrary to those espoused by the mass publications and the major television networks will be subtly and sometimes not so subtly criticized by them. President Nixon has long been exposed to biased reporting and analysis and it was the Vice President who straightforwardly came to his defense in a number of now-famous speeches.

So I want the news media to know, and I want to make certain that the country knows, that a large majority of my colleagues in the House and Senate are wholehearted supporters of Vice President AGNEW. This is the story the news writers and broadcasters should be disseminating—not that a few men have called for a new Vice President, but that the greatest number of my colleagues here in Washington will not settle for any but the one we have. I want SPIRO AGNEW on this ticket this November, and I am sure the President will show his agreement in August.

AGNEW—THE RIGHT MAN

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

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, many of us who have been involved in Republican politics for a number of years recall the abortive 1956 effort to "dump Nixon" from the Vice-Presidency. That was an unpleasant chapter in our party's history, and not one that many of us want to see repeated. Unfortunately, a small number of Republican Senators seem to have forgotten the consequences of that struggle.

I know the President has not forgotten what happened in 1956, and I am certain he will treat these recent criticisms of Vice President AGNEW with the disdain they deserve. But the issue is deeper than a struggle for the nomination within the

Republican Party. The real issue is this thinly disguised attack on a man who has served his country and his party loyally for almost 4 years as its Vice President.

Anyone who has been Vice President or who has studied the office with any care knows of the difficulties it entails. It takes great dedication to fill a post that John Nance Garner once described as "not worth a bucket of warm spit." For many years that description was accurate. When Richard Nixon was Vice President, however, the situation began to change, and that change has continued unabated since then. In actual fact, SPIRO AGNEW has played a larger role in fostering and implementing policies in this administration than any Vice President in history.

Not only has he expanded the policy-making role of the Vice President, he has continually demonstrated his desire to make the Federal Government and its procedures less burdensome to the average citizen. Through his Office of Intergovernmental Relations, he has sought to cut through the red tape that enmeshes the National Government. In more personal terms, he has traveled to virtually every State in the Nation to speak and converse with citizens. These discussions with the average person have never received the kind of attention they deserved, but that has not changed SPIRO AGNEW's mind about their importance.

I for one am well pleased with his record, and I believe the great majority of the citizens agree with me. I think it would be a great mistake to drop Mr. AGNEW from the Republican ticket this November. I urge the President to retain the Vice President, and keep his winning team intact.

CHOICE OF VICE PRESIDENT SHOULD BE MADE BY PRESIDENT

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on June 29, the President reiterated a position he had taken in January of this year—that Vice President AGNEW was part of a winning team which the President did not wish to break up. This week a few Senators voiced their opinions on this subject, opinions opposed to the President's announced position. In my judgment, the statements of these Senators are not only misguided, but more seriously, they run contrary to what I believe to be the President's prerogative.

Part of our political tradition is the long-standing practice that presidential nominees exercise their own discretion in selecting a running mate. This tradition has been especially strong with incumbent Presidents. Much has been written recently about the supposed value of allowing party conventions to choose the Vice President. It is still my view, based on my political experience and what I believe to be the opinions of a majority of the citizens of this country, that this choice should be made by the President.

I know that the President will consult with members of our party before mak-

ing his decision, but until he solicits that advice, I see no purpose to be served by interjecting uncalled for remarks into his deliberations. It is not sufficient to me that those who have spoken out characterize their remarks as only hypothetical or suggestive. Whatever their intent, these individuals have done a disservice to the President and to the Vice President.

POLITICAL REFORM

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, political reform seems to be a matter of great concern today. I would like to start a new kind of political reform in the matter of the selection of the presidential and vice presidential candidate, which would be simply this: In the case of the Vice Presidency that the candidate be selected by the President and the delegates to the convention, and not by those who write or speak in the media. I think it would be a wholesome improvement in our political system, Mr. Speaker.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 15641, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION, 1973

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1042 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1042

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15641) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule by titles instead of by sections. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. Speaker, I know of no controversy over this rule, and I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1042 provides for 2 hours of debate under an open rule for the consideration of H.R. 15641, the Military Construction Authorization bill for fiscal year 1973.

The rule provides the bill shall be read by title.

The purpose of H.R. 15641 is to au-

thorize funds for military construction for fiscal year 1973.

The total amount authorized in this bill is \$2,575,781,000. The Department of Defense had originally requested \$3,047,961,000. The Committee on Armed Services reduced this by \$472,180,000, of which \$399,400,000 is related to the elimination of the Safeguard construction program.

The authorization for the Safeguard program was eliminated from this bill in anticipation of favorable action by the Congress on the recent SALT agreements concluded by President Nixon during his trip to Moscow. Of the \$399,400,000 for Safeguard taken out of this bill, \$6,000,000 to be used for family housing at the Grand Forks Safeguard site, was transferred to the military procurement bill, H.R. 15495. This bill passed the House on June 27, 1972.

Of the total amount in this bill \$568,920,000 is for the Army, \$520,966,000 is for the Navy, \$283,813,000 is for the Air Force, \$35,709,000 is for Defense agencies, \$1,050,741,000 is for family housing, \$8,447,000 is for deficiency authorizations, and \$107,185,000 is for Reserve components.

One item in this bill is \$19,400,000 to fund the first increment of a new Defense office building to be constructed at Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D.C. The eventual total cost of this structure is presently estimated at \$170,000,000.

The committee report contains a letter from the Department of Defense supporting the originally requested authorization.

There are no minority views in the committee report.

The Committee on Armed Services reported the bill by a rollcall vote of 33 to 1.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 15580, AMENDING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE AND FIREMEN'S SALARY ACT OF 1958

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1041 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1041

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15580) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to increase salaries, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 27(b) of rule XI are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of

the Committee on the District of Columbia, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1041 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 15580 to provide salary increases for District of Columbia policemen and firemen. Because the record vote of the committee to report the bill is not contained in the report, points of order are waived for failure to comply with clause 27(b) of rule XI.

The purposes of H.R. 15580 are to increase the salaries of members of the District of Columbia Police and Fire Departments, to amend their Retirement and Disability Act and to increase certain District of Columbia taxes.

The revised salary schedule will provide an average increase in pay of 17 percent. The increases will become effective on the first day of the first pay period on or after July 1 of this year.

Helicopter pilots and members of the explosive disposal unit shall receive \$2,100 annually in addition to basic salary. Provisions are made for technicians to receive an additional \$680 per year and for detective sergeants to receive an additional \$500 per year. The position of detective sergeant will be phased out by attrition. Plainclothesmen shall receive a clothing allowance of not more than \$300 a year.

Annuity holders shall receive a 17 percent increase and the legislation provides that in the future their annuities will be increased the same percentage as salary increases.

The Retirement and Disability Act is amended that retirement pay will be based on a high-3-year average rather than on base pay at the time of retirement.

In the event an annuitant retires on disability and accepts other employment, a system of oversight and reevaluation of continued disability is established.

Revenue for the cost of the legislation will be derived from an increase in general sales taxes from 4 percent to 5 percent, an increase in taxes on hotel rooms, liquor sales, and meals from 5 percent to 6 percent. These increases will become effective on the first day of the month after the 30th day after enactment of the legislation. The police and fire departments are expected to absorb 15 percent of the costs for fiscal year 1973 in their operating budgets.

Cost of the legislation over a 5-year period is estimated at \$89,240,000.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule in order that the legislation may be considered.

Mr. SMITH of California, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, as stated by the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK), House Resolution 1041 does provide for 1 hour of debate under an open rule for the consideration of H.R. 15580, having to do with salary increases for the District of Columbia firemen and police. The waiver of points of order was necessary because the report did not contain the vote of the committee.

The primary purpose of H.R. 15580 is to provide a raise in salary and increased retirement benefits for District of Columbia policemen and firemen. In addition, this bill will raise taxes in the District to help offset the cost of this legislation.

The bill will provide an average salary increase of 17 percent for the metropolitan police force, the fire department, the Executive Protective Service and the U.S. Park Police. The starting salary for privates will be increased from \$8,500 to \$10,000 per year. These salary increases are to become effective on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after July 1, 1972. The bill will change the longevity system by basing longevity pay upon total years of service in the departments, rather than upon years of service in a given salary class.

Extra compensation is provided for some members of the departments, such as helicopter pilots, members of the explosive disposal unit, technicians and detective sergeants. A clothing allowance is authorized for plainclothesmen. A ceiling on overtime pay is raised, and retirement annuities are increased. The bill provides a measure of surveillance with respect to further employment of officers and members subsequent to their retirement for disability.

Finally, the bill raises taxes in the District of Columbia. The general sales tax is increased from 4 to 5 percent. The sales tax on rentals of transient rooms and lodgings, and on the sale of restaurant meals and all alcoholic beverages is raised from 5 to 6 percent.

The total cost of this bill is estimated at \$17,848,000 for fiscal year 1973. The committee report indicates that the metropolitan police force and the fire department can absorb 15 percent of the estimated cost of this bill for fiscal year 1973, or \$2,677,200, in their operating budgets. This leaves \$15,170,800 which must be paid for out of new revenues. It is estimated that the tax increases will produce \$15,800,000 of additional revenue, which apparently would leave a small surplus.

There are no departmental letters or minority views in the committee report. However, the committee report does note that the Federal Pay Board found that the provisions of this bill are not inconsistent with the criteria which the Board has adopted pursuant to the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 274]

Abourezk	Dowdy	Mills, Ark.
Alexander	Dulski	Mosher
Anderson,	Dwyer	Murphy, N.Y.
Calif.	Edmondson	Obey
Anderson,	Evans, Colo.	Passman
Ill.	Evins, Tenn.	Pike
Anderson,	Flynt	Podell
Tenn.	Fulton	Pryor, Ark.
Ashley	Gallagher	Rarick
Blanton	Goldwater	Rees
Blatnik	Gray	Rooney, N.Y.
Broomfield	Hagan	Ryan
Byrnes, Wis.	Hebert	Scheuer
Carey, N.Y.	Jonas	Scott
Chappell	Jones, Tenn.	Selberling
Clark	Keith	Shipley
Clay	Kemp	Slack
Conyers	Long, La.	Spence
Curlin	McCloskey	Springer
Daniels, N.J.	McClure	Stuckey
Davis, Ga.	McKevitt	Teague, Tex.
Dent	McMillan	Veysey
Diggs	Mathias, Calif.	Wiggins
Dorn	Matsunaga	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 364 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS TO FILE A REPORT ON H.R. 15951

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works have until midnight tonight to file the report on H.R. 15951, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to undertake a national program of inspection of dams.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS TO FILE A REPORT ON H.R. 15950

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works have until midnight tonight to file the report on H.R. 15950, to amend section 125 of title 23, United States Code, relating to highway emergency relief to authorize additional appropriations necessary as a result of recent floods and other disasters.

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

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY COOPERATION

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

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the resumption of active international monetary cooperation by the United States, through its decisions to help preserve the exchange-rate structure agreed at the Smithsonian last December and to reactivate the Swap Network among central banks which provides resources to help do so, is greatly welcome. Such cooperation is essential to promote basic U.S. economic and foreign policy interests. It is gratifying that the administration, along with the Federal Reserve System, has seen the wisdom of this course.

The actions announced yesterday, however, represent only a start toward the major overhaul of the international monetary system which is desperately required if we are to avoid recurring economic crises and the steady undermining of international political relations which they foster. The latest problems, centered on sterling and the dollar, reveal once more that fundamental changes are needed in the means by which international balance-of-payments positions are adjusted and world liquidity is provided, and in the international role for the dollar. Such changes can provide major support for the national interests of the United States. It is, therefore, to be hoped that the actions taken yesterday indicate a U.S. willingness to participate actively, and even help lead, in prompt progress toward negotiating such reforms.

THE 11TH COMMANDMENT

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

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, California Republicans once formulated a rule known as the "11th commandment." That rule said "Thou shalt not speak ill of another Republican." The success of that rule across the country has been demonstrated over the past 8 years as our party has increased its strength on all levels of government. Its success was best proven in the 1968 election of Richard Nixon and SPIRO AGNEW.

And yet at a time when the administration and our party face an unprecedented opportunity to score significant gains in the Congress and the Senate against a disorganized and disunited Democratic Party, some of our own supporters are violating the fundamental precept that has guaranteed our victories in the past. I refer, of course, to the attacks on Vice President AGNEW appearing in the press this week.

The unity of our party is necessary not only for the partisan gain, but also for the best interests of our country. The President has spoken on the subject of his running mate this November. He has stated that he does not now desire to break up a winning team. It is simply foolish to take public positions contrary to that of the President. Good Republicans should be uniting now, to capitalize on the opportunities open to us, and not trying to divide our party.

We all remember the deleterious effects of the "dump-Nixon" movement in 1956. We should all want to obviate any repetition of that fiasco in 1972. I know I speak

for a great majority of my colleagues here in the Congress when I say that I am content to await the President's final decision. If he should ask my advice, I will give it. But I will not countenance any efforts to split this party before or during the convention in August. Republicans who truly wish the President's reelection in November will, I am certain support me in this intention.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION, 1973

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15641) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 15641, with Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FISHER) will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Chairman, today we are presenting H.R. 15641, the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1973.

The purpose of this bill is to provide military construction authorization and related authority in support of the military departments, and is necessary for enactment before appropriations can be provided to finance these activities of the military departments during fiscal year 1973.

The bill as submitted by the Department of Defense requested \$3,040,119,000 for new authorizations.

Our committee recommends the approval of \$2,575,781,000. This is a reduction of \$472,180,000. The Department's request included \$1,073,684,000 for all family housing expenditures including 12,181 new family housing units instead of the 9,684 requested in fiscal year 1972.

The Department of Defense request this year is largely people oriented, as evidenced by the very substantial increase in this area for troop housing and community support facilities, and the increase in the number of family housing units proposed. Your Armed Services Committee has fully supported and encouraged the Department of Defense and the military departments' efforts in this area.

In view of the emphasis on peoples projects in the fiscal year 1973 request, your Armed Services Committee faced an especially difficult task in effecting substantial reductions. However, every member of your Armed Services Committee was determined that the final committee recommendations should be

made on a realistic basis, and recommends only those projects that the committee was fully convinced were essential to our military needs. Including the four military services and the Defense agencies, there were over 800 separate projects at 375 individual installations which your Armed Services Committee had to evaluate.

After extensive hearings by the subcommittee and review of each project requested by the Department of Defense, the committee was successful in searching out those proposals that in our view could be deferred without impairing the operational effectiveness of the armed services. In addition, the committee is convinced that these reductions will in no way jeopardize our national security.

The military construction authorization for fiscal year 1973, as reflected in H.R. 15641, totals \$2,567,334,000 for new authorization and \$8,447,000 for deficiency authorizations.

The committee bill we now seek to bring before the House reduces the amount requested by Defense approximately 15.5 percent. This reduction may be considered somewhat misleading since it includes \$339.4 million related to the elimination of the Safeguard construction. Without Safeguard, the net reduction is approximately 3 percent which is somewhat lower than the reductions made last year by the committee.

In the case of the Reserves, the committee added \$5 million each for the Navy and Marine Corps Reserve and for the Air National Guard, based on the committee's concern regarding the adequacy of the requested program, with particular reference to the fact that in the future we will find ourselves increasingly dependent upon our Reserve Forces. Nevertheless, the committee has reviewed all of the programs and where it felt reductions could safely be made by deferral of projects to subsequent years, such was done.

I would like to discuss each project in H.R. 15641 with you, but I am afraid I would unnecessarily try the patience of the Committee. However, there are many significant items contained in this bill which I do feel that you would be interested in.

I know that one of the matters this Committee would like to be informed of in some detail is the situation in South Vietnam as it relates to the military construction program. Last year this committee reported to you that the construction program in South Vietnam had progressed so well that the contractor effort was scheduled for termination by July 1 of this year, and no additional military construction authorization and appropriation were being requested. In the program now before you, there is no new authorization being requested and the contractor effort, as we reported last year, was terminated on June 30, 19 days ago. The remaining construction in Vietnam in support of RVN forces is being pursued primarily by local contractors and by Republic of Vietnam Army Engineers.

Also, in anticipation of the favorable action by Congress on the recent SALT agreements concluded with the U.S.S.R.,

the committee struck in its entirety the Army's fiscal year 1973 request for Safeguard in the amount of \$387 million as well as a related \$12.4 million reduction in the family housing title—\$6 million of which is for family housing at Grand Forks and was previously considered by the committee in the procurement bill.

Bachelor housing and community support facilities—comprise approximately 25 percent of the entire request for the military departments. These facilities are needed to attract and retain dedicated and competent people in the military service. The bill includes modernized and new bachelor enlisted quarters for approximately 108,000 personnel and 1,700 new or modernized bachelor officers' quarters at a cost of \$387,581,000. Related to the construction of bachelor housing is a proposal by Defense to revise the present statutory limitation from a cost-per-man basis to a square-foot basis. Our committee does not object to this proposal since it maintains the cost control we believe necessary for this important segment of our construction program.

In the family housing title—we have recommended approval for the construction of 11,720 new units. This represents a 19.5 percent increase over those new units authorized last year, excluding housing units for Safeguard. We share the Secretary of Defense's belief that adequate military housing is a key factor in retaining qualified personnel and in moving in the direction of a zero draft. You will also note that title VI expands the homeowners' assistance program to cover homeowners outside the United States who are not now eligible for assistance.

Your Armed Services Committee has long recognized the importance of providing adequate medical care for all service personnel and the need to maintain a forward looking military medical program. Regretfully, this year's program is considerably smaller than last year's program; however, last year the medical portion contained \$112.5 million for Walter Reed, which inflated that program. We believe Defense should do more in this area in future programs as the need is great.

The use of the Department of Defense contingency authority for construction has been under close scrutiny by your Armed Services Committee. As a result of our prompting, the Secretary of Defense has improved the management of this authority. The committee is of the opinion that \$20 million will be sufficient for fiscal year 1973, which is \$10 million less than the Secretary of Defense requested.

This year's bill includes \$171,016,000 for pollution abatement at our military installations. Our committee has fully supported the President's goal to bring our facilities in the United States into compliance with existing standards by December 1972. This committee notes with pleasure that with completion of the work proposed in the fiscal year 1973 bill, the goal of meeting current standards will have been largely met. However, the committee recognizes that more re-

strictive standards are currently evolving so that there will be a continuing need for additional facilities to meet future criteria.

The committee is vitally concerned with insuring the future operational capability of our military installations, particularly airfields which are being threatened by urban encroachment. Several projects to acquire interests in land under the air installation compatible use zone—AICUZ—program are included in this year's bill and have been endorsed by the committee.

The committee has added language to this bill which will insure that in the future the Armed Services Committees will be informed in advance when the Department of Defense plans to acquire significant amounts of lease space through GSA, such as the example of the Department of the Navy's move to the Crystal Plaza from the old Main Navy and the Munitions Building on Constitution Avenue.

The committee is convinced that there is a large deficiency of adequate administrative space in the Nation's Capital area—over 4.7 million net square feet—which can be partially satisfied by the construction of a Defense Office Building at Bolling Air Force Base. This committee supports the need to invest in publicly owned facilities where economy and the long-term interests of the Government have been demonstrated. Accordingly, the committee approved the first increment of the office building—\$19.4 million—which is estimated will ultimately cost a total of \$170 million. Construction of this building which will accommodate 10,000 personnel—1.5 million square feet—will also provide for a major reduction in the amount of leased space for the Department of Defense.

Additionally, the committee provided for deficiency authorizations to prior year enactments. A problem did exist in this area in the past and, as a result of our investigations, new procedures were put into effect by the services and an increased flexibility was enacted in fiscal year 1970. The necessity to amend prior year authorizations has not disappeared; however, we believe that it is now under control. For instance, the number of deficiency requests has dropped from a high of 28 in fiscal year 1971, to 12 in fiscal year 1972, and to only 10 in this year's program.

Your Armed Services Committee has spent many hours on this bill, and I can assure you that it is a good bill. Enactment of our recommendations will enhance the security of these United States by providing the armed services with those facilities required to maintain our fighting forces at a creditable deterrence level. We have done this without undue sacrifice of our Nation's resources. I feel strongly that we have fulfilled our responsibility to the American taxpayer.

In summary, members of the Committee, I feel your Armed Services Committee has done an outstanding job with this bill and has again demonstrated its competence in handling a tough job in a reasonable time, and finally, has demonstrated its awareness of the need for fiscal restraint. Therefore, I urge your unanimous support.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to invite the specific attention of the committee to a new program designed for the use of lands adjacent to military airfields that will be compatible with essential flying activities. When our military airfields were established, years ago, they were sited in rural areas. This was to protect population centers from aircraft operation noise and to minimize damage to property and lives in the event of accidents. Over the years this degree of separation between military flying operations and urban development has eroded as our country has experienced great urban expansion and as the military installations provided an economic attraction.

As a result, homes, schools, and public buildings have been constructed in close proximity to military installations. The inhabitants soon experienced considerable discomfort from high noise levels that were significantly aggravated as we moved into the jet age. All too frequently members of these communities have sought relief through limitations on or outright termination of military flight operations. Obviously relief of this sort seriously compromises the value of the substantial investment that the Federal Government has made in the affected installations.

To prevent this situation from becoming more critical the Air Force has proposed the compatible use zone concept. This concept envisions the restrictive use of lands in a rectangular zone extending 1 mile on each side of the runway centerline and 2½ miles beyond each end of the runway. The area within this zone is subjected to the greatest noise intensity and is the area of greatest potential for landing or takeoff accidents.

It is not necessary that the zone remain as open unused land nor that its use be restricted to agriculture. Compatible use can certainly be profitable and complement communities in the general location. The basic criteria is that its use not result in high density populations. Quite in keeping with the concept would be the use of the area for light industry, non-spectator sports and recreation, scrap and wrecking yards, open storage, cargo terminals, agriculture and other low density uses.

Ideally, forceful community planning and zoning would be the most economical method of achieving the concept, and at some military installations this technique is quite effective. Where it cannot be arranged the Air Force will then attempt to secure an interest in the lands within the zone by an exchange for excess of surplus lands of equal value. As a last resort the Air Force would turn to the purchase of sufficient interest in land within the zone to be able to restrict it to use compatible with flying operations.

The concept is programed on an incremental basis over a number of years. This bill carries the initial authorization involving 20,100 acres of land at a potential value of \$12 million. However, in anticipation of reasonable success in lo-

cal zoning and a greater degree of success in land exchanges only \$2 million is being requested in appropriations.

I am pleased to support an authorization that so reasonably approaches a serious problem and I suggest and solicit the support of this body so that the program may move ahead.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15641, the fiscal year 1973 military construction authorization bill. This is a sound bill. I urge its immediate enactment. At this point I would like to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas, for his vigorous and patriotic leadership in drafting and presenting this bill. The members of the subcommittee also worked diligently and effectively to produce it. They too deserve much credit.

Mr. Chairman, this is the second of the major authorization bills that the Armed Services Committee presents to the House each year. Earlier we presented the weapons procurement authorization bill.

As the chairman of the subcommittee pointed out in his opening remarks, we were unable to reduce the Department of Defense's request more than we did because of the emphasis on "people projects." Approximately 25 percent of the entire request for the military departments is for bachelor housing and community support facilities. Also, I would like to point out to my colleagues that our committee actually did not have the entire \$3 billion request to work on from the outset, because approximately \$700 million of the \$1.1 billion authorized in the family housing section—title V—are relatively fixed costs. This amount is for mortgage payments, and for operating and maintaining the housing inventory of over 370,000 units. There is very little flexibility, if any, in these costs. Therefore, you can see the difficulty faced by the Armed Services Committee in its consideration of this bill.

I would like to express my full support of H.R. 15641 because it recognizes twin goals: it provides construction which our committee believes to be absolutely necessary, and at the same time it recognizes the President's call for economy and a reduction of defense expenditures whenever possible. I will not take the time of the House to go into extensive details because I do not think it is necessary to repeat what our chairman has already told you.

The reductions made by the Armed Services Committee were not based on a judgment that the items were not desirable or important, but because the committee felt that they could be safely deferred without jeopardizing the security of the Nation or reducing the effectiveness of our military services.

Our committee was certainly pleased that no request for authorization was presented for any further construction in Southeast Asia. Information furnished the committee revealed that our construction effort is over 97 percent in place and that the contractor combine terminated its operation on June 30, 1972.

The chairman has talked to you about the increased request for family housing.

However, I want to point out that I can think of no area where the requirement is more justified, or where we can get a better return for our money. I am sure that most Members of this House receive letters from service personnel outlining problems of one kind or another. We all receive these letters daily. But, I am willing to wager that 999 out of 1,000 received by our committee request better housing rather than more pay. Last year we approved a pay increase for the dedicated men and women in the armed services. I can think of nothing more contradictory than to approve such a pay increase as we did and then disapprove housing expenditures which have, if anything, an even greater impact on career retention. In this regard, I am especially pleased with the bill not only in relation to family housing but in the steps we are taking to improve the quality of bachelor housing for both officer and enlisted personnel. I pointed out to you earlier that approximately 25 percent of the military construction program for the armed services was to improve living conditions for bachelor personnel. We are long overdue in making improvements in this area. I would like to emphasize to the House that the offset agreement reached with the Federal Republic of Germany will greatly improve our bachelor housing conditions in that country.

The kasernes, which house our bachelor enlisted personnel in Germany, were constructed for the most part in the late 19th or early 20th century according to European standards for that period. Under the offset agreement reached in December 1971, the Federal Republic of Germany assumes responsibility for a major rehabilitation program to the U.S. barracks in Germany. The German Government has this program presently underway and will spend approximately \$183 million improving living conditions in Germany for our bachelor personnel. We are advised that the program is proceeding expeditiously and the morale of our personnel is already improving.

Mr. Chairman, there are many other things I could say about this legislation, but I will not take the time of the House to do so now. The committee report fully spells out the various programs approved, and we are prepared to answer any questions that the Members may have.

I know that there are members who feel that there are justifiable programs in their districts which deserve to be authorized. I can only say that, looking at one project alone, I would probably agree with them. But we are obliged to evaluate each project on its merits relative to other proposed projects. This bill is limited to what we deem essential. We look upon a stable economy as the second line of defense.

I hope that the Members of the House will support the bill in that spirit.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, the military construction authorization bill, prepared by Subcommittee No. 2 of the Armed Services Committee under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from

Texas (Mr. FISHER), represents a significant and a prudent step forward in providing housing and other facilities which are sorely needed to support our Armed Forces.

I warmly congratulate the chairman and the members of his subcommittee on this very fine work.

As noted in the committee report, the bill emphasizes "people projects." There is over a billion dollars recommended for family housing, including the construction of 11,720 new family housing units and an increase of over \$10 million in family housing improvements. This will represent the highest dollar amounts and numbers authorized in any year under the family housing program. In addition, some 20 percent of the regular construction program will be spent to improve living conditions for bachelor personnel. I personally feel that the provision of adequate and attractive family housing and bachelor housing represents one area in which the Department of Defense and the Congress can take very positive steps to improve the welfare of military personnel and their families and to improve the recruitment and retention of qualified personnel in the Services.

The bill properly continues the emphasis on pollution abatement which has been evidenced in the last few years. It also allows that prudent steps be taken to effect timely exchange or purchase of land near air installations to prevent its development for uses incompatible with these installations.

We have had serious problems in this connection heretofore. It is time to correct the situation.

I feel that the committee has done an excellent job in weeding out some projects for which there appears to be less urgency and in including other badly needed projects in the bill, so as to produce a substantial net reduction of \$73,185,000. Sound savings always are welcome to the taxpayers.

There is one subject which concerns me in the area of family housing, and I would like to obtain the committee's opinion on it, if possible. H.R. 13771 and H.R. 14917 would authorize the military Secretaries to declare inadequate certain on-base family housing. I understand that this is considered an increasingly important morale problem. The Department of Defense has indicated a favorable response to this proposal.

I know of the interest of the distinguished gentleman from Texas and his subcommittee in this matter. I believe the committee has discussed it with Defense witnesses.

May I ask the chairman if it is anticipated that it will be possible to obtain action on this matter during this session of Congress?

Mr. FISHER. In response to the gentleman's inquiry, the committee has given a considerable amount of study to this particular problem, to which the gentleman from Florida refers. I know there is much interest being manifested in it.

I understand the legislation the gentleman referred to has been referred to the subcommittee, and we are hopeful that a hearing can be set upon it in the near future.

Mr. SIKES. I appreciate the distinguished gentleman's response.

Again I want to congratulate the Committee on Armed Services and particularly the chairman and the members of the subcommittee for their excellent work on the military construction bill. I strongly recommend its approval.

The military construction programs, Mr. Chairman, are small in comparison to most of those considered by the Congress, but they are very essential to the morale and the effectiveness of the personnel of the armed services and their families. We are making substantial improvements in military facilities, but our country can and should do more. We in the Congress will, I believe, welcome enlarged programs from the Department of Defense where they are justified.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIRNIE).

(Mr. PIRNIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, it has been a privilege to serve on the subcommittee which has conducted the hearings on this military construction authorization bill. Our attitude has been very much that described by the gentleman from Florida, and our emphasis has been very definitely upon the welfare of our personnel in the armed services.

I fully support the military construction authorization bill as presented by the Armed Services Committee and am particularly pleased with the family housing program contained in title V of the bill. This portion of the bill reflects general agreement by the committee with the Department of Defense position which continues to place major emphasis on the maintenance of our Armed Forces and the welfare of our individual servicemen. I believe that the consensus of the Congress is that the "provision of adequate housing for military families is of vital importance to enhancing career attractiveness and achieving an all-volunteer force," as was stated by Assistant Secretary of Defense Shillito in recent testimony.

Bearing this in mind, title V authorizes the appropriation of funds in the amount of \$1,050,741,000 for the Department of Defense family housing program. This amount is to cover: construction of 11,720 new housing units; increased emphasis on improvements to existing housing; operation, maintenance, and debt payment of the existing housing inventory; and the leasing of housing in specified situations. However, an amount of \$4,089,000 associated with the request to expand the leasing program was deleted as were other minor requests.

Overall, I feel the committee has done an excellent job in appraising the needs of the Department of Defense in this vital area and I am confident that the program which is being presented will assist materially in establishing the attractiveness of a career in the military services. I heartily recommend your acceptance of this bill.

I would like to pay tribute to the leadership of the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the subcommittee, who has been most exacting in directing the

study of this bill. He has been very fair and comprehensive in the handling of the hearings, and his remarks with respect to the objectivity of the bill reflect not only his personal views but that of those who have been privileged to serve with him.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY).

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 15641, and am proud to be a member of this subcommittee under the able leadership of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FISHER) which went into this bill in great detail.

I would like to commend the chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FISHER), and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRAY), the ranking member on the Republican side, and the other members of the subcommittee, and especially our counsel, who have presented today a good bill.

I am in full agreement with the committee's recommendation regarding facilities for the Reserve Forces in title VIII, and my remarks will be limited to title VIII of the bill pertaining to the Reserve Forces.

Mr. Chairman, Reserve Forces must be recognized as a vital element of the first line of defense against external threats to our Nation. The Reserve and National Guard will be the primary source of military manpower in future emergencies instead of increased draft calls. To enable the Reserve Forces to accomplish this important role, adequate facilities are required to insure that the necessary level of combat readiness can be obtained.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 15641 includes \$107,185,000 for Reserve Forces facilities, which, Mr. Chairman, is 33 percent over last year's amount, and which is the largest amount authorized for Reserve Forces facilities during the last 10 years.

In view of the role we expect the Reserve Forces to play in future emergencies, this increased emphasis must be taken to insure that our Guard and Reserve units are provided with modern and effective training facilities. This bill includes \$33,570,000 for the Army National Guard; \$33,500,000 for the Army Reserve; and \$19,175,000 for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves; \$14 million for the Air National Guard; and \$6,400,000 for the Air Force Reserve.

I believe it is significant that reductions were possible and were made in other portions of the initial military construction request.

However, Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Armed Services was concerned that the requests for the Navy and Marine Corps Reserves and the Air National Guard were inadequate. The Committee on Armed Services' concern was demonstrated when it was found necessary to increase the amount for the Navy and Marine Corps Reserve, and the Air National Guard by \$5 million each. This additional \$10 million will provide those urgent facilities which should be provided now.

Mr. Chairman, there is a shortfall, a dropoff, of selected Reserve strengths

of 48,800—almost a 50,000 shortfall—as of June 30, 1972, in the Reserve Forces of the United States. I am hopeful the improvement of the facilities for Reserve Forces will attract young Americans into the Reserve program.

I support the committee's concern regarding the Reserve Forces, and endorse the committee's recommendations as set forth in H.R. 15641.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FISHER) for yielding me this time.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CLANCY).

(Mr. CLANCY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, we are pleased with the progress that the Department of Defense is making in air and water pollution abatement and feel that the services are truly taking the lead in this Nation's concerted effort to protect and enhance our environment. This year's program again indicates an acceleration of this effort and represents a significant increase over the authorization requested for this purpose last year. The greater emphasis evidenced by this program is in consonance with the national policy declared by the National Environmental Policy Act. This is also in accord with Executive Order 11507, dated February 4, 1970, which requires that necessary actions to abate pollution by Federal agencies be completed or underway by December 31, 1972.

For too long this Nation has regarded its atmosphere and water resources as limitless, free resources. The limits are now in sight and we must move to preserve what is left not only for ourselves but for those who will follow. This committee has been providing authorization for pollution on an accelerated basis at defense installations since fiscal year 1968. From fiscal year 1968 through fiscal year 1972 these authorizations amounted to approximately \$307 million. This year's program includes \$171 million for air and water pollution control at defense installations both in the United States and overseas. Of this total amount, \$106.9 million is for the abatement of water pollution at 79 installations and \$64.1 million is for the abatement of air pollution at 54 installations. The water pollution control projects will provide treatment of sewage and waterborne industrial wastes, including some advanced waste treatment projects and connection, wherever feasible, to regional waste water treatment facilities, to comply with updated Federal, State, and local water quality standards. This year's program also includes collection and onshore treatment facilities for handling of ship wastes. This is the initial effort to control water pollution from naval vessels at shore installations.

The air pollution control projects are principally fuel conversions for heating plants to also comply with updated Federal, State, and municipal air quality standards regarding sulfur and fly ash. Other air pollution control projects relate to processing industrial exhausts and the construction of incinerators. We have been advised that all of these projects

have been coordinated with the Environmental Protection Agency. Full advantage will be taken of the research and development efforts of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Defense, and Industry.

In last year's program, all water pollution projects were included as one line item for each of the services, as were all air pollution rated projects. This practice is continued in this year's program, as the improved visibility provided in this manner has assisted greatly in the management and execution of the program.

We fully endorse the efforts of the Defense Department in identifying and programming these pollution abatement projects and the full amount requested for authorization is approved. This program essentially completes the initial effort by the services to bring all installations into compliance with existing standards. However, we realize that new legislation and updated quality standards will impose follow-on projects in subsequent years.

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

Mr. CLANCY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I rise to address a few remarks to several areas of this year's military construction bill (H.R. 15641) that are of particular interest to me and I believe will be to the whole body of the House. Before proceeding with my remarks, I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Congressman O. C. FISHER, the chairman of Subcommittee No. 2 of the Armed Services Committee, for the expeditious and effective manner in which hearings on this important bill were handled this year. Nor should I overlook and give recognition to the leadership, guidance and assistance given to the committee by the chairman, the able gentleman from Louisiana, Congressman F. EDWARD HEBERT.

My remarks will be limited to a discussion of the Navy's pollution abatement, people oriented, and 6th Fleet support programs. For the last several years, the requests for pollution abatement facilities have been increasing. This year the Navy was asked to explain the significance of these programs in lay terms so that all Members of Congress would have a clear understanding of what the pollution abatement program provides the military services. It was also felt that this type of information could be used for providing more accurate and descriptive responses on the increasing number of inquiries that are being received from constituents on the subject of pollution abatement facilities. A complete statement on this subject will be found in this year's hearings. Therefore, I shall only highlight some of the more significant elements of this statement. The first thing we should recognize is that pollution abatement is simply a new term for many types of facilities that we have been authorizing for years that have had as an objective the improvement of the environment. Some examples of these facilities are sewage treatment plants, sewage distribution systems, land fills, and boiler plant stack emission controls.

What has brought about this increased emphasis on pollution abatement? It is recognition of the need to do more, with an increasing population. To maintain the quality of air and water that are such vital elements in our lives. I am sure if most of you search your memories you do not have to go back far to find remembrances of powerplants belching out clouds of black smoke, or being aware of the fact that Lake Michigan was the repository for the discharge of many of the sewer systems from towns that bordered on the lake after only primary treatment. For those of you on the coasts you may have similarly been aware that some cities were dumping their sewage into the ocean without treatment.

Previously, restrictive standards for water quality were minimal to protect us from the more obvious diseases such as typhoid and dysentery.

The air quality standards were based more on the effects on the wash hanging on the line than on the harmful effects gases such as nitrous oxides and sulphur dioxide may have on the health of man.

Now, however, as a result of Federal, State, and local laws and regulations the treatment of human sewage must be upgraded and the effluent treated so that it no longer depends upon a larger water course to dilute it and render it harmless; boilers must be converted to burn cleaner fuels, oil, and gas instead of coal; and scrubbers must sometimes be installed so that the stack gases are clean; systems must be installed on fire-fighting training schools which prevent dense black clouds of smoke rising into the air; sanitary landfills must take the place of trash destruction by open burning; ships can no longer dump untreated sewage into the Nation's estuaries, but rather must pump into pier sewers and treatment plants; industrial wastes must be treated and rendered harmless.

All of the problems enumerated will be corrected in part by facilities authorized in this bill which provides \$81.4 million for Navy pollution abatement facilities.

I would also like to make a few observations with respect to the Navy's people-oriented facilities program. When I say Navy, I am also including the Marine Corps, since the Marine Corps probably has devoted more of their facilities construction program to people-oriented projects than any other service over the last several years.

The Navy allocated 22 percent of this year's program to troop housing and community support facilities. Last year, the authorization for these facilities categories was 39 percent of the total Milcon authorization. What is the driving force in the need for improvement in these types of facilities? The Navy believes that the modernization of the shore establishment to support operations, and the modernization of the Navy's maintenance/productive base will be without benefit unless the Navy can recruit and keep qualified personnel to operate the current and future weapon systems.

This program has as its objective, which was best stated by the Marine Corps, the provisions of modern, com-

portable, and reasonably private living accommodations and personnel support type facilities for bachelors that will influence their desire to make the Navy or Marine Corps a career. With the prospects for an all-volunteer force, the need for emphasis on people-oriented facilities is likely to be enhanced.

I, for one, am delighted to see this type of people-oriented facilities program, which does something for the unsung servicemen that have contributed so much for our country over the past several years. We should probably be doing more, but I am confident that the Navy has tried to strike a balance between their operational, maintenance, and logistic support facility requirements and their people-oriented facilities program.

Evidence of the need for a balanced program is the requirement for a modest construction program at the Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Sicily, and the Naval Detachment, Souda Bay, Crete.

The Soviet Union's shift to a maritime strategy over the past decade has manifested itself by the emergence of the Soviet Mediterranean Fleet, comprising missile ships, modern amphibious assault ships and submarines. This force has increased its operations in the Mediterranean Sea and utilizes several eastern Mediterranean ports for replenishment. Our policy commits the Navy to a strong role in the eastern Mediterranean to insure the strategic balance is not altered and that Middle East policy options are not limited. The Navy's successful performance of this mission is hampered by the austere shore-based support facilities in the eastern Mediterranean. This year's program continues a program started in fiscal year 1971 to upgrade the installations at the naval air facility—NAF—Sigonella, Sicily, and Naval Detachment—NAVDET—Souda Bay, Crete. These bases are strategically located close to primary 6th Fleet operating areas and offer in being operational airfields for use in fleet air logistics, air anti-submarine warfare, and military airlift operations, with the Souda Bay port facilities also capable of supporting 6th Fleet ships.

The current Military Airlift Command—MAC—terminal for all 6th Fleet personnel and most air cargo logistics is at Naval Station, Rota, Spain, outside the western end of the Mediterranean. The 6th Fleet operations are now oriented predominately to the central and eastern Mediterranean, a distance of about 1,200 to 2,500 miles eastward. Materials and personnel are distributed to the fleet by Fleet Tactical Support Squadron VR-24 homeported in Rota with a detachment at NAF Naples. Further delivery to the fleet is made by carrier onboard delivery aircraft having a range of 500 to 1,200 miles. Establishing a 6th Fleet MAC terminal at Sigonella and changing the homeport of VR-24 to Sigonella with a detachment at Souda Bay will extend the logistics support 1,200 miles farther into the area of operations and put VR-24 aircraft within single flight range of the 6th Fleet carriers.

Improved maintenance and personnel support facilities will be provided for ASW land-based patrol units to correct

severe crowding and other shortcomings now encountered during deployments to Sigonella. The facilities at Souda Bay will be adequate to support a detachment of land-based ASW patrol aircraft.

While these facilities address only the normal intensity of operations anticipated, the improved base structure they provide will enable loading surges of up to 50 percent to be accommodated during unforeseen contingency situations. The facilities programs requested for the naval air facility, Sigonella and the naval detachment, Souda, are \$8.9 million and \$5.3 million, respectively.

The committee believes the modest investments in the provision of facilities at the naval air facility, Sigonella, and the naval detachment, Souda Bay, will result in material benefits in terms of operational and logistic support to the 6th Fleet.

From an examination of just three portions of the Navy's program, I believe it is clear that the committee, the Department of Defense, and the Navy have a difficult task in attempting to come up with a balanced military construction authorization program. Although the task is difficult, I firmly believe that this year's bill strikes a good balance between operational, logistic support, pollution abatement, and people-oriented facilities. I recommend your passage of the bill as presented.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DANIEL).

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation and I commend the chairman of the subcommittee for his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on behalf of the troop housing projects for the Army in the military construction bill.

During the hearings on this bill your committee reviewed the Army facilities and determined that the Army was moving ahead in an orderly and resolute manner in bringing up the housing to adequate and modern standards. This bill before you provides for construction of 15,901 new enlisted barrack spaces and 458 bachelor officer quarters at permanent installations in the United States. In locating the new construction the Army has assured us that emphasis has been placed on those troop stations which have shown the largest deficits in permanent construction and which would also assist in taking World War II temporary barracks out of service as rapidly as possible.

I think a brief description of the barracks standards for which the Army is requesting funds is appropriate in that the Army is asking us to support a level of facility development. The Army recently completed competition to obtain a modern barracks design which will provide new living accommodations commensurate with the needs of today's soldier. Two outstanding designs were selected and these will form the basis for standard plans for barracks at large divisional installations. The new design will create simple and functional type dormitory type accommodations, as differentiated from the open-bay, institu-

tional-looking barracks which have been the past standard. While the new design will increase the gross area of the barracks by about 10 percent, the interchangeable use of rooms, modular construction potential, and repetitive layouts are expected to keep the overall cost at the level which would be experienced if the current designs were utilized. This small increase in gross area is by no means extravagant and will help in overcoming the lack of personal privacy and the insufficiency of security of personal belongings that continue to be irritants to our soldiers in the Army today.

To direct the formulation of a plan for housing adequacy, the Army has established an Army Housing Committee. This committee, first of all, provides a forum for continuous communications among the various Army staff elements having responsibilities in the field of housing; second, reviews proposals for housing improvement from staff proponents; and third, assures accelerated action in the formulation and coordination of a comprehensive plan for achieving housing adequacy.

The new construction and modernization projects in the fiscal year 1973 program are completely in consonance with the committee's deliberations. Additionally, the Army has developed a new Army stationing and installations plan that is fundamental to housing planning since it establishes the basis of requirement by installation.

I believe it is of paramount importance to provide our soldiers with adequate housing. If we continue to require that they live in old dilapidated structures, we cannot possibly expect to attract quality personnel to volunteer for service in our Armed Forces, much less retain those career personnel who are presently serving.

I, therefore, earnestly recommend that we approve those troop housing projects included in the bill presently before you for consideration.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BRINKLEY).

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of provisions in this bill that will enable the Air Force to continue their important program for the modernization of facilities at their logistics command depots. We are providing authorization in fiscal year 1973 for \$29.5 million for projects at five Air Force depots. Last year we provided authorization of \$55 million to enable the Air Force to initiate this important program. It is a long-range program and we see a need for additional authorizations over the next few years.

Authorizations already granted and those required in the future will enable the Air Force to replace facilities that have long since outlived their useful life and also some facilities that are functionally inadequate to meet the demands of processing the advanced weaponry of today. Some of the facilities in use today were constructed in early World War I and many others originally designed and constructed for a 5-year life have been extended in use for as much as 25 years.

The work to be done by the Air Force

should provide significant economies in personnel and material resources. As an example on some facilities already authorized planning has already reached the point where the Air Force has been able to program personnel reductions. This was an important consideration to the committee since the members wanted assurance that the newly authorized construction would not be used to build up Air Force organic capability to absorb work which the committee feels should continue to be placed with aerospace contractors.

The authorizations proposed are in recognition of a program that has been professionally prepared. It is balanced as to cost versus assured economies, it preserves the balance between work accomplished by organic forces and that accomplished by contractors and it provides facilities that are in consonance without modern Air Force weapons.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT).

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, it is my distinct privilege to address my colleagues and give my full support to the fiscal year 1973 military construction bill. Under the most able and wise leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, the Committee on Armed Services has produced a well-balanced program that is responsive to the needs of each of our military services. In giving my support to this authorization bill, I will address my remarks to title II, the Navy's portion, which totals \$520,966,000.

The Navy portion of this bill reflects the Navy shore establishment's purpose of providing worldwide logistic support that is required for our naval forces. These requirements are more critical due to increased activity and development of Soviet naval forces. To keep pace with this threat, the Navy requires new and improved research and development facilities that will promote technological developments which will lead to new and more efficient naval forces, weapon systems and logistic support. New facilities are also needed for our fighting men to keep their morale high and induce them to select the military as a career. Many existing naval facilities are old, dilapidated and cannot provide the facilities support needed to maintain the fleet at a maximum degree of readiness so important for insuring and supporting national policy. I would like to discuss several categories of projects to give you an idea of the wide spectrum of projects and requirements that this program is responsive to.

The first category is operational and training facilities. Major projects in this category range from ship berthing improvements at the Naval Station, Charleston, S.C., and dredging for the Naval Submarine Base, New London, Conn., to an academic building at the Naval War College, Newport, R.I. Other major specific projects include pier alterations and utilities at the Naval Air Station, North Island, Calif., at the Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, Calif., and at the Naval Station, San Diego, Calif.; applied instruction buildings at the Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tenn.; a combat systems maintenance school at

the Naval Schools Command, Mare Island, Calif.; an electronics warfare training facility at the Naval Communications Training Center, Pensacola, Fla.; and a recruit processing facility at the Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill.

The second general category is for maintenance and production facilities. This category includes major projects for an aircraft maintenance hangar at the Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Sicily; jet engine test cells at Naval Air Rework Facility, Jacksonville, Fla.; an aircraft assembly hangar at Naval Air Rework Facility, Pensacola, Fla.; and a bomb loading plant modernization, at Naval Ammunition Depot, McAlester, Okla.

There is one major project in the category for research, development, and test facilities and that is the radar laboratory at the Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, D.C.

Category 4 is supply facilities and includes projects like a cold storage warehouse at the Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Va.

Medical facilities are the fifth category. This year, two new hospitals at New Orleans, La., and at Pensacola, Fla., are approved so that proper and adequate medical aid can be given to service personnel and their dependents. There are also five projects for dispensary improvements.

Category 6, administrative facilities, covers a wide range of functional requirements, including administrative space at the Naval Facility, Sigonella, Sicily, an engineering/system analysis addition at the Naval Air Rework Facility, Quonset Point, R.I., and a data processing center for the Navy Finance Center, Cleveland, Ohio.

Category 7 is housing and community facilities. Once again, significant emphasis is placed on bachelor housing, messing facilities, and community support facilities, by the Navy. Morale and retention of personnel will be increased by providing personnel with facilities that compare favorably with those found in the civilian community.

Category 8 is utilities and ground improvements. Projects in this category are essential for shore activities to provide full and effective fleet logistic support. Primarily, these projects involve the upgrading and modernizing of obsolete systems which are presently operating under full or overloaded capacities. Another major portion of category 8 is air and water pollution abatement projects. These projects demonstrate the Navy's awareness of the seriousness of the pollution problem and its willingness to vigorously pursue a program for its correction. The projects include boiler plant emission controls, landfill and dunnage disposal facilities, incinerators, pier sewer systems for the collection of shipboard wastes, and plants for industrial waste treatment. There are also projects for wastewater, waste oil, and other waste treatment.

The ninth and final category is real estate. The Navy has one major project that will acquire the necessary land to prevent urban encroachment within the explosive hazard zone at the Naval Ammunition Depot at Oahu, Hawaii.

The Marine Corps program makes up about 20 percent of the Navy's total program and its significant aspects can be summarized as follows: A large portion of the program is for a land exchange project at Marine Corps Air Stations in Orange County, Calif., that will prevent urban encroachment from curtailing air operations at El Toro and Santa Ana Air Stations. Another significant portion of the program is for new or modernization of bachelor housing facilities as the Marine Corps also feels that this is a significant factor in troop morale and retention. The remaining portion of the Marine Corps program is devoted to aviation operation and maintenance facilities, dental facilities, administrative space, and facilities for improving and/or expanding utility systems.

A wide range of requirements has been effectively developed by the committee into a balanced program that handles the urgently needed projects first. These projects are all valid requirements and I recommend that you approve this bill in its entirety.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to voice my support for the construction of the Western Medical Institute of Research which is included in the bill before us at this time.

The new facility of which I speak is designed to provide a capability for general medical research with the emphasis in the field of infectious diseases that cause non-effective rates in the U.S. Army. The research will be particularly oriented toward communicable and infectious diseases of remote areas of the world.

I can testify from personal experience that during periods of armed conflict, infectious diseases, particularly tropical diseases, have taken a toll in man-days which has far exceeded that of enemy action. When our young men are sent to combat in tropical environments, they are faced with these additional dangers. Many of the diseases they are exposed to are capable of killing and incapacitating just as surely as enemy armies. It is my considered view, both as a physician and as a former member of the armed services, that before we commit our troops to such areas we should make every effort to develop the medical weapons to conquer and prevent these diseases.

Malaria, snail fever, dengue fever, sand-fly fever, and diarrheal diseases all have the capability to immobilize armies. These few examples are provided to illustrate the urgency of construction of the Western Medical Institute. Research programs addressing these kinds of problems are indispensable to timely development of effective preventive measures for future use with troops. This effort must be supported now, since the research to accomplish the stated goals will require a number of years for completion. The preventive measures must be ready in advance. The cost of not having them will be tremendous.

Exemplary of the cost of tropical disease are the more than 42,000 cases of malaria that have occurred in U.S. troops operating in Vietnam. The cost has been over \$36 million in hospitalization, per-

sonnel replacement, and man-days lost. To delay the necessary research will not save money. Delay, however, will engender a significant risk of an enormously more expensive disease among combat troops in the next several decades.

At the present time, the Army's research activities engaged in combating these diseases are widely scattered, severely overcrowded, and seriously outdated.

The Western Medical Institute of Research will correct a bad, if not deplorable situation first conceived and started during World War II, but unfortunately allowed to lapse. The institute represents the first step in a long-range plan to consolidate the Army Medical Department's research institutes in the continental United States. This consolidation will increase efficiency, reduce overhead costs, and diminish needs for supporting personnel. This is especially appropos in this day of enhanced transport and communication. The Western Medical Institute will combine into one facility the activities of three laboratories now scattered over the United States and Japan. This consolidation will enormously enhance the productivity of the research effort in tropical diseases. Colocation of the Western Medical Institute with Letterman Army General Hospital is essential. This relationship will provide research expertise and corresponding research laboratory support to the hospital, in return for access to its clinical facilities and patient population. The Letterman staff will be stimulated, and patient care will be improved to even higher levels than those now achieved.

The plan is, that the Western Medical Institute of Research will be constructed in three phases. The first two are already under construction. The bill before you contains the third and final phase. The facility is being built to the most modern standards. It utilizes space layout of the most flexible means to promote efficient operation. As a former chief of personnel, Office of the Surgeon General, during World War II, let me stress that protecting the health of our fighting men will continue to be an essential ingredient of our national preparedness posture. Regardless of the level of U.S. military involvement, our men must be kept sufficiently well to function effectively on the line. This is best achieved by development of individual disease-preventive measures through meaningful research.

Gentlemen, I solicit your support of this worthy project which is clearly in the national interest.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Long).

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, as a former member of this very distinguished committee I want to address a few questions to the chairman and to some of the members of the committee. First, however, I want to offer a preamble concerning the Army Intelligence School that was formerly located at Fort Holabird in my district and which has been transferred to Fort Huachuca.

At the time this transfer proposal was made I naturally opposed it, as any Congressman who is losing an installation would do. I was disturbed at that time to

note that there was not adequate housing at Huachuca and that the water table was very low. I brought this to the attention of the Defense Department and the Army. They denied both of these allegations. It seemed to me they were very much lacking in candor.

Later on the chairman of the Military Construction Appropriations Subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES), and I visited Fort Huachuca. We found a tremendous lack of housing there. We also found that the water table was, as we had been told, sinking. We came back with some warnings to the Defense Department that this transfer could be a serious mistake.

I have been pursuing this line, as a Congressman defending his district, and have been doing it for several years. I was recently very much interested to note that the Armed Services Committee itself had appointed a subcommittee under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE), and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DANIEL), and the gentleman from California (Mr. GUBSER), from the minority. They came in with a report which was unanimous, in which they basically substantiated all the things I had been saying during that time. The title of the report I believe was "Money Down a Dry Hole."

Many millions of dollars went into this. The subcommittee accused the Army of a considerable lack of candor in this operation.

I want to address my remarks to the 100 housing units that are in this bill for Fort Huachuca. I am not going to offer an amendment. I gather the 100 housing units are in the bill because a mistake has been made and we have to provide the housing for the people there.

Is that a fair way to state the situation, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, in response to the gentleman's question, which I think is very appropriate, I want to state that the 100 units which are in the bill were authorized at the request of the Department. The committee was informed the requirements would have existed regardless of the transfer, but some of those transferred will probably occupy some of the units, if eligible.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Would have existed in any case?

Mr. FISHER. In any case, regardless of the transfer.

While I am responding to the gentleman, I would like to commend the gentleman for his alertness in looking after this particular problem and the concern which he has expressed. I think all of us who have these problems in our districts need to follow through on them and see how the money is spent after the installations have been moved away. Sometimes there is quite a different story after we check upon them. I think the gentleman is quite properly looking into this.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I compliment the Armed Services Committee for launching this investigation.

I did want to ask a question of the gentleman or perhaps the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DANIEL), a member of that subcommittee, who I see is here.

What is proposed to be done about the 800 housing units—later adjusted downward to 569 units—which the Army has said in the past it needs at Fort Huachuca? This is an enormous number of housing units. I believe there are 1,700 housing units worldwide in this bill, and 669 for Fort Huachuca alone would cost millions of dollars. This bill provides for 100 of these units, which will cost approximately \$2.6 million.

In view of this report, of which the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DANIEL) was a prominent author, what is the future of the 569 units? Does the committee feel the Army will be asking for these units in the future?

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. First I should like to say I agree thoroughly with the gentleman from Maryland that the DOD was seriously in error when this transfer was made.

With regard to the specific question about more housing units, the request has not been made yet to our committee, so I cannot definitively answer the question.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I believe that is a fair answer the gentleman has given me.

Though 569 units is a tremendous number of housing units to build at Huachuca, considering the situation there, which seems doubtful in many respects, including the water table. I would hope that the committee would in future years cast a very cold eye on any proposal to provide the 569 additional housing units there, in view of the tremendous housing shortage for the military which exists worldwide.

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I am glad to yield further.

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. The information which came to the committee suggested that the water supply at the present rate of consumption would last about 60 years. However, if we go into the type of construction the gentleman is talking about now, obviously this would not be the case.

The gentleman may be assured that the committee would look with a jaundiced eye upon any attempt to construct 569 housing units at that location.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, it is a distinct privilege to address my colleagues on the subject of the military construction bill. The Committee on Armed Services, under the most learned and able leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, has produced a sound, well-balanced program for each of our military services. I welcome this opportunity to speak in support of enactment of this military construction authorization bill. I will address my remarks to title II of the bill, the Navy's program, which totals \$520,966,000.

The naval shore establishment's purpose is to provide the required logistic support for our modern naval forces. With today's technological developments

resulting in the evolution of new and more efficient naval forces and weapons systems; modern, and in many instances complicated and unique shore facilities are required to give the proper support. Your committee has the continuing objective of insuring that naval and Marine Corps units receive the necessary authorization to provide those essential facilities required for the maintenance of a high state of combat readiness. Construction, as authorized in this bill, will provide positive advances in accomplishing this objective.

In order to assure that the shore stations are fully capable of providing needed support, the Navy maintains surveillance of the facilities available and required. As deficiencies are identified, new weapons systems become operative, and as advancements are attained through research, the Navy's military construction managers conduct critical reviews of the competing facilities requirements. By this manner, the Navy determines which of the urgent requirements are most urgent. This procedure results in a finely balanced program such as is contained in title II of the bill.

I should like to speak briefly first on those segments of the program devoted to direct support of the major fleets.

Construction of new shore facilities and the orderly replacement of antiquated existing structures must be considered as an internal part of the overall navy programs for construction and conversion of new ships, and the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and other weapon systems through which our Atlantic, Mediterranean, and Pacific Fleets will be modernized and equipped to face the challenge of the 1970's and beyond. As we commission new attack carriers, guided missile frigates, destroyers, attack submarines, and fast combat support ships, as we modernize our nuclear ballistic submarine forces, and as we adapt our carriers to the multipurpose role of attack and antisubmarine warfare, we must realize the attendant need for modern operational support bases and airfields. It is from such modern complex of naval bases that the vital logistics element of seapower is derived.

An authorization of \$59 million is included in this bill for facilities needed by the Atlantic Fleet and Naval Forces, Europe. The growing Soviet naval forces in the Eastern Mediterranean and indeed throughout the Atlantic Ocean area presents a serious challenge to our 6th and 2d fleets, making it a matter of utmost importance that the necessary shore-based facility support be furnished to our forces in these areas.

An appraisal in early 1971 of shore-based support facilities in the Eastern Mediterranean disclosed an urgent need to upgrade the present installations at the Naval Air Facility—NAF—Sigonella, Sicily, and Naval Detachment—NAVDET—Souda Bay, Crete.

Development of these bases will extend the logistic support of the fleet to the area of the Mediterranean where fleet operations are increasing.

To effect the needed upgrading of facilities at Sigonella and Souda Bay, this year's bill contains 15 projects and \$8.9

million and eight projects and \$5.3 million for facilities at Sigonella and Souda Bay, respectively.

The major projects at Sigonella are a structural aircraft fire rescue station, an aircraft maintenance hangar, a public works maintenance shop, a dispensary and dental clinic addition, and a dependent school addition. At Souda Bay, the major projects are aircraft maintenance hangar shops, bachelor enlisted quarters, bachelor officer's quarters, and utilities.

For upgrading facilities at other Atlantic Fleet bases and stations, the following major operational and logistic support projects were included in this year's bill:

Ship berthing improvements at the Naval Station, Charleston, S.C.; an applied instruction building at the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Fla.; dredging and powerplant expansion at the Naval Submarine Base, New London, Conn.; a dock basin for floating drydock at the Naval Station, Newport, R.I.; electric utilities for piers at the Naval Station, Norfolk, Va.; an airframe maintenance facility at the Naval Air Station, Oceana, Va.; and an integrated aircraft maintenance facility at the Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, R.I.

Additionally, a total of eight personnel and community support projects are included at the various Atlantic Fleet stations and bases.

Authorization in the approved amount of \$90.9 million is included for direct support of the Pacific Fleet. Of this amount, approximately \$36.9 million is people oriented and will provide 14 urgently needed bachelor enlisted and officer quarters and other personnel support facilities.

Pacific operational and logistic support facilities include the following major projects: an electrical distribution system, a pier 2 extension with utilities, and a utilities system expansion project at the Naval Air Station, Alameda, Calif.; an ordnance disposal group facility at the Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, Hawaii; pier extension with utilities at the Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif.; an aircraft intermediate maintenance facility at the Naval Air Station, Miramar, Calif.; a flight control/rescue facility and pier utilities at the Naval Air Station, North Island, Calif.; pier utilities at the naval submarine base, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii; pier and utilities at the Naval Station, San Diego, Calif.; and an aircraft parking apron at the Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Wash.

Also to be noted about this year's program is the Navy's extensive effort to abate air and water pollution. A significant portion of the military construction program, approximately \$81 million is devoted to this high priority concern of the Nation. The Navy has made a concerted effort to conform to the ever more stringent pollution abatement laws and this program reflects its efforts by approving 64 items for pollution abatement at 49 Navy and Marine Corps installations.

With the introduction into the fleet of more highly sophisticated ordnance, ships, planes and systems components, training has become a critical factor in

total fleet support. In an effort to keep personnel abreast of the technological developments and to insure continued fleet readiness, the Navy has requested and we have approved projects totaling more than \$65.3 million for training facilities. These projects represent a balanced cross section of the total training requirement and include projects for both officer and enlisted training.

A portion of title II in the amount of \$101.5 million is in support of the Marine Corps and will provide 43 projects at 16 installations. Of that total, \$41.1 million is for the provision of modern living quarters for 8,075 bachelor marines.

I have reserved for my final comment, a particular segment of the Navy's portion of the bill, the package for personnel support facilities, projects primarily for people. New authorization of \$119 million was approved for people-related projects. Of this amount, \$103 million will provide adequate living spaces for 22,541 bachelor enlisted and officer men and women of the Navy and the Marine Corps. Our Navy men and marines deserve to be housed adequately. The Navy believes, as evidenced by the percentage of their program devoted to personnel support facilities, that the provision of adequate troop housing will measurably improve their retention rate. I share this belief and I am encouraged by the positive steps being taken by the Navy to improve the living conditions for Navy personnel.

There are several features of the bill that stand out. It authorizes the most urgent facilities. It is responsive to the continuing need for operational effectiveness. It provides improvement for the personnel who support and operate these forces. It provides some logistic support facilities for ships, aircraft and missiles as well as for men. At first thought, we might consider it desirable to accomplish all needed construction at the earliest possible date, however, title II of this bill has been tempered in light of the realities of the overall needs of the Navy and Marine Corps and the current budgetary climate.

Be assured, the facilities projects contained in the bill are all valid requirements which will allow our Navy and Marine Corps to maintain and sustain the high state of combat readiness required for carrying out assigned missions.

I wish to emphasize that, in my opinion, your Armed Services Committee has developed a soundly conceived, yet quite austere bill. I recommend that you approve it in its entirety.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Chairman, for many reasons I cannot support H.R. 15641, this year's military construction authorization bill.

I do not question the need for a large part of the funds authorized by this bill for improved living conditions for our servicemen.

What puzzles and distresses me is the Armed Services Committee's apparent attitude, implicit and explicit in the committee report, that this bill involves dollar figures and nothing more. The committee seems to assume that the Department of Defense has the right to design programs and determine priorities, and it is the committee's task merely to cut a

little bit here and trim a little bit there, making sure that the overall cut falls somewhere in the 2- to 5-percent range. Nowhere in any document available to me is the rationale for this construction program challenged, nor are these priorities examined.

Take the following examples:

First. Military administration is over-centralized in the Washington, D.C., area, and according to the committee report "Secretary Laird has recognized the need to relocate activities from the Washington area." Yet the committee has approved the construction of an administrative facility in Washington at the cost of \$170 million. Why? Because "if we do not move ahead with this proposal, it is conceivable that the costs will escalate." Such tortured logic could be used to justify the construction of almost anything.

Second. The committee has authorized \$70 million to support American troops in Europe—exactly the amount requested by the Defense Department—despite the overwhelming evidence that substantial troop reductions can and should be made without jeopardizing American security interests in Europe in any way.

Third. Although Congress added an amendment to last year's foreign assistance authorization bill forbidding direct military assistance or the sale of military weapons to the repressive military junta in Greece, and although the current American military presence in Greece has embarrassed many Americans and our country's European allies, the committee has approved without alteration a \$5.3 million construction request for the naval detachment at Souda Bay in Greece, and another unspecified sum for the Athenai Airport in Athens.

Fourth. The committee has approved the Defense Department's request for \$14.3 million to begin initial site construction for the Trident missile system project. This project, originally known as ULMS, is of highly doubtful desirability, is unnecessary to the defense of our country, and involves fantastic costs estimated at \$30 billion in the next decade.

Fifth. The committee has approved a request for \$800,000 "to provide a facility" at Andersen Air Force Base in Guam, to use the vague language of the committee report. Construction at this base, where the Strategic Air Command is the host command, can have only one purpose—to aid in or tactically support the shameless and promiscuous bombing of Indochina.

Surely these five examples involve matters of policy which transcend the dollar figures involved. Surely these examples demand explanation—if not explanation, at least comment. For only one of these examples—the first—does the committee comment on policy matters, and there only to suggest that action be taken "so that the Congress may be kept informed."

What, then, has the Armed Services Committee wrought?

It has produced an authorization bill which reduces the Defense Department's budget request by 2.7 percent, despite the fact that the Department asked for 35 percent more than it was granted last

year. This 2.7 percent reduction is less than half of last year's 5.6 percent reduction—curious, indeed, in light of the committee's insistence that we are entering the "post-Vietnam era."

It has produced a bill authorizing the expenditure of \$33 million for projects described by one word—"classified."

It has approved funds for virtually every project which the Department of Defense asked for—no more and no less. It has neither created nor deleted a single program, despite the profound policy implications inherent in many of these funding requests.

It disturbs me that a committee of this Congress should appear to behave so subserviently, especially when \$2.58 billion and so many important domestic and foreign policy issues are involved. Has the Congress devoted enough time to the consideration of this authorization and the priorities implicit in it? Has the Defense Department justified these priorities?

I believe the answer to these questions is no. It is conceivable, although probably unlikely, that a more full justification was made to the committee in its frequent—indeed, typical—secret hearings. However, I cannot ratify the expenditure of this money if it is based on secrets too dark to disclose to the American people.

Further work is necessary to produce an authorization bill which accurately reflects our valid military construction needs, while furthering efforts toward a workable and consistent American foreign policy. At this time, I urge defeat of H.R. 15641.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my support of H.R. 15641, the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1973. This measure is vitally important to the maintenance of our Nation's Armed Forces, including the ability of defense installations in my own district to perform their missions.

Authorizations in the bill we are voting on today provide more than \$9 million to construct facilities in the New London-Groton, Conn., area essential for improved logistic support to the Atlantic Submarine Fleet.

Included in the bill is \$985,000 for a compression chamber for the naval submarine medical center. This money is in addition to an original authorization in 1968 which had totaled \$1,590,000. The compression chamber will provide an advanced and applied research facility for gathering biomedical data, using man as a test subject up to depths of 2,000 feet. An urgent requirement exists for the compression chamber and the importance of this advanced and applied research to the future strength of the Navy cannot be overstated.

Also included in the bill is \$5,032,000 to dredge the Thames River, from the mouth to the submarine base. The channel will be deepened from 32 and 33 feet to 36 feet deep to accommodate the deeper draft of the new 688-class attack submarine, seven of which will be constructed at the Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics in Groton.

Another section of the bill provides \$2,615,000 for the extension of the existing powerplant on the submarine base.

The plant's present capacity is 12,500 kilowatts. It would be increased to 24,700 kilowatts to accommodate the surge in power requirements for the new ships.

A total of \$728,000 is authorized for a trainer building extension, a facility which would contain submarine training simulators for the 688-class vessels. The simulators will replace six obsolete models now housed in four separate buildings. These new machines will simulate conditions too dangerous to practice at sea.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, at a time when Congress has received considerable criticism for overspending, I am concerned that the military construction bill before us today, which is modest by current standards, may be more than is absolutely needed. Yesterday the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), told this body that the House had appropriated already more than \$20 billion in excess of the budget requested.

With every sector of our economy demanding more, it is hard to single out any one expense area as better able to sustain a cut in its expectations than the next. However, this year's military construction bill, like last year's is supposed to reflect more people needs so that we can attract a volunteer army and eliminate the need for conscription.

I have strongly supported the concept of the volunteer army, and I do not expect to vote for the extension of the draft, absent some emergency conditions, when it expires next June 30. Nevertheless, using the construction of gymnasiums, arts and craft centers, and even bachelor and family housing units as an incentive for enlistments, seems to me to be an ineffective way of providing lures and incentives. Not all of our servicemen can enjoy family or bachelor quarters. Many do not want craft centers. I suspect that it may be hard to justify auto craft centers on the basis of broad appeal to our military men.

It seems to me that it would be far better to pay our military personnel a reasonable and comparable wage which would attract them to military service. If we would take all the traditional benefits normally given to our military personnel and put them into wage increases, we would have a benefit package that every one of them could use and that would be more attractive than the traditional package of lures.

By allocating our incentives in this way, we would also spotlight the true costs of our military personnel. We would have the total personnel costs shown more dramatically. I have stated many times that the way to reduce military expenditures is to reduce military personnel. If we could show true personnel costs, the need for personnel reduction would become far more obvious.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the committee on reducing the budget by 2.7 percent in this bill. I regret that the committee was not able to match the 5.6-percent cut which it achieved last year. It is my earnest hope that in the future the committee will take a different kind of look at its incentive system so that

all benefits paid to our military men can be used by all of them.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. VAN DEERLIN). Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (First Army)

Fort Belvoir, Virginia, \$11,027,000.
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, \$1,078,000.
Fort Dix, New Jersey, \$1,215,000.
Fort Eustis, Virginia, \$7,535,000.
Fort Knox, Kentucky, \$20,244,000.
Fort Lee, Virginia, \$1,048,000.

(Third Army)

Fort Benning, Georgia, \$6,040,000.
Fort Bragg, North Carolina, \$964,000.
Fort Campbell, Kentucky, \$13,797,000.
Fort Gordon, Georgia, \$5,225,000.
Fort Jackson, South Carolina, \$18,650,000.
Fort McClellan, Alabama, \$333,000.
Fort Rucker, Alabama, \$3,232,000.

(Fifth Army)

Fort Bliss, Texas, \$5,839,000.
Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, \$1,966,000.
Fort Hood, Texas, \$32,416,000.
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, \$1,054,000.
Fort Polk, Louisiana, \$4,997,000.
Fort Riley, Kansas, \$787,000.
Fort Sill, Oklahoma, \$14,958,000.
Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, \$18,578,000.

(Sixth Army)

Fort Carson, Colorado, \$17,457,000.
Presidio of Monterey, California, \$4,118,000.
Fort Ord, California, \$8,451,000.
Presidio of San Francisco, California, \$12,367,000.

MILITARY DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Fort McNair, District of Columbia, \$120,000.
Fort Myer, Virginia, \$1,815,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND
Anniston Army Depot, Alabama, \$1,460,000.
Army Materials and Mechanics Research Center, Massachusetts, \$332,000.
Harry Diamond Laboratories, Maryland, \$20,867,000.

Lexington-Blue Grass Army Depot, Kentucky, \$1,610,000.
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, \$475,000.
Pueblo Army Depot, Colorado, \$654,000.
Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, \$547,000.
Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, \$444,000.
Seneca Army Depot, New York, \$715,000.
Sierra Army Depot, California, \$2,633,000.
Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona, \$926,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY AIR DEFENSE COMMAND
Various Locations, \$1,923,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY SECURITY AGENCY
Vint Hill Farms, Virginia, \$1,549,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

For Huachuca, Arizona, \$862,000.
Fort Ritchie, Maryland, \$545,000.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY
United States Military Academy, West Point, New York, \$3,493,000.

ARMY MEDICAL DEPARTMENT

Fitzsimons General Hospital, Colorado, \$685,000.
Walter Reed Army Medical Center, District of Columbia, \$13,161,000.

MILITARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND TERMINAL SERVICE

Military Ocean Terminal, Bayonne, New Jersey, \$3,245,000.
Military Ocean Terminal, Sunny Point, North Carolina, \$802,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, ALASKA

Alaska General, Alaska, \$673,000.
Fort Richardson, Alaska, \$1,273,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, HAWAII

Fort Kamehameha, Hawaii, \$1,245,000.
Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, \$4,326,000.
Fort Shafter, Hawaii, \$987,000.
Tripler Army Medical Center, Hawaii, \$1,589,000.

BARRACKS MODERNIZATION

Various Locations, \$103,225,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations: Air Pollution Abatement, \$31,405,000.
Various Locations: Water Pollution Abatement, \$36,502,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES, SOUTHERN COMMAND

Canal Zone, Various Locations, \$8,129,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, PACIFIC

Korea, Various Locations, \$2,018,000.

KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE

National Missile Range, \$13,289,000.
Site Defense of Minuteman, \$19,000,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY SECURITY AGENCY

Various Locations, \$1,655,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

Various Locations, \$1,412,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, EUROPE

Germany, Various Locations, \$11,953,000.

Various Locations: For the United States share of the cost of multilateral programs for the acquisition or construction of military facilities and installations, including international military headquarters, for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area, \$58,000,000: *Provided*, That, within thirty days after the end of each quarter, the Secretary of the Army shall furnish to the Committees on Armed Services and on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a description of obligations incurred as the United States share of such multilateral programs.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next Military Construction Authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those

real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1973, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 103. (a) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES," in section 101, as follows:

(1) With respect to "Burlington Army Ammunition Plant, New Jersey," strike out "\$384,000" and insert in place thereof "\$650,000."

(2) With respect to "Sierra Army Depot, California," strike out "\$369,000" and insert in place thereof \$761,000."

(3) With respect to "Tobyhanna Army Depot, Pennsylvania," strike out "\$115,000" and insert in place thereof "\$261,000."

(b) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "\$180,502,000" and "\$265,699,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$181,306,000" and "\$266,503,000," respectively.

SEC. 104. (a) Public Law 92-145 is amended under the heading "POLLUTION ABATEMENT," in section 101 as follows:

(1) With respect to "Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement Facilities," strike out "\$34,791,000" and "\$2,000,000" and insert in place thereof "\$35,291,000" and "\$2,500,000," respectively.

(b) Public Law 92-145 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 702 "\$363,126,000" and "\$404,500,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$363,626,000" and "\$405,000,000," respectively.

Mr. FISHER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title I be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the next to the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask several questions concerning this bill. Since title I deals with funds for rehabilitation of buildings, installing of permanent and temporary public works, and so on and so forth, I should like to ask some questions about construction.

When Mr. Packard left the Department of Defense earlier this year he expressed great disappointment that he had been unable to close a number of military bases and other installations throughout the country.

I should like to ask some member of the committee, how many bases have been closed during the past year? And in the case of this bill, is there any money to be expended upon bases and other installations that Mr. Packard suggested be closed which were, apparently, a part of the President's program for closures across the country?

Mr. FISHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FISHER. I can only respond to the gentleman by saying that with respect to every one of the more than 800 projects we considered on a line item basis, we granted authorization for no project at a base where there is any indication of plans to close or substantially reduce the installation.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is say-

ing—it was hard for me to hear him—is he saying there is no money being expended for construction or rehabilitation on installations which may be closed?

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman is correct. That is what we were told.

Mr. GROSS. I must ask the question why, when a man serving in the position Mr. Packard in the Department of Defense could not justify them, these bases were not closed. Why were they not closed?

Mr. FISHER. In response to that question, the gentleman from Texas is not in a position to state anything on behalf of the Department of Defense or Mr. Packard. We have no official communication requesting closure.

Mr. GROSS. Did the committee go into this at all?

Mr. FISHER. Well, questions, of course, are continually arising in the committee during various considerations regarding the status of bases. Some of those may be the ones the gentleman from Iowa refers to. I simply do not know. However, it is our information that bases where projects are requested in this bill are not programed for closure.

Mr. GROSS. With respect to the situation in Europe, have we recovered anything from the properties we turned over to the French Government when NATO was moved from that country?

Mr. FISHER. It is my understanding, I will say to the gentleman, that we are in the process of recovering a fairly substantial amount of our losses there as a result of that. I think it is about \$80 million. That is due to the transfer out of France and is being paid in annual installments by NATO infrastructure funds.

Mr. GROSS. It is my understanding we have expended some \$190 million on the improvement of properties in Germany and that we are not very successful in obtaining reimbursement for those improvements. Would that be a reasonably correct figure?

Mr. FISHER. Well, the West German Government, as I understand it, is in the process of spending \$183 million for the improvement of American-occupied barracks located in West Germany.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, the report accompanying the bill so states.

Mr. FISHER. I am sure there is a lot to be said for excessive expenditures anywhere in the world where we operate, but so far as the committee knows the operations in Germany are being carried on in an efficient manner.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. GROSS. It is my understanding with regard to the expenditures for improvement of the properties in Germany on which this Government has expended some \$190 million, that we have recovered thus far only \$270,000.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman may be entirely correct. That simply does not come within the purview of this particular committee. We are not fully in-

formed about the status of this recovery situation as it now exists.

Mr. GROSS. With respect to the construction of motels, how much money is there in this bill for that purpose?

Mr. FISHER. There is no money whatever in this bill for the construction of hotels.

Mr. GROSS. I mean motels on military bases.

Mr. FISHER. I will explain to the gentleman I know what he is talking about and I share his concern about that program, but that is being paid for out of nonappropriated funds.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

With respect to a new administrative building why would the committee insist upon the construction of a new building for the Department of Defense when we have that huge installation just across the Potomac River, and the Forrestal Building was only recently constructed? How much further are we going to go in adding to the space already provided in the Pentagon and supplemented only recently by construction of the Forrestal Building?

Mr. FISHER. If the gentleman will yield, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Iowa, which is a very valid one, and which has occurred to many of us, the facts are that as of this time we are renting about 4,700,000 square feet of space or more, for administrative purposes for the Department of Defense in the Washington metropolitan area. That is a lot of space, and it is costing a lot of money. Rentals are high, and a lot of people are making considerable profit as a result of it, although it is done on a competitive basis.

We hope that by using Government-owned land for the construction of a Government-owned building that over the long pull it will mean saving money for the American taxpayers. That is the whole story.

Mr. GROSS. Are the offices getting larger in the Pentagon? Are they tearing out the partitions, or are they increasing the personnel even though we are supposed to be winding down a war? What is the story? What causes the necessity for additional office space for the Department of Defense?

Mr. FISHER. For many years this rental program has been going on, and as it is now there is a deficit of approximately 4.7 million square feet. The Secretary has indicated a plan to move enough people out of the Washington area to relieve maybe 2 million of the square feet in this space, and we are proposing to provide about 1.5 million square feet in this new building. So, even with this start we will still have to continue with some rentals. I could not agree with the gentleman from Iowa more that the time is long overdue for retrenchment in that respect, and we are just as anxious as anybody could be for that to be brought about.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman, and I hope there will be retrenchment, but I fear the worst.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations

and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

FIRST NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, \$2,227,000.

Naval Hospital, Newport, Rhode Island, \$423,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Newport, Rhode Island, \$546,000.

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island, \$2,050,000.

Naval War College, Newport, Rhode Island, \$8,469,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, Quonset Point, Rhode Island, \$1,460,000.

Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island, \$3,636,000.

THIRD NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, \$7,647,000.

Naval Submarine School, New London, Connecticut, \$723,000.

FOURTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey, \$107,000.

Naval Air Test Facility, Lakehurst, New Jersey, \$1,504,000.

Navy Finance Center, Cleveland, Ohio, \$2,777,000.

NAVAL DISTRICT, WASHINGTON

Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, District of Columbia, \$5,563,000.

Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Maryland, \$4,914,000.

Naval Electronic Systems Test and Evaluation Facility, St. Inigo, Maryland, \$140,000.

Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Maryland, \$438,000.

Naval Hospital, Quantico, Virginia, \$185,000.

FIFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Fleet Anti-Air Warfare Training Center, Dam Neck, Virginia, \$294,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Virginia, \$1,300,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia, \$3,319,000.

Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Virginia, \$5,116,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia, \$3,186,000.

Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia, \$5,968,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia, \$2,347,000.

Naval Security Detachment, Sugar Grove, West Virginia, \$475,000.

SIXTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida, \$479,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, Jacksonville, Florida, \$6,950,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida, \$3,676,000.

Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida, \$2,227,000.

Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory, Panama City, Florida, \$500,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, Pensacola, Florida, \$6,275,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida, \$2,850,000.

Naval Communications Training Center, Pensacola, Florida, \$4,998,000.

Naval Hospital, Pensacola, Florida, \$19,156,000.

Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, \$700,000.

Naval Air Station, Glynnco, Georgia, \$1,213,000.

Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, \$6,584,000.

Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina, \$5,316,000.

Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina, \$3,452,000.

Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee, \$10,512,000.

EIGHTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Hospital, New Orleans, Louisiana, \$11,680,000.

Naval Ordnance Missile Test Facility, White Sands, New Mexico, \$160,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, McAlester, Oklahoma, \$6,336,000.

Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas, \$642,000.

Naval Air Station, Kingsville, Texas, \$250,000.

NINTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Navy Public Works Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, \$108,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, \$11,348,000.

ELEVENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, California, \$2,761,000.

Naval Air Station, Imperial Beach, California, \$1,252,000.

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California, \$5,586,000.

Naval Station, Long Beach, California, \$1,844,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California, \$4,372,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, North Island, California, \$3,015,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, California, \$10,504,000.

Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California, \$665,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California, \$470,000.

Fleet Anti-Air Warfare Training Center, San Diego, California, \$1,026,000.

Navy Public Works Center, San Diego, California, \$1,758,000.

Naval Station, San Diego, California, \$8,291,000.

Naval Submarine Support Facility, San Diego, California, \$631,000.

TWELFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California, \$8,134,000.

Naval Facility, Centerville Beach, Ferndale, California, \$664,000.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, \$3,981,000.

Naval Schools Command, Mare Island, Vallejo, California, \$5,153,000.

Naval Shipyard, Mare Island, Vallejo, California, \$4,450,000.

Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California, \$5,491,000.

Fleet Numerical Weather Central, Monterey, California, \$2,830,000.

Naval Station, Treasure Island, San Francisco, California, \$2,690,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Skaggs Island, California, \$237,000.

Naval Air Station, Fallon, Nevada, \$214,000.

THIRTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Communication Station, Adak, Alaska, \$591,000.

Naval Arctic Research Laboratory, Barrow, Alaska, \$1,114,000.

Naval Shipyard, Puget Sound, Bremerton, Washington, \$5,992,000.

Naval Torpedo Station, Keyport, Washington, \$96,000.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, \$8,744,000.

FOURTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, Hawaii, \$1,120,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Hawaii, \$10,516,000.

Naval Dispensary, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, \$3,593,000.

Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, \$424,000.

Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, \$2,623,000.

Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, \$2,755,000.

MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

Marine Barracks, Washington, District of Columbia, \$5,233,000.

Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico, Virginia, \$6,492,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, \$9,872,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, \$2,143,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, New River, North Carolina, \$3,748,000.

Fleet Marine Force, Atlantic, Norfolk, Virginia, \$2,602,000.

Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Georgia, \$236,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina, \$2,757,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina, \$4,612,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, \$2,030,000.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Landing Field, Camp Pendleton, California, \$2,996,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, \$14,972,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California, \$523,000.

Marine Corps Air Stations, Orange County, California, \$40,379,000.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California, \$2,017,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Hawaii, \$1,050,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Air Pollution Abatement Facilities, \$25,194,000.

Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement Facilities, \$55,016,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Communication Station, Ponce, Puerto Rico, \$586,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, \$1,497,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Sabana Seca, Puerto Rico, \$660,000.

Naval Facility, Grand Turk, The West Indies, \$271,000.

ATLANTIC OCEAN AREA

Naval Air Facility, Lajes, Azores, \$120,000.

Naval Air Station, Bermuda, Bermuda Islands, \$90,000.

Naval Air Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, \$144,000.

Naval Hospital, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, \$738,000.

Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, \$3,310,000.

Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, \$1,297,000.

EUROPEAN AREA

Naval Communication Unit, London, England, \$88,000.

Naval Detachment, Souda Bay, Crete, Greece, \$5,308,000.

Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Sicily, Italy, \$8,932,000.

Naval Station, Rota, Spain, \$860,000.

INDIAN OCEAN AREA

Naval Communication Facility, Diego Garcia, Chagos Archipelago, \$6,100,000.

PACIFIC OCEAN AREA

Naval Communication Station, Harold E. Holt, Exmouth, Australia, \$1,743,000.

Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Islands, \$1,008,000.

Naval Hospital, Guam, Mariana Islands, \$598,000.

Naval Magazine, Guam, Mariana Islands, \$968,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Guam, Mariana Islands, \$158,000.

Naval Station, Guam, Mariana Islands, \$202,000.

Navy Air Support Unit, Iwakuni, Japan, \$166,000.

Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Republic of the Philippines, \$4,470,000.

Naval Communication Station, San Miguel, Republic of the Philippines, \$395,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, \$287,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations: Water Pollution Abatement Facilities, \$1,200,000.

Sec. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified Navy installations and facilities by acquiring, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the amount of \$14,300,000.

Sec. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop Navy installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by (1) unforeseen security considerations, (2) new weapons developments, (3) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (4) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next Military Construction Authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1973, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

Sec. 204. (a) Public Law 89-568, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 201 as follows:

(1) With respect to Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, California, strike out "\$3,412,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,017,000".

(b) Public Law 89-568, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 802, "\$123,909,000" and "\$148,072,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$124,514,000" and "\$148,677,000", respectively.

Sec. 205. (a) Public Law 80-110, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 201 as follows:

(1) With respect to Naval Submarine Medical Center, New London, Connecticut, strike out "\$1,590,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,575,000".

(b) Public Law 90-110, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 802, "\$422,599,000" and "\$470,796,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$423,584,000" and "\$471,781,000", respectively.

Sec. 206. (a) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 201 as follows:

(1) With respect to Naval Observatory Flagstaff Station, Flagstaff, Arizona, strike out "\$286,000" and insert in place thereof "\$804,000".

(2) With respect to Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, strike out "\$1,384,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,703,000".

(b) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 201 as follows:

(1) With respect to Naval Magazine, Guam, Mariana Islands, strike out "\$3,287,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,457,000".

(c) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 602, "\$246,118,000", "\$21,994,000" and "\$269,086,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$246,955,000", "\$26,164,000" and "\$274,093,000", respectively.

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND

Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colorado, \$5,423,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida, \$388,000.

AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND

Gentile Air Force Station, Dayton, Ohio, \$138,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah, \$3,060,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, \$3,483,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California, \$9,318,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia, \$8,936,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, \$10,359,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, \$14,464,000.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee, \$300,000.

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, \$3,566,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California, \$534,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida, \$10,920,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico, \$893,000.

Satellite Tracking Facilities, \$151,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois, \$5,875,000.

Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi, \$4,454,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, \$3,644,000.

Laredo Air Force Base, Laredo, Texas, \$133,000.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas, \$711,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado, \$987,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California, \$2,426,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, \$674,000.

Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas, \$2,235,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas, \$5,074,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona, \$329,000.

AIR UNIVERSITY

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama, \$3,000,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Elson Air Force Base, Fairbanks, Alaska, \$2,885,000.

Various locations, \$2,012,000.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland, \$2,971,000.

Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, District of Columbia, \$20,226,000.

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma, \$543,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware, \$2,785,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington, \$1,470,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey, \$4,509,000.

Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, California, \$1,009,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois, \$359,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California, \$274,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii, \$6,983,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana, \$2,708,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas, \$92,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona, \$2,665,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota, \$103,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota, \$1,812,000.

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York, \$3,306,000.

Grissom Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana, \$138,000.

K. I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Marquette, Michigan, \$338,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine, \$2,523,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, California, \$4,512,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota, \$1,664,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, \$5,271,000.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California, \$3,185,000.

Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts, \$455,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan, \$948,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas, \$210,000.

Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico, \$175,000.

England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana, \$2,095,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, California, \$379,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico, \$772,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida, \$2,798,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia, \$1,629,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida, \$4,428,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho, \$318,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, \$145,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada, \$2,620,000.

Pope Air Force Base, Fayetteville, North Carolina, \$1,955,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina, \$4,000,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

United States Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colorado, \$3,312,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE SECURITY SERVICE

Goodfellow Air Force Base, San Angelo, Texas, \$1,540,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations: Air Pollution Abatement Facilities, \$7,300,000.

Various Locations: Water Pollution Abatement Facilities \$9,691,000.

AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBLE USE ZONES

Various Locations, \$12,000,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Satellite Tracking Facilities, \$310,000.

AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND

Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, \$1,704,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Various Locations, \$4,612,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, \$800,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Germany, \$11,422,000.

United Kingdom, \$5,605,000.

Various Locations, \$3,404,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations: Air Pollution Abatement Facilities, \$171,000.

Various Locations: Water Pollution Abatement Facilities, \$4,537,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in total amount of \$18,660,000.

SEC. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next Military Construction Authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment in the total amount of \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1973, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 304. (a) Public Law 91-142, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES," in section 301 as follows:

(1) With respect to Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona, strike out "\$4,462,000" and insert in place thereof, "\$5,008,000".

(b) Public Law 91-142, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 702 "\$208,611,000" and "\$268,994,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$209,157,000" and "\$269,540,000", respectively.

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for Defense agencies for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES
DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Arlington Hall Station, Virginia, \$1,600,000.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY

Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Maryland, \$2,236,000.

Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute, Bethesda, Maryland, \$360,000.

DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY

Defense Automatic Addressing Facility, Tracy, California, \$137,000.

Defense Construction Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio, \$972,000.

Defense Documentation Center, Alexandria, Virginia, \$98,000.

Defense Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, \$722,000.

Defense Depot, Memphis, Tennessee, \$828,000.

Defense Depot, Ogden, Utah, \$1,091,000.

Defense Depot, Tracy Annex, Stockton, California, \$218,000.

Defense Electronics Supply Center, Dayton, Ohio, \$159,000.

Defense General Supply Center, Richmond, Virginia, \$2,067,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, \$5,221,000.

Sec. 402. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities which he determines to be vital to the security of the United States, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$20,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including real estate actions pertaining thereto.

TITLE V—MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

Sec. 501. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to construct, at the locations hereinafter named, family housing units and mobile home facilities in the numbers hereinafter listed, but no family housing construction shall be commenced at any such locations in the United States, until the Secretary shall have consulted with the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, as to the availability of adequate private housing at such locations. If agreement cannot be reached with respect to the availability of adequate private housing at any location, the Secretary of Defense shall immediately notify the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate, in writing, of such difference of opinion, and no contract for construction at such location shall be entered into for a period of thirty days after such notification has been given. This authority shall include the authority to acquire land, and interests in land, by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

(a) Family housing units—

(1) The Department of the Army, three thousand nine hundred forty-eight units, \$100,098,000:

National Guard Battalion Headquarters, Bethel, Alaska, two units.

National Guard Battalion Headquarters, Nome, Alaska, two units.

Fort Huachuca, Arizona, one hundred units.

Sierra Army Depot, California, eighty units.

Fort Carson, Colorado, three hundred units.

Walter Reed Army Medical Center, District of Columbia, three hundred units.

Fort Benning, Georgia, four hundred seventy-four units.

United States Army Installations, Oahu, Hawaii, six hundred forty units.

Fort Riley, Kansas, one hundred units.

United States Army Installations, St. Louis, Missouri, two hundred units.

Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, one hundred units.

Fort Bragg/Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina, five hundred units.

Fort Hood, Texas, one thousand units.

Fort Belvoir, Virginia, one hundred fifty units.

(2) The Department of the Navy, four thousands six hundred units, \$119,900,000:

Naval Complex, Long Beach, California, four hundred units.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, four hundred units.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California, one hundred units.

Naval Complex, Washington, District of Columbia, six hundred units.

Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida, three hundred units.

Naval Complex, Oahu, Hawaii, five hundred units.

Naval Complex, Great Lakes/Glenview, Illinois, three hundred fifty units.

Naval Complex, New Orleans, Louisiana, one hundred units.

Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, two hundred units.

Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey, two hundred units.

Naval Complex, Newport, Rhode Island, one hundred fifty units.

Naval Complex, Charleston, South Carolina, two hundred units.

Naval Complex, Norfolk, Virginia, six hundred units.

Naval Security Group Activity, Galeta Island, Canal Zone, twenty units.

Naval Complex, Guam, Marianas Islands, two hundred thirty units.

Naval Air Station, Bermuda, two hundred fifty units.

(3) The Department of the Air Force, three thousand one hundred sixty-eight units, \$76,024,000:

Maxwell/Gunter Air Force Bases, Alabama, two hundred units.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona, four hundred units.

Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado, three hundred units.

Bolling Air Force Base, District of Columbia, four hundred units.

Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland, three hundred units.

Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada, two hundred units.

Laredo Air Force Base, Texas, two hundred units.

Hill Air Force Base/Defense Depot, Ogden, Utah, three hundred eighteen units.

Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, five hundred units.

San Vito Air Station, Italy, one hundred fifty units.

Incirlik Air Base, Turkey, two hundred units.

(b) Mobile Home Facilities—

(1) The Department of the Army, four hundred twenty-one spaces, \$1,662,000.

(2) The Department of the Navy, four hundred thirty-two spaces, \$1,725,000.

(3) The Department of the Air Force, five hundred fifty spaces, \$2,000,000.

Sec. 502. Authorization for the construction of family housing provided in this Act shall be subject, under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, to the following limitations on cost, which shall include shades, screens, ranges, refrigerators, and all other installed equipment and fixtures:

(a) The average unit cost for each military department for all units of family housing constructed in the United States (other than Hawaii and Alaska) shall not exceed \$24,000 including the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

(b) No family housing unit in the area specified in subsection (a) shall be constructed at a total cost exceeding \$42,000 including the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

(c) When family housing units are constructed in areas other than that specified in subsection (a) the average cost of all such units shall not exceed \$33,500 and in no event shall the cost of any unit exceed \$42,000. The cost limitations of this subsection shall include the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

Sec. 503. Notwithstanding the limitations contained in prior military construction authorization Acts on cost of construction of family housing, the limitations contained in section 502 of this Act shall apply to all prior authorizations for construction of family housing not heretofore repealed and for which construction contracts have not been executed by date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 504. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions or extensions not otherwise authorized by law, to existing public quarters at a cost not to exceed—

(1) for the Department of the Army, \$22,511,000.

(2) for the Department of the Navy, \$9,121,000.

(3) for the Department of the Air Force, \$11,955,000.

Sec. 505. Notwithstanding the limitations contained in section 502 of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to construct or otherwise acquire, four family housing units in Brazil at a total cost not to exceed \$215,000. This authority shall include the authority to acquire lands and interests in land.

Sec. 506. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to accomplish repairs and improvements to existing public quarters in amounts in excess of the \$10,000 limitation prescribed in section 610(a) of Public Law 90-110, as amended (81 Stat. 279, 305), as follows:

The United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, eleven units, \$275,000.

Royal Air Force Station Mildenhall, New Market, United Kingdom, one unit, \$18,500.

Sec. 507. Section 515 of Public Law 84-161 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is amended by (1) striking out "1972 and 1973" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "1973 and 1974", and (2) striking out the third sentence and inserting a new sentence as follows: "Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities, including the cost of utilities and maintenance and operation, may not exceed: for the United States (other than Hawaii), Puerto Rico, and Guam an average of \$215 per month for each military department, or the amount of \$300 per month for any one unit; and, for Hawaii, an average of \$265 per month for each military department, or the amount of \$315 per month for any one unit."

Sec. 508. Section 507 of Public Law 88-174 (77 Stat. 307, 326), as amended, is amended by (1) striking out "1972 and 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "1973 and 1974", and (2) striking out "\$210" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$275".

Sec. 509. There is authorized to be appropriated for use by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, for military family housing as authorized by law for the following purposes:

(1) for construction and acquisition of family housing, including improvements to adequate quarters, improvements to inadequate quarters, minor construction, relocation of family housing, rental guarantee payments, construction and acquisition of mobile home facilities, and planning, an amount not to exceed \$323,881,000, and

(2) for support of military family housing, including operating expenses, leasing, maintenance of real property, payments of principal and interest on mortgage debts incurred, payments to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and mortgage insurance premiums authorized under section 222 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1715m), an amount not to exceed \$726,860,000.

TITLE VI. HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE

SEC. 601. Effective November 30, 1970, section 1013 of Public Law 89-754 (80 Stat. 1255, 1290), as amended, is amended by (1) deleting the period at the end of subsection 1013(d) and adding the following: "except in connection with compensation for property located on a base or installation pursuant to subsection (1)."; and by (2) adding the following new subsection:

"(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) (2) and the second proviso of subsection (b), Federal employees or military personnel employed at or near a military base or installation outside the United States who are otherwise eligible under the criteria as set forth above shall be entitled to compensation for losses arising (1) out of the sale of property, or (2) out of the inability to sell property located on a base or installation, incident to the owner's transfer, reassignment, or involuntary termination of employment, which results in his relocation. Such employees or military personnel whose property is located off a base or installation shall be entitled to compensation under subsection (c) for losses sustained in private sales. Such employees or personnel whose property is located on a base or installation, who sell or are unable to find a purchaser for such property, may surrender their interest in such property to the United States, and shall be entitled to compensation, notwithstanding lack of ownership of the land on which such property is located, in an amount equal to (A) 90 per centum of the sum of the present owner's purchase price of the dwelling and improvements, and all costs of ownership including interest on notes, utilities and services, maintenance and insurance, less (B) the total of all housing allowances received from the Government during ownership and occupancy of the dwelling, all rents collected, and the sale price, if any, received for the property, as determined by the Secretary of Defense: *Provided, however,* That the maximum compensation shall in no event exceed 90 per centum of the unamortized portion of the cost of the property, including improvements, at the time ownership is terminated, as reflected in the amortization schedule, if any, relating to such property. For the purpose of this subsection, the term 'United States' means the several States and the District of Columbia."

TITLE VII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even

though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 702. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public work projects authorized by titles I, II, III, IV, and V, shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, \$453,464,000; outside the United States, \$115,456,000; or a total of \$568,920,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$465,490,000; outside the United States, \$41,176,000; section 202, \$14,300,000; or a total of \$520,966,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$232,588,000; outside the United States, \$32,565,000; section 302, \$18,660,000; or a total of \$283,813,000.

(4) for title IV: A total of \$35,709,000.

(5) for title V: Military family housing, \$1,050,741,000.

SEC. 703. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), any of the amounts specified in titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum when inside the United States (other than Hawaii and Alaska), and by 10 per centum when outside the United States or in Hawaii and Alaska, if he determines that such increase (1) is required for the sole purpose of meeting unusual variations in cost, and (2) could not have been reasonably anticipated at the time such estimate was submitted to the Congress. However, the total cost of all construction and acquisition in each such title may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated in that title.

(b) When the amount named for any construction or acquisition in title I, II, III, or IV of this Act involves only one project at any military installation and the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, determines that the amount authorized must be increased by more than the applicable percentage prescribed in subsection (a), the Secretary concerned may proceed with such construction or acquisition if the amount of the increase does not exceed by more than 25 per centum the amount named for such project by the Congress.

(c) Subject to the limitations contained in subsection (a), no individual project authorized under title I, II, III, or IV of this Act for any specifically listed military installation may be placed under contract if—

(1) the estimated cost of such project is \$250,000 or more, and

(2) the current working estimate of the Department of Defense, based upon bids received, for the construction of such project exceeds by more than 25 per centum the amount authorized for such project by the Congress, until after the expiration of thirty days from the date on which a written report of the facts relating to the increased cost of such project, including a statement of the reasons for such increase has been submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(d) The Secretary of Defense shall submit an annual report to the Congress identifying each individual project which has been placed under contract in the preceding twelve-month period and with respect to which the then current working estimate of the Department of Defense based upon bids received for such project exceeded the amount authorized by the Congress for that project by more than 25 per centum. The Secretary shall also include in such report each individual project with respect to which the scope was reduced in order to permit contract award within the available authorization for such project. Such report shall include all pertinent cost information for each individual project, including the

amount in dollars and percentage by which the current working estimate based on the contract price for the project exceeded the amount authorized for such project by the Congress.

SEC. 704. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States and its possessions under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Department of the Navy, or such other department or Government agency as the Secretaries of the military departments recommend and the Secretary of Defense approves to assure the most efficient, expeditious and cost-effective accomplishment of the construction herein authorized. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report annually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives a breakdown of the dollar value of construction contracts completed by each of the several construction agencies selected, together with the design, construction supervision, and overhead fees charged by each of the several agents in the execution of the assigned construction. Further, such contracts (except architect and engineering contracts which, unless specifically authorized by the Congress, shall continue to be awarded in accordance with presently established procedures, customs, and practice) shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report annually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 705. (a) As of October 1, 1973, all authorizations for military public works (other than family housing) to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in titles I, II, III, and IV of the Act of October 27, 1971, Public Law 92-145 (85 Stat. 394), and all such authorizations contained in Acts approved before October 28, 1971, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) authorizations for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts, land acquisitions, or payments to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, in whole or in part before October 1, 1973, and authorizations for appropriations therefor; and

(3) notwithstanding the repeal provisions of section 705(a), of the Act of October 27, 1971, Public Law 92-145 (85 Stat. 394, 410), authorizations for the following items which shall remain in effect until October 1, 1974:

(a) utilities in the amount of \$2,200,000 at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 26, 1970 (84 Stat. 1204), as amended.

(b) utilities in the amount of \$2,333,000 at Radford Army Ammunition Plant, Virginia, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 26, 1970 (84 Stat. 1204), as amended.

(c) utilities in the amount of \$876,000 at Fort Ritchie, Maryland, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 26, 1970 (84 Stat. 1204), as amended.

(d) land acquisition contiguous to the Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California,

as authorized in title II, section 204 of the Act of October 26, 1970 (84 Stat. 1204, 1212).

(e) land acquisition contiguous to the Marine Corps Air Station, Santa Ana, California, as authorized in title II, section 205 of the Act of October 26, 1970 (84 Stat. 1204, 1212).

(b) Effective fifteen months from the date of enactment of this Act, all authorizations for construction of family housing, including mobile home facilities, all authorizations to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions, or extensions to existing family housing, and all authorizations for related facilities projects, which are contained in this or any previous Act, are hereby repeated, except—

(1) authorizations for family housing projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions or manufactured structural component contracts in whole or in part before such date; and

(2) authorizations to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions or extensions to existing family housing, and authorizations for related facilities projects, as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts before such date.

Sec. 706. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction projects inside the United States in excess of a unit cost to be determined in proportion to the appropriate area construction cost index, based on the following unit cost limitations where the area construction cost index is 1.0:

(1) \$27.00 per square foot for permanent barracks;

(2) \$29.00 per square foot for bachelor officer quarters;

unless the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the limitations contained in prior Military Construction Authorization Acts on unit costs, the limitations on such costs contained in this section shall apply to all prior authorizations for such construction not heretofore repealed and for which construction contracts have not been awarded by the date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 707. Section 709 of Public Law 92-145 (85 Stat. 394, 414) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 709. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the lands constituting Camp Pendleton, California, may be sold, transferred, or otherwise disposed of by the Department of Defense unless hereafter authorized by law: *Provided, however*, That with respect to said lands the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, may grant leases, licenses, or easements pursuant to chapter 159 of title 10, United States Code."

Sec. 708. Section 2662 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(e) No element of the Department of Defense shall occupy any general purpose space leased for it by the General Services Administration at an annual rental in excess of \$50,000 (excluding the cost of utilities and other operation and maintenance services), if the effect of such occupancy is to increase the total amount of such leased space occupied by all elements of the Department of Defense, until the expiration of thirty days from the date upon which a report of the facts concerning the proposed occupancy is submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives."

Sec. 709. Titles I, II, III, IV, V, and VII of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Authorization Act, 1973".

TITLE VIII

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

Sec. 801. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop additional facilities for the Reserve Forces, including the acquisition of land therefor, but the cost of such facilities shall not exceed—

(1) For the Department of the Army:

(a) Army National Guard of the United States, \$33,570,000.

(b) Army Reserve, \$33,500,000.

(2) For the Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, \$19,715,000.

(3) For the Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air National Guard of the United States, \$14,000,000.

(b) Air Force Reserve, \$6,400,000.

Sec. 802. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on lands includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

Sec. 803. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Authorization Act, 1973."

Mr. FISHER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all of the remaining titles of the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee very kindly consulted with me this morning on what had started out as a possible amendment on my part, but which the gentleman thinks can be adequately taken care of by making legislative history.

I refer to the item on page 2, line 6, which provides for a land swap aimed at creating a bumper zone around the Miramar Naval Air Station in southern California to provide for the additional noise that will be created by a squadron of F-14 planes shortly to be included at Miramar.

Also on page 22 of the report on the bill, the matter is referred to as "Land Acquisition—Exchange" at what is presumed to be an equal value of \$702,000. Data which is contained in the DD form 1391c sheets, names the Christiana Oil Corp. of Los Angeles as the owner of 138 acres involved in the transaction, the San Diego School District, with 69 acres, and the city of San Diego with 23 acres, and Navy land consisting of 155 acres that, on an even-up swap, according to this line item, would have the equal value of \$702,000 on each side.

Independent appraisals indicate the value of the 230 non Government acres involved to be about \$760,000 rather than \$702,000. And the value of Navy land involved is well over \$2,000,000. This seems to be a ratio of about 3 to 1 in the value of Navy property to be exchanged for privately owned land of something around \$760,000.

The Christiana Oil Corp.'s subsidiary, Tierra Santa Developers, stand to wind up with acreage spanning all four corners of a major future freeway interchange, which is within about 10 minutes of downtown San Diego.

The proposed deal was put together by the Navy Facilities Command Office in San Diego, apparently bypassing the normal channels of the Navy Real Estate Division here in Washington.

The Real Estate Division says that the law does not permit an exchange as provided in these reports and in this bill.

An initial review of information bears out the estimates of value that I have cited.

My San Diego colleague, Congressman Bob Wilson, agrees that any exchange involving Government property should be on a basis of equal value exchange.

I was wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the chairman of the subcommittee could provide some assurance that this obvious fairness should be carried out in the final legislation.

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, first I commend the gentleman for bringing this matter up. I rather think from the hasty look that we have taken at it, that additional wording is necessary in order to fully protect the public interest in respect to what the gentleman has discussed.

Certainly it was not the intention of the committee, and it is not the intent of the bill for anybody to be bound to an even swap, because that would not necessarily be fair to the Government, and we would not want that to happen.

We understand that the Navy Department does not intend it that way. But the language may be such that it should be changed to give a positive assurance about it.

The gentleman was kind enough to discuss this with me earlier today, and we agreed, I believe, that when we go to conference on the bill, we will make a very careful study of this point and follow the suggestions made by the gentleman from California.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I very much appreciate the chairman's consideration of fairness and his assurance on this matter.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied with the answers that have been given to our colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, in regard to how hard our committee tried to find out what military bases could be closed.

Nor am I satisfied with the answers dealing with the NATO infrastructure

and the increasing contributions the Germans made in the last year or 2.

I recommend that the clerks we have on the Appropriations Committee and on your committee get together and make up a report and let us put it in the Record, because there are better answers than we have presented on this floor today.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the establishment of the Army's veterinary school facility at Fort Sheridan is in the interest of an efficient and effective Army. Fort Sheridan is well united to this activity and the improvement recommended to the committee should be approved and the facility should be completed. Mr. Chairman, there appears to be a misunderstanding as to the purpose and function of the Veterinary School. It is, as I understand it, a food inspection and testing service which assures nutritious, wholesome, and appropriate foodstuffs to the officers and men of the Army. There is no need to locate this facility on a farm, in a food warehouse, or in a packing plant. The Veterinary School is well placed at Fort Sheridan, and full accommodation for this activity at Fort Sheridan should be approved by the committee. I am hopeful that the necessary authorization will be approved ultimately during this Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 15641), to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1042, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. FISHER. 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 372, nays 17, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 275]

YEAS—372

Abbutt	Annanzio	Barrett
Abernethy	Archer	Begich
Abourezk	Arends	Bell
Adams	Ashbrook	Bennett
Addabbo	Ashley	Bergland
Alexander	Aspin	Betts
Andrews, Ala.	Aspinall	Bevill
Andrews,	Baker	Biaggi
N. Dak.	Baring	Biester

Blackburn	Gibbons	Mitchell
Blatnik	Goldwater	Mizell
Boggs	Gonzalez	Mollohan
Boland	Goodling	Monagan
Bolling	Grasso	Montgomery
Bow	Gray	Moorhead
Brademas	Green, Oreg.	Morgan
Brasco	Green, Pa.	Moss
Bray	Griffin	Murphy, Ill.
Brinkley	Griffiths	Murphy, N.Y.
Brooks	Gross	Myers
Brotzman	Grover	Natcher
Brown, Mich.	Gubser	Nedzi
Brown, Ohio	Gude	Nelsen
Broyhill, N.C.	Haley	Nichols
Broyhill, Va.	Hall	Nix
Buchanan	Halpern	Obey
Burke, Fla.	Hamilton	O'Hara
Burke, Mass.	Hammer-	O'Konski
Burleson, Tex.	schmidt	O'Neill
Burlison, Mo.	Hanley	Patman
Burton	Hanna	Patten
Byrne, Pa.	Hansen, Idaho	Pelly
Byrnes, Wis.	Hansen, Wash.	Pepper
Byron	Harsha	Perkins
Cabell	Harvey	Pettis
Caffery	Hastings	Peysner
Camp	Hathaway	Pickle
Carlson	Hays	Pike
Carney	Hechler, W. Va.	Pirnie
Carter	Heckler, Mass.	Page
Casey, Tex.	Heinz	Poff
Cederberg	Helstoski	Powell
Celler	Henderson	Preyer, N.C.
Chamberlain	Hicks, Mass.	Price, Ill.
Chappell	Hicks, Wash.	Price, Tex.
Clancy	Hillis	Pucinski
Clark	Hogan	Purcell
Clausen,	Hollifield	Quile
Don H.	Horton	Quillen
Clawson, Del.	Howard	Railsback
Clay	Hull	Randall
Cleveland	Hungate	Rarick
Collier	Hunt	Reuss
Collins, Ill.	Hutchinson	Rhodes
Collins, Tex.	Ichord	Riegle
Colmer	Jacobs	Roberts
Conable	Jarman	Robinson, Va.
Conover	Johnson, Calif.	Robison, N.Y.
Conte	Johnson, Pa.	Rodino
Corman	Jones, Ala.	Roe
Cotter	Jones, N.C.	Rogers
Coughlin	Karh	Roncallo
Crane	Kazen	Rooney, Pa.
Culver	Keating	Rostenkowski
Daniel, Va.	Keith	Roush
Daniels, N.J.	Kemp	Roussellot
Danielson	Kling	Roy
Davis, S.C.	Kluczyński	Runnels
Davis, Wis.	Koch	Ruppe
de la Garza	Kuykendall	Ruth
Delaney	Kyl	St Germain
Dellenback	Kyros	Sandman
Denholm	Landgrebe	Sarbanes
Dennis	Landrum	Satterfield
Dent	Latta	Saylor
Derwinski	Leggett	Scherle
Devine	Lennon	Scheuer
Dickinson	Lent	Schmitz
Diggs	Link	Schneebell
Dingell	Lloyd	Schwengel
Donohue	Long, Md.	Scott
Dorn	Lujan	Sebelius
Downing	McClary	Shoup
Duncan	McCollister	Shriver
du Pont	McCormack	Sikes
Dwyer	McCulloch	Sisk
Eckhardt	McDade	Skubitz
Edwards, Ala.	McDonald,	Smith, Calif.
Ellberg	Mich.	Smith, Iowa
Erlenborn	McEwen	Smith, N.Y.
Esch	McFall	Snyder
Ehlerman	McKay	Staggers
Evans, Colo.	McKinney	Stanton,
Fascell	McMillan	J. William
Findley	Macdonald,	Stanton,
Fish	Mass.	James V.
Fisher	Madden	Steed
Flood	Mahon	Steele
Flowers	Mailliard	Steiger, Ariz.
Foley	Mallory	Steiger, Wis.
Ford, Gerald R.	Mann	Stephens
Ford,	Martin	Stokes
William D.	Mathis, Ga.	Stratton
Forsythe	Mayne	Stubblefield
Fountain	Mazzoli	Sullivan
Fraser	Meeds	Symington
Frelinghuysen	Melcher	Talcott
Frenzel	Metcalfe	Taylor
Frey	Michel	Teague, Calif.
Fuqua	Mikva	Teague, Tex.
Galifianakis	Miller, Calif.	Terry
Garmatz	Miller, Ohio	Thompson, Ga.
Gaydos	Mills, Md.	Thompson, N.J.
Gettys	Minish	Thomson, Wis.
Gialmo	Mink	Thone

Tiernan	Whalen	Wright
Udall	Whalley	Wyatt
Ullman	White	Wydler
Van Deerlin	Whitehurst	Wyllie
Vander Jagt	Whitten	Wyman
Vanik	Widnall	Yates
Veysey	Williams	Yatron
Vigorito	Wilson, Bob	Young, Fla.
Waggonner	Wilson,	Young, Tex.
Waldie	Charles H.	Zablocki
Wampler	Winn	Zion
Ware	Wolf	Zwach

NAYS—17

Abzug	Dow	Rangel
Badillo	Drinan	Rees
Bingham	Edwards, Calif.	Reid
Chisholm	Harrington	Rosenthal
Conyers	Hawkins	Roybal
Dellums	Kastenmeier	

NOT VOTING—43

Anderson,	Fulton	Mosher
Calif.	Gallagher	Passman
Anderson, Ill.	Hagan	Podell
Anderson,	Hébert	Pryor, Ark.
Tenn.	Hosmer	Rooney, N.Y.
Belcher	Jonas	Ryan
Blanton	Jones, Tenn.	Seiberling
Broomfield	Kee	Shipley
Carey, N.Y.	Long, La.	Slack
Curlin	McCloskey	Spence
Davis, Ga.	McClure	Springer
Dowdy	McKevitt	Stuckey
Dulski	Mathias, Calif.	Wiggins
Edmondson	Matsunaga	
Evins, Tenn.	Mills, Ark.	
Flynt	Minshall	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. McClure.
Mr. Podell with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Ryan with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Anderson of California with Mr. Mathias of California.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. McKevitt.
Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Spence.
Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Seiberling with Mr. Kee.
Mr. Slack with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Curlin.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Stuckey.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, and to include extraneous matter.

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

SALARY INCREASES FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE AND FIREMEN

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15580), to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary

Act of 1958 to increase salaries, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CABELL).

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 15580, with Mr. PIKE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CABELL) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, under the rule the general debate is limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN) and the gentleman from Texas. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN), pending which I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, as Members are aware, is a bill to bring into line the pay scales of the Police and Fire Departments of the District of Columbia. In addition to bringing the pay scales into line with today's living conditions, the bill does provide a slight additional payment for technicians, for pilots of helicopter units because of more dangerous circumstances, and additional training required for these positions. It also adds an incentive increment designed to hold more of the more experienced men in the service, to retain that expertise in the department and thereby preclude the many early retirements we are suffering in those departments.

The total pay increase which has been approved by the Pay Board is 17 percent, which I remind the Committee again is the first adjustment in their pay raises since July 1, 1970, by legislation then approved and made retroactive to July 1, 1969. The cost of that 17-percent increase would be \$11,911,000. The cost of estimated overtime, which has been materially reduced and which we hope will be reduced even more, is estimated at \$750,000. For the helicopter pay and the bomb disposal unit there is \$30,000. There is an allowance for plainclothesmen, which is entirely justified, which is \$127,000. The cost of equalization of the retirees will be \$4 million, and the credits for longevity will be \$1,030,000.

Of the total \$17.8 million estimated cost attached to this measure, the District of Columbia government will absorb a 15-percent portion, or \$2,677,000. The balance of the necessary funds will be raised by increasing the sales tax on room rentals, alcoholic beverages, and restaurant meals from 5 percent to 6 percent, which will generate an estimated \$2.8 million. The general sales tax is being raised from 4 percent to 5 percent, which will generate an estimated \$13 million. That will leave a slight surplus of over one-half million dollars over the amount required for the funding of this increase in pay.

I would like to direct the attention of Members to the fact that the longevity increase will be 5-percent increase on periods of service of 15, 20, 25, and 30 years. Such longevity pay however will not be computed on retirement pay nor will the longevity increments be recomputed to the benefit of the present retirees.

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

Regarding the bill before us, many of us have struggled trying to bring out a good bill for your consideration. Prob-

ably we should have acted some time ago, but we only received the draft legislation from the District government in May.

The feeling of our committee has been that the police and firemen of the District of Columbia have not had comparative increases over a period of years, whereas District and Federal classified workers have received three raises. Our study also indicates that the average salary increase for police and firemen in other cities of 100,000 population has been more prompt and is now at a higher rate than is in effect in the District of Columbia.

The last increase which was given to the police and firemen here was some time ago, and that was based on the salaries of 1969.

In effect, the salary computation now is what might appear to be quite generous, but at the same time it is believed to be fully justified based on historic computations and analyses.

Therefore, I am pleased to speak in support of H.R. 15580, a long overdue salary adjustment for District of Columbia police and firemen. As the chairman has explained, the bill provides an average 17-percent salary increase for all officers and members covered by this bill, and this same increase applies to retired police and firemen or their survivors. This is essentially a "catch-up" and "go-ahead" pay adjustment to offset the effect of inflation since the last pay raise. It is retroactive to July 1, 1972.

The need for this salary increase is discussed in considerable detail in House Report No. 91-1180 accompanying this bill. The new salary scales will place Washington, D.C., in the best possible competitive position to recruit and retain police and firemen. Comparisons with other cities in the country that exceed 500,000 in population are contained in the report:

POLICE PAY, WASHINGTON, D.C., AND COMPARABLE CITIES

City	Private		Detective		Sergeant		Lieutenant		Captain		Chief	
	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum
District of Columbia (now)	\$8,500	\$12,240	\$10,625	\$13,805	\$11,475	\$14,945	\$13,300	\$16,625	\$15,800	\$19,750	\$28,500	\$32,750
Proposal (H.R. 15580)	10,000	14,400	12,500	16,250	13,580	16,980	15,700	18,840	18,600	21,390	34,700	36,800
Atlanta	8,320	10,257	8,671	10,699	9,048	11,154	10,257	12,636	11,622	14,313		26,728
Baltimore	8,199	10,419			11,475	12,615	13,215	14,535	15,255	16,810	21,256	
Boston	8,000	10,301	9,638		12,516		14,393		16,522		22,152	
Columbus	8,060	10,795			11,232	12,251	12,792	14,040	14,685	16,078	20,155	22,100
Dallas	7,680	9,600	11,580	14,400	11,580	14,400	12,780	15,600	13,980	16,800		28,176
Denver	8,488		12,216		13,092		14,040		15,120			26,040
Memphis	7,200		9,420	10,512			9,888	11,520	10,896	13,236	15,336	20,556
Milwaukee	11,190	11,662	12,495	13,441	12,070	12,952	10,642	12,881	12,881	15,729	24,111	30,419
New Orleans	6,360	7,500	7,440	9,000	7,440	9,000	8,400	10,020	9,780	11,700		
Phoenix	8,448	10,592			10,188	12,816	12,204	15,480	14,076	17,976	21,960	27,888
Pittsburgh	9,563		10,841		11,400		12,474		13,612			23,200
San Francisco	13,208				15,704		18,356		21,554			37,232
St. Louis	7,838				11,206		12,220		12,818			22,178
San Diego	10,140	12,324			11,736	14,268	13,260	16,116	15,348	18,660	22,692	27,576
Seattle	9,120	11,304			11,916	12,996	13,920	15,048	15,948	17,244		27,242

Source: Pay scales in effect Feb. 1, 1972, as submitted to the committee from the various cities listed.

The entrance salary for privates will be increased from \$8,500 to \$10,000, and the highest salary for privates from \$12,240 to \$14,400, attainable after 16 years of service as at present. The starting salary for chiefs will increase from \$29,925 to \$34,700, and the top salary for chiefs will be raised from the present \$32,775 attainable after 4 years of service in that position, to \$36,800 which is to be attained after 2 years of service. The bill

CXVIII—1549—Part 19

provides, however, that no salary—the amount presented by the schedule plus any additional amount provided for total service longevity or particular assignments or positions—may exceed the basic salary for level V of the Executive Schedule, which at present is \$36,000.

The salary increases are to become effective on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after July 1, 1972.

In addition to the salary increases, ex-

tra pay is being provided for helicopter pilots, members of the explosives disposal unit, employees determined to be technicians, and detective sergeants. A clothing allowance not to exceed \$300 a year will also be provided for the first time for officers or members of the police force assigned to perform duties in plain clothes.

The rationale of this provision is the fact that all uniformed members of the

Metropolitan Police force are furnished their uniforms free of charge, for which reason it seems discriminatory that the plain clothesman should not have some compensation for the cost of his clothing which he must wear on duty. Your committee is advised that such a clothing allowance for plainclothesmen is provided in many urban police departments.

This clothing allowance shall not be used for the purpose of computing overtime, promotions, or retirement benefits.

CORRECTION OF LIMITATION ON OVERTIME PAY

When overtime pay was first authorized for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force—Public Law 89-282, approved October 21, 1965—it was stipulated that such overtime pay could be paid only to the extent that such payment would not cause the recipient's aggregate rate of compensation to exceed the minimum scheduled rate of basic compensation provided for service step 1 in class 10 of the D.C. Police and Firemen's Salary Act. At that time, this was the lowest basic salary provided for the Chief of Police and the Fire Chief, and it was the intent of the Congress that this would serve as a ceiling for all members' aggregate compensation including any overtime wage.

This provision was not changed when the D.C. Police and Firemen's Salary Act was amended in 1970, however, at which time the Chiefs' salary class was redesignated as class 11, and class 10 became the class assigned to Assistant Chiefs. Thus, by oversight, the ceiling for aggregate pay, including overtime, was inadvertently lowered to the basic salary of step 1 for Assistant Chiefs.

Section 113 of this bill corrects that oversight, by changing the limitation to that of step 1 of the salary class applicable to the Fire Chief and the Chief of Police, thus restoring the original intent of the Congress in this respect.

EFFECT ON RETIREES ANNUITY

Included in the bill is a change in the method of computing the salary to be used in annuity computations. Under existing law, annuities are computed on the basis of the salary in effect on the date an officer or member is separated from the service.

Section 115 provides that the annuities of all individuals retired from these services prior to the effective date of these 1972 amendments to the D.C. Police and Firemen's Salary Act shall be increased by not less than 17 percent as a result of these amendments to the salary schedule; and also that in the event of future salary increases for active members, the annuities of members then retired shall continue to be increased by a percentage not less than the percentage increase in salary for the class and step to which such retirees are assigned for annuity increase computation purposes.

This provision assures the continued equitable application of the concept of the original Equalization Act of 1923 (42 Stat. 1263), under which retired D.C. policemen and firemen since that time have had their annuities recomputed whenever there have been increases in salaries for active members, their annuities being then computed on the basis

of the new salary for the class and step in which the member was retired. This has been the only source of increases in annuities granted to retired District of Columbia policemen and firemen to offset increased costs of living, as they do not benefit from periodic cost-of-living adjustments as do retirees under Civil Service and other retirement systems.

This provision in the bill is necessary by reason of another section which changes the salary basis for the computation of all annuities, which will be discussed further on in this report.

Under this bill, the computation will hereafter be made on the basis of the highest average earnings during any 3 consecutive years of police or fire service.

The adoption of the 3-year averaging feature will make the computation of police and firemen's annuities comparable with those of other District and Federal employees including Members of Congress. No changes are made in the provisions with respect to the length of service or the percentages used in computing the annuities, either for regular retirements or for disability retirements.

A saving clause in the bill will prevent any individual retiring subsequent to the enactment of this legislation from receiving an annuity less than he could have received had he retired immediately prior to the passage of the act, with his annuity computed on the basis of his salary on that date increased by 17 percent.

REEXAMINATION OF MEMBER RETIRED FOR DISABILITY WHEN HE ACCEPTS SUBSEQUENT EMPLOYMENT

Section 202 of the bill provides that if a member of the D.C. police or fire departments is retired on disability, and becomes employed after the effective date of these 1972 amendments to the D.C. Police and Firemen's Salary Act, under such regulations as the Commissioner of the District of Columbia shall prescribe the member shall notify the Commissioner of such employment; and as soon thereafter as is practicable the Commissioner shall require the member to undergo a satisfactory medical examination of the disability upon which the member's retirement is based. The Commissioner is required to promulgate the regulations referred to within ninety days after the date of enactment of this act, and he shall give timely written notice of the promulgation of such regulations to all members retired for disability.

Your committee is advised that during the years 1969, 1970, and 1971, some 85 percent of all retirements from the Metropolitan Police force and from the Fire Department of the District of Columbia were for disability. We are told further that this figure is inordinately high as compared with the experience with police and fire service retirees in other cities. Additionally, we are told that a considerable number of these disability retirees subsequently accept other employment; and while we are confident that many such retirees are justified in accepting other employment which is feasible for them in their partially disabled condition, it is our opinion that this system of reevaluation of

a retiree's continued disability and a judgment as to the propriety of his receiving both a second salary and his full disability nontaxable, retirement pension from the District of Columbia government is fully justified.

REVENUE PROVISIONS

In order to provide the funding necessary to meet the costs of the salary increases provided in the bill, the following District of Columbia tax increases are provided:

1. General sales tax, increased from 4 percent to 5 percent. It is estimated that this will yield some \$13 million of additional revenue per year;

2. Sales tax on rentals of transient rooms and lodgings, and on the sale of restaurant meals and all alcoholic beverages, both off-sale and by the drink, from 5 percent to 6 percent. This increase is estimated to yield an additional \$2.8 million per year.

These tax increases, all of which were requested by the District of Columbia government, will become effective on the first day of the first month which begins on or after the thirtieth day after the date of enactment of this bill.

NEED AND JUSTIFICATION FOR SALARY INCREASES

The last salary increase for District of Columbia policemen and firemen was approved on June 30, 1970—Public Law 91-297; 84 Stat. 354—and was made retroactive to July 1, 1969. However, while this increase was made retroactive, it was based actually upon the District's competitive position and other economic factors as they existed in 1969. Hence, the District of Columbia policemen and firemen may truly be said not to have received a salary increase in the past 3 years.

The following facts point up the critical need for a salary adjustment for District policemen and firemen at this time:

First, between the period from August, 1969 to February, 1972, the cost-of-living for the District of Columbia rose by 10.6 percent, thereby substantially reducing the real earnings of the city's policemen and firemen.

Second, salaries for District of Columbia and Federal classified employees have been increased an average of 17.4 percent as a result of increases granted in January, 1970, in June, 1971, and in January, 1972. Further, the District's 8,000 "blue collar" employees have received increases averaging 19.2 percent during the period from November, 1969 and November, 1971.

Third, competitively, District of Columbia police and fire privates presently rank in last place with respect to both minimum and maximum salaries, compared with those in the six local jurisdictions comprising the Washington Metropolitan area. Also, these salaries do not compare favorably with those paid in other cities of comparable population. The following exhibits indicate the District's poor competitive position at this time, and also the improvement which the enactment of this bill will achieve, both in the Washington Metropolitan area and as compared with 15 other large cities.

The pay increases effected by the reported bill will make Washington police

and firemen salaries rank No. 1 over that paid the police and firemen in the surrounding jurisdictions.

Fourth, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that the average annual rate of increase in salaries for policemen and firemen in cities over 100,000 population, for the last 5 years, was 7.6 percent; during this same period, the average for District policemen and firemen was 6.6 percent.

I believe it is entirely reasonable to consider that the effectiveness of a truly sound salary administration policy is its ability to recruit its share of qualified individuals in the labor market, to retain highly competent employees who are giving quality performance, and to provide a salary which assures all employees a reasonable degree of economic security.

It appears to me from the four economic factors referred to above, that the District of Columbia falls far short of such a policy with respect to its policemen and firemen under current conditions, and that the following principles may reasonably be used as guides toward this objective:

First, rates of pay for District policemen and firemen must be maintained in a favorable competitive position with the rates of such pay in major cities with populations in excess of 500,000, and especially such cities in the eastern half of the United States. In the past, this area has constituted the primary labor market for recruitment of District of Columbia policemen and firemen.

Second, rates of pay for District policemen and firemen should be in reasonable alignment with rates of pay for classified employees of the Federal and District governments, not only on the basis of comparable duties and responsibilities, but also with due consideration of the hazards inherent in the duties of police and fire personnel in large urban departments and also the special problems existing in large cities.

Third, rates of pay for District policemen and firemen must be competitive with the highest rates of pay for policemen and firemen in other jurisdictions of the Washington Metropolitan area. This is essential if the District government is to compete successfully with the surrounding jurisdictions who use the difficulties of such work in the city as a means to entice prospective police and fire personnel to the suburban areas.

At the present time, the District of Columbia is unable to comply with any one of these three principles with respect to salaries for its policemen and firemen.

Under the conditions outlined above, it is the opinion of this committee that the salary increases provided in this proposed legislation, which will afford an average 17-percent increase for all police and fire personnel in the District, are fully justified and appropriate at this time. The officers and members of these services will be afforded no more than an increase comparable to those which have accrued to other government personnel during the period of the past 3 years which has elapsed since the policemen and firemen of the District have had any salary increase whatever.

On May 8, 1972, the Federal Pay Board found that the amendments to the Dis-

trict of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act contained in this bill are not inconsistent with the criteria which the Board has adopted pursuant to the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970.

I reserve the remainder of my time for further debate.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL).

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge the support of my colleagues for the bill H.R. 15580, the principal purpose of which is to provide officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the Executive Protective Service, and the U.S. Park Police force.

The bill will provide an average overall increase of 17 percent for the members of these forces. The starting salary for privates will be raised from \$8,500 to \$10,000 and their maximum salary from \$12,240 to \$14,400. At the other end of the scale, the chiefs' salaries will range from \$34,700 to \$36,800, as compared to the present range from \$29,925 to \$32,775.

A revision of the salary schedule eliminates the present longevity steps and substitutes instead new service steps. In addition, an entirely new system of total service longevity pay is provided, as follows:

One. For total service of at least 15 years but less than 20 years, additional salary equal to 5 percent of the salary provided for step 1 of the salary class to which the member is assigned.

Two. For service beyond 20 years but less than 25 years, extra salary equal to 10 percent of such salary;

Three. For service between 25 and 30 years, 15 percent; and

Four. For service in excess of 30 years, 20 percent.

It is provided, however, that no member's total salary shall exceed that for level V of the Executive Schedule, which at present is \$36,000.

The importance of this revision of the present longevity system is that at present the longevity steps are all based upon length of service in a single salary class, and are actually unattainable because members seldom remain in a single salary class long enough to reach these longevity pay levels. The new longevity system proposed in H.R. 15580, however, is based upon length of service in the department. Thus, for the first time there will be a real incentive for members to remain in service as long as possible, and consequently the forces will reap the benefit of the older members' experience and expertise. At present, these long service longevity salaries, which will not be used for the computation of annuities, will apply to 815 members.

There is no question whatever that the salary increases provided in this proposed legislation must be enacted without delay, in the interests of the effectiveness and morale of the members of these vital forces whose function is to protect the lives and property of the citizens of our Nation's Capital, as well as of the millions of visitors who annually visit this historic shrine.

The last salary increase for District policemen and firemen, while enacted in 1970, was made retroactive to July 1,

1969, and I wish to emphasize the fact that that salary level was established on the basis of the departments' competitive position and the other economic factors which existed in 1969. Hence, there has been no salary increase now for 3 years. And during this 3-year interval, the cost of living in the District of Columbia has risen at least 11 percent, the salaries for classified employees of the Federal and District of Columbia governments have been increased by an average of more than 17 percent, and those of the District's blue collar workers by more than 19 percent.

As for the competitive position of the District's police and fire forces, this has eroded during this 3-year period to a desperately low level. Since 1969, in the suburban jurisdictions of the Washington metropolitan area the police and fire forces have received an average of three salary increases and an average increase of 18.5 percent in their starting salary level. And in the 23 other U.S. cities having populations of more than 500,000 persons these police and fire starting salaries have been increased by an average of 22 percent during this same period.

As a result of these several increases in salaries for police and fire personnel elsewhere while those in the District have remained static, today the District of Columbia police and fire privates rank in last place for both minimum and maximum salaries paid in the six local jurisdictions in the metropolitan area, and in 13th place, which is below the median, in comparison with the 23 other largest cities for entrance salaries.

Under these conditions, it is obvious that the District police and fire forces cannot compete successfully, either locally or in the national labor market, in the recruitment and retention of competent employees who may be expected to give quality performance. I regard it as essential that the District salary levels compare favorably with those in the larger cities at least in the eastern half of the country; and they must be maintained at the very top among those paid in the Washington metropolitan area, because these jurisdictions cite the comparatively difficult conditions facing police and fire personnel in the city in their efforts to proselyte the more capable young members to the suburban areas.

The bill also provides for additional hazardous duty pay for officers and members of the police forces in the city who are assigned to duty as helicopter pilots, and also as members of the explosive disposal unit. This extra salary is established at \$2,100 per year. This "bonus" is amply justified in view of the extensive training necessary to equip these personnel for their specialized work and also the fact that these members face an ever-present element of personal danger which is not normally encountered by other members of these departments.

Less important provisions of the bill authorize a clothing allowance not to exceed \$300 per year for officers and members assigned to plainclothes duty, which is in keeping with existing practice in other urban police departments, and also correct an existing inadvertent inequity with regard to the limit on over-

time pay. This latter will provide that overtime pay earned during a pay period cannot bring any member's total pay during that period to a level higher than that provided for step 1 of the salary class of the chief of police and the fire chief. This was actually the limitation in existence when the chiefs occupied salary class 10; however, when the chiefs of the services were reassigned to a new salary class 11 in the Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1970, this provision was not changed and the ceiling, by oversight, became the level of salary step 1 for assistant chiefs.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to address myself briefly to the one serious flaw in the salary provisions of this bill.

As far back as February 1971 representatives of the District of Columbia police and fire employees met with the staff of the District of Columbia Personnel Office to explore the feasibility of a salary bill which could receive the support of the District government and also meet the salary standards which the members felt they must attain. These negotiations continued for many months, and resulted in a memorandum of understanding signed by all parties in December 1971. This accord was on the substance of the bill H.R. 12710, which was introduced last January 27.

That bill provided for a two-stage salary increase, the first stage averaging 11 percent increase and becoming effective as of January 1, 1972, and the second stage providing an additional 6 percent increase effective on July 1, 1972. Thus, this understanding would have provided these members with an 11 percent increase some 6 months earlier than the 17 percent increase provided in the present bill, H.R. 15580. I well understand that the District of Columbia government, which has been charged with the responsibility of providing their own revenues to defray the costs of any salary increases for its police, firemen, and teachers this year, could not recommend any retroactive pay increases of any kind, simply because they cannot levy any new taxes retroactively and hence cannot fund any salary increases except on a prospective basis. And while all the salary increases agreed upon were originally planned to be prospective, the unavoidable delays in getting the legislation before the Congress, including the approval of the Office of Management and Budget and of the Federal Pay Board, made this impossible. Despite this fact, however, I feel strongly that it is essential that we in the Congress keep faith with these public servants whom the city agreed should have an increase in pay as of January 1 of this year, and make this possible through some form of Federal contribution.

Specifically, I feel that the salary provisions of this bill should be made retroactive to March 1 of this year. I understand that this will cost approximately \$6 million. I submit that if the pending legislation on revenue sharing, which this body has already approved, is enacted into law this will provide the District with an immediate additional \$13 million, retroactive to January 1, and I cannot conceive of a more important use

for \$6 million of that amount than for this purpose.

I attempted to get a retroactivity feature in the bill during committee deliberations on the measure, without success. But I wish to state that I shall continue my efforts to achieve this measure of simple justice to these men at every stage of the legislative process if necessary.

Finally on this subject, I understand that the District of Columbia Personnel Office has assured the District of Columbia Policemen's Association that if the salary increases provided in H.R. 15580 do not have an effective date earlier than July 1, 1972, which is the date presently in the bill, the District of Columbia government will "actively and vigorously support and sponsor" a new 5.5-percent pay increase effective on January 1, 1973. I wish to state at this time that if my present efforts to incorporate this retroactive feature into the legislation now before us are not successful, then I shall introduce and support with all the energy at my command a bill to provide this new pay raise for these men as of that date.

The bill H.R. 15580 also amends the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Retirement Act, by providing that officers and members of these forces shall have their annuities computed in the future upon the basis of their average highest 3 years of salary, as is presently the case for retirees under civil service as well professional employees of the District of Columbia Board of Education. At present, District of Columbia policemen and firemen have their annuities based upon their salary at the time of their retirement.

In this connection, the bill provides that all presently retired members will receive an increase in their annuities of not less than 17 percent, through the application of the Equalization Act of 1923.

The bill also assures all members of these services who are on active duty at the time of this legislation that their annuities will be based on a salary not less than their salaries immediately prior to the date of enactment of this bill, plus 17 percent thereof.

I wish to state, however, that I regard this amendment to the District of Columbia policemen's and firemen's retirement as retrogressive, and I take exception to it on principle.

Since the District of Columbia police and firemen's retirement system was started some 50 years ago, it has always been provided that these members will be retired at annuity based upon their salary at the time of their retirement.

This is the way it has been done for a number of years. But it was provided in this bill, without hearings, without discussion, without testimony, that we would just arbitrarily change that procedure so that they would have to retire in the future on a rate based on their average salary for their three highest years.

Of course, it was claimed that this action will provide an annuity basis formula for police and firemen retirees which is the same as is provided for classified Government employees. But the work for the policeman and the fireman is far different from that of the classified

employees. And this provision, in my opinion, is retrogressive in that it repeals a long-standing formula for police and firemen's annuity computation which has long been recognized as being in keeping with the extremely hazardous nature of their duties, and institutes a less favorable formula just because it applies to sedentary office workers. I cannot agree with the philosophy of this change.

The other amendment to the Retirement Act in this proposed legislation will provide a degree of supervision over the members who are retired by reason of disability, to the extent that when such a member accepts other employment he will be required to undergo an examination of the condition upon which his retirement was predicated, and a review of the actual continuance of the disability. The District of Columbia Commissioner will be required to formulate regulations for this procedure, and I am confident that this matter will be administered with proper regard for the fact that partially disabled persons can in many cases engage in further employment even though their disability may continue.

Mr. Chairman, it is imperative that the salary provisions of this bill, retroactive if possible to March 1, 1972, be enacted without further delay. The structure of these new salary provisions was approved on May 8 by the Federal Pay Board as being "not inconsistent with the criteria which the Board has adopted pursuant to the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, as amended," and they have been approved also by the Department of Management and Budget. I also wish to point out that the salaries of District of Columbia policemen and firemen are not adjusted periodically to meet increases in the cost of living, as are those of Government employees under civil service. For this reason, these men have had to support their families now for a period of 3 long years on salaries which were no more than adequate when they were approved as of July 1, 1969. Thus, these salary increases provided in H.R. 15580 are in truth "catch-up" raises, which will do no more than provide an overdue measure of justice to these gallant men upon whom so much of the welfare and safety of the residents of this depend every day.

The imbalance which has been permitted to develop between the salaries for District policemen and firemen and those paid in the surrounding suburban jurisdictions has had a very serious and disturbing effect upon the ability of the District of Columbia forces to retain their younger members. A recent survey of 400 persons leaving the police forces in the city reveals that about 100 left to accept jobs with other law enforcement agencies, and approximately 75 left to further their education so that they could command salaries upon which they might support their families properly. Most disturbing is the fact is that most of those who left to accept positions in other police agencies had more than 1 year of service on the Metropolitan Police force. The officers who left to further their education, on the other hand, were mostly in their probationary period.

This trend must be stopped, and the most effective immediate means is through the enactment of this legislation.

Title III of the bill provides more than sufficient revenues to defray the costs involved in the legislation as reported, by raising the District of Columbia general sales tax rate from 4 percent to 5 percent and by increasing the sales tax on hotel rooms, restaurant meals, and alcoholic beverages from 5 percent to 6 percent. It is estimated that these tax increases will produce about \$15.8 million per year, which exceeds the estimated cost of the salary increases, over and above the part thereof which the departments can absorb, by more than \$600,000. In addition, as I have pointed out, there is more than sufficient prospective funding to bear the cost of making two-thirds of the salary increases retroactive to last January 1, pending in the revenue-sharing bill.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE).

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time when the amendment on retroactivity is offered, I plan to give it my full support, at this time I would like to point out the reasons why I think the House should support the retroactivity amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL).

I rise in support of retroactivity for the police and firefighters of the District of Columbia.

Legislation to provide salary increases for these employees—whose service to the community on a day-to-day basis is immeasurable—has been pending for quite some time now. The police and firemen and the District of Columbia government had reached an understanding on this matter as early as last December. Over 2 months ago, it was referred to the Pay Board, at which time I wrote to Chairman Boldt urging that he expedite a ruling with respect to an exemption from the President's economic stabilization guidelines. Exemption was granted, and furthermore, retroactivity was approved.

The last increase for the District's police and firemen took place June 30, 1970, retroactive to July 1969. Between August 1969 and November 1971, the cost of living in Washington rose 10.6 percent. It is now the end of June, and this figure has no doubt climbed even higher. Yet, the bill before us provides for a salary increase effective the first pay period on or after July 1, 1972. Let us not make these employees absorb the cost-of-living increase on their outdated, static salaries, and, thereby, innocently suffer because of the delay in acting on this legislation.

I wholeheartedly support retroactivity to January 1, and urge its favorable consideration.

Also at the appropriate time I am going to offer an amendment which would put back into this pay bill the additional incentive pay feature which was in the original legislation. The educational incentive pay feature, although other aspects of the bill were controversial, was completely agreed upon by the District government, the District of Columbia

Policemen's Association, and the Firefighters' Association, local No. 36.

Commissioner Graham Watt stated if there is ever one overriding feature in this request, it is the recognition of a new professionalism required of the policemen and firemen today. And professionalism and education go hand in hand.

So I urge the Members of the House to give serious consideration to this educational incentive feature which is used in so many jurisdictions across the country and which does so much to make it possible for us to have the type of professionalism that we need from these guardians of public safety.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. McMILLAN).

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in full support of the bill now pending before the Committee, H.R. 15580.

I hope that the House will accept this bill as it is or as near the amount requested by the District of Columbia government as possible for our committee to give them.

I think that the House Committee on the District of Columbia and the U.S. Congress have been really liberal to the Police Department in Washington during the 35 years that I have been a Member of this body. I have supported every bill that has been reported to the floor of the House which would increase salaries of policemen and firemen.

I remember, when I came here, that policemen did not have 1 day off a week, and they paid for their own uniforms. However, now they are at the top 10 of all the police forces in 20 cities where the population is between 500,000 and 1 million, salarywise.

We have always made an effort to keep the police and firemen and teachers on the same salary schedule, as near as possible, with the surrounding territories. And if this bill is enacted, the Police Department in Washington, D.C., and the Fire Department will be at the top of these forces in this community and within these 20 cities that I just mentioned.

I believe that we are giving the Commissioner everything that he asked for in this bill. He asked for a tax on alcoholic beverages and on several other items. And we gave them exactly what he asked for. I am very much opposed to some of these taxes for the simple reason that every time we add a tax on any product in the District of Columbia, we run this business out into Virginia and Maryland. I have seen that happen on numerous occasions since I have been in the Congress. However, if that is what the Commissioner wants, I am backing him, and we will go along with the proposals that he asks for.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI).

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I rise to associate myself with my colleagues, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE), and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL) with reference to two areas—retroactivity and retirement.

I compliment the committee for its forward look insofar as the main thrust of the bill is concerned—and that is the salary increase. But with that thrust there comes another responsibility, and that is the responsibility to provide for equity so far as date of the application of the raise is concerned. To me this raise is long overdue. There has been an inordinate delay affecting these raises—or affecting the legislation. It has been properly said in the past, and it applies here most appropriately—justice delayed is justice denied. The delay in granting salary increases has worked a hardship, and that delay, for whatever reason, has worked a hardship on the policemen and firemen in the District of Columbia. In the field of labor generally it has been universally accepted as a policy that when salary increases are finally arrived at and settled after much deliberation, that they should be arrived at on a retroactive basis.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill (H.R. 15580) entitled, "Salary Increases for District of Columbia Police and Firemen."

This bill would amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to provide a new and revised salary schedule, as well as providing an average 17 percent salary increase for the District's police and firemen. The effective date of this portion of the bill is July 1, 1972. I would have preferred to see the retroactive provisions of the original city agreement kept in tact, and thus reduced the 3-year time period between the past and present salary increases. The result of this delay has been that the police and firemen in the District have had to suffer an economic disadvantage in a time of rapid inflation.

Second, the bill amends the District of Columbia Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act to change the salary base upon which retirement annuities shall be based. This portion of the bill also have a drawback, however, because the annuities for individuals retiring from these services are to be computed on the basis of the individual's "average pay" instead of his basic salary at the time of his retirement as is now provided in the law. This "average pay" is defined as the highest annual rate resulting from averaging the member's rates of basic salary in effect over any 3 consecutive years. This provision is a step backward, since the police and firefighters of the District have been recipients of a pension based on salary at the time of retirement for more than 50 years. This action of reducing the retirement benefits in exchange for an increase in salaries is a gross injustice to the firemen and policemen of our Nation's Capital.

Finally, the present law is amended with respect to certain taxes in the District of Columbia to provide new revenues to meet the additional costs of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the need for this pay increase is blatantly obvious when we examine the facts surrounding this measure.

First, the cost of living in the District of Columbia has increased by 10.6 per-

cent from August 1969 to February 1972. This has meant that the real earnings of the city's policemen and firemen has been substantially reduced over this period.

Second, the salaries of District of Columbia and Federal classified employees have been increased an average of 17.4 percent as a result of increases in January 1970, in June 1971, and in January 1972. In addition, the 8,000 "blue collar" workers in the city have received increases averaging 19.2 percent during the period from November 1969 to November 1971.

While I support the pay increases for these workers, I find it difficult to understand why the Congress has been so tardy in providing increases to the District's firemen and policemen. These men and women place their lives on the line every day in order to protect the public from criminal elements. As a former police officer in New York City, I can tell you that the job is not an easy one. Surely, these gallant men and women deserve a salary commensurate with the fine job that they are doing.

Finally, in comparison to the six local jurisdictions comprising the Washington metropolitan area and other large cities in the country, the salaries of the firemen and policemen in the District of Columbia do not compare at all favorably. Thus the increase is necessary if the District is going to be able to compete with metropolitan area jurisdictions in the hiring of qualified personnel and keep them on the job.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this measure and provide the District of Columbia policemen and firemen with this 17-percent salary increase which they so richly deserve.

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

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McMILLAN. I would like to state to the gentleman that I have always been in support of all the salaries that come up for police and law enforcement officers of the District of Columbia, and we thank him.

I would like to advise the gentleman as chairman of the committee that we began hearings on this earlier this year, but we could not go forward until we heard from the District of Columbia officials, and they did not send a bill down here until May 11, giving us just what they wanted, and it required the last 2 months to get together on that.

Mr. BIAGGI. I am not critical of the committee. The chairman recalls I complimented the committee and especially the most respected chairman for the work done on behalf of police and firemen. If the origin of the criticism is to be directed at the officials of the District, then that is where it should lie and it should be for the Congress to correct it.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN).

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15580 and I also intend to give my enthusiastic support of the amendments to be offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Gude) and the

gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Broyhill).

I hope the House today will resoundingly approve this pay bill which is so vitally needed by our local police and firemen. This 17-percent increase in pay is richly deserved, but also the January 1, 1972, effective date is also richly deserved.

You have read the statistics as well as I, and you know that the Washington, D.C., Police Department is becoming an outstanding crime-fighting operation. The District of Columbia crime rate, once the shame of the Nation, has been plummeting. Crime in the Nation's Capital has been drastically reduced, and our police officers are entitled to a great deal of the credit for this situation, and yet the police officers in the District of Columbia are the lowest paid in all of the metropolitan areas.

We are also well served here in the Capital City by our dedicated firemen. The tragic devastation, distress and confusion recently caused by the storm Agnes spotlighted, I believe, the heroic, intelligent and sensitive service that is being given by our firemen each and every day. These efforts too often go unnoticed and unappreciated.

For these and many other reasons I unhesitatingly support this long overdue and acutely needed pay raise for these dedicated employees who are so vital to our peace and safety.

The merits of the increase and the amount of the increase before us here today should not be in question. At the time this well deserved pay raise was presented, as many prior speakers have indicated, there was no dispute about the two-stage proposal: 11 percent on January 1 and 6 percent on July 1. This seemed fair and reasonable to everyone who was concerned with this legislation at that time.

The financially beleaguered policemen and firemen and their families have received no pay increase since July 1, 1969, and their salaries have fallen 18 percent behind their fellow public servants in other departments of the government. I remind my colleagues that their wives buy at the same grocery stores as the wives of those other government employees, and they are way behind in the cost-of-living increases.

Now, through no fault of policemen or firemen, the simple passage of time has robbed them of two-thirds of this pay increase, the 11 percent they were to have received January 1 of this year.

Now, you can anticipate what the effect it had on morale when the committee saw fit not to put in this January 1 effective date.

Equity demands, as far as I am concerned, that we strongly support the amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Broyhill, to make the pay raise effective on the first pay period after March 1 of this year. The kind of first-class systems that we have on our District of Columbia Police and Fire Departments can only come about when people with top qualifications and training are melded together under competent leadership into a cohesive working team.

These men willingly face danger daily, relying on their colleagues beside them for support and protection. The highest possible morale and esprit de corps are essential to the effectiveness of our police and fire departments.

The inequities which would result from denying the retroactive effective date would jeopardize the morale of our policemen and firemen. It seems, Mr. Chairman, that our society is slow to give thanks and praise to our policemen and firemen and quick to complain and criticize. Today we, the elected representatives of that society, have an opportunity to demonstrate our appreciation in a tangible way. Mr. Chairman, our policemen and firemen need this testimony of our gratitude and appreciation for the job they are accomplishing in the glare of national attention under extremely trying circumstances.

The proposed amendments meet an obligation which we owe these dedicated men and women. I urge my colleagues to support the Broyhill and the Gude amendments and I hope we will do so resoundingly. I also urge support of the bill itself.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment that I hope this House passes the bill because I think we have seen the police department faced with some very serious problems in months past and we have seen the expert way in which they have handled the problems and the courageous way in which they have handled the problems. I believe they deserve the compliments of every one of us.

May I further say that this being the Nation's Capital, where we have visitors from all over the United States and from all over the world, there is nothing more important to this city than good police and fire protection. I believe the police and fire departments have done an outstanding job in the District of Columbia.

I would say this bill deserves our support. I am sorry it took as long as it did for us to get to it. I also want to point out, as has the chairman, that the reports from the city government were not in our hands as early as they might have been to make this pay raise effective earlier. But, finally, we have arrived at a bill which I think has great merit.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the Delegate from the District of Columbia.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill as reported by the committee. We are appreciative of the fine work done by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CABELL), as well as the chairman, in bringing this bill to the floor of the House.

As most of the Members of Congress are aware, both the city government and the Delegate from the District of Columbia are in full support of this bill which will provide a richly deserved and long delayed raise for our police and our firemen.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN).

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First of all may I express my appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee and to the chairman of the full committee on the speed with which they acted. I have heard various reports that there were dilatory tactics used in the committee. I think it should be re-emphasized that the District of Columbia government only brought its request and its report to the committee in May and it was only after the District of Columbia brought in its request that the committee and staff were able to work on the bill. So there have been no dilatory tactics on the part of the committee.

I commend the chairman of the subcommittee and the chairman of the full committee on the diligence with which they pursue the various legislative matters with respect to the District of Columbia.

As a new member of that committee I must say I am impressed, and I have found their legislative leadership to be very contrary to many of the adverse reports which currently seem to be afloat.

I would like to direct a question to the chairman—a question which occurred as a result of a visit to my office today by a representative of the firemen in the District. I think there is a misunderstanding on the retirement provisions of the committee bill. My question is this: If a person, a fireman or a policeman, is injured in line of duty, disability occurs, and the person is forced to retire, is it not true the person retires at that time on the current salary he is receiving, which would be the present salary plus the 17 percent or 17.6 percent?

Mr. CABELL. In answer to the gentleman's question, that is my understanding.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I believe this does need to be cleared up, because the allegation was made they would have to retire on a 3-year average. I believe that is misinformation.

Mr. CABELL. No. The 3-year average does not apply to retirement for disability.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL).

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time to direct some questions to the chairman.

Could the gentleman tell me what percentage of the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police who are retiring are retiring on disability at the present time?

Mr. CABELL. The figures we have indicate that from 85 to 90 percent of all our present retirees are on disability retirement. Namely, 2,412 retirees out of 2,728 total retirees.

Mr. KYL. This of course raises a number of questions. Therefore, I would ask if the committee has done any checking to see what percentage of those who have retired on disability have been employed by other police forces in the metropolitan area, or how many of those people are now employees of the school security system doing essentially the same work they did before?

Mr. CABELL. We have not made an exhaustive study of that, but we have every

reason to believe that a great number of them are filling full-time jobs at the present time.

Mr. KYL. After being retired on disability.

Mr. CABELL. Bear this in mind, also. The reason we are favorable to longevity increases but at the same time do not want them to apply for retirement credit is to encourage people to stay in our uniformed services. Under present retirement in 20 years a man can retire. At that time he can be 40 years old. He can immediately then go into industry and build another retirement. He can get a full salary, which he can draw from industry or commerce, and also build up a social security base. That is why we want to discourage these people from premature retirement.

Mr. KYL. Is my understanding correct that if a person retires on disability he may then draw unemployment compensation for a matter of 18 months?

Mr. CABELL. I am not familiar with that.

Mr. KYL. Is it true that there is an income tax advantage to retiring under disability?

Mr. CABELL. Very definitely, because disability retirement is nontaxable.

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

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. KYL. The reason why I ask these questions, Mr. Chairman, is that there is no one in this House who is more an advocate of meeting the legitimate needs of our policemen than the gentleman from Iowa. But, because of what seemed to be unnatural and unreasonable percentages in this business of retirement what I am afraid of is that one of these days the real, honest to goodness, dedicated police of the District of Columbia are going to get a black eye because we will find ourselves in a position we cannot defend. This is especially true when they retire early, get unemployment compensation, get a tax break, and take a job right here doing essentially the same thing they were doing before disqualification for physical reasons.

I believe it is in the interest of the police to try to take care of this matter, and I hope the committee action will do that.

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

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BIAGGI. I share the gentleman's views. I, like the gentleman knows, and like him, am an advocate of policemen's rights. As the gentleman knows, I spent 23 years with the New York City Police Department.

I am looking at these percentages, and something cries out here. When something is wrong we should look into it. This is inordinate. This is unjustifiable, in my judgment. It is a percentage I have never seen in my life. It is a shock to have it revealed to me.

I do not make the observation that if a man is deserving he should not receive it. We should protect that man's rights.

However, there is something wrong with the procedure. May I suggest to the committee or to the officials of the city that they look into this procedure and compare it to the practices of many other cities that have at least as many, if not more, policemen with substantially less percentages and oftentimes more hazardous conditions.

Mr. KYL. I can understand why until a matter of 18 months ago or 2 years ago a policeman in the District of Columbia would have wanted to retire at the earliest possible moment. But conditions have improved since that time. Still the statistics do not indicate any lowering of the pressures or incentives to retire under a disability. I do hope the committee does take a serious look at this, not because I am trying to injure the police but because I am interested in the police who serve the District of Columbia.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I think everybody on the committee shares your concern with the high number of people who retired on disability and who are still working. As I understand it, back in 1960 or 1961 there was a request for a change in the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CABELL. I yield the gentleman from Iowa 1 additional minute.

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The law of disability was expanded so it was not just that if a person were disabled but if an injury was aggravated by his service in the police department or fire department then it might be the basis for retirement. It is this particular language that apparently provided the leeway for a very large number of retirees.

I say to the gentleman from Iowa that in the bill that is brought to the floor there is an effort to try to stop this. There is a requirement that if a person retires on disability, he has to report to the doctors for reexamination. In this way we hope at least to check on it and find out if in fact such person is disabled and, if he is or claims to be and is working in another job, then what is the degree of the disability. Then, if that does not work, and the policeman or fireman in the District are not aware of the concern over the abuse of this privilege, then I think new language or a new provision must become a part of the law.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, I certainly wish to thank the gentleman from Iowa for his contribution and for bringing up that particular point.

Without casting any aspersions on the present retirees, we do think that the figures provided by the District government are substantial enough to merit further study and to merit the provision written into the act before you today requiring annual physical examination.

I would like to remind the committee that with this talk you have heard about how penurious we have been with regard to the District police department actually in the last 17 years the classified employees' salaries of the District

of Columbia government have gone up 81.5 percent, while the policemen and firemen salaries have gone up 82.3 percent. So I certainly think the police and firemen are keeping pace.

I would also like to correct a misconception—and I am sure it was inadvertent—the statement that there have been no increases since 1969. Actually, the pay bill providing the last pay increase for the police and fire departments was passed on June 30, 1970, which brought it into the next year, which would be the 1971 fiscal year, and was retroactive to July 1, 1969.

So the increments have been well in line. At the time of the 1970 raise for the police and fire departments those salaries were the tops for the entire Washington metropolitan area, and were very nearly the top or at the top for all cities of 500,000 to 1 million population, and now the recommended 17 percent increases again put the police and fire department salaries of the District of Columbia at the very top of the metropolitan area, and again either at the top or very nearly the top of all such forces in cities of 500,000 to 1 million population.

Everybody wants to give them everything that is possible, but I do say also

that some of our watchdogs of the Treasury should be a little more careful and a little more watchful of the Treasury because anything that is done with reference to these increases comes out of the pockets of all of the taxpayers of the country because we are having to subsidize, and very heavily, the District of Columbia—\$190 million being the current annual Federal contribution or payment to the District.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I also rise in support of H.R. 15580, salary increases for the police and firemen in the District of Columbia. The firemen and law officers are typical of the dedicated and devoted Americans at the grassroots level who make this Nation the greatest on earth. These men need our support, backing, and encouragement as never before. The firefighter and police officer play an important role in protecting our environment from waste, destruction, and criminal elements—they are on the firing line to preserve freedom.

Mr. Chairman, every day these men and women are in constant danger in protecting our well-being so that we may carry out our congressional duties here in Washington. Not only in the District of Columbia, but police officers and firemen throughout our Nation are on duty

and enable our constituents to live and carry out their business within the boundary of the law without fear of intimidation and reprisal. The American public owes these dedicated men and women a deep sense of gratitude and appreciation for their devotion to duty for the common good.

Mr. Chairman, just this morning at the Members' prayer breakfast, our colleague, Hon. MARIO BIAGGI, spoke to us on the hazards in the life of a police officer. Representative BIAGGI, one of the most decorated police officers in the history of our Nation, is a great example of the dedication, courage, and compassion of this country's policemen and firemen. I pray for the day when peace and order will prevail, and the suffering and potential dangers to these men and women will be reduced and eliminated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE AND FIREMEN'S SALARY ACT

SEC. 101. The salary schedule contained in section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-823) is amended to read as follows:

"SALARY SCHEDULE

"Salary class and title	Service step—								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Class 1: Fire private, police private.....	\$10,000	\$10,300	\$10,800	\$11,300	\$12,100	\$12,900	\$13,400	\$13,900	\$14,400
Class 2: Fire inspector.....	11,400	12,100	12,800	13,500	14,200	14,900	15,600	16,300	17,000
Class 3: Detective, assistant pilot, assistant marine engineer.....	12,500	13,125	13,750	14,375	15,000	15,625	16,250	16,875	17,500
Class 4: Fire sergeant, police sergeant, detective sergeant.....	13,580	14,260	14,940	15,620	16,300	16,980	17,660	18,340	19,020
Class 5: Fire lieutenant, police lieutenant.....	15,700	16,485	17,270	18,055	18,840	19,625	20,410	21,195	21,980
Class 6: Marine engineer, pilot.....	17,150	18,005	18,860	19,715	20,570	21,425	22,280	23,135	23,990
Class 7: Fire captain, police captain.....	18,600	19,530	20,460	21,390	22,320	23,250	24,180	25,110	26,040
Class 8: Battalion fire chief, police inspector.....	21,560	22,640	23,720	24,800	25,880	26,960	28,040	29,120	30,200
Class 9: Deputy fire chief, deputy chief of police.....	25,300	27,015	28,730	30,445	32,160	33,875	35,590	37,305	39,020
Class 10: Assistant chief of police, assistant fire chief, commanding officer of the executive protective service, commanding officer of the U.S. Park Police.....	30,000	32,000	34,000	36,000	38,000	40,000	42,000	44,000	46,000
Class 11: Fire chief, chief of police.....	34,700	36,800	38,900	41,000	43,100	45,200	47,300	49,400	51,500

SEC. 102. Section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-823) is amended (1) by striking out "The" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), the", and (2) by inserting after the salary schedule in that section the following:

"(b) Compensation may not be paid, by reason of any provision of this Act, at a rate in excess of the rate of basic pay for level V of the Executive Schedule contained in subchapter II of chapter 52 of title 5, United States Code."

SEC. 103. Section 201 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-824 (a)) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 201. The rates of basic compensation of officers and members in active service on the effective date of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1972 shall be adjusted as follows:

"(1) Each officer or member receiving basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date at one of the scheduled service step rates of subclass (a) or (b) of salary class 1 in the salary schedule in effect on the day next preceding such effective date shall be placed in and receive basic compensation in salary class 1 in the salary schedule in effect on and after such date, and each such officer or member shall be placed at

the respective service step in which he was serving immediately prior to such date. Each officer or member receiving basic compensation immediately prior to such date at one of the scheduled longevity step rates of subclass (a) or (b) of salary class 1 in the salary schedule in effect on the day next preceding such effective date shall be placed in and receive basic compensation in salary class 1 in the salary schedule in effect on and after such date, and each such officer or member shall be placed in a service step as follows:

"From—	To—
Class 1, subclass (a) or (b):	Class 1:
Longevity step A.....	Service step 7.
Longevity step B.....	Service step 8.
Longevity step C.....	Service step 9.

"(2) Each officer or member receiving basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date at one of the scheduled service step rates of subclass (a) or (b) of salary class 2 in the salary schedule in effect on the day next preceding such effective date shall be placed in and receive basic compensation in salary class 2 in the salary schedule in effect on and after such date, and each shall be placed at the respective service step in which he was serving immediately prior to such date. Each officer or member receiving basic compensation immediately prior to such date at one of the scheduled longevity

step rates of subclass (a) or (b) of salary class 2 in the salary schedule in effect on the day next preceding such effective date shall be placed in and receive basic compensation in salary class 2 in the salary schedule in effect on and after such date, and each such officer or member shall be placed in a service step as follows:

"From—	To—
Class 2, subclass (a) or (b):	Class 2:
Longevity step A.....	Service step 5.
Longevity step B.....	Service step 6.
Longevity step C.....	Service step 7.

"(3) Each officer or member receiving basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date at one of the scheduled service step rates of salary class 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, or 9 in the salary schedule in effect on the day next preceding such effective date shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding scheduled service step and salary class in the salary schedule in effect on and after such date. Each officer or member receiving basic compensation immediately prior to such date at one of the scheduled longevity step rates of salary class 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, or 9 in the salary schedule in effect on the day next preceding such effective date shall receive basic compensation at the corresponding salary class in the salary schedule in effect on and after such date, and each shall be placed in a service step as follows:

"From—	To—
Class 3:	Class 3:
Longevity step A-----	Service step 5.
Longevity step B-----	Service step 6.
Longevity step C-----	Service step 7.

"From—	To—
Class 5:	Class 5:
Longevity steps A and B--	Service Step 5.

"From—	To—
Class 6, 7, 8, or 9:	Class 6, 7, 8, or 9:
Longevity steps A and B--	Service step 4.

"(4) Each officer or member receiving basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date at one of the scheduled service step rates of subclass (a), (b), or (c) of salary class 4 in the salary schedule in effect on the day next preceding such effective date shall be placed in and receive basic compensation in salary class 4 in the salary schedule in effect on or after such date, and each shall be placed at the respective service step in which he was serving immediately prior to such date. Each officer or member receiving basic compensation immediately prior to such date at one of the scheduled longevity step rates of subclass (a), (b), or (c) of salary class 4 in the salary schedule in effect on the day next preceding such effective date shall be placed in and receive basic compensation in salary class 4 in the salary schedule in effect on and after such date, and each shall be placed in a service step as follows:

"From—	To—
Class 4, subclass (a), (b), or (c):	Class 4:
Longevity step A-----	Service step 5.
Longevity steps B and C--	Service step 6.

"(5) Each officer or member receiving basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date at one of the scheduled service step rates of salary class 10 or 11 in the salary schedule in effect on the day next preceding such effective date shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding scheduled service step and salary class in the salary schedule in effect on and after such date, except that any such officer or member who immediately prior to such date was serving in service step 4 of salary class 10 or in service step 3 of salary class 11 shall be placed in and receive basic compensation in a service step as follows:

"From—	To—
Class 10:	Class 10:
Service step 4-----	Service step 3.
"From—	To—
Class 11:	Class 11:
Service step 3-----	Service step 2."

SEC. 104. Section 202 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-825) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 202. Each officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force, Executive Protective Service, and United States Park Police force assigned on or after the effective date of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1972—

"(1) to perform the duty of a helicopter pilot, or

"(2) to render explosive devices ineffective or to otherwise dispose of such devices,

shall receive, in addition to his scheduled rate of basic compensation, \$2,100 per annum so long as he remains in such assignment. The additional compensation authorized by this section shall be paid to an officer or member in the same manner as he is paid the basic compensation to which he is entitled. No officer or member who receives the additional compensation authorized by this section may receive additional compensation under section 302."

SEC. 105. (a) Section 203 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-826) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 203. The aide to the Fire Marshal shall be included as a Fire Inspector in salary class 2."

(b) Section 204 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-826a) is repealed.

SEC. 106. Section 302 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-828) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 302. (a) The Commissioner of the District of Columbia, in the case of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the Secretary of the Treasury, in the case of the Executive Protective Service, and the Secretary of the Interior, in the case of the United States Park Police force, are authorized to establish and determine, from time to time, the positions in salary classes 1, 2, and 4 to be included as technicians' positions.

"(b) Each officer or member—

"(1) who immediately prior to the effective date of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1972—

"(A) was in a position assigned to subclass (b) of salary class 1 or 2 or subclass (c) of salary class 4, or

"(B) was in salary class 4 and was performing the duty of a dog handler, or

"(2) whose position is determined under subsection (a) to be included in salary class 1, 2, or 4 on or after such date as a technician's position,

shall on or after such date receive, in addition to his scheduled rate of basic compensation, \$680 per annum. An officer or member described in paragraph (1)(A) or (2) shall receive the additional compensation authorized by this subsection until his position is determined under subsection (a) not to be included in salary class 1, 2, or 4 as a technician's position or until he no longer occupies such position, whichever occurs first. An officer or member described in paragraph (1)(B) shall receive such compensation so long as he performs the duty of a dog handler. If the position of dog handler is included under subsection (a) as a technician's position, an officer or member performing the duty of a dog handler may not receive both the additional compensation authorized for an officer or member occupying a technician's position and the additional compensation authorized for officers and members performing the duty of a dog handler.

"(c) Each officer or member who immediately prior to the effective date of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1972 was assigned as a detective sergeant in subclass (b) of salary class 4 shall on or after such date, receive, in addition to his scheduled rate of basic compensation, \$500 per annum so long as he remains in such assignment. Each officer or member who is promoted after such date to the rank of detective sergeant from the eligible list in force on such date shall receive, in addition to his scheduled rate of basic compensation, \$500 per annum so long as he remains in such assignment.

"(d) The additional compensation authorized by subsections (b) and (c) shall be paid to an officer or member in the same manner as he is paid the basic compensation to which he is entitled."

SEC. 107. Section 303 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-829) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 303. (a) Each officer and member, if he has a current performance rating of 'satisfactory' or better, shall have his service step adjusted in the following manner:

"(1) Each officer and member in service step 1, 2, or 3 of salary class 1 shall be advanced in compensation successively to the next higher service step at the beginning of

the first pay period immediately subsequent to the completion of fifty-two calendar weeks of active service;

"(2) Each officer and member in service step 4 or 5 of salary class 1 shall be advanced in compensation successively to the next higher service step at the beginning of the first pay period immediately subsequent to the completion of one hundred and four calendar weeks of active service;

"(3) Each officer and member in service step 6, 7, or 8 of salary class 1 shall be advanced in compensation successively to the next higher service step at the beginning of the first pay period immediately subsequent to the completion of one hundred and fifty-six calendar weeks of active service;

"(4) Each officer and member in salary classes 2 through 11 who has not attained the maximum service step rate of compensation for the rank or title in which he is placed shall be advanced in compensation successively to the next higher service step rate for such rank or title at the beginning of the first pay period immediately subsequent to the completion of one hundred and four calendar weeks of active service, except that in the case of an officer or member in service step 4, 5, or 6 of salary class 2 or 3, service step 4 or 5 of salary class 4, and service step 4 of salary class 5, such officer or member shall be advanced successively to the next higher service step at the beginning of the first pay period immediately subsequent to the completion of one hundred and fifty-six calendar weeks of active service.

"(b) As used in this title, the term 'calendar week of active service' includes all periods of leave with pay, and periods of nonpay status which do not cumulatively equal one basic workweek."

SEC. 108. Section 304 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-830) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 304. (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section, any officer or member who is promoted or transferred to a higher salary class shall receive basic compensation at the lowest scheduled rate of such higher salary class which exceeds his existing scheduled rate of basic compensation by not less than one step increase of the next higher step of the salary class from which he is promoted or transferred.

"(b) Any officer or member receiving additional compensation as provided in section 302 of this Act who is promoted or transferred to a higher salary class shall receive basic compensation at the lowest scheduled rate of such higher class which exceeds his existing scheduled rate of basic compensation by at least the sum of one step increase of the next higher step of the salary class from which he is promoted or transferred and the amount of such additional compensation."

SEC. 109. Section 305 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-831) is amended by (1) striking out "Commissioners" and inserting in lieu thereof "Commissioner", and (2) striking out "or Subclass" immediately after "Class".

SEC. 110. Section 401 of the Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-832) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 401. (a) (1) In recognition of long and faithful service, each officer and member in the active service on or after the effective date of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1972 shall receive per annum, in addition to the rate of basic compensation prescribed in the salary schedule contained in section 101 of this Act, an amount computed in accordance with the following table:

"If an officer or member has completed at least:
15 years of continuous service.....

20 years of continuous service.....
25 years of continuous service.....
30 years of continuous service.....

He shall receive per annum an amount, fixed to the nearest dollar, equal to:
5 per centum of the rate of basic compensation prescribed for service step 1 of the salary class of such salary schedule which he occupies.
10 per centum of such compensation.
15 per centum of such compensation.
20 per centum of such compensation.

"(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), continuous service as an officer or member includes any period of his service in the Armed Forces of the United States other than any period of such service (A) determined not to have been satisfactory service, (B) rendered before appointment as an officer or member, or (C) rendered after resignation as an officer or member.

"(3) Each officer and member shall receive additional compensation in accordance with paragraph (1) only as long as he remains in the active service. Such compensation shall be paid in the same manner as the basic compensation to which such officer or member is entitled, except that it shall not be subject to deduction and withholding for retirement and insurance, and shall not be considered as salary for the purpose of computing annuities pursuant to the Police-men and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act and for the purpose of computing insurance coverage under the provisions of chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code.

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other law, individuals retired from active service prior to the effective date of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1972, and who are entitled to receive a pension relief allowance or retirement compensation under the Police-men and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act, shall not be entitled to receive an increase in their pension relief allowance or retirement compensation by reason of the enactment of this section.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other law, each deputy chief of the Metropolitan Police force and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall, upon completion of thirty years of continuous service on the police force or fire department, as the case may be, be placed in, and receive basic compensation at, the highest service step in the salary class to which his position is assigned in the salary schedule contained in section 101. For purposes of this subsection, in computing a deputy chief's continuous service on the police force or fire department, there shall be included any period of his service in the Armed Forces of the United States other than any period of such service—

- (1) determined not to have been satisfactory service,
- (2) rendered before appointment as an officer or member, or
- (3) rendered after resignation as an officer or member."

Sec. 111. Section 501 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-833) is amended by (1) adding "and the Executive Protective Service" immediately after "United States Park Police", and (2) striking out "or Sub-Classes" at the end of such section.

Sec. 112. The Act approved May 25, 1926 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-131), is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "That", and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) The Chief of Police of the Metropolitan Police force, the Commanding Officer of the Executive Protective Service, and the Commanding Officer of the United States Park Police force, are each authorized to provide a clothing allowance, not to exceed \$300 in any one year, to an officer or member assigned to perform duties in 'plainclothes'. Such

clothing allowance is not to be treated as part of the officer's or member's basic compensation and shall not be used for the purpose of computing his overtime, promotions, or retirement benefits. Such allowance for any officer or member may be discontinued at any time upon written notification by the authorizing official."

Sec. 113. Subsection (h) of the first section of the Act approved August 15, 1950 (D.C. Code, sec. 9-904(h)), is amended by striking out "class 10" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "the salary class applicable to the Fire Chief and Chief of Police".

Sec. 114. Section 301 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-518) is amended—

(1) by striking out "Such" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as otherwise provided in this section, such";

(2) by striking out the third sentence;

(3) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 301." and by adding the following at the end thereof:

"(b) The increase prescribed by subsection (a) of this section in the pension relief allowance or retirement compensation received by an individual retired from active service before the effective date of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1972 under the Police-men and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act as a result of the increase in salary provided by the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1972 shall not be less than 17 per centum of such allowance or compensation.

"(c) Each individual retired from active service and entitled to receive a pension relief allowance or retirement compensation under the Police-men and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act shall be entitled to receive, without making application therefor, with respect to each increase in salary, granted by any law which takes effect after the effective date of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1972, to which he would be entitled if he were in active service, an increase in his pension relief allowance or retirement compensation computed as follows: His pension relief allowance or retirement compensation shall be increased by an amount equal to the product of such allowance or compensation and the per centum increase made by such law in the scheduled rate of compensation to which he would be entitled if he were in active service or the effective date of such increase in salary.

"(d) Each increase in pension relief allowance or retirement compensation made under this section because of an increase in salary shall take effect as of the first day of the first month following the effective date of such increase in salary."

Sec. 115. (a) Section 2 of the Act of September 8, 1960 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-823b) is repealed.

(b) Section 2 of the Act of October 24, 1962 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-823c) is repealed.

(c) Section 102 of the Act of September 2, 1964 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-823d) is repealed.

(d) Section 102 of the District of Columbia Police-men and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1966 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-823d-1) is repealed.

(e) Section 2 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1968 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-823d-2) is repealed.

(f) Section 103 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1970 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-823d-3) is repealed.

Sec. 116. The effective date of this title and the amendments made by this title shall be the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after July 1, 1972.

Sec. 117. This title may be cited as the "District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1972".

TITLE II—POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN'S RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY ACT AMENDMENTS

Sec. 201. (a) Subsection (a) of the Police-men and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act (D.C. Code, sec. 4-521) is amended by adding after paragraph (16) the following new paragraph:

"(17) The term 'average pay' means—

"(A) in the case of a member who first becomes a member after the effective date of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1972, the highest annual rate resulting from averaging the member's rates of basic salary in effect over any three consecutive years of police or fire service, with each rate, weighted by the time it was in effect, except that if the member retires under subsection (g) and if on the date of his retirement under that subsection he has not completed three consecutive years of police or fire service, such term means his basic salary at the time of his retirement; and

"(B) in the case of a member who was in active service on the effective date of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1972 and who retires under this section after such date, the greater of—

"(i) the amount determined under subparagraph (A), or

"(ii) the basic salary of such member in effect on the day next preceding such date increased by 17 per centum."

(b) (1) Subsections (f), (g), and (h) of such Act (D.C. Code, secs. 4-526—4-528) are each amended by striking out "his basic salary at the time of retirement" each place it occurs and inserting in lieu thereof "his average pay".

(2) Subsections (g)(2) and (h)(1) of such Act are each amended by striking out "his basic salary at the time of his retirement" and inserting in lieu thereof "his average pay".

(3) Subsection (h)(3) of such Act is amended by striking out "the basic salary of such member at the time of retirement" and inserting in lieu thereof "the average pay of such member".

(4) Subsection (k)(2) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 4-531) is amended by striking out "step 6, subclass (a), class 1" and inserting in lieu thereof "service step 6 of salary class 1".

(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall not reduce (1) the amount of the annuity, relief, or retirement compensation of an individual retired under the Police-men and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act before the effective date of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1972, or (2) the relief or annuity of any person which is computed on the basis upon which such retired individual's annuity, relief, or retirement compensation is computed.

Sec. 202. (a) Subsection (m) of the Police-men and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act (D.C. Code, sec. 4-533) is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(m)" and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) If a member is retired under subsection (f) or (g) of this section and is employed on or after the effective date of the

District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1972, such member shall, in accordance with such regulations as the Commission shall prescribe, notify the Commissioner of the employment; and the Commissioner shall, as soon as practicable after the receipt of such notice, require each such member to undergo a medical examination (satisfactory to the Commissioner) of the disability upon which the member's retirement under such subsection is based."

(b) The Commissioner of the District of Columbia shall (1) promulgate the regulations required by paragraph (2) of subsection (m) of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act not later than ninety days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and (2) give timely written notice to each member retired under subsection (f) or (g) of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act of the promulgation of such regulations.

SEC. 203. The amendments made by section 201 of this title shall take effect on the ninetieth day following the date of the enactment of this Act. Section 202 of this title shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE III—REVENUE FOR SALARY INCREASES

SEC. 301. (a) (1) Section 125 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2602) is amended by striking out "4 per centum" in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "5 per centum".

(2) Paragraphs (2) and (3) of such section 125 are each amended by striking out "5 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "6 per centum".

(3) (A) Paragraph (a) of section 127 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2604(a)) is amended by striking out "and other than sales or charges for rooms, lodgings, or accommodations furnished to transients."

(B) Paragraph (c) of such section is repealed.

(C) Paragraphs (a) and (b) of such section are redesignated as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively.

(b) (1) Section 212 of the District of Columbia Use Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2702) is amended by striking out "4 per centum" in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "5 per centum".

(2) Paragraphs (2) and (3) of such section 212 are each amended by striking out "5 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "6 per centum".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins on or after the thirtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. CABELL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. BROYHILL OF VIRGINIA

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments, one of which is a technical perfecting amendment, and I would ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that they may be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia: Page 9, beginning in line 14, strike out "from the eligible list in force on such date," and on Page 18, strike out lines 16 through 18 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 116. (a) The effective date of this title and the amendments made by this title shall be the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after March 1, 1972.

(b) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of the amendments made by this title only in the case of an individual in the service of the District of Columbia government or of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of United States) on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to an officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, or the Executive Protective Service, who retired during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after March 1, 1972, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act, for services rendered during such period, and (2) in accordance with the provisions of subchapter 8 of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code (relating to settlement of accounts of deceased employees), for services rendered during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after March 1, 1972, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act, by an officer or member who dies during such period.

(c) For the purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

(d) For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an officer or member is eligible under the provisions of chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code (relating to government employees group life insurance), all changes in rates of compensation or salary which result from the enactment of this title shall be held and considered to be effective as of the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, the thrust of the amendments has already been read, and the balance of the amendment is merely boiler-plate. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

I will explain the purpose of the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to make the effective date of the pay raise effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after March 1, 1972. At the present time, the bill provides for the pay raise to be effective on the first day of the first pay period that begins on or after July 1 of this year.

In other words, my amendment would make the effective date retroactive by 4 months.

I explained in my previous remarks that there was an agreement, a memorandum of understanding, a copy of which I have here in my hand, between the Police and Firemen's Associations and the District of Columbia government, which stated in part that two-thirds of this pay bill would be made effective as of January 1 of this year, and one-third effective as of July 1. This memorandum of understanding was signed back in December. Negotiations were commenced in February of 1971, and were underway for approximately 10 months.

The net effect of this amendment would accomplish this same purpose by making the entire salary increase effective on March 1. This simplifies the presenting and writing of the amendment and also will simplify the administration of the pay raises. As I have said the substance of this amendment was originally agreed to in toto. It is fair and proper, and by every yardstick the members of the Police Department and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia are entitled to what we are providing here in this amendment. It is the absolute minimum of justice, Mr. Chairman. This Congress should provide for these men in order to pay a debt we owe them for the services that they have rendered to our Nation's Capital—to the citizens of the city, to our families, and to our constituents who visit this Capital City.

This amendment has the approval of the Pay Board.

The only reason that the committee provided for a July 1 effective date in the bill as reported, rather than the date which had been agreed upon, was the delay in our consideration of this legislation.

The gentlewoman from Oregon said a moment ago that reference has been made to dilatory tactics on our part. I do not know to whom she was referring at the time. I certainly am not claiming that there were dilatory tactics. Of course, we were unable to get consideration of this legislation until the time it actually was reported out of the committee. However, it is not the fault of the policemen and firemen who serve in this city that we had a legislative problem and a legislative logjam.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. My reference was to the various allegations which were made that dilatory tactics were used by the committee. I thought the record should be very, very clear that there was no dilatory action taken by any member of the committee that I know of. And if there is any fault, it might be the District of Columbia government in not bringing up their request until May 11.

I also might say that I have some question about the making of an agreement back in December about retroactivity when the action was to be dependent on what the Congress does.

I do not know how they can make a binding agreement last December on

what the Congress must do on the date of the pay raise going into effect.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. It was determined that this was fair and proper by the District government, in an agreement between them and representatives of the police and firemen's associations.

The only reason we did not make the effective date January 1 or March 1, as provided for in this amendment, is that in the legislation we are attempting to provide sufficient tax revenue to pay the cost of these pay increases. I do not object, as I said earlier, to raising the revenue; but we should not pass judgment on what the policemen and the firemen are entitled to in the matter of pay increases on the basis of whether or not we are able to raise tax revenues at a particular time.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NELSEN. While sitting here, several Members have come by asking me for information as to the dollars that would be required in the event that we did go back to March, and it was my understanding that there was a feeling that somehow or other it could be worked out.

I hope the gentleman would speak to that point, because I am sure that this is something they would be concerned about.

I might mention also that I did support the retroactive feature going back to January in the committee.

This, of course, is a compromise and provides a simplicity of operation which has merit.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

(Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia asked and was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. My point is that, without precedent, we are setting a pay increase and the effective date of this pay increase on the basis of our ability or our action in raising tax revenue here in the District of Columbia. But if that is to be a factor—and if it is so important that we want to establish this precedent—then I must call your attention to the fact that this body has approved, in other legislation, revenue sharing if you please, a \$13 million windfall for the District of Columbia. This is to be for the last half of the past fiscal year. So the city has some \$13 million of Federal funds pending in that legislation.

Now, I have said that this retroactive date is fair and proper, and that these public servants are entitled to this pay increase effective on March 1.

I said earlier that the last pay increase that the District of Columbia police and firemen received was effective on July 1, 1969, and since that time the Federal and District of Columbia government employees and legislative employees have received the following increases:

On December 28, 1969, there was a 6-percent increase; on January 10, 1971, a 5.9-percent increase; on January 9 of

1972, legislative employees included, a 5.5-percent increase, for a total of 17.4 percent, or a cumulative total of 18.4 percent. They have received these increases while the District of Columbia police and firemen have received nothing.

All I am asking here in this amendment is that we help them to catch up a little bit, by making the effective date March 1 instead of July 1.

Back in 1964, we attempted to establish parity between the salaries paid in the police department, the fire department, and the classified employees, and we established a parity between the beginning firemen and policemen with a GS-8 classified employee. Let us see what has happened with the GS-8 classified employee since the last pay bill for the police and firemen.

At that time, the GS-8 employee was receiving \$8,449 and the beginning policeman and fireman was receiving \$8,500. Since that time, up to July 1 of this year, the GS-8 whom we are supposed to equate with the starting policeman and fireman, has received \$2,205 more than the latter. Thus, parity now has certainly not been maintained.

This retroactive amendment that I am proposing will help that private, that starting policeman, to pick up only \$504 of the \$2,205 that he has lost by comparison, just by our failure to get around to passing timely legislation to help him to catch up.

The retired classified employee, including the increase that he is going to receive effective July 1 of this year, would have received a total increase of 24.2 percent since the last pay bill that we passed for the police and firemen.

Again, mind you, this amendment will make the increases retroactive only to March 1 of this year. The Government blue-collar worker, since July of 1969, has received a 20-percent increase. During the past 3 years, the building trades workers in the metropolitan area of Washington have received an average increase of 33 percent. Now it costs the wives of the police and firemen just as much to pay for food and rent and clothing and the basic necessities of life for their families and loved ones as it does all of these other people that we have been cognizant of, and who have received substantial pay increases during these past 3 years.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, we also are not doing too well for our police and firemen here in our Nation's capital, as compared with those in other large cities. Back in 1969, the District was top among the jurisdictions of the metropolitan area of Washington in salaries for police and firemen. Now, we are No. 6, the lowest in the whole area—in both minimum and the maximum pay for the police and firemen.

Of the 25 cities of this Nation over 500,000 population, the District now ranks 18th in minimum pay for the police and firemen, and 13th in maximum pay. Even if this legislation passes—which I hope it will—the District will rank only seventh among these cities in minimum salaries for police and firemen. There are 39 cities in this country smaller

than the District of Columbia, whose police and firemen receive higher starting salaries than we are proposing for the District here in this legislation. And many cities are proposing even further increases.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, why can we not pay our police and firemen here in the Nation's Capital, on whom we are so dependent, as much as such officers are being paid in other cities of comparable size?

Actually, their work and their responsibilities are increasing. We tried to get this pay made retroactive by an amendment offered in the committee, but unfortunately the motion failed by a vote of 12 to 12, so obviously the committee was split in their feelings about when the effective date of this legislation should be.

The only reason—and I repeat this for emphasis—offered for not making the raise effective on January 1 or March 1 is that we cannot afford it, or that we did not provide for the money in time. That excuse has never been used before, in connection with salary increases for the military or the legislative or the classified government employees. If these police and firemen are entitled to the pay, and I say they have earned it, then they should receive it on the promised date whether we have provided all the necessary revenues or not. In a revenue sharing bill, this body has approved a bonanza for everybody sufficient to take care of this extra pay.

We owe a debt of gratitude to these people who have served us at the risk of their lives and who have often been spat upon and struck and cursed in the performance of their duties. I say the excuse that we cannot afford this retroactive pay is not acceptable. I say we cannot afford not to pay it, and that the employees are entitled to it. I hope this amendment will be overwhelmingly approved.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the first thing we need to do is to understand clearly the problems involved and to dispel some of the clouds regarding the so-called agreement between the District of Columbia and the police and firemen unions. The District of Columbia has no legal right to enter into an agreement as such. That is the responsibility of this Congress. This District of Columbia government can, under pressure, agree that it will recommend certain things, but that does not mean it has the full force and effect of the law, nor is such an agreement on this Congress.

Again, getting to this subject of how penurious we are with our uniformed services, tell me what other job we can think of where a 20-year-old boy with a high school diploma can start out at \$10,000 a year, which will be the new scale for a private. Under the present scale the average salary for present pri-

vates is \$9,270. The average under the new scale will be based on their length of service and their steps in grade. Under the new schedule, the privates' average salary will be \$10,906. That is even better I believe than being a Congressman. It certainly does not involve any greater danger.

I am not belittling the value to us of the sacrifices and the dangers and the hazards involved for our police and fire departments, but I do think we have got to stay within the bounds of reason. The retroactivity of which the gentleman from Virginia speaks would cost a flat \$4 million, which is not available. The only place the District of Columbia can get it would be to come back to the Congress and ask for an additional Federal contribution. I think our Federal contributions to the District have certainly been most generous, when they have been stepped up from \$126 million a year to the current rate of \$190 million a year. So I defy anybody to say that this Congress is pinch-penny when it comes to the operations of the District of Columbia.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CABELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman inform me on this. I understand the Pay Board has approved the pending bill and the raise of 17 percent. Did the Pay Board consider any element of retroactivity?

Mr. CABELL. Not to my knowledge. I am not positive on that just now. I do not think so. The Board's decision was predicated on a pay increase in two steps, the first, 11 percent, to take effect upon a date specified by Congress, and the second, 6 percent, taking place July 1, 1972.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CABELL. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that the bill as presented to the Pay Board, which was the original bill, provided for two-thirds retroactivity to January 1. The Committee wrote the present bill subsequent to that action.

Mr. CABELL. I believe where the misconception came in is that the proposal submitted to the Pay Board was 11 percent for the first schedule effective the first pay period after date of enactment, and 6 percent for July.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CABELL. I yield.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. The net effect of my amendment is the same thing. This will make it 17 percent effective as of March 1.

Mr. CABELL. I do not quarrel that this is the effect of the amendment, but the gentleman has not told me where he is going to get the \$4 million, and that is a question we must face.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. In the gentleman's experience in the Congress, has there ever been a time when any pay bill came before the Congress which we

required to provide new revenues to underwrite the cost involved, for any group of employees—police, firemen, or classified workers?

Mr. CABELL. I believe that has been done before. I do not believe one can justify everything the Congress has done. I do not intend to do so, any more than I would justify the retroactivity the gentleman proposes.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Virginia is a member of the Ways and Means Committee. If revenue was not provided for a general pay increase then there is a failure on the part of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. CABELL. The gentleman also refers to the revenue sharing bill, but that still has not become law. Therefore, those are some chickens we cannot count.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members will resoundingly defeat this amendment, just as it was defeated in the subcommittee and in the full committee.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendments.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of talk about this pay raise and dilatory tactics. There is one point I would like to stress in urging support for this amendment. That is that the policemen and firemen have not received a pay increase since July 1, 1969, while their neighbors and friends and fellow employees in other Government agencies have received increases of some 18 percent.

If we appreciate the kind of work our policemen and firemen are doing to protect us in the Nation's Capital, I believe simple equity demands that this retroactive provision, which is reasonable in every way, ought to be supported, and this bill ought to be amended by the proposal of the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, the wives of our police and firemen are shopping in the same stores as the wives of other Government workers. They are subjected to the same increases in utility rates, and, in every other way, they are bearing the burdens of the increasing costs of inflation.

We all know what has happened since July 1, 1969, in rising costs.

If we are going to reward these dedicated public servants for the work they do, I believe we ought to support the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL).

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

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

Mr. CABELL. I should like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that he is kicking the same dog around which has been kicked around for a long time; that is, saying the firemen have not had a raise since 1969. The date of that raise was June 30, 1970, and it was made retroactive to July 1, 1969, so they have had a raise that brought them up to salaries commensurate with the going rate of fiscal year 1971.

Mr. HOGAN. But the gentleman will admit that it was effective July 1, 1969. That is when the increase went into effect. And it responded to the cost of living at that point in time.

Mr. CABELL. Yes, but there was more to it than just what the retroactivity would have been, because we gave them a much bigger increase than they would have had otherwise and put them No. 1 in the metropolitan area in 1970. So let us keep the figures straight.

Mr. HOGAN. I believe the figures are clear.

I want to make it clear that I in no way criticize the chairman of the subcommittee or the chairman of the full committee. I do not share any feelings that there have been dilatory tactics. As a former member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I know how hard working and dedicated the members of that committee are.

However, the fact remains that these families have been denied the pay raise for too long a time, and I think equity demands we support this retroactive provision.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is indeed hard to oppose this amendment for retroactive pay for policemen and firemen. It is harder to do it in an election year. But I do want to make one thing perfectly clear and that is that both the city government and I support the bill as it is written. Both of us want to give the policemen and the firemen the pay increases which they deserve, but we have not supported the retroactive measure at this point, because we cannot do it without the necessary resources and without the necessary money.

Through increases in the sales and use taxes we have raised \$15.8 million toward the \$17,848,000 of cost that would be required for this adequate 17 percent increase in salaries. As a part of that package the departments of the District of Columbia government agreed to absorb \$2,667,200 of the increases, which leaves an annual difference of only \$639,000. Retroactive payments will cost at least \$1 million a month.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAUNTROY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I wish to commend the gentleman for his expression of fiscal responsibility, but may I ask the gentleman this question: Does not the gentleman think it would be fair that we pay the policemen and firemen who serve his community somewhat along the lines of comparability with the salaries paid to the white collar workers and blue collar workers who serve this community? Do you not think that would be fair?

Mr. FAUNTROY. That is right, and it is precisely the reason why I have supported the full 17 percent requested.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Let me ask this question. The gentleman should know that it is the white collar workers—

The CHAIRMAN. The delegate from the District of Columbia has the time. Does the gentleman request the delegate to yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FAUNTROY. Yes, if you wanted me to yield to another question.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. The other types of employees who serve the gentleman and his constituents have received far more than what we have provided in this bill to the policemen and firemen.

Mr. FAUNTROY. I commend to you the words of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee on the starting pay which this very generous increase makes available to those entering the service of the community in our police and fire departments. It is not a question of whether we support the 17-percent increase. The only question is where shall we get the money to cover the retroactive pay provision? If my distinguished colleague wants to do something, I suggest he package with this proposal—

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield further?

Has the gentleman ever asked this question before in connection with any legislation he has proposed for the District of Columbia?

Mr. FAUNTROY. Always.

The CHAIRMAN. The delegate has the time.

Mr. HOGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAUNTROY. The gentleman will yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOGAN. Does the gentleman not believe that the money which would accrue to the District government from the revenue-sharing bill, if it is finally enacted, could be used for this purpose?

Mr. FAUNTROY. It might be used for that purpose if, as you suggested, it is passed. And that is a big if on which we would like to have more assurance.

First of all, we would like to be assured that those resources would be made available not only for providing a pay increase to the police and firemen, but we have a lot of other public servants not the least of which are the teachers of the community who have requested a 17-percent increase. We are now speaking in terms of providing a 7-percent increase for the teachers of the community again at the expense of the people of the city solely.

Mr. HOGAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Is it not true that the District of Columbia government supported the original proposal to make the pay raise effective January 1? The amendment before us now makes it effective the first pay period after March 1. So is it not reasonable since this only makes it conform to what the District of Columbia government agreed to originally?

Mr. FAUNTROY. My information is that the District of Columbia government in providing us with the proposal for funding this pay raise stated on May 11 that the sales tax proposals could not be made retroactive to January 1, and that they, therefore, dropped their support of the January 1 effective date.

In short, gentlemen, the District government has supported the subcommit-

tee chairman and the committee chairman on the full 17-percent increase by not making it retroactive to January 1.

Mr. HOGAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. FAUNTROY. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. The gentleman has pointed out, and I think very importantly, that the revenue bill to which we have made reference provides \$13 million of Federal funding, on a retroactive basis for the District of Columbia. This has not passed the Congress as yet, but it has been approved by this body. Thus, we have approved by action of this body a \$13 million retroactive payment to the District of Columbia, and it is this body that is presenting and acting on this legislation at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from the District of Columbia has expired.

(On request of Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FAUNTROY was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FAUNTROY. I yield further to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I believe that I had completed my statement that we are acting at this time on this legislation, and that this body has acted on the revenue sharing bill. We will send both of the bills over to the other body, which I am sure will act upon them in a responsible manner as they generally do.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, again I would urge that we think in terms of a revenue raising proposal that would provide the teachers with a comparable pay increase, and under those terms I am sure that the retroactive use of the proposed funds from the revenue sharing bill might be put into consideration at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from the District of Columbia has again expired.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendments offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL).

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, I cannot agree with the Delegate from the District of Columbia. I was a cosponsor of the bill to provide the police and firemen with an 11-percent increase on January 1, and a 6-percent increase on July 1. The District government supported that bill, and as far as I know they still support it. The Pay Board supported it. The Office of Management and Budget approved of it. And then by a 12 to 12 vote in the committee the amendment failed, and that is why the proposal is now brought here to the floor.

I thought last spring that the police and firemen were entitled to this pay raise, and I still think they are entitled

to it. I join the Delegate from the District of Columbia in his concern about where the money is coming from because the money is coming probably from some of my constituents, but I know that they are very pleased to have the courteous and efficient service these firemen and policemen render to them in the District of Columbia.

So I hope that this Committee will not be led astray by the arguments that have been made.

I think this raise is justified. It has been approved by almost everybody. I know that our very fine and considerate and distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CABELL) has opposed it on fiscal grounds only. Nevertheless I think it should be adopted, and I hope that the Committee will adopt it.

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

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to set the record straight as to the agreement, and the recommendations of the District government, the Office of Budget Management, and so forth. Here is the message, here is the bill and request submitted to our committee by the District government under the date of May 11, 1972, and I quote from the statement:

Title I of the bill will accomplish the following: Establish a two-phase salary increase which would adjust salaries approximately 11 percent on the first day of the pay period which begins on or after date of enactment.

It does not say anything about January.

And then "an additional 6-percent increase on the first day of the first pay period on or after July 1."

Now, how can you get a recommendation from this for January effective date when it was submitted on May 11?

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. I think if the Chairman would look at the recommendation that the city government gave to the Pay Board and to the Office of Management and Budget, he would find it was the original bill which provided for 11 percent on January 1 and 6 percent on July 1, and it was after that, because no action had been taken, that they changed the bill that you have just read.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CABELL. This is the bill that was sent to us by the District government.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. I do not disagree with that point.

Mr. CABELL. This is the only bill—they had not submitted any other bill, because they had not come up with a funding recommendation, and they had not been before the Pay Board. The bill which District government submitted to us is the only bill that was submitted, namely, on the date of May 11, and it made no reference to January 1.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. The District government does not officially change its position, but because the Congress, our committee, had admonished them to come up with recommendations including the revenue to pay for it—that is the reason they changed their position, and not because they do not think that the policemen and firemen are not entitled to it, and not because they did not originally agree to it.

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

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CABELL. May I say that I am not competent to read the minds of the District government. I do not know what they thought—I can only go by what they sent to us in the printed word.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am wholeheartedly in favor of an increase in pay for both the firemen and policemen in the District of Columbia, and I thought that the committee came up with a pretty good bill with really very generous increases in salary, in longevity steps and in retirement benefits.

I have heard it suggested that if we make it retroactive, we will pay for it out of the windfall that the District of Columbia will get from revenue sharing. I am one who hopes that the other body has a little better judgment than this body had with regard to revenue sharing. I am not sure that the District of Columbia is going to get that windfall. Therefore, some alternative plan is going to have to be adopted in terms of paying for that extra cost if retroactivity is adopted.

In terms of what you are doing for the policemen and firemen in the District of Columbia—if you are a captain and you are now getting \$16,469 under the bill, you will be getting \$19,389.

If you are a private in the first step, it increases from \$9,270 to \$10,906.

If you stay in the service, there is the additional longevity feature.

I would like to have you consider what the policemen and firemen in the District of Columbia receive in comparison to those in other cities. I am speaking now of 19 cities that have over 500,000 population, and which I think is a fair comparison.

If you are from the city of Baltimore at the present time and consider the minimum pay for a policeman—Baltimore ranks 15th among the 19 cities. While at the present time the District of Columbia even under the current salary ranks 10th. But under this bill which has been brought forth by the committee on minimum salaries, Washington, D.C., would be fourth highest among the 19 cities.

And if we are talking about maximum salaries, the new schedule would place the District of Columbia first. It would have the highest salary of any of these 19 cities with over 500,000 population.

At the present time under the present salaries for maximum pay for police privates the rankings of the 19 cities include the following:

Atlanta is 15th.

Baltimore 13th.

Boston 14th.

Cincinnati 11th.

Dallas 18th.

Indianapolis 20th.

New Orleans 16th.

Pittsburgh 12th.

St. Louis 17th.

San Antonio 19th.

And so on.

The District of Columbia 10th.

Under the new schedule that we bring to you without retroactivity, the District of Columbia would be first—first in this list of 19 cities with over 500,000 population.

It seems to me that is treating policemen in the District of Columbia fairly well.

In terms of the firemen privates—again if we consider the 19 cities—at the present time the District of Columbia, for minimum salaries for the people who are starting—the District of Columbia would be 15th. And that is a pretty bad record.

In terms of maximum salaries, however, paid at the present salary schedule—the District of Columbia would be 10th among the 19 cities. But with the new bill being brought to you by the committee, the District of Columbia for minimum salaries would be third—the third highest among the 19 cities with over 500,000 population. And when we consider maximum salaries for firemen privates, the maximum salaries paid under the committee bill without the retroactive feature, the District of Columbia would be the first of all of the 19 cities with over 500,000 population.

Now, I think that this is a fair bill that was worked out by the committee. I think that the salary increase that was given to both policemen and firemen is an adequate increase at this time, and that does not mean that there should not be increases in the years ahead. I again want to reiterate what the chairman has said a couple of times, that the last pay raise was not in 1969, but in 1970; but there was a retroactive feature in it. So there was a pay increase 2 years ago in 1970.

It would seem to me that with this kind of balance with the increases in pay and the increases in the taxes that we propose in the bill, with the longevity steps, that it is a fair bill. It is fair to the other cities of the country who are helping to pay the taxes, and it is fair to the policemen and firemen here in the District of Columbia. I urge the adoption of the committee bill without this amendment.

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I find it difficult to believe that we are now struggling with a question involving the dating back to March 1 instead of July 1 this proposed salary increase. I have had the occasion, as I am sure many of you have, to talk with a great number of firemen and policemen in the District. These men have been basically planning on this increase in salary, and their families have been counting on this raise, which I think is a fair raise, I do not think it in any way overpays the policemen and firemen in the District; they have been promised this raise since the first of the year.

They were contemplating that this raise would be effective as of January 1 and not as of March 1 and certainly not as of July 1. I believe in view of the cost of living that we have seen today and certainly right here in the District, that it is not unreasonable that these men should be given the raise as of the first of March. I think of the things we demand in this District of the police and the firemen; it is truly a unique service that they provide. It is far different than many cities in this country.

I think the effectiveness that they have displayed since the enactment of the various District of Columbia crime bills over the last 4 or 5 years have produced a dramatic decrease in the rate of crime in this city—the rate of crime has dropped 48 percent. I think that this demonstrates the type of job that these men have done.

These men are human beings just like anyone else. Suddenly we seem to be casting them as a separate category of person that does not have to pay bills, does not have to plan for his family's vacation and their future, these people, the police, and firemen have done this planning and they have been counting on this raise.

They have been grossly underpaid for the job we were asking them to do, certainly in comparison with the New York City Police, which I think is the area we ought to be comparing the District Police to, they have been underpaid. I would like to urge that we set aside the problems that may be involved in the committee situation and go right ahead and adopt this amendment and put the pay raise into effect as of March 1.

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

Mr. PEYSER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GUDE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. The gentleman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) made some very persuasive comments as far as the ranking of the pay of our Metropolitan Police in relation to the pay of forces in other cities. But what is being overlooked is that these men because of the delay in enacting this measure are now in a position where they have to catch up for 6 months they have not been paid at the levels which we agree are proper. They and their families are being penalized through no fault of their own.

Mr. PEYSER. That is correct.

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

Mr. PEYSER. Yes, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman say that we ought to compare the situation in Washington, D.C., with that which exists in the city of New York?

Mr. PEYSER. I am saying we should compare the job we ask our police to do in the District, in the Nation's Capital, to the police in the city of New York.

Mr. GROSS. The city of New York is broke. I do not know about Washington, D.C., but you are busted in Fun City.

Mr. PEYSER. I ask the House to support this amendment and give the police and firemen the raise they so justly deserve.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask

unanimous consent that all debate on these amendments and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly in opposition to the amendment. I am aware the police and firemen in good faith have bargained for an increase effective as of January 1. They have bargained for other positions, and in subsequent debate I hope to offer an amendment which will restore one of those provisions in the pension system.

My difficulty in supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia, as much as I admire him and respect his capacities, is that this would be the one area in which we have not provided the funding for an increase. If the gentleman who offered the amendment had included a proposal to increase the Federal payment or even had offered a proposal for a commuter tax to provide the necessary funds, then I would have been in support of the amendment. But to say that we should increase the taxes on food and the other things we are doing to provide the overall 17 percent increase, knowing we cannot make those taxes retroactive, seems to me to be unacceptable. We cannot keep up the District's part of the bargain unless those funds are provided.

I would say to the policemen and firemen that when we have finished here, we will have provided all in all a pretty good package; certainly it does not include all they want and certainly not all they agreed to; but given the fiscal straitjackets which have been put on the city's capacity to pay these increases, I think this is the best we can do.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

There seems to be a great deal of discussion about the salary increases, but I want to refer to page 8 of the committee report. Incidentally, I did not write it. I presume the staff did. Here is what it states:

The last salary increase for District of Columbia policemen and firemen was approved on June 30, 1970 (P.L. 91-297; 84 Stat. 354), and was made retroactive to July 1, 1969. However, while this increase was made retroactive, it was based actually upon the District's competitive position and other economic factors as they existed in 1969. Hence, the D.C. policemen and firemen may truly be said not to have received a salary increase in the past three years.

I want to comment that I did support the retroactive feature in the committee and I will support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia) there were—ayes 22, noes 32.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendments were rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GUDE

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GUDE: Page 18, insert after line 15 the following:

SEC. 116. (a) The Commissioner of the District of Columbia, in the case of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the Secretary of the Treasury, in the case of the Executive Protective Service, and the Secretary of the Interior, in the case of the United States Park Police force, may—

(1) establish eligibility requirements for, and

(2) pay to any officer or member (other than an officer or member in salary class 10 or 11 of the salary schedule contained in section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958) who (A) is in the force, Department, or Service under their jurisdiction, and (B) meets such eligibility requirements,

additional annual compensation for successful completion of educational course work leading to a degree in police or fire science or administration. Such additional compensation shall be fixed to the nearest dollar and shall be payable at the rate of 2 percent of the scheduled rate of basic compensation for service step 1 of salary class 1 of such salary schedule, in effect at the time of payment, for each 15 acceptable credit hours of such educational course work completed, except that the rate payable may not exceed 16 percent of such scheduled rate.

(b) The additional compensation authorized by this section shall be in addition to the basic compensation to which such officer or member is entitled and shall be paid in the same manner as such basic compensation. Such additional compensation shall not be subject to deduction or withholding for retirement or insurance and shall not be considered as salary (1) for the purpose of computing annuities pursuant to the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act, or (2) for the purpose of computing insurance coverage under chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other law, individuals retired from active service prior to the effective date of this title and entitled to receive a pension relief allowance or retirement compensation under the provisions of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act shall not be entitled to receive an increase in their pension relief allowance or retirement compensation by reason of the enactment of this section.

(d) This section shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after the sixtieth day following the date of the enactment of this Act.

Redesignate the succeeding sections accordingly.

Page 18, line 16, strike out "The" and insert in lieu thereof "Except as provided in section 116, the".

Mr. GUDE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD. This is the amendment which was originally in the original bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering would put back into the police and firemen's pay raise bill the educational incentive pay feature of the original legislation.

Specifically, my amendment provides additional compensation for successful completion of educational course work leading to a degree in police or fire science administration.

Such compensation shall be payable

at the rate of 2 percent of the corresponding salary for service step 1 of salary class 1 at the time of payment, for each 15 credit hours of course work, not to exceed 16 percent. Educational incentive pay is one of the aspects of this controversial legislation on which there was complete agreement by the District government, the District of Columbia Policemen's Association, and the Firefighters' Association, Local No. 36.

In a survey of more than 750 cities conducted by the International Association of Chief of Police, it was determined that—

Thirty-three cities grant specific pay increases for college work;

Twenty cities provide higher starting salaries;

Fourteen cities require continuing college work as a basis of receiving incentive increases;

Sixty-eight cities give credit for college work on promotion exams; and

Two hundred seventy eight¹ cities pay the cost of tuition or part of it.

Moreover, four of the six local jurisdictions, including my own district—Montgomery County, Md.—provide extra incentive pay similar to that which I propose here.

Professionalism and its goal of better service to the community can best be maintained through higher education for our police and firemen. Educational incentive pay is a growing trend across the country, and I do not believe Washington should deny its officers the opportunity to improve their administrative and technical abilities in this way. Participation in college level courses among members of the District's forces has been increasing steadily over the past few years. Most of these officers have attended local colleges and universities on their own time and often using their own money.

Furthermore, such pay should go far in alleviating the present problem which the police and fire forces now have in keeping young men—many of them in the first year on the force—who leave the department in order to further their education. As for recruitment of qualified individuals, additional compensation for higher education can only be a plus.

I strongly urge that we put this feature back into this bill, as originally proposed. I reiterate that it was a factor agreed to by all major parties in the original negotiations—the District government and both the Police and Firefighters Associations. I believe it would be "penny-wise and pound foolish" of the Congress not to include it at this time.

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to have a police force that will do the job of dealing with the increasing complexities of law enforcement and the increasing complexities of fighting fires in modern cities we need to have the kind of professionalism which will be provided for by my amendment.

This amendment would cost approximately \$1.5 million. There will be a subsequent amendment offered which would cover the cost of this.

¹ 448 cities arrange working hours to avoid conflict with school work.

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

Mr. GUDE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PEYSER. I rise to support this amendment. I can think of no better way of investing our money than in furthering the education of these men. It has been proved in every city which has entered into this type of program to be one of the most beneficial things to the public as to fighting crime. I very much support this amendment, the police and firemen need all the help we can give them.

Mr. GUDE. I thank the gentleman for his support.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

There has been one facet of this educational question that has not been stated as yet. I am sure it was an oversight.

The District government is today paying 90 percent of the tuition for those who wish to take college work.

They are arranging their schedules to fit the hours in which they could receive this training. There are presently approximately 1,200 members of the police and fire departments who are taking advantage of this and getting this 90 percent subsidy of that tuition.

But let us not lose sight of the fact that after all this work, assuming they are learning something that would be beneficial to their work, is for their own good. It is for their own advancement, because certainly they should be able to advance faster if they have accumulated more expertise in this subject.

If you are going to start giving automatic pay increments just because they have completed a certain number of hours of college work, then you will find yourself in the untenable position of a captain, we will say, who does not have college credits. Here is one who does have them. He is a man with less seniority on the force but is doing exactly the same work and with the same responsibilities and maybe he is not even as competent as the man without the college credits. Yet this man is automatically paid more for the same type of work.

Mr. GUDE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CABELL. Very shortly.

I do not think we can possibly justify paying them extra for having done that which they should do with some incentive for their own betterment and promotion in their chosen work.

Now, it is true that the LEAA are funding this work, but let us see how much good it is doing to this force. I am sure even if the LEAA money should be withdrawn, we can then find the money to continue the subsidization of their tuition.

Mr. KYL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CABELL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. As a matter of fact, the gentleman knows before the LEAA Act was passed, the District of Columbia had an educational program in which we had 500 to 1,000 individuals in attendance at classes to better themselves and also at the same time to take advantage of the promotional opportunities because they could not pass the examinations to hold up the grade.

Mr. CABELL. That is entirely correct.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WHITE. Along the lines of the question asked by the gentleman from Iowa, suppose they try to go to college and take some course and thereby receive bonuses on their salaries. Then because of the expertise he has gained he is promoted, let us say, to a sergeant, as an illustration. Would he start as a sergeant at a higher level than a basic sergeant because he had the bonus experience in college?

Mr. CABELL. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Would he be promoted on the basis of his college credits and receive an extra advantage over the other sergeant?

Mr. CABELL. He would get a double advantage. Of course, he gets the advantage accruing to him by virtue of the promotion at a rapid rate, but on top of that he gets the additional money provided by virtue of what this amendment would do, which would put him ahead of the earnings of a man who had been already in that particular pay bracket for several years. It just destroys the personal incentive. Why, sure, if I can get extra money for going out and learning how to draw pictures, I would do it.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment can be defeated.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Can the gentleman tell me what amount of increase in pay a 30-year veteran in class 10 would receive under this bill which we have before us today?

Mr. CABELL. Yes; if the gentleman will be patient for a moment while we look up these tables.

The increase in the schedule would be a little less than \$8,000.

Mr. KYL. Let me repeat the question: For a 30-year veteran in the class 10 salary bracket, that individual's salary as a result of this bill moves up \$8,000.

Mr. CABELL. Let me correct the figure that I gave the gentleman.

On class 10, with 30 years of service, including the 17 percent increase proposed in his bill, and his longevity, his pay would be, his increase, over what it would be today, would be about \$8,000 per year.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, a number of years ago we had a lot of problems with the Metropolitan Police Force when promotions were given because an individual knew somebody up on the Hill or he was somebody's relative. We moved away from that. But I cannot understand how the Committee on the District of Columbia would bring a bill to the floor which gives to a few individuals an increase in pay of \$8,000. I cannot understand that. I think it is unconscionable.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would like to point out, with respect to the

debate regarding educational incentives, that such incentives are a common practice in public administration in this country. I know in my jurisdiction, and I am sure in practically every other jurisdiction in this country, that it is the practice to give educational pay incentives to teachers as they advance in their educational degrees. Pay incentives are a tried and true means of increasing the professional competence of workers in a number of fields.

Again I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment. Regardless of how people may feel about individuals in the Department I am going to mention, I think it is generally recognized by every Member of the Congress and nearly every American that the really elite police department of the United States is the Federal Bureau of Investigation. A feeling of confidence comes when it is reported that the Federal Bureau of Investigation is participating in the investigation of a heinous crime.

The educational requirements to be a special agent for the Federal Bureau of Investigation are at least 4 years of college. There is no such requirement for the police department in the District of Columbia, and it would be grossly unfair to have such a requirement just overnight because there obviously are a great number of members of that force who have not attained that degree of academic study.

But to allow the security of this community in the future as we go along to depend entirely on the occasional Horatio Alger who educates himself and who is able to acquire skill in police administration by turning off the television and reading every night—I think that is asking too much of human nature.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation is excellent generally, because there is a general educational standard for special agents in the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

A thousand years ago when I was on the police force back home, one night a signal came over the radio that a liquor store had been held up. As is the usual police procedure, a description of the getaway car was flashed. It was an unusual kind of automobile—and 3 minutes later there came exactly the described car past the point where my partner and I were parked, which was in the southeastern part of Indianapolis. We began following the car. We hit headquarters for an additional description—which was “wearing a light tan jacket, et cetera,”—under the street light that is our man—wearing the light tan jacket.

So at the proper place, with the proper procedures and security, we stopped the car at gunpoint, and we arrested the citizen in the car and informed him that he fit the description of a holdup man, and then we signaled for the detective division to bring people out, to bring witnesses.

His story to us on the spot was that he was just on his way to buy a loaf of bread for his wife. When the detectives arrived, that turned out to be the truth. He was not the right man. But he fit the description to a T. I apologized and said, “Sir, you have, by cooperating with the police

and not taking a negative attitude, been a good citizen." He said, "I understand perfectly, officer."

Then I went back to the squad car.

But my partner lingered for a moment, and when he came back, I asked him what he had been doing. He said that he had issued the ticket for speeding. I said, "Speeding? He was driving 20 miles an hour in a 30-mile-an-hour zone, and in the evening." My partner said, "You do not understand. If we did not arrest him for something, we can be sued for false arrest."

Well, I am sure that every Member of the Congress knows the common law of this country and the common law in England, for that matter, on probable cause for arrest. My partner could not have been more wrong and with all due respect to him, he could not have been less educated on that phase of police administration.

An FBI agent would never do that, and a London bobby would never do that.

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

(Mr. JACOBS asked and was given permission to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I implore the Committee to adopt this incentive to upgrade the general educational level—not the occasional one—but the general educational level of the Metropolitan Police Department—not for us maybe today or next year, but just to begin the process to bring it up in the Nation's Capital to the level of professionalism that one finds in London and the level of professionalism that one finds in the Federal Bureau of Investigation. And that is not to demean this department, because there are many excellent officers, but it is just a policy—something that we can count on in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the support of this amendment.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this gentleman takes this opportunity to correct the statement that was made a while ago that the total increment, including longevity, as proposed would not be under \$12,000. As originally stated, a restudy of the tables indicate that the maximum amount that could accrue to a 30-year veteran because of pay schedule would be slightly under \$8,000 a year.

Mr. Chairman, I did want to correct the record with respect to that.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to address the gentleman from Maryland.

It is not that I have an objection to the incentive program whereby a member of the police force can get increments in salary by going to college and thereby developing his expertise.

What bothers me is that a private can go to college and get this expertise and on the basis of that obtain a promotion to sergeant and starts at a higher salary than the other sergeants.

The illustration used by the gentleman from Maryland as to educators saying that those teachers who have additional education, like an M.S. degree, thereby receive higher salaries, is true.

However, by parallel I would point out it is my understanding that such a teacher when promoted to, say, a principal, would start at the basic salary of a principal.

If the amendment you have presented does not start a person at a sergeant position at the higher salary but starts him at a base salary and then allows him increments as a sergeant as he gets his education and to go higher as he gets his education, then I would have no objection to his amendment.

Mr. GUDE. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his comments. I would only say that if a man attains a rank of sergeant and has taken professional training by which he would receive this incentive, he would be better qualified on the average than others who attain the same grade and the same rank, but who have not received the same professional training.

Mr. WHITE. But he would start at a higher salary than the other sergeants.

Mr. GUDE. He would receive that additional compensation, but I would say on the average there would be no doubt he would be better qualified.

Mr. WHITE. I think there is an inherent unfairness in that. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JACOBS) there were—ayes 9, noes 31.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MIKVA

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MIKVA:

Page 19, strike out line 4 and all that follows down through and including line 11 on page 21.

Page 21, line 12, strike out "202" and insert in lieu thereof "201".

Page 22, strike out lines 11 through 14.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, let me explain what all that technical language does. The present pension system of the firemen and policemen in the District of Columbia measures their pension benefits based on their salary at date of retirement. In the committee we changed that to put it on a 3-year averaging basis. I must confess, however, we did that without a single word of testimony being taken on the pension system at all, and particularly without a single word of testimony being taken on this piece of the pension system.

I happen to favor an averaging system as a rule. I think that over a long time it is a more equitable measure of what the person's pension ought to be than to take the salary at the exact moment of retirement and use that as a basis for measuring his pension.

However, I think that the employees have a legitimate grievance in saying that we should not make such a fundamental and radical change in the pension system without holding hearings on this measure and any other provisions of the pension system that we propose to revise. They have had that provision in their law for over 50 years. To change it without giving them an opportunity to be

heard is not a good example of the legislative process. We originally got into this situation because we were trying to prevent windfall benefits to many pensioners. I think that we have provided for that adequately elsewhere in the bill, and, therefore, this amendment would restore the measuring time as the date of retirement.

If at some time the chairman of the committee or someone else offers amendments to the pension bills which would include an averaging provision, I would certainly support it, but I think the employees affected are entitled to be heard before we make such a drastic change.

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

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman says we take care of windfalls in some other section of the bill. Take the case of a man with 30 years of service on the police force, eligible for retirement. This bill gives him an approximate \$8,000 increase. Would he be able to retire the next day and have his pension based on that new salary?

Mr. MIKVA. No. That provision is not being affected by this amendment I am offering.

Mr. KYL. If the gentleman will yield further, does the gentleman assure me there are no windfalls which would occur under this bill as a result of his amendment?

Mr. MIKVA. The only windfall the pensioner would receive is the 17-percent increase, which is also being given to the pensioners, other than that, there is no windfall.

Mr. KYL. Would the average person who has reached the age of retirement, who has served long enough to retire under this bill, be able to retire immediately and retire at a rate more than he ever earned as a policeman?

Mr. MIKVA. No.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA).

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Boggs was allowed to proceed out of order.)

CHANGE IN LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding.

I take this opportunity to announce to the House that the bill originally scheduled for consideration on tomorrow will not be considered and that there will not be a session on tomorrow. The reason is that the Senate subcommittee has adopted the provisions of our bill, the so-called Agnes bill, and made them a part of H.R. 15692, which is the bill we passed shortly before the 4th of July recess.

It is probable that bill will now be eligible for passage by the House as amended by the Senate or for a conference between the two bodies. The Senate committee may take final action on Tuesday, and in order to facilitate the consideration of this emergency legislation

and further in order to give the Members who had planned events on tomorrow the opportunity to carry out those engagements, I am making this announcement at this time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one quick question?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does that apply to the bill from the Public Works Committee as well?

Mr. BOGGS. At this time I am not able to answer that question. I really do not know. I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, it was not planned under any circumstances to call up the public works bill on tomorrow.

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the majority leader bringing that up. I have just left the House Banking and Currency Committee. There is a third alternative. If we do not like the Senate bill or we are just so far in disagreement that we cannot go into conference, still according to our chairman we will meet quickly on any differences, so there are three alternatives for the House.

Mr. BOGGS. I appreciate the gentleman making that statement.

I have been informed that on both sides in the Banking and Currency Committee there is a willingness to facilitate consideration of this legislation in order to bring relief as quickly as possible to the people who have suffered.

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, this procedure was undertaken in order to facilitate our taking up the bill.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I associate myself with the remarks made. The House and the committee did not know when we made these plans what action the Senate was going to take. They have completed just today in a subcommittee the action which the gentleman referred to, which changes completely the position of the House and lays some new groundwork for expeditious legislation for these poor suffering Americans who have been victims of the recent disasters.

Mr. BOGGS. I appreciate the contribution of the gentleman.

(On request of Mr. Boggs, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I repeat that I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA). The language the gentleman's amendment would strike from the bill should not have been in the bill to start with.

As pointed out by the gentleman from from Illinois, there have been no hearings on this particular item and thus there is no real understanding as to what

the amendment would do. I am talking about the language the gentleman's amendment would strike. There is no testimony on the subject. There is really no knowledge on the part of the committee as a whole as to the harm or damage that might be done if this language were left in the bill.

I feel, Mr. Chairman, that it was a rather punitive and penalizing action on the part of the Committee on the District of Columbia when they inserted this language into the bill in the first instance, because the bill is intended primarily to increase the pay of police and firemen in the District of Columbia. But while increasing the pay, this present bill will also take away certain other benefits for our police and firemen. In other words, we are forcing our police and firemen to barter away various rights they are entitled to, which they have earned over the years, in order to get a pay increase to which they are entitled at this time.

As I said in my earlier remarks, Mr. Chairman, this is a retrogressive action on the part of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and I am delighted that the gentleman from Illinois has offered an amendment to strike that language from the bill.

As the gentleman pointed out, the language inserted into the bill would adversely affect the method by which the police and firemen's annuities are computed at the time of their retirement. Ever since we have had this retirement system for over 50 years, the retirement benefits have been based on the salary the police and firemen receive at the time of their retirement. This is the same procedure and the same system used to determine the annuities of military retirees.

What the committee was attempting to do was to provide the same method of computing retirement that has been in effect for a number of years for classified government employees. But there was an entirely different reason for providing this different retirement system for police and firemen, as compared to that which is provided for the classified and white-collar employees.

If we do not adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois what we will be doing, actually, is reneging on an agreement that our city and police and fire departments made with the police and firemen when they first came to work in these departments. There was a commitment made that their salaries would be so much, and that after serving so many years their retirement benefits would be based upon a certain formula. Now we have gotten these recruits to come to work, and without notice, without hearing, without any opportunity for them to testify, we are attempting to change the procedure. This is tantamount, in my opinion, to changing the rules after the game has started.

The gentleman from Iowa addressed a question a moment ago to the gentleman from Illinois regarding any windfall that might result to any individual if this amendment is adopted. Actually, insofar as those on retirement now are concerned, it would make no difference whether the amendment is adopted or not. And in the case of a member re-

tiring immediately after the bill is passed, it would make no difference.

Where the difference would come in would be after the next pay bill. Then the members would be required to wait for 3 years in order to receive the benefit of that pay increase in their retirement annuities.

So it would pay that policeman and fireman to retire just before the next pay bill goes into effect, which is a ridiculous situation, indeed.

That is an example of what happens when we adopt language in a bill in a haphazard manner, without proper study, consideration, and hearings.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that, if we need to do something—and possibly we should—to change the retirement system for District of Columbia policemen and firemen, then let us do it by separate legislation, let us have hearings and receive testimony, and come forward with a sound and proper proposal for such changes.

Mr. KYL. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Let us take the case of a man who is now in one grade and within the next month after this bill becomes law, he is promoted from his grade to the grade of lieutenant and he gets an increase in percentage because he is now a lieutenant. He then retires. If you do not have the 3-year average, he retires at his new rank with the salary increase, even though he served in that position only for a matter of a few days. Is that correct?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. It is provided in the bill that it will not take effect for 3 years. Therefore, if someone is promoted in the next month after this bill becomes effective, it is my understanding—and I could be in error on it because there is a lot of misunderstanding about this provision—

Mr. KYL. Yes, there is. Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (continuing). Because we did not have adequate time to discuss it—it is my understanding that he would retire at the new salary at that time, because there should be a 3-year grandfather clause in the bill.

The reason for that was that it would not provide an incentive for an employee to retire before the bill becomes effective. If we had not put that language in there, it would have been an encouragement for an employee to retire before the effective date of this legislation. It is my understanding that the grandfather clause was to take effect in 3 years, but if I am in error, then I shall stand corrected. That is the reason why the amendment should be adopted.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Would this be a fair analogy? If Members of Congress under the set-up of this Board procedure received an increase in salary of, let us say, \$10,000 next February 1; if we adopted the Mikva amendment, it would be the same as any Member of Congress being able to retire as of January 20 on the increased salary which he had never

worked a day to receive. Is that a fair analysis?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Let me answer the gentlewoman's question in this manner. If the Mikva amendment is adopted, the method under which the policemen and firemen would retire in the future would be identically the same as it is now and would have been last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for evading my question and confusing the subject, but I think the analogy is correct, namely, that if the Mikva amendment is adopted and to pursue the analogy: if the Congress were to get an increase of any kind, then any Member of Congress could retire based on the new salary for which they have not worked a single day in their lives.

If we as Members of Congress adopted that kind of a law for ourselves and if we could retire on this increase, without ever having worked under the new salary schedule, you know every paper in the country would be screaming about the giveaway.

I suggest in all fairness it does not make good sense to have a law where you provide an increase and employees do not work a single day and still base retirement benefits on the basis of the new salary schedule under which they have not worked. I oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. CABELL. No. Not at this moment. I thank the gentlewoman for her contribution to this.

I would like to call your attention, if I may, to the fact that there are very few pension and retirement systems, to my knowledge, that do not take an average. The reason for that is quite simple. We have, I am told, a number of officers who right now are ready to retire and are already sweating out this 17 percent pay increase.

Under the Mikva amendment that would be entirely permissible to work one day or one week under that schedule and then retire on that as his salary. By the same token, someone who has just been promoted, maybe has only been in the job that he has presently for a very short time, and then get the 17 percent increase on that promotional increase, then we lose him.

Let me say to the Members that purpose of longevity increments, the purpose of steps in grade, the purpose of providing for very liberal pension plans is to hold your people, not to make it too profitable for them to retire and go to work somewhere else, with the major portion of their income being derived from their pension they retire on.

It has been mentioned that there might be inequities. I know of no particular instance of where there would be actually an inequity. The proposition was raised that there have not been hearings. There was considerable discussion on that.

This subcommittee chairman will promise definitely that if members of the committee wish, I will hold hearings by the subcommittee to hear these others on these inequities, and if the inequities are proven then we will sponsor an amendment to this bill and will thus be able to alleviate or rectify any such real inequities that might be provided by voting down the Mikva amendment.

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

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, our respected colleague, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) said she had a little difficulty understanding the reasoning of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL).

I think that the gentleman's arguments might be summed up with these words: "Yes, Santa Claus, there is a Virginia."

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, I hope sincerely that the Members will defeat this amendment, and I will keep to my promise that if inequities are shown we will call hearings on this, and it should not take long to rectify any such inequities.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FAUNTROY

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FAUNTROY:

Page 18, insert after line 21 the following:
SEC. 118. The United States shall reimburse the District of Columbia for overtime compensation paid to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia for services in connection with assemblages, marches, and other demonstrations in the District of Columbia which relate solely to the Federal Government. The manner and method of ascertaining and paying the amount needed to so reimburse the District of Columbia shall be determined in accordance with an agreement which the Commissioner of the District of Columbia and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall enter into.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is intended to share the cost with the United States of demonstrations directed solely at the Federal Government. It would authorize the United States to reimburse the District of Columbia for overtime compensation incurred by the Police and Fire Departments through an agreement between the District of Columbia and the Office of Budget and Management.

This city has raised the entire amount of the pay raise through an increase in the sales tax from 4 to 5 percent, and hotel, alcohol, and restaurant taxes from 5 to 6 percent.

If it were not for the fact that the city had agreed to absorb within the current departmental budget appropriations 15 percent of the increase, we would be faced with a deficit of \$2 million.

Under this arrangement, there is a small cushion of some \$600,000. This, of course, is not the soundest financing that could have been found. But we are faced with the fact that in this city our police

officers and firemen are called upon to provide protection and to maintain order during the increasing and myriad demonstrations that are led and organized and filled with people who are protesting the policies of the Federal Government. They are not protesting the policies of the District Government—but they are costing the city government money.

We would not object to paying these moneys to provide for the protection of their constitutional right for a free expression if we had the resources. But we do not have the funds, and we do not have the basis upon which these funds may be raised.

There is no other source except the Congress.

Since 1969, overtime costs alone have doubled almost \$3 million, one-half of the amount expended for the police and fire protection during these events.

At the appropriate time I will insert in the RECORD the actual dollar figures expended for each year since 1969. Suffice it to say right now, however, that the demonstrations have not disappeared, but are, in fact, growing in a new kind of persistence and a new kind of determination, as witness, by those who have marched on this building, holding vigils and organized with the intent of coming to this city once again.

Let me emphasize once more that I and the city certainly do not have any objections to demonstrations. I know that the Members of this body do not have any objection. But the fact is that the city police are called out, and they do cooperate with the demonstrators, and for the most part, the demonstrations have been peaceful and orderly and informative, and not overly disastrous.

This amendment does not shift the entire burden of the police and firemen's salaries to the Federal Government—only the overtime compensation. I emphasize this because I do not perceive it as unfair to have the city budget bear the cost of the regular salaries even though the salary determinations may have been made with this fact distinctly in mind.

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

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I have been too busy as a Member of the Congress to pay any attention to demonstrations around here. But I do read the newspapers and I watch television. I notice that the delegate from the District of Columbia has been in the forefront of a few demonstrations.

Now if you have been participating in and leading demonstrations, it is rather sanctimonious, is it not, to come in here now and ask the Federal Government to pay for overtime cost of the Police Department to take care of the demonstrations that the Representative from the District of Columbia participated in and led?

I saw that you were leading a demonstration out on the steps of the Capitol. You lead a demonstration down to the White House. A lot of policemen were here on both occasions according to the television and the newspaper, and it seems rather ironic to come here and offer an amendment asking for the Federal Government to pay for overtime pay

of policemen caused by the demonstrations which you led. In light of your leading and participation I think you owe the House some explanation why we should support an amendment calling for overtime pay for the Police Department by the U.S. Treasury.

Mr. FAUNTROY. If the gentleman wishes to amend the amendment to exclude those demonstrations, which the delegate from the District of Columbia participated in, I am sure that that might be debatable, but the fact is that these demonstrations that have cost this city out of the taxpayers of this city out of their resources more than \$3 million over the past 3 years have not been led by the delegate.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Was not the Federal contribution to the District of Columbia increased from \$126 million to \$190 million, and would not that take care of the overtime cost for demonstrations?

Mr. FAUNTROY. No, it does not—it does not.

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

Mr. FAUNTROY. I yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the Delegate from the District of Columbia has expired.

(Mr. FAUNTROY asked and was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. JACOBS. Let me point out, Mr. Chairman, that although demonstrations are not my bag, as I understand the Constitution of the United States and decisions thereunder, a peaceful demonstration is protected by the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution in that it is lawful to drive an automobile in the District of Columbia, and police officers are also required to direct traffic. When a Member of Congress drives his car as he does in the District of Columbia or any other Members of Congress, I do not think that casting personal aspersions on the Delegate from the District of Columbia, or raising any question about his lawfulness is proper. I have heard no one allege that he is engaged in the violation of any law, by the exercise of a protective right under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. FAUNTROY. I will yield 30 seconds when I finish my statement.

I simply state to the gentleman the fact that the taxpayers in the District of Columbia are obliged every year to absorb costs in terms of overtime for policemen that are the result directly of demonstrations aimed not at District government but at Federal Government, and I ask the Federal Government to share in that cost.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAUNTROY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia in response to the question asked by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS). I think he is correct in interpreting what his understanding is that last year we did increase the Federal payment to the District of Columbia, taking into consideration the additional cost of the District of Columbia

government as a result of demonstrations. I have a question to ask the gentleman in view of the fact that he has shown a great deal of fiscal responsibility here today in opposing—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the Delegate from the District of Columbia has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia) Mr. FAUNTROY was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. The gentleman opposed an amendment that I offered earlier that would make the pay raise retroactive to March 1 on the basis that we did not have the revenue, and I think the gentleman asked where the money was coming from. These are people he represents. It serves him and his people. May I ask the gentleman the same question: Where is the money coming from that he is talking about which now costs the Federal Government a great deal of money?

Mr. FAUNTROY. I will be glad to answer in two respects. First of all, the fact is that we recommended that that come from contingency funds that might come through OMB that could be allocated in this fashion. Secondly, I do not recall specific reference to funds, allocated and authorized in the last Federal payment, being made for overtime pay for use in covering demonstration costs of the Police Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the Delegate from the District of Columbia (Mr. FAUNTROY).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk which, because of the disposition of the preceding three amendments, I shall not offer at this time. I direct the committee's attention to title III of this bill on page 22. The title is called Revenue for Salary Increases, and as of this point in the debate under the 5-minute rule, the rule is in balance.

I have the personal view that the cigarette tax in the District of Columbia is not at the level that it should be, but I shall defer my amendment until possibly the teachers salary bill comes to the floor, or such time that it is appropriate, in my judgment, and completely germane to the vehicle which is before the committee.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CABELL

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CABELL: Page 1, line 5, strike out "Act" and insert in lieu thereof "Acts".

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CABELL

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CABELL: Page 2, line 13, strike out "(a)".

Page 10, insert "in his service step" after "service" in lines 8, 13, and 19; and on page 11, insert "in his service step" after "service" in lines 3 and 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CABELL

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CABELL: Page 18, insert after line 15 the following:

SEC. 116. (a) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of the amendments made by this title only in the case of an individual in the service of the District of Columbia government or of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to an officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, or the Executive Protective Service, who retired during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1972, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act, for services rendered during such period, and (2) in accordance with the provisions of subchapter 8 of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code (relating to settlement of accounts of deceased employees), for services rendered during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1972, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act, by an officer or member who dies during such period.

(b) For the purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

(c) For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an officer or member is eligible under the provisions of chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code (relating to government employees group life insurance), all changes in rates of compensation or salary which result from the enactment of this title shall be held and considered to be effective as of the date of enactment of this Act.

Redesignate the succeeding sections of title I accordingly.

Mr. CABELL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, the amendment that is being read at the moment I assure Members makes it possible to make the salary increase retroactive to July 1.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CABELL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CABELL

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CABELL: Page 19, line 15, strike out the comma immediately following "rate".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CABELL).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair (Mr. PIKE) Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 15580) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to increase salaries, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1041, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. BROYHILL OF VIRGINIA

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in its present form I am compelled to be opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia moves to recommit the bill H.R. 15580 to the Committee on the District of Columbia with instructions to report the same forthwith to the House with the following amendments: Page 9, beginning in line 14, strike out "from the eligible list in force on such date".

And on page 18, strike out lines 16 through 18 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. 116. (a) The effective date of this title and the amendments made by this title shall be the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after March 1, 1972.

(b) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of the amendments made by this title only in the case of an individual in the service of the District of Columbia government or of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to an officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, or the Executive Protective Service, who retired during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after March 1, 1972, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act, for services rendered during such period, and (2) in accordance with the provisions of subchapter 8 of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code (relating to settlement of accounts of deceased employees), for services rendered during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after March 1, 1972, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act, by an officer or member who dies during such period.

(c) For the purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such

individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

(d) For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an officer or member is eligible under the provisions of chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code (relating to government employees group life insurance), all changes in rates of compensation or salary which result from the enactment of this title shall be held and considered to be effective as of the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. 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 165, nays 201, not voting 66, as follows:

[Roll No. 276]

YEAS—165

Abourezk	Gray	Powell
Abzug	Green, Pa.	Price, Ill.
Adams	Griffiths	Pucinski
Addabbo	Gubser	Railsback
Anderson, Ill.	Halpern	Reuss
Annunzio	Hanley	Rodino
Ashley	Hansen, Idaho	Roe
Barrett	Harrington	Rogers
Bennett	Harsha	Roncalio
Biaggi	Harvey	Rooney, Pa.
Bieber	Hastings	Rosenthal
Blatnik	Hathaway	Rostenkowski
Bolling	Hays	Rousselot
Bow	Helstoski	Ruth
Brademas	Hicks, Mass.	St Germain
Brasco	Hicks, Wash.	Sandman
Brotzman	Hogan	Sarbanes
Brown, Mich.	Horton	Saylor
Broyhill, N.C.	Howard	Schwengel
Broyhill, Va.	Hunt	Scott
Burke, Mass.	Johnson, Calif.	Sebelius
Burton	Kastenmeier	Shoup
Carter	Keating	Shriver
Cederberg	Keith	Snyder
Chamberlain	Kemp	Springer
Clancy	Kluczynski	Stanton,
Clark	Koch	J. William
Clausen,	Kyros	Stanton,
Don H.	Lent	James V.
Cleveland	Link	Steele
Collier	Lloyd	Steiger, Ariz.
Conte	McClary	Stratton
Cotter	McCollister	Symington
Crane	McDonald,	Thompson, Ga.
Daniels, N.J.	Mich.	Thompson, N.J.
Dent	McKinney	Thomson, Wis.
Dickinson	Macdonald,	Thone
Donohue	Mass.	Tiernan
Dow	Madden	Ullman
Drinan	Mailliard	Vander Jagt
Duncan	Meicher	Vanik
Ellberg	Miller, Ohio	Vigorito
Esch	Minish	Whalen
Evans, Colo.	Mizell	Whalley
Fascell	Moorhead	Whitehurst
Findley	Morgan	Williams
Fish	Murphy, Ill.	Wilson, Bob
Flood	Murphy, N.Y.	Winn
Ford, Gerald R.	Myers	Wolff
Ford,	Nelsen	Wyder
William D.	Nix	Wyman
Frenzel	Obey	Yates
Frey	O'Konski	Yatron
Garmatz	O'Neill	Zablocki
Gaydos	Patten	Zwach
Gialmo	Pettis	
Goldwater	Peyser	
Grasso		

NAYS—201

Abbutt	Eshleman	Mitchell
Alexander	Fisher	Mollohan
Andrews, Ala.	Flowers	Monahan
Andrews,	Foley	Montgomery
N. Dak.	Forsythe	Moss
Archer	Fountain	Natcher
Arends	Frelinghuysen	Nedzi
Ashbrook	Galifianakis	Nichols
Aspin	Gettys	O'Hara
Badillo	Gibbons	Pelly
Baker	Gonzalez	Perkins
Baring	Goodling	Pickle
Beigh	Green, Oreg.	Pike
Belcher	Griffin	Pirnie
Bergland	Gross	Poage
Betts	Grover	Poff
Bevill	Haley	Preyer, N.C.
Bingham	Hall	Price, Tex.
Blackburn	Hamilton	Purcell
Boggs	Hammer-	Quile
Boland	schmidt	Randall
Bray	Hanna	Rangel
Brinkley	Hansen, Wash.	Rarick
Brooks	Hawkins	Rees
Brown, Ohio	Hechler, W. Va.	Rhodes
Burke, Fla.	Heckler, Mass.	Riegle
Burleson, Tex.	Heinz	Roberts
Burlison, Mo.	Henderson	Robinson, Va.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hillis	Robison, N.Y.
Byron	Hollifield	Roush
Cabell	Hosmer	Roy
Caffery	Hull	Roybal
Camp	Hungate	Runnels
Carlson	Ichord	Satterfield
Carney	Jacobs	Scherle
Casey, Tex.	Jarman	Scheuer
Celler	Johnson, Pa.	Schmitz
Chappell	Jones, Ala.	Schneebeli
Clawson, Del	Jones, N.C.	Sikes
Clay	Karh	Sisk
Collins, Ill.	Kazen	Skubitz
Collins, Tex.	King	Smith, Calif.
Colmer	Kyl	Smith, Iowa
Conable	Landgrebe	Smith, N.Y.
Conover	Latta	Steed
Conyers	Leggett	Steiger, Wis.
Corman	Lennon	Stephens
Coughlin	Long, Md.	Stokes
Culver	McCormack	Stubblefield
Daniel, Va.	McCulloch	Sullivan
Danielson	McDade	Taylor
Davis, S.C.	McEwen	Teague, Calif.
Davis, Wis.	McFall	Udall
de la Garza	McKay	Van Deerlin
Delaney	McMillan	Vessey
Dellenback	Mahon	Waggonner
Dellums	Mallary	Waldie
Denholm	Mann	Ware
Dennis	Mathis, Ga.	White
Derwinski	Mayne	Whitten
Diggs	Mazzoli	Widnall
Dingell	Meeds	Wright
Downing	Metcalfe	Wyatt
du Pont	Michel	Wyllie
Eckhardt	Mikva	Young, Fla.
Edwards, Ala.	Miller, Calif.	Young, Tex.
Edwards, Calif.	Mink	Zion
Erlenborn	Minshall	

NOT VOTING—66

Abernethy	Fulton	Pepper
Anderson,	Fuqua	Podell
Calif.	Gallagher	Pryor, Ark.
Anderson,	Hagan	Quillen
Tenn.	Hébert	Reid
Aspinall	Hutchinson	Rooney, N.Y.
Bell	Jonas	Ruppe
Blanton	Jones, Tenn.	Ryan
Broomfield	Kee	Selberling
Buchanan	Kuykendall	Shipley
Byrne, Pa.	Landrum	Slack
Carey, N.Y.	Long, La.	Spence
Chisholm	Lujan	Staggers
Curlin	McCloskey	Stuckey
Davis, Ga.	McClure	Talcott
Devine	McKevitt	Teague, Tex.
Dorn	Martin	Terry
Dowdy	Mathias, Calif.	Wampler
Dulski	Matsunaga	Wiggins
Dwyer	Mills, Ark.	Wilson,
Edmondson	Mills, Md.	Charles H.
Evins, Tenn.	Mosher	
Flynt	Passman	
Fraser	Patman	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Martin.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Terry.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. McClure.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Hutchinson.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Mills of Maryland.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Matsunaga with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. McKevitt.
Mr. Anderson of California with Mr. Mathias of California.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Wampler.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Spence.
Mr. Slack with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Seiberling.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Ryan.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Fraser.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Podell.
Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Pepper.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Kee.
Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Long of Louisiana.

Messrs. JOHNSON of California, TIERNAN, ABOUREZK, GARMATZ, ROUSSELOT, and HANLEY changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CHAPPELL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the rest of the week, if any, and for next week.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman from Michigan, as announced earlier in the afternoon, we have completed the program for this week, and it is my intention to ask to go over until Monday.

For next week Monday is District day. There are no bills, but we have scheduled H.R. 13366, cyclamates ban compensation, which will be brought up under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

On Tuesday: H.R. 14542, Air Force officers authorized strength; H.R. 3542, armed services leave allowances; H.R. 14911, leave for armed services missing personnel; and H.R. 14538, Civil Defense Act amendment, each under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week, H.R. 12931, rural development conference report; H.R. 11128, Indian rights; H.R. 12807, architect and engineers selection; H.R. 7060, firefighters retirement; and H.R. 440, Customs and Immigration inspectors retirement, all subject to rules being granted.

Of course, conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, JULY 24, 1972

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

INDIANA AMERICAN LEGION SUPPORTS ACADEMY FOR MEDICAL EDUCATION

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Indiana American Legion, at their State convention in Indianapolis recently, enacted a resolution supporting the establishment of an academy to provide medical education on the same basis as applicants are admitted to other academies throughout the Nation.

The resolution was sponsored by Judge Richard S. Kaplan of Gary, Ind., one of the pioneer leaders in American Legion activities, not only in the Indiana Legion, but also activities in the national Legion convention affairs in behalf of our veterans.

This resolution was adopted by 2,000 Legion delegates assembled at the Indiana State convention and will be submitted for enactment at the national Legion convention in October of this year.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks the resolution which was enacted at the recent Indiana State American Legion convention in Indianapolis April 11, 1972:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, it is a well known fact that this country is suffering from a tremendous shortage of physicians, and,

Whereas, many young men and women who are brilliant students and who would like to study medicine, cannot gain admission to medical schools because of the lack of facilities, and,

Whereas, even the armed forces cannot fulfill its needs for physicians, and,

Whereas, the need for physicians is even greater than the need for officers in our armed forces, yet despite this obvious fact, we are training men and paying for those men at West Point, Annapolis and the Air Force Academy, and,

Whereas, the situation now existing in this country with reference to the shortage of physicians could be eliminated if a Medical Academy was established on the same basis as exists at West Point, Annapolis and the Air Force Academy, and,

Whereas, the United States Government created a precedent for this Country by establishing a Nurse Cadet Corps during World War II which created thousands of nurses who otherwise would never have had the means to become nurses,

Now, therefore, be it resolved: by the Gary Memorial Post No. 17, American Legion, Department of Indiana, in regular meeting assembled, that we urge the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Defense of the United States to immediately secure and implement the means for a Medical Academy where young men and women with suitable qualifications may apply and receive a medical education on the same basis as men are admitted to other academies, namely, that upon graduation and receipt of their degree they shall serve their internship in the armed forces for a period of four (4) years and once they have completed their service with the armed forces may leave the service and enter into private practice to the end that our shortage of physicians may rapidly diminish.

Be it further resolved: that upon adoption of this Resolution that it be forwarded to the 1st District for adoption at a 1st District Meeting and after adoption by the 1st District that it be sent to the Department of Indiana for adoption and eventually forwarded to the National Department for adoption.

Done this 11th day of April, 1972.

IN FAIRNESS, LEGISLATION THAT SHOULD BE ENACTED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, during the recent congressional recess, I returned to my district to conduct office hours to meet with hundreds of constituents. In these meetings, questions were raised time and time again as to what Congress intended to do about raising other Government pension programs in light of the 20 percent boost for social security recipients. They were concerned, as are others who have written to me, that Congress might not respond and individuals under the Railroad Retirement Fund would be ignored and that those receiving benefits under Veterans' Administration programs would actually lose income because of the social security increase.

On my return to Washington, I instructed that appropriate legislation on these two major points be drafted. To-

day, I am introducing two bills, one to increase the Railroad Retirement Fund payments by 20 percent, and a second to amend title 38 of the United States Code to prevent the loss of veterans compensation and pension benefits as a result of increases in social security.

Earlier in the week, in checking with the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, it was uncertain what future action might be taken. However, in a committee session yesterday, the matter was discussed, and I announced my intention of introducing legislation. It was decided that there was great merit for such hearings and they have been scheduled to commence next Wednesday to consider a "temporary 20 per centum increase in annuities" in amending the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937. I am delighted with this decision by the committee.

As you know, a very serious problem has developed in financing the Railroad Retirement Fund and a special Commission was created to study the problem. This Commission was expected to file its report with Congress last month. To date, the report still has not been submitted. While I believe that the Commission study could be helpful in deliberations by Congress, I do not think it is imperative that Congress delay or stall legislative action to help millions of Americans who are dependent upon the Railroad Retirement Fund until the Commission completes its work. Congress has an obligation to these people.

As to the legislation concerning veterans' compensation and pension benefits, as you all know, there is a ceiling on the combined payments an individual can receive from both social security and the Veterans' Administration. It is necessary, as in past years, to increase this ceiling whenever Congress passes an increase in one of the two programs. To fail to do so means a loss of benefits and economic hardship for thousands of families. It is estimated that under the present social security increase, a family's veteran's benefits could be reduced by as much as \$80 to \$90 per month.

I am also introducing a third bill dealing with our social security program of immense interest to all. This would provide an increase of the limitation on earnings by individuals now receiving social security benefits. As you know, the current limitation is \$1,680. My bill would boost this limitation to \$3,000.

I would like to call your attention to an editorial which appeared in the Sunday, July 16, 1972, edition of "The Saginaw News," Saginaw, Mich., on this subject. Permit me to quote to you the concluding paragraph from this editorial, which was received today.

Congress and the President should act speedily to perform their duty to retirees willing and able to help themselves without forcing them to lose what is rightfully theirs anyway.

The editorial follows:

[From the Saginaw News, July 16, 1972]

EARNINGS LIMIT UNFAIR IN SOCIAL SECURITY LAW

The most massive Social Security increase in history—20 per cent or about \$8.5 billion—

has been enacted, providing millions of retirees with a most welcome addition to their income.

For those who have to pay for the boost, however, the news is less than cheery, even though it had to be foreseen by anyone who has followed the pattern of Social Security actions in recent years.

With this being an election year, and with the new benefits timed to begin just before the November balloting, some kind of improvement in Social Security benefits was absolutely inevitable. The only question was the amount and how to pay for it.

As it turned out, the amount was the highest mentioned during deliberations, and the payment method remained the same as usual, payroll contributions from wage-earners and their employers.

The maximum deduction will go in 1973 from \$468 per year to \$594, with another deduction hike slated for 1974. But of course, that won't be until after the election, and presumably by 1976 we'll be used to it.

Thus in the last three or so years, retirees have gained a cumulative 45 per cent improvement over previous benefit levels. This year's 20 per cent comes on top of a 10 per cent increase in 1971 and a 15 per cent boost a year before that.

We don't begrudge the elderly their benefits. Many count pennies from month to month. They certainly possess no magic exemption from the higher living costs that affect us all. One estimate says the latest hike will remove 1.5 million persons from poverty and help millions of others whose income hovers just above official poverty levels.

But we don't think Congress went far enough in revising Social Security provisions, and we're not talking about how much the increase was.

Instead, we're thinking of the legal provision limiting the amount a retiree can earn on his own without suffering a loss of benefits.

And we're glad to see a change in the law listed among further Social Security legislation being advocated by President Nixon.

Right now, a retiree between the ages of 65 and 72 can earn no more than \$1,680 in wages without losing any benefits. He gets to keep only half of what he earns up to \$2,880. Above that level, he suffers a 100 per cent loss of Social Security.

Considering that, in principle, a retiree only receives in benefits what he supposedly paid for during working years, the anti-job provision amounts to little more than governmental theft.

It lends credence to those who say that in many cases, equal payments into a private pension plan would guarantee a retiree more money than he can expect from Social Security—without loss for earnings after official retirement.

Besides, what so special about age 72, when suddenly, the law now says, a retiree can keep all of what he can earn? Those years between ages 65 and 72 just happen to be the ones during which a retiree is most likely to be able to earn extra money.

Even worse, the earnings regulation applies only to wages, not to income from investments such as bonds or savings or stocks.

As it works out, the retiree who can really use the extra wages he's able to earn is far worse off than a retiree who doesn't work but collects extra income, in full, from resources most Social Security recipients simply don't have at hand.

The proposal now before the House of Representatives to liberalize the earnings law is an excellent idea. We have little hope it will remove the earnings restrictions entirely, but we certainly feel the limit should be far above the current absurdly low level.

Congress and the President should act speedily to perform their duty to retirees

willing and able to help themselves without forcing them to lose what is rightfully theirs anyway.

ORWELL'S "1984" ARRIVES EARLY AT DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SKUBITZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, it may be inappropriate for a dyed-in-the-wool Republican to comment on a Democratic Convention but I am moved to do so by an article that appeared in the Washington Post of July 19, written by Jack Valenti.

I, too, as so many of us here on this floor, knew President Lyndon B. Johnson. I knew him and of him for almost 30 years during my service in the other body as an aide to two Senators, and during my 10-year tenure as a Member of this honorable body. As a Republican, as a fiscal conservative, as one who disagrees with the policy of vesting more and more authority in the Federal Establishment and less and less in local government, I frequently found myself in opposition to Johnsonian policies and programs, particularly during his Presidency.

But Lyndon Johnson was born and lived. He was a legislator, a Vice President and a President for 30 years. His hero was Franklin D. Roosevelt and in all matters of economic and social welfare for the masses he sought to emulate him.

In short, he was for everything that the Democratic Party claims it espouses, and more importantly, he brought more of it into being than any of his predecessors. His skill as a legislator, his zeal as a persuader, his knowledge of how to get things done has not yet been equalled—much to the discomfiture of Members of my party at times, and to myself personally.

And yet as one listened and viewed the happenings at Miami recently, one who did not know better could believe that Lyndon Johnson never was. These people who owed, in many instances, their education, their economic well-being, their chance to shine in their own reflected glory; these people whose memories are short or who are shorn of knowledge existing before today, had erased Lyndon Johnson from Democratic Party history.

It is their party and I suppose they have a right to do with it as they please—fortunately. But try as they may, they cannot erase history. Lyndon Johnson was and will remain the 36th President of the United States. This is not Russia and he cannot be made a nonperson.

Those who try to do so are Monday-morning quarterbacks who seek to exculpate their own inconsistencies by blotting out the memory of one who inherited an evil and sought to deal with it forthrightly.

I share with Mr. Valenti, whose prose I lack, my utter distaste for what the American people witnessed at Miami. I include Mr. Valenti's article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

... BUT "DEJOHNSONIZATION" MADE L. B. J. A
NONPERSON

(By Jack Valenti)

As I watched the Democratic telethon, and then the convention that followed I kept waiting for someone to acknowledge that Lyndon Johnson was a Democratic President. But as the week ended it became clear that as far as the telethon and the convention were concerned (except for a late Thursday night speech by Senator Kennedy) President Johnson was a non-person, expunged from the Democratic Party with the same kind of scouring effectiveness that Marxist revisionists use to rewrite Communist history. As a final petty insult, the managers of the convention made sure LBJ's picture was absent among the portraits of FDR, Truman, Stevenson and JFK.

It seemed odd that the party, so firmly fixed in its zeal to bring justice and hope to all Americans, turned its back on President Johnson, who more than any President in all U.S. history accomplished what had eluded all his predecessors in the area of human rights, education, health care, aid to the poor, conservation, and just plain caring about the powerless, the forgotten, and the uninvited.

It was an act of discourtesy, not to mention memory gone sour.

I cannot but believe that black people throughout this land understand with a fervor born of too much neglect that it was a President from the Southwest, of all places, who did more to lift the level of their living and to secure their pride than any other man. The first black on the Supreme Court, the first black in the Cabinet, the first black Assistant Attorney General. Have we forgotten? The Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Equal Housing Act of 1968 have fastened in conscience and legislation rights that belong to all U.S. citizens. But before Johnson these rights existed only in rhetoric. Lyndon Johnson gave human rights the covenant of national law.

Ever since Lincoln, Presidents have made the motions and gone through the ritual of putting human rights on the agenda. But not until Johnson came to command did aspirations transform into achievement. Charles Evers and every black elected official in the South know better than any of us that it was the Johnson human rights action that gave the vote to the black man, and with that vote he could now govern.

But in the convention no one wanted to remember, and no one seemed to care.

For years the Democratic Party talked and talked about bringing education to the masses, but federal aid to this educational advance always foundered and faltered and never happened. It was the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in the Johnson administration that burst the carapace of opposition and for the first time the poorest child in the bleakest ghetto or on the most remote rural farm now has a chance to get an adequate education. That Johnson legislative achievement was the beginning, the essential beginning, and all that now has taken place owes its life to that source-bed of educational aid. But in the convention, they all forgot.

To the aged and the sick, this blotting out of Johnson must have produced a peculiar torment. How long has the Democratic Party put Medicare in its platform? But that is where it always stayed, in the platform, words without substance, promises undelivered, pledges without redemption. Medicare and all that it has meant to those to whom lingering sickness was a family financial disaster didn't just happen. It was the result of the Johnson determination that help for the poor sick aged was a right that had

to be fulfilled and it was. This was an achievement worthy of hall-bursting applause. But in the convention, there was only a shameless silence.

The list of advances in human justice is endless, almost a hundred landmark pieces of legislation that aimed at caring about those who had many partisans and shouters but few achievers.

It was all very strange, a dimly lit Orwellian adventure in which nonspeak and nonmemory paraded the telethon and the convention like some ravaged ghosts.

There is an old French maxim which declares that if we were without faults we would not take so much pleasure in finding them in others. Perhaps it is possible, for those who suddenly found hindsight a splendid luxury, to erase their Vietnam guilts by devouring their former leader. Perhaps.

It was written of Lord Burleigh, adviser to English monarchs, that "he never deserted his friends till it was very inconvenient to stand by them."

There was a lot of inconvenience on display over TV last week.

EIGHTEEN PERCENT RESPONSE TO A CONSTITUENT QUESTIONNAIRE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, a remarkable 18 percent of the household residents in my congressional district—the Second District of Massachusetts—have responded to a questionnaire I mailed out in late May. Of 146,475 questionnaires sent throughout the district, 25,973 were filled out and returned to my office. This rate of response, surprising by anyone's standards, is nearly twice the 10 percent rate considered good by professional opinion researchers.

The questionnaire—soliciting constituents' attitudes on issues ranging from busing to the Vietnam war, from welfare to wage-price controls—has given me a valuable fresh look at voter opinion in my district.

I want to commend the 25,973 constituents who took the time to inform me of their views on the major issues now confronting the United States. In so doing, they have exercised a right and duty of citizenship, going one step beyond the ballot box.

I offer special thanks, Mr. Speaker, to the students in the government and history classes at Chicopee High School, who tallied the bulk of the questionnaire responses, and to their teacher, Phillip L. Corso.

I thank, as well, the news media—newspapers, television, radio—for making the results known throughout my district.

Here are the results:

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Do you think the wage-price controls enacted by the President are working?	
Yes (22.7%)	5,801
No (62.3%)	15,905
Undecided (15%)	3,825
Total	25,531
2. Should the Federal Government assume the entire cost of welfare payments?	
Yes (44.9%)	11,419
No (42.7%)	10,862
Undecided (12.3%)	3,131

3. Which of the following would you favor for U.S. policy in Southeast Asia?	
Administration's Vietnamization (48%)	12,252
Withdrawal in 1972 (42.7%)	10,862
Undecided (7.2%)	1,827
Total	25,513

4. Do you favor Federal revenue sharing with State and Local Governments?	
Yes (73.4%)	18,747
No (14.5%)	3,708
Undecided (12.1%)	3,081
Total	25,536

5a. Do you agree with the Supreme Court's decision upholding the use of compulsory busing to overcome racial imbalance?	
Yes (12.1%)	3,074
No (83.2%)	21,119
Undecided (4.7%)	1,225
Total	25,391

5b. Would you object to minority children being bused into your schools if vacancies exist?	
Yes (33.4%)	8,471
No (61.2%)	15,489
Undecided (5.3%)	1,342
Total	25,302

5c. Would you object to having your children bused to other schools to overcome racial imbalance?	
Yes (82%)	20,848
No (12.6%)	3,208
Undecided (5.3%)	1,341
Total	25,397

5d. Do you favor a constitutional amendment prohibiting the involuntary busing of children out of their own neighborhood to overcome racial imbalance?	
Yes (75.3%)	18,892
No (18.3%)	4,589
Undecided (6.3%)	1,584
Total	25,063

6. Do you think Social Security payments should increase automatically with the rise of cost in living?	
Yes (89.3%)	22,424
No (7.1%)	1,776
Undecided (3.5%)	886
Total	25,086

7. Should amnesty be granted to those who left the U.S. rather than serve in the military during the Vietnam conflict?	
Yes (11.4%)	2,872
No (53.3%)	13,312
Contingent (31.2%)	7,785
Undecided (4%)	1,004
Total	25,973

U.S. SOVEREIGNTY OVER CANAL ZONE—LATEST ATTACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, over a period of many years I have observed a weak, vacillating, and pusillanimous policy on the part of our Department of State as regards U.S. sovereignty and ownership of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal. This has been evidenced by a piecemeal erosion as shown by a series of actual or attempted sur-

renders. Among these events were the 1936-39 treaty that started the process and the 1955 treaty that accelerated it; the display in 1960 of the Panama flag in the Canal Zone equal with that of the United States and the employment of alien Panamanians in Panama Canal security positions, such as members of the Canal Zone Police; an attempt to liquidate the Panama Railroad, which was fortunately blocked by the House of Representatives; and the current canal treaty negotiations, the announced prime purpose of which is the surrender to Panama of our indispensable sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

In this connection, it cannot be emphasized too strongly that when the 1903 Panama Canal Treaty for the construction of the canal and its subsequent maintenance and operation was negotiated, both Panama and the United States considered full U.S. sovereignty indispensable. History has completely established the wisdom of that action. The canal cannot be operated with any degree of efficiency with less authority than that conferred by the 1903 treaty, which has continued and must always continue so long as the United States maintains the canal.

The latest significant development on the Isthmus is a decree by the revolutionary Panama Government establishing election districts for Panamanian elections to be held in the Canal Zone, which are open acts of sovereignty not authorized under existing treaties. Because of their significance for future U.S. control over the canal, I wrote the Secretary of Army requesting essential information. The Army response indicated an indirect approval by the State Department of the Panamanian action to which I took strong exception in a reply to the Secretary of the Army.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the present situation as regards the canal, it is well to recall the fact that during the construction era, this great project was under the direct supervision of the Secretary of War with little intervention by the Department of State. This was fortunate for if the State Department had been active in the manner that it has been since 1952, I do not see how the canal could ever been completed.

The two crucial present issues concerning the canal are: First, sovereignty over the Canal Zone; and second, the major modernization of the existing canal. The sea level proposal which has been so persistently promoted, is irrelevant and should be so recognized. It merely serves as an excuse to bring about surrender of U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone in the name of securing "better relationships" with Panama, thereby confusing the real issues.

What is needed at Panama is not further appeasement but a positive policy of sovereignty by the United States. Such policy can be initiated by action on the pending legislation for the major modernization of the canal. Enactment of these measures would immediately serve notice on the world that the United States intends to meet its treaty obligations as regards the operation of the canal. Moreover, it would be in the best

interest of Panama as well as of hemisphere security.

Supervision of the Panama Canal is now exercised by the Secretary of the Army under the President. It is time for the Secretary to assert the prerogatives of his office as regards the canal and thus end the uncertainty and confusion that has plagued and still plagues the work of maintaining, operating, and defending our strategic waterway.

In order that the Congress and the Nation may have the facts as revealed by the indicated letters, I quote the entire exchange as part of my remarks:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., June 13, 1972.

HON. ROBERT F. FROEHLKE,
Secretary of the Army,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Spanish language press of Panama, *El Matutino* of May 10, announced the creation by Panama of Panamanian election districts in the Canal Zone for elections to the National Assembly, and as an affirmation of Panamanian sovereignty over the Zone.

The exercise by Panama of such political powers in the U.S. owned Zone territory is not authorized under treaties which grant to the United States all the rights, powers and authority of sovereignty in perpetuity to the entire exclusion of the exercise of such rights, power and authority by Panama.

Information is desired as to the significant facts in the situation.

An early reply is requested.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., June 22, 1972.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: This is in response to your letter of 13 June 1972, to Secretary Froehlke requesting information on the establishment of Panamanian election districts in the Canal Zone.

As in previous elections, the Canal Zone Government has encouraged Panamanian employees to carry out their civic responsibility and to vote in the scheduled August elections. The interested agencies of the United States Government have studied the Panamanian decree establishing election districts within the Canal Zone and have concluded that our treaty rights are in no way diminished by this decree nor by the participation of the Panamanian residents of the Zone in this voting. Nevertheless, in view of the erroneous interpretations being given to the decree, such as that in the newspaper article cited in your letter, the Department of State has sent a diplomatic note to the Panamanian Government affirming our understanding that the decree and the scheduled elections do not represent any effort by the Government of Panama to assert authority in the Canal Zone.

Sincerely,

HENRY L. T. KOREN,
Deputy Under Secretary of the Army.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., July 6, 1972.

HON. ROBERT F. FROEHLKE,
Secretary of the Army,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: A Department of the Army letter of 22 June 1972 signed by Deputy Under Secretary of the Army Henry L. T. Koren advises that interested agencies of the Executive Branch of our government have studied the Panamanian decree establishing election districts in the Canal Zone

and concluded that United States treaty rights are in no way diminished, blames Isthmian newspapers for "erroneous interpretations" of the decree, and states that the State Department has sent a diplomatic note to the Panama Government expressing our understanding that such decree and the scheduled elections do not represent any effort on the part of Panama to assert authority over the Canal Zone.

The present government of Panama is a pro-Red Revolutionary dictatorship closely associated with Soviet Cuba and exercises a strict censorship over the Panamanian press. As indicated by the attached news story, it is already taking steps to remove from the Constitution of Panama certain provisions recognizing the status of the Canal Zone. Thus the facts in the situation clearly contradict the State Department views as summarized in the Army Department's letter.

Your attention is respectfully invited to the following sequence of events:

In 1955, the Executive Department negotiated a treaty providing for giving to Panama certain valuable real estate, including the designed terminal freight yards and passenger stations of the Panama Railroad in the Cities of Panama and Colon. This treaty even contemplated the liquidation of the entire railroad. Fortunately, the House of Representatives intervened with an independent investigation and saved the main line, and now this strategic railroad still provides much needed transportation including passenger service for the people of Panama from new passenger stations in Ancon and Cristobal.

In September 1960, President Eisenhower, on bad advice and in a mistaken gesture of friendship, authorized the display of one Panama flag at Shaler's Triangle in the Canal Zone as visual evidence of Panama's so-called "titular sovereignty," over this U.S. territory, which means nothing but a revisionary interest in the sole event the United States abandons the Panama Canal. As predicted by me at the time, such display was interpreted as recognition of Panama's full sovereignty and led to still greater demands, culminating in the Red-led 1964 mob assaults on the Zone that required the use of U.S. Armed Forces to save the lives of our citizens and protect the Canal itself.

Later, there were efforts by the State Department to cede jurisdiction over major Cristobal piers, the Thatcher Ferry Bridge, and Thatcher Highway to Panama in what amounted to programs for the piece meal liquidation of the Canal enterprise but they were likewise blocked by the Congress.

The division of the Canal Zone into election districts and holding elections in it are acts of sovereignty. To blame Isthmian newspapers that only publish approved news for "erroneous interpretations" reflects a lack of comprehension of the realities involved that is difficult to understand or accept. For the State Department to send a diplomatic note asserting that agency's understanding that the execution of the indicated decree in the Canal Zone does not represent any effort by Panama to assert its authority is contrary to the facts. What would the Executive Department do in the event Mexico should decree voting districts and conduct elections in southern California which has a large Mexican population?

Our government must keep in mind the fact that the Panamanian Government considers such political action as holding elections in the Canal Zone amounts to recognition by the United States of the validity of Panama's claims of sovereignty over the entire Canal Zone. No contrary position can be expected from the present Government of Panama.

When the United States undertook the great task of constructing the Panama Canal and its subsequent operation those who formulated our Isthmian policy believed that

complete U.S. sovereignty and ownership were absolutely essential. That was at a time when enemies hostile to our presence on the Isthmus did not exist.

Today the situation is entirely different. We know that U.S.S.R. policy is to drive the United States from the Isthmus and to dominate the Canal. The Red takeover of Cuba was the first major step in that direction. Therefore, the need for our continued undiluted sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Canal Zone and Canal is greater than ever. Instead of reducing the Zone it should be widened to include the entire watershed of the Chagres River as was once recommended by General Clarence Edwards when he was Commanding General of U.S. Forces on the Isthmus.

The Canal Zone and Panama form part of the coastline of the United States. Their protection is just as much a Federal responsibility as that of the Chesapeake Bay or San Francisco Harbor. All the talk and jargon dealing with the proposed surrender of our indispensable authority over the Canal Zone and Canal are totally unrealistic and oblivious to what our government decided was necessary when it assumed the responsibility for constructing the Canal and its subsequent operation and protection. Comparing the Canal Zone with a temporarily held military base overseas is wholly irrelevant and should not be allowed to confuse the issue.

As Secretary of the Army you are charged by Executive Order with responsibility for supervision of the Panama Canal and you certainly should not permit such undermining of United States sovereignty over the Canal Zone as is now being attempted, regardless of any other agency of government.

Having followed the canal question for many years, I can assure you that it is non-partisan in character and that the Congress will never assent to the surrender of the Panama Canal or its indispensable protective frame of the Canal Zone.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

PANAMA TO DROP CLAUSE LIMITING JURISDICTION

A provision that recognizes "jurisdictional limitations" imposed by international treaties is to be dropped from Panama's Constitution.

Marcelino Jaen, chairman of a commission that is drafting constitutional amendments, announced that the commission gave a standing vote of approval to the proposed change.

Article 3 of the Constitution reads: "The Republic of Panama is established on the continental and insular territory between Colombia and Costa Rica, in accordance with the boundary treaties entered into by Panama with those Republics."

"Jurisdictional limitations stipulated in public treaties entered into prior to this Constitution are hereby recognized."

The commission is proposing that the entire last paragraph be eliminated.

The provision has been carried in all of Panama's constitutions since 1903 and refers to the Panama Canal Zone, which the United States controls by virtue of the 1903 Panama Canal Treaty.

Panama has consistently denounced the treaty as unfair and as having been imposed on it by the United States because of the circumstances at the time the agreement was signed shortly after it seceded from neighboring Colombia. The treaty was signed for Panama by Philippe Bunau-Varilla, a French engineer who later wrote he was trying to save the French Canal Co.'s investment in its ill-fated attempt to build the waterway.

Panama and the United States are conducting negotiations now to replace the 1903

treaty. Panama has made recovery of full jurisdiction over the Canal Zone its major demand in the current talks.

The constitutional amendments being drafted by a 25-member commission will be submitted to an Assembly of Community Representatives to be elected Aug. 6.

Chairman Jaen said the provision to be eliminated is both a "contradiction" and an "anachronism."

"A contradiction," a commission statement said, "because it is inconceivable that after drawing up the most convincing argument in Latin American diplomatic history for the abrogation of the Hay-Bunau-Varilla treaty, the very country involved includes in its Charter provisions for the respect of the wretched treaty signed by a French adventurer and the Secretary of State of the United States; and assigns validity to the leonine terms of the agreement, the worst of which is the grant in perpetuity of the Panama Canal Zone. It is an anachronism because the provision upholds a state of injustice which has been repudiated throughout the evolution of international life—the unanimous rejection of unfair treaties. . ."

The statement said the proposed amendment stands for "reaffirmation of sovereignty, defense of the international personality of the state, reiteration of the undelayable need to reincorporate the Canal Zone to national jurisdiction and, above all, a clear manifestation of the new nation to preserve honor and dignity in its constitutional context."

THIEU GIVEN AN EXTRA \$400 MILLION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration provided \$400 million more in military assistance last year to the South Vietnamese Government than was reported to the Congress.

Whether by design or just plain bureaucratic bungling and mismanagement, the Nixon administration gave President Thieu \$400 million more in aid than reported to the Congress in fiscal year 1971.

Under the MASF system, the administration was required to provide quarterly reports reflecting the estimated expenditures of the MASF fund used for military assistance. The Nixon administration provided \$1.9 billion instead of \$1.5 billion to the Thieu regime in fiscal 1971.

The MASF fund is used to pay for the pacification and military assistance fund in several Southeast Asian countries including Vietnam. The fund was first established in 1966 when the Congress passed a special \$12.5 billion supplemental appropriation to pay for the war. At the time, a funding mechanism like MASF may have made sense, but today, with the war rapidly winding down in terms of American involvement, a fund like MASF should be discontinued.

The reason, Mr. Speaker, I raise the question about whether the administration's poor estimate of aid given to the Thieu Government was by design of bungling, is simply because the administration's estimate of assistance provided to the Vietnamese militia during the last 4 years was 50 percent less than the administration had previously reported. \$900 million has been provided to the

Vietnamese militia instead of the \$1.8 million estimated by the administration.

These disparities in estimates have been uncovered by the General Accounting Office in a report that was released earlier this week.

Mr. Speaker, I find the administration's inability to properly estimate expenditures in Vietnam one of the most shocking examples of bureaucratic bungling and inefficiency that I have ever encountered. I am calling upon both Secretary Laird and Secretary Rogers to immediately explain to the Congress and the American people how this morass of poor judgment, bad procedures, and practically nonexistent accounting systems ever occurred in the military assistance program.

With DOD providing and administering some funds and AID spending others, nobody has any overall control over these massive expenditures as a result of the massive funding system.

I am recommending to Secretaries Laird and Rogers that all responsibility for the administration of aid to South Vietnam be returned to AID and that Agency be made accountable for any further mistakes.

In addition to its inability to make decent estimates, the U.S. aid program which is organized by an administrative unit known as CORDS, has maintained very little control over \$360 million in U.S.-owned and controlled currency. The General Accounting Office found that funds were given to the South Vietnamese as transfers rather than on the basis of actual expenditures. The United States never knew whether funds were being spent for high-priority projects or if they were being used effectively for the purposes intended.

The General Accounting Office also found that—

Effective controls over commodities provided to war victims were not established. Large quantities of food had spoiled, unneeded items had been purchased but not used for long periods, and the items had been diverted to ineligible recipients.

Mr. Speaker, it is abundantly clear that lack of administration by U.S. agencies is undoubtedly one of the causes of corruption which seems to be a way of life in South Vietnam.

My hope is that this GAO report will be such a shocker that the administration of aid funds to Vietnam will be immediately reorganized and tightened up. Some agency must take overall responsibility and exert more direct control over expenditures provided as aid to the South Vietnamese Government.

A PLEA FOR ASSISTANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues may have viewed on national television networks or been aware of the public surrender of Pvt. Thomas Michaud, USMC, to authorities at the National Democratic Convention in Miami Beach, Fla., after allegedly hav-

ing been absent without leave from the U.S. Marine Corps for approximately 3 years.

The young marine's dramatic and courageous gesture was a plea for assistance from the American people—assistance not only for himself but for the thousands of servicemen who have deserted from their ranks throughout the period of tragic conflict in Southeast Asia. In response to that plea and as the sponsor of legislation that would provide for unconditional amnesty for deserters immediately after the cessation of hostilities in Indochina, I felt that it was appropriate and my obligation to do whatever I could to assist Private Michaud.

In a letter to the Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable John W. Warner, I requested that he personally intervene in this case in order to expedite the private's discharge from the Marine Corps. I have not sought amnesty for this young man, for it is my position that such could not be granted until after our involvement in the hostilities in Indochina ends.

To quote from my letter:

It is my conviction, however, that a court-martial and potential resulting sentence to a period of confinement are unwarranted. Pvt. Michaud has suffered enough. He has lived in exile in his own country in constant fear of apprehension, fear of ever seeing his family, and undoubtedly in a state of inner turmoil because of his principled and conscientious stand against violence and the Vietnam war.

It is apparent to me that he surrendered in such dramatic fashion to demonstrate to the American people the plight of his fellow servicemen who find themselves in a similar status and to raise the concern of elected officials present in Miami and elsewhere with respect to the urgency of the amnesty issue. The fashion in which Pvt. Michaud's act of surrender was accomplished constituted an unusual display of selflessness and courage. For that reason and because of the great hardship that he has already endured, I feel that this young man should be treated with leniency.

I am informed that Pvt. Michaud has requested today that he be administratively separated in lieu of court-martial, and I respectfully urge that that request be honored. By so doing, the Marine Corps would be recognizing the human needs and welfare of its men in keeping with its finest traditions and would mitigate rather than supplement the hardships Pvt. Michaud has already suffered.

Beyond the letter, I requested a personal meeting with Secretary Warner to discuss the Michaud case, but was informed that he would not receive me, that he considered it "inappropriate" to involve himself in the case.

Private Michaud is typical of many military men who have departed ranks and gone absent without leave because of their strong opposition to U.S. military policy in Southeast Asia. He enlisted in the Marine Corps at age 17 with his older brother, to whom he was extremely close and attached, after having spent 11 years in an orphanage and never having received more than a ninth-grade education. Following basic training, he served an 18-month tour in the Philippines, on guard duty for the entire period. In 1968, he requested a tour in Danang in order to be with his older brother who

was stationed there, but instead was sent to the I Corps region to serve with a reconnaissance unit. Having completed that tour, he was ordered to Camp Lejeune from which he absented himself soon thereafter in mid-1969. His stated reason for "deserting" was his opposition to the Vietnam war and violence in general.

Thousands of conscriptees and forced enlistees who have gone into exile or underground in this country because of the brutalizing effects of this tragic war will be returning or surfacing in the months and years to come. As Members of Congress, we cannot ignore the issue of amnesty for deserters. Some of my colleagues have advocated amnesty for draft-evaders but have ignored this other large body of deserters. Most of the draft-evaders were college-educated, middle-class individuals who reached their decisions to resist on the basis of abstract and often moralistic assessments of the war. Most of the deserters are working-class youths, and many are not as articulate in giving abstract reasons for deserting, although they are even more committed since their reasons grow from practice rather than theory. It would be unfairly discriminatory to grant amnesty to draft-evaders while denying it to deserters, who simply developed their moral awareness after entry into the service rather than before.

Private Michaud should make us all pause to think about this extremely serious issue. By calling it to our attention, he has manifested a selflessness that should be met with the concern for his welfare by those of my colleagues who share his position on the war.

BICENTENNIAL PARK ACT OF 1972

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. ST GERMAIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Bicentennial Park Act of 1972 I have introduced today would establish a national park or national recreation area in each of the 20 States where none now exists as a gift to the American people for the Nation's 200th birthday. The parks would be opened in time for the bicentennial celebration on July 4, 1976.

The growing concern about protecting our environment has focused great attention on the need to establish more national recreation areas.

So many people are using and abusing national parks today that the streams are becoming polluted and the traffic jams on park roads are more common than deer in the woods. Our parks have become so overcrowded that this summer the National Park Service is limiting the number of visitors for the first time in its history.

There is an urgent need to expand the national park system, particularly near urban areas where recreation and cultural facilities are most needed. Recreation areas can no longer be considered a luxury. They are a vital human necessity that touches the root cause of much personal and civil discontent in our cities. Many elderly and poor Americans seldom have an opportunity to use our national

parks because they are too costly or too far away from the metropolitan areas.

The Bicentennial Park Act would be a major step toward solving these problems. It would create parks in the following States: Alabama, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Idaho, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. Each park would be a minimum of 500 acres, and would be developed and maintained by the National Park Service.

Park sites would be chosen for their natural, recreation, or historic settings and convenience to metropolitan areas. When possible they would be built on surplus Federal lands, including unneeded military installations. In addition to picnic and playground areas, there would be an amphitheater or flexible outdoor stage for public meetings, theater, dance, and music. They would emphasize participation and involvement, culture, and contemplation. The parks would also include facilities for craft exhibits, folk festivals, sports, bicycle paths, and nature walks.

To discourage traffic problems, the Bicentennial Park Act directs the Secretary of Transportation to develop at least three demonstration projects to provide convenient, low-cost transportation between the parks and cities.

The increasing pollution and traffic jams in national parks are a sad commentary on the state of our national recreation areas as we mark the 100th anniversary of the National Park Service. Since 1872 our national parks have served as a cornerstone of environmental protection. To assure their survival, we must establish new national recreation areas not only where we find them, but where we need them most, near our cities where 75 percent of the population lives, but where only 25 percent of the recreation areas are located.

Finally, the cost of creating parks under the Bicentennial Park Act would be substantially less than the plan proposed by the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. The Commission has estimated that its parks would cost \$23 million each. They would also charge admission and be operated by the States after the bicentennial. My park bill would reach more Americans at less cost to the people and the Federal Government, and leave no additional financial burden for the States after 1976.

PROMPT, EARNEST NEGOTIATIONS ARE REQUIRED TO AVOID MONETARY TURBULENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on June 23 the British Government resolved to stop intervening in exchange markets. Since the Bank of England halted purchases of pounds with foreign currencies, the value of the pound has slipped to slightly over \$2.40, as compared with the previous parity of \$2.60. The British authorities' decision to let the pound float rather than introduce the draconian ex-

change controls that would have been necessary to stem the crisis was a sound one.

Since the inception of the British float almost a month ago, the dollar, as another major currency whose value was believed likely to slip, has been under almost continuous downward pressure in exchange markets. This pressure has been maintained despite an announcement by the six-member countries of the European Economic Community on June 26 that they would, if necessary, defend existing fixed exchange rate parities by purchasing more dollars. But the situation continued to deteriorate. During the week ending July 14, European central banks were forced to acquire, according to press reports, \$2.5 billion to prevent an upward movement in the dollar value of their own currencies.

In the face of these pressures, the finance ministers of the six original Common Market members and the four other countries that are scheduled to join next year met last Monday and Tuesday, July 17 and 18, in London to weigh measures for discouraging exchange rate speculation and to chart a unified course toward monetary reform. Monday they issued a list of eight characteristics that all agreed should be incorporated in any new international monetary system.

On Tuesday, the day following the announcement, the exchange markets relaxed, and for the first time in a week European central banks were not obliged to make purchases of dollars to support the value of our currency.

The remarkable fact about the list of eight desirable characteristics agreed upon by the Finance Ministers of the expanded Common Market on July 17, 1972, is that it is not very different from an IMF document I described in a floor speech last March 23. This internal memorandum is entitled "Reform of the International Monetary System—a Sketch of its Scope and Content," and is dated March 7.

The list of issues touched upon by the EEC Finance Ministers also corresponds essentially to the seven unresolved questions detailed in the communique distributed by the Group of Ten Ministers on December 18, 1971. This communique was published at the conclusion of the Smithsonian meeting which, following President Nixon's preemptive strike on August 15, 1971, established a new set of exchange rate parities.

Furthermore, all these documents bear a striking similarity to a monetary accord issued by the six Common Market nations on September 13, 1971. Finally, they also closely resemble the 10 points of Dr. Arthur Burns' May 12, 1971, speech at Montreal to the International Banking Conference. For purposes of comparison, there follows the July 17, 1972, list of points of agreement by the expanded EEC countries, my March 23, 1972 speech, the December 18, 1971 communique, the 10 points in the Burns' May 12, 1972 speech, and the September 13, 1971 monetary accord:

EEC LIST OF POINTS
(July 17, 1972)

The parities among currencies should be fixed at recognized levels but those parities

should be easily adjustable from time to time as required by economic conditions.

All currencies should be freely convertible into other currencies.

There should be effective international regulation of the supply of liquidity (money) in the world.

Necessary adjustments in their balance of payments should be freely made by participating countries.

Means should be found to reduce the destabilizing effects of short-term capital flows, such as the flight from sterling that led Britain to float her pound on June 23.

The principle that both surplus and deficit countries have equal rights and obligations should be established.

The interests of developing countries should be taken into account by the developed countries.

There is no conflict between these principles and the Common Market countries' objective of achieving an economic and monetary union among themselves.

[Floor Speech by Representative REUSS—
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, H2455-H2457,
Mar. 23, 1972]

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY REFORM—LET US
GET GOING

THE SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

MR. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, by passing overwhelmingly earlier this week H.R. 13120, to modify the par value of the dollar, the Congress has constructively cooperated with the administration Phase I of international monetary reform.

I am confident that Congress will cooperate equally constructively with the vastly more important phase II of international monetary reform. This is the sense of the one agreed statement of all Members—Republican and Democratic—of the joint committee in its 1972 joint economic report, released today. While differences throughout the 150-page report by Republicans and Democrats, and by Members of each party, were deep and wide on almost every issue, all agreed in the following statement:

We must promptly start negotiations on longer term international monetary reform. We should explore the potential of utilizing such reform as a means to promote capital flows toward less developed countries. A reformed international monetary system should guarantee sufficient exchange rate flexibility.

To the same effect are the report's majority views on international economics, pages 59 to 67; the minority views, pages 126 to 136; and the additional views of Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, pages 137 to 139.

This same view—that international monetary reform is needed, and that negotiations should start now—runs through the mainstream of international monetary utterances since the crisis of last August 15.

On September 13, 1971, the six of the European Economic Community—France, West Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg—came on strong for a reconstruction of the international monetary system, stressing the modification of fixed parities, the growing reliance on "reserve instruments collectively created and managed internationally," and attention to "the needs of developing countries." Three days later, Japan, Canada, Great Britain, Sweden, and Switzerland, indicated their adherence to the declaration of the six.

The spirit of reform was reiterated—this time with the United States joining in—in the December 18, 1971, communique which followed the group of 10 Smithsonian meeting in Washington. That communique concluded:

The Ministers and Governors agreed that

discussions should be promptly undertaken, particularly in the framework of the IMF, to consider reform of the international monetary system over the longer term. It was agreed that attention should be directed to the appropriate monetary means and division of responsibilities for defending stable exchange rates and for insuring a proper degree of convertibility of the system; to the proper role of gold, of reserve currencies, and of Special Drawing Rights in the operation of the system; to the appropriate volume of liquidity; to re-examination of the permissible margins of fluctuation around established exchange rates and other means of establishing a suitable degree of flexibility; and to other measures dealing with movements of liquid capital. It is recognized that decisions in each of these areas are closely linked.

The spirit of reform is thus bipartisan, multinational, desperately needed, and long delayed.

And what of the administration, and particularly the Treasury, where the responsibility lies?

Like a patient suffering with a fever, the Treasury's attitude toward reform comes in fits and starts, interspersed with periods of profound coma. There was the swashbuckling activity of August 15, followed by months of ambiguity and inaction. Then there were the great December moments at the Azores and the Smithsonian, followed again by months of innocuous desuetude.

Just in the last few days have come some overt and visible signs that the administration and the Treasury are again thinking about monetary reform. The Treasury's view on international monetary reform is that it is "wrestling with the complexities of this most complex subject."

All sorts of bold new ideas, undreamt of in the Smithsonian philosophy, are being floated. As reported in the New York Times of March 11, "Secretary Connally is toying with an idea for a future world economy divided openly and purposely into several major blocks."

Again, as reported in the Wall Street Journal of March 20, Secretary Connally advocates an "automatic discipline" against countries that run chronic surpluses in their balance of payments, a discipline which would require surplus countries to give up part of their excess monetary reserves to a special fund from which deficit countries could borrow. The idea was so new, reported the Wall Street Journal, that the Secretary has not yet been able to discuss it with his "key strategist," the Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs.

The principal thing holding the Treasury back, it appears, is its inability to decide on just whom to negotiate with.

I speak today, because I believe there is a proper forum for the negotiation of international monetary reform, one that should be convened without delay; that there is a proper subject matter for negotiation, with most of the technical details already well thought through; and that there is a proper timetable, one looking toward the practical achievement of monetary reform by the time of the annual meetings of the International Monetary Fund-World Bank in Washington next autumn.

I shall discuss these questions of Reform—Who? Reform—What? and Reform—When? And I believe that the Congress will support constructive initiatives by the administration along the lines I project.

REFORM—WHO?

On the question of the proper parties and forum for negotiating international monetary reform—an obvious first order of priority—the Treasury's position, as stated in the Wall Street Journal of March 20, hints at simultaneous negotiations in three places:

One among the traditional "Group of Ten"

key industrial countries, one in another group representative of the 20 nations on the executive board of the IMF, and a new group representing major power blocks.

Simultaneous negotiations with three vaguely overlapping groups sounds to me like a poor way to proceed. We do not have enough expert jugglers to keep three balls in the air at once. Neither does anybody else.

Apart from the dispersion of energy involved in simultaneous negotiations in three forums, two of the three forums suggested are poor ones. Secretary Connally himself has criticized the Group of Ten as being "limited to industrial nations and wealthy nations." He is quite right. With the UNCTAD countries about to assemble in an indignation meeting in Santiago, Chile, in the next few weeks, it does not make sense to pick a forum for monetary reform which would exclude them.

Likewise, to adopt the Treasury's obsession with "major power blocks" concedes too much to the curse of bigness. Why in the name of commonsense do we want to go around forming power blocks—European, Japanese, African, Latin America, or any other kind? Within the power block, they tend to set up a hateful master-slave relationship. Between and among the power blocks, they make for aggressiveness, when what is needed is cooperation.

That leaves the third Treasury suggestion—"another group representative of the 20 nations on the executive board of the IMF." While the suggestion is somewhat misleadingly put, it has great merit.

In fact, the International Monetary Fund, through its Managing Director Pierre-Paul Schweitzer, on January 24, 1972, unfolded in great detail an excellent plan for a ministerial group of 20 who between them would represent all the 120 countries of the IMF. Basically, this would simply involve an upgrading to the ministerial level of the present 20 executive director groupings. Some of the IMF executive directors, like the United States, represent, but one major country. Others represent a group of countries, such as the Netherlands-Austria-Yugoslavia-Israel grouping. Still others represent a greater number of less developed countries, such as the executive director grouping for 18 African countries which have all emerged from French colonialism.

The IMF January 24 suggestion is that each of these 20 groups be a little club, with a head and some deputies which would give broad-scale representation—usually through finance ministers or central bank presidents—to the various countries in the grouping. Frequent rotations would insure fairness to all countries in the grouping.

The January 24 initiative has been well received in discussions between executive directors of the fund since January.

Here is a way to achieve unity through diversity. We ought to adopt the IMF suggestion tomorrow, and convene the new 20-member streamlined monetary parliament within the next few weeks. It should stay on the job until a reform is agreed upon, for presentation to the fund's governors and then for ratification by the Fund members.

REFORM—WHAT?

Once this 20-member group has convened, it needs an agenda. Here, again, the International Monetary Fund has been spending the months since August 15 most usefully. Its able staff has refined the issues and posed some answers on the whole gamut of problems involved in international monetary reform. Dozens of staff papers have culminated in the basic document "Reform of the International Monetary System—A Sketch of Its Scope and Content," dated March 7, 1972. The paper and its predecessors have been widely discussed by the executive directors and staff of the fund and tentative agreement is beginning to emerge.

The document concerns itself with all the basic questions of monetary reform: How to bring about prompter changes in exchange rates; how to consolidate outstanding dollar and sterling balances into special drawing rights; how to finance balance-of-payments deficits and surpluses of reserve countries; how to attain symmetrical multicurrency intervention; how to make special drawing rights than gold the standard in which par values are expressed; how to provide an attractive rate of interest of special drawing rights; how to make the international monetary system better serve the needs of developing countries.

The March 7 "Sketch" could serve well as a starting point for the 20-member group negotiation. For the "Sketch" so to serve would not require that the United States agree with its every point. But negotiations must start somewhere, and the "Sketch" is a good place to start.

REFORM—WHEN?

Nothing concentrates a monetary expert's mind better than the knowledge that he is expected to produce something. The goal of a new monetary agreement by the September meeting of the Fund and Bank should do just that. If the broader questions of international monetary reform are pursued with the same zeal that attended the pursuit of the realignment of last December, there should be no difficulty in accomplishing what is needed in the 6 months between now and next fall.

Nobody—certainly not the United States—will win by further delay. Delay simply exposes the world to the danger of further monetary crises, to a return to autarchy and fragmentation. Let us move.

COMMUNIQUE OF THE MINISTERIAL MEETING OF THE GROUP OF TEN ON DECEMBER 18, 1971, IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

1. The Ministers and Central Bank Governors of the ten countries participating in the General Arrangements to Borrow met at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington on 17th–18th December, 1971, in executive session under the Chairmanship of Mr. J. B. Connally, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States. Mr. P.-P. Schweitzer, the Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund, took part in the meeting, which was also attended by the President of the Swiss National Bank, Mr. E. Stopper, and in part by the Secretary-General of the O.E.C.D., Jonkheer E. van Lennep, the General Manager of the Bank for International Settlements, Mr. R. Larre, and the Vice-President of the Commission of the E.E.C., Mr. R. Barre. The Ministers and Governors welcomed a report from the Managing Directors of the Fund on a meeting held between their Deputies and the Executive Directors of the Fund.

2. The Ministers and Governors agreed on an inter-related set of measures designed to restore stability to international monetary arrangements and to provide for expanding international trade. These measures will be communicated promptly to other governments. It is the hope of the Ministers and Governors that all governments will cooperate through the International Monetary Fund to permit implementation of these measures in an orderly fashion.

3. The Ministers and Governors reached agreement on a pattern of exchange rate relationships among their currencies. These decisions will be announced by individual governments, in the form of par values or central rates as they desire. Most of the countries plan to close their exchange markets on Monday. The Canadian Minister informed the Group that Canada intends temporarily to maintain a floating exchange rate and intends to permit fundamental market forces to establish the exchange rate without inter-

vention except as required to maintain orderly conditions.

4. It was also agreed that, pending agreement on longer-term monetary reforms, provision will be made for 2¼ percent margins of exchange rate fluctuation above and below the new exchange rates. The Ministers and Governors recognized that all members of the International Monetary Fund not attending the present discussions will need urgently to reach decisions, in consultation with the International Monetary Fund, with respect to their own exchange rates. It was the view of the Ministers and Governors that it is particularly important at this time that no country seek improper competitive advantage through its exchange rate policies. Changes in parities can only be justified by an objective appraisal which establishes a position of disequilibrium.

5. Questions of trade arrangements were recognized by the Ministers and Governors as a relevant factor in assuring a new and lasting equilibrium in the international economy. Urgent negotiations are now under way between the United States and the Commission of the European Community, Japan, and Canada to resolve pending short-term issues at the earliest possible date and with the European Community to establish an appropriate agenda for considering more basic issues in a framework of mutual cooperation in the course of 1972 and beyond. The United States agreed to propose to Congress a suitable means for devaluing the dollar in terms of gold to \$38.00 per ounce as soon as the related set of short-term measures is available for Congressional scrutiny. Upon passage of required legislative authority in this framework, the United States will propose the corresponding new par value of the dollar to the International Monetary Fund.

6. In consideration of the agreed immediate realignment of exchange rates, the United States agreed that it will immediately suppress the recently imposed 10 percent import surcharge and related provisions of the Job Development Credit.

7. The Ministers and Governors agreed that discussions should be promptly undertaken, particularly in the framework of the IMF, to consider reform of the international monetary system over the longer term. It was agreed that attention should be directed to the appropriate monetary means and division of responsibilities for defending stable exchange rates and for insuring a proper degree of convertibility of the system; to the proper role of gold, of reserve currencies, and of Special Drawing Rights in the operation of the system; to the appropriate volume of liquidity; to re-examination of the permissible margins of fluctuation around established exchange rates and other means of establishing a suitable degree of flexibility; and to other measures dealing with movements of liquid capital. It is recognized that decisions in each of these areas are closely linked.

DR. BURNS' 10 POINTS OF MAY 12, 1972

First, a significant further strengthening of the processes of international consultation and cooperation;

Second, responsible domestic policies in all the major industrial countries;

Third, a substantial degree of autonomy for domestic policies, so that no country would feel compelled to sacrifice high employment or price stability in order to achieve balance of payments equilibrium;

Fourth, more prompt adjustments of payments imbalances, to be facilitated by definite guidelines and consultative machinery for determining when parities need to be changed;

Fifth, a symmetrical division of responsibilities among surplus and deficit countries for initiating and implementing adjustments of payments imbalances;

Sixth, systematic long-range plans for the evolution of world reserves and official credit arrangements;

Seventh, a continued but diminishing role for gold as a reserve asset, with a corresponding increase in the importance of SDR's;

Eighth, a better international consensus than exists at present about the proper role of reserve currencies in the new system;

Ninth, re-establishment of some form of dollar convertibility in the future;

And finally, tenth, a significant lessening of restrictive trading practices as the result of negotiations complementing the negotiations on monetary reform.

MONETARY ACCORD OF SEPTEMBER 13, 1971

The Council of the European Community again examined the problems raised following the measures taken by the United States Government on Aug. 15, 1971.

It considers that the fundamental problem is that of reconstructing an international economic and monetary system on the basis of the institutions which have hitherto looked after it (the International Monetary Fund and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) and bearing in mind the needs of developing countries.

The Council considers it necessary for the countries of the Community to adopt a common position in this respect, in close collaboration with the candidates for membership.

1. The Council, having taken note of the work of the [E.E.C.] monetary committee and the committee of central bank governors, as well as the commission's communication to the Council of Sept. 9, 1971, agreed that a joint Community position in the Group of Ten and in the I.M.F. should be based on the following principles:

All Reforms of the international monetary system should respect the principle of fixed parities, which should be modified as soon as it is seen that they are no longer realistic. Such a system is necessary for the security of trade transactions and the expansion of exchanges, in which the Community, the world's leading commercial grouping, is particularly interested.

A satisfactory balance in international payments relations founded on the above-defined principles will only be established if there is a differentiated realignment in the party relations of industrialized countries. Such a realignment should include the currencies of all the countries concerned, including the dollar. It should be done in conditions such that the sharing out of the burden of the adjustment takes account of the relative economic situation of these countries and of their foreseeable development.

(B) The orderly functioning of a thus reformed international monetary system demands that measures be put into effect concerning international capital movements. These could include a limited widening of exchange fluctuation margins, so as to lessen the effects of different interest rates, as well as appropriate measures to discourage destabilizing short-term capital movements.

(C) International liquidities will continue to be made up of gold and, in growing part, of reserve instruments collectively created and managed internationally. This implies, the adaptation and development of the system of Special Drawing Rights combined with a gradual decrease of the role of national currencies as reserve instruments.

(D) The new equilibrium of international payments will only be maintained if in future all countries or organized groupings of countries respect without exceptions the obligations and constraints of the process of adjusting their balance of payments and put the appropriate internal policies into effect.

In the framework of a reformed international monetary system, the authority and scope for action of the I.M.F. should be strengthened in all fields where the com-

petence applies. Member states of the Community will try to adopt common positions in this institution.

Noting that the operations of the I.M.F. are made more difficult by recent events, the Council considered it indispensable that the activity of this institution should be able to continue normally, thanks to internal arrangements relative to transactions in the main currencies used by the Fund. The continuance of this activity is of interest not only to industrialized countries but, even more, to developing ones. It would in addition be indispensable to the proper functioning of an exchange system specific to the Community.

2. The Council also examined how the situation had developed in the foreign-exchange markets of the members of the Community. It noted that the proper functioning of these markets had not hitherto been seriously perturbed and took note with satisfaction of the collaboration established between Community central banks, which it wished to see continue.

Realizing that if the present monetary difficulties continued too long, they would raise undoubted dangers for the good functioning of the Community, particularly the common agricultural policy, the Council asked the commission to draw up a special report on the consequences of the present situation on the functioning of the agricultural common market and confirmed the mandate given on Aug. 19 to the monetary committee and the committee of central bank governors to seek as soon as possible methods enabling a stabilization of the Community's exchange relations.

3. The Council underlined the gravity of the United States decision to introduce a 10 per cent surcharge and internal investment and export tax incentives. These measures prevent the formation of realistic exchange rates. They are an obstacle to the readjustment of parities. Moreover, they can provoke serious perturbations in international exchanges. The Council therefore calls for the suppression of these measures.

Reviewing international monetary developments during the last year and the series of documents just reproduced, a two-part conclusion is evident. First, the monetary officials of the major industrial nations have been in essential agreement since last September upon the desired features of a reformed international monetary system. Second, only prompt, diligent, and more-or-less continuous negotiations can avoid periodic upheavals in exchange markets during the interim period when the dollar is inconvertible and when the details of international monetary reform are being hammered out. If exchange crises are permitted to occur from time to time, controls will spread, and the risk that the world will be divided into two or three antagonistically competitive monetary blocs will substantially increase.

The danger of being forced to absorb intolerable amounts of dollars brought the European Finance Ministers together last Monday. Their prompt action in moving the world toward monetary reform has reduced apprehensions in exchange markets. This is an object lesson not to be ignored.

Both the U.S. Treasury and the European governments have been languid in pursuing agreement on monetary reform. In my March 23 speech, I urged that a Group of Twenty patterned after the IMF Executive Directors be convened to negotiate monetary reform. The Directors have now agreed upon this ap-

proach and have submitted it to the IMF Governors on June 28 for what is certain to be their approval. Formal voting closes on July 26.

I also urged that the fund sketch of March 7, 1972, be used as a basis for promptly initiating negotiations, with the target date for conclusion this coming September's annual meeting of the IMF. Instead, the Treasury has not even indicated when negotiations are to begin.

Yesterday we saw an initiative on the part of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve that apparently marks a major shift in U.S. responsibility for the dollars which foreign central banks are continuing to accumulate as a result of our persistent deficits. For the first time since August 1971, the New York Federal Reserve Bank intervened in the exchange market there to buy dollars with a foreign currency and thus boost the value of our currency. By accepting part of the burden for upholding the par values negotiated at the Smithsonian in December 1971, U.S. authorities seem to be indicating that henceforth they will pursue a more active role in achieving reform of the international monetary system.

If official U.S. intervention in the New York exchange market is, indeed, the precursor to vigorous U.S. leadership for monetary reform, I wholeheartedly approve of it. If, however, it is a step back toward pre-August 1971 business-as-usual normality, during which U.S. officials retreated from reality and ignored what was happening to the U.S. balance of payments and to the international monetary system, I deplore it.

Above all, what is needed now is a clear U.S. statement calling for monetary negotiations by the Twenty, to start July 27, and to continue morning, noon, and night until agreement is reached. The basis for negotiations should be the five documents reproduced above. There is no reason why, at the least, a good progress report cannot be made to the IMF at its annual meeting in September.

Financial officials should not need a new crisis every month in order to become re-invigorated, to rediscover their sense of purpose, and to move toward a reform the general outlines of which we already know. The risks of permanent damage to the international monetary system and the costs of delay in negotiating a reform will only increase as action is postponed and as conclusive agreement is pushed further and further into the future. Reasonable men should be able to reach agreement without the pressure of an immediate collapse hanging over them. The time for dalliance is gone.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY PACIFIC CONFERENCE OF LEGISLATORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to resolutions adopted at a meeting of the elected legislators of territories un-

der U.S. jurisdiction in Hawaii, May 1 to 6, 1972. The resolutions of the Pacific Conference of Legislators are as follows:

RELATIVE TO REQUESTING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR TO PROVIDE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FUNDS FOR THE TERRITORY OF AMERICAN SAMOA

Whereas, the islands of the Pacific are necessarily limited in their potential for progress and achievement by the lack of natural resources and productive physical qualities; and

Whereas, growth under these natural conditions can only be achieved by a sound infrastructure which will build a firm base for attracting and sustaining industrial and commercial activity; and

Whereas, the government of the United States which has political and administrative jurisdiction over many of these islands has recognized the problems connected with economic growth in the Pacific Basin and has among other things provided for financial assistance to Guam and the Trust Territory by making available economic development funds; and

Whereas, there is a common bond among the islands which look to the United States for assistance in their efforts to improve their community well being and to keep pace with the economic growth of the other areas of the world; and

Whereas, such bond requires that the welfare and growth of the islands should be matters of equal concern and parity of treatment by the Department of the Interior and the Congress of the United States; now therefore be it

Resolved, that the Pacific Conference of Legislators does hereby respectfully urge the Department of the Interior and the Congress of the United States to make available to the people of American Samoa economic development grants and loans to the same degree as received by other possessions and territories of the Pacific area over which it has jurisdiction; and be it further

Resolved, that the President certify to and the Secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the Honorable Phillip Burton, Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs, the Honorable Quentin Burdick, Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs and to the Honorable Harrison Loesch, Secretary of the Interior.

RELATIVE TO REQUESTING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ESTABLISH A 5-YEAR PROGRAM OF SCHOLARSHIPS IN HIGHER EDUCATION FOR THE MEMBER JURISDICTIONS OF THE PACIFIC CONFERENCE OF LEGISLATORS

Whereas, there is a continuing involvement towards greater self-government among the islands of the central and western Pacific under American jurisdiction; and

Whereas, this movement should be encouraged and strengthened as a viable demonstration of democracy in action; and

Whereas, while one of the cornerstones of a viable democratic government is a knowledgeable and well informed electorate, many qualified graduates of the secondary schools of the Pacific area are compelled to forego the benefits of continuing higher education because of a lack of funds and inaccessibility of institutions of higher learning; now therefore be it

Resolved, that the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is respectfully requested to take all necessary steps to establish a five-year program of scholarships in higher education for at least fifty qualified high school graduates from the United States territories, possessions and trust territories in the Pacific area; and be it further

Resolved, that the President certify to and the Secretary attest the adoption hereof, and

that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the Honorable Phillip Burton, Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs and the Honorable Quentin Burdick, Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs.

RELATIVE TO EXPRESSING TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRITORIAL AND INSULAR AFFAIRS AND MR. WILLIAM G. THOMAS, CONSULTANT TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE, THE GRATITUDE OF THE PACIFIC CONFERENCE OF LEGISLATORS FOR THEIR SUPPORT AND ENDORSEMENT OF THE CONFERENCE

Whereas, the United States House of Representatives Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs, has on many occasions expressed its wholehearted endorsement of the organization, purposes, directions and activities of the Pacific Conference of Legislators; and

Whereas, Mr. William G. Thomas, Consultant to the Subcommittee, has participated in this Fourth Annual Conference, his presence serving most admirably and appropriately to indicate the continued support of the House Subcommittee for the goals and directions of this Conference; now therefore be it

Resolved, that the Pacific Conference of Legislators does hereby express to the House of Representatives Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs and to Mr. William G. Thomas, Consultant to the Subcommittee, the deep gratitude of the Conference for their support and endorsement of the Fourth Annual Conference; and be it further

Resolved, that the President certify to and the Secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the Honorable Phillip Burton, Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs, and to Mr. William G. Thomas.

RELATIVE TO EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE PACIFIC CONFERENCE OF LEGISLATORS REGARDING FEDERAL POLICY IN THE AMERICAN JURISDICTIONS OF THE PACIFIC BASIN

Whereas, the Fourth Annual Pacific Conference of Legislators held in the State of Hawaii from May 1-6, 1972, for the Legislators and staff members of legislative bodies of the various jurisdictions in the western and central Pacific Islands has reviewed and considered various mutual problems in an attempt to find common solutions to these problems; and

Whereas, during the duration of the Conference, the various jurisdictions considered certain problems which relate to them as American jurisdictions, attempting to achieve a common understanding of their various relationships within the Federal governmental structure; and

Whereas, the focus and theme of the Conference was established in a number of Conference and pre-Conference remarks and discussions relating to the various interrelationships between the U.S. Federal jurisdiction and the particular member jurisdictions; and

Whereas, it was established by the member jurisdictions of the Conference that four of the major issues of common concern in this area were the following:

1. The need for a more definite Federal land policy in Guam, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and American Samoa,

2. the effect of the military presence in the member jurisdictions and more particularly in the United States territory of Guam,

3. the need for Federal funding for the economic development of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Guam, American Samoa and the other American jurisdictions of the Pacific Basin, and

4. the desire of the participating Ameri-

can jurisdictions within the Pacific Basin for increased political self-determination; and

Whereas, the Fourth Annual Pacific Conference of Legislators presented a forum for the discussion of these issues of common concern and elicited a variety of solutions which are worthy of further consideration and review by both the Federal government of the United States and the member jurisdictions of the Pacific Conference; and

Whereas, the members of the Fourth Annual Pacific Conference of Legislators have reached a consensus concerning these four vital issues of Federal policy considered by the Conference and are of the opinion that it would be fitting and appropriate to express this consensus; now therefore be it

Resolved, that the Pacific Conference of Legislators does hereby express the sense of the Conference regarding the following issues relating to United States federal policy in the Pacific Basin:

1. The Pacific Conference of Legislators finds that there is at present no consistent and uniform Federal land policy among its territories and possessions in the Pacific Basin and therefore the Conference does hereby respectfully request the Federal government of the United States to develop a uniform land policy for this area similar to that practiced in the States of the United States but giving due regard to the lack of voting representation of these territories and possessions in the United States Congress and the manifest antipathy of these jurisdictions toward the policy of Federal land taking and the practice of Federal eminent domain,

2. The Pacific Conference of Legislators finds that the United States military presence within certain member jurisdictions, although economically beneficial to these jurisdictions, has oftentimes been detrimental to the political and social development of these jurisdictions, the military governments oftentimes developing a supreme attitude toward the citizens of these jurisdictions and therefore the Conference does hereby respectfully request the Federal government of the United States to review, study and consider procedures for resolving these conflicts between the United States military jurisdictions and the peoples of the American jurisdictions of the Pacific Basin.

3. the Pacific Conference of Legislators finds that the economic development of the American jurisdiction of the Pacific Basin has been seriously neglected for a long period of time and, while being aware that the United States government has recently begun to assist these jurisdictions in this development, is nevertheless of the opinion that additional funds for economic development should be made available to these United States territories and possessions, and therefore the Conference does hereby respectfully request the Federal government to assist in their economic development,

4. the Pacific Conference of Legislators finds that many of the American jurisdictions of the Pacific Basin are dissatisfied with their present political status, some of these jurisdictions being classified as "unincorporated territories", and some having the status of wards of the United Nations under the jurisdiction of the United States, in either case these jurisdictions being unable to fully determine their own destiny either directly or indirectly through a vote in the Congress of the United States, and therefore the Conference does hereby respectfully request the Federal government of the United States to review the various political statuses of the jurisdictions of the Pacific Basin with a view to providing a more viable and democratic status for those jurisdictions dissatisfied with their present Federal relationship; and be it further

Resolved, that the President certify to and the Secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be transmitted to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President

of the United States, the Honorable Rogers C. B. Morton, Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Quentin N. Burdick, Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs, and to the Honorable Philip Burton, Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs.

WHY DO WE DISTINGUISH IN OUR AID TO THE VICTIMS OF MAN-MADE AND NATURAL DISASTERS

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the committee on which I serve, Banking and Currency, is now engaged in marking up a bill entitled the "Disaster Recovery Act of 1972." Its purpose is to provide assistance to the victims of Hurricane Agnes and the devastating flood disaster which struck the State of South Dakota in June 1972. As I listened to the testimony of the Members from Pennsylvania, the Governor of Pennsylvania, the Members from the States of Washington and California, and the administration spokesman, Frank Carlucci, Deputy Director, Office of Management and Budget, I was struck by our readiness to speedily provide \$1.5 billion for such disaster relief with outright grants of up to \$5,000 to individuals and 1 percent loans. I have no quarrel with this action, because of the human suffering involved. But, as I listen to the testimony I changed in my mind the purpose clause from its current:

The Congress hereby finds and declares that the untold suffering, the loss of human lives, and the interruption of life and commerce resulting principally from flooding, high waters, and wind-driven waters associated with the hurricane and tropical storm Agnes, and the devastating flood disasters which struck the State of South Dakota in the month of June 1972, compels enactment of special measures designed to aid the victims of these catastrophes in their efforts to restore and rehabilitate devastated homes, farms, and businesses—

To—

The Congress hereby finds and declares that the untold suffering, the loss in productivity of human lives, and the interruption of life and commerce resulting principally from man made disasters and the failure of government to provide jobs and housing compels enactment of special measures designed to aid the victims of these catastrophes in their efforts to provide jobs and restore and rehabilitate and create decent housing for all of our citizens.

I know that were such a bill to be submitted to this Congress to provide the same kind of assistance to victims of manmade disasters that we intend to give the victims of natural disasters, it would receive short shrift. As we sit here today millions of our citizens are living in abject poverty in rat-infested slums and without employment. Their condition is not of their own making but rather a manmade disaster created by others.

I would like to know why it is we distinguish between natural disasters, and those made by man. To carry the question to the absurd, "Would the ghettos of Harlem, South Bronx, Bedford Stuyvesant become eligible for the assistance

now intended for the victims of Hurricane Agnes, if through some magical way we were able, without loss of life or personal injury, to have the East River flood those areas? Do we need the intervention of God before we address ourselves to the problems that man has created?

If we do not change this policy, we will have a national disaster.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

(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, once again it is my privilege to join with my colleagues in remembering the valiant submerged nations of the world in this 13th observance of Captive Nations Week.

Although there has been change in the relations between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in recent years, millions of citizens of that area are still deprived the normal and self-evident results of all men by action of the Soviet ruling hierarchy. Nearly every nation of the world has a written constitution and the Soviet Constitution, on paper, is among the most democratic of them all. However, in practice, the liberalism is not carried out and there is no self-determination in the Iron Curtain countries; moreover, there are none of the basic freedoms of speech, religion, or mobility as we enjoy them in our country.

In 1940, the U.S.S.R., after underhandedly dealing with Nazi Germany, occupied "for their own protection" Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, three sovereign nations each with a proud heritage. Moscow changed sides after Operation Barbarossa—Hitler's invasion of Russia, June 1941—and finally in 1943, having Germany on the run, proceeded to enslave Rumania, Poland, and Czechoslovakia as the Russian machine moved west toward the Atlantic across Europe. By 1948, under the guise of popular democratic regimes, the Soviets were able to secure the government of Albania, Bulgaria, and Hungary to the Communist cause.

We have seen the Soviet Union at work many times; witness the Warsaw destruction, Eastern Germany, Hungary in 1956, the 8 days of terror in Czechoslovakia in August 1968; in Poland in 1970 and most recently in Kaunas, Lithuania, in 1972. Another serious problem is the plight of the millions of Soviet Jews in the Ukraine. These are only but a few instances of Soviet tyranny and aggression.

This list could go on and on but I will not belabor my colleagues with already known facts. Every day that any man is compelled to live under a rule not of his own choice but one that constrains his every will, his every freedom, and his every thought he is captive and is living under an oppressive and repressive government and should do everything in his power to combat that power.

This week is Captive Nations Week and I would like to join with my colleagues in saluting the valiant peoples

of these captive nations and I wish to express my sympathies and hopes that these people will again be returned to the stature of free men, for which they have so long fought.

CONTROL ADVISORY COMMITTEES

(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, on May 9, 1972, the House passed H.R. 4383, the Federal Advisory Committee Standards Act. This measure was the result of extensive investigation by the House Government Operations Committee into the use and abuse of advisory committees in the Federal Government. The bill is presently being considered by the Government Operations Committee in the other body, and it is hoped that legislation on the subject will be forthcoming in the near future.

In addition, subsequent to House passage of H.R. 4383, the President signed Executive Order 11671, which, while it does not preclude the need for legislation, does take an important step toward bringing advisory committees under control.

The July 17, 1972, issue of U.S. News & World Report contains an excellent article summarizing the progress which has been made in the effort to bring advisory committees under control. Congratulations to Gerald Parshall and the editors of U.S. News & World Report on a fine article. I recommend it to my colleagues for their consideration:

WASHINGTON WORRY: ALL THOSE ADVISERS

The White House and Congress have begun a drive to get a grip on a sprawling and controversial element of the Government: the advisory committee.

The drive is a reaction to criticism that top-level Government policies are being shaped behind closed doors by appointed committees or commissions of private citizens and bureaucrats who are unknown to the public, often represent vested interests and who operate virtually without supervision.

President Nixon made his move on June 5 by issuing an executive order designed to bring most advisory committees under centralized control, open their proceedings to the public and abolish any such groups that have outlived their usefulness.

The House of Representatives previously had passed a bill aimed at the same objectives. A similar measure is nearing final action in the Senate.

CONFLICTING FIGURES

Indicative of how the advisory-committee system has been functioning unchecked for years is the fact that officials cannot even agree on how many such groups there are.

The White House Office of Management and Budget lists 1,724 consulting bodies, including 40 appointed by the President. More than 1,100 are advisory in nature, and are comprised of experts and interested citizens from outside the Government. The rest are interagency groups of Government employees who consult with each other on mutual problems.

But congressional researchers contend that there could be as many as 1,800 "outside" advisory commissions, plus 1,400 interagency committees scattered throughout the federal hierarchy—involving 20,000 members and 4,400 staff workers, and costing taxpayers about 75 million dollars a year.

Most of these groups operate secretly, or at least with a minimum of fanfare.

A survey conducted for the House Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee showed that about half the 2,000 meetings checked were closed to the public.

Only one fourth of the sessions were documented by a stenographic transcript, and only 8 per cent of the meetings resulted in a public report of votes on action taken.

CLEAR VIOLATION

Commented Representative William S. Moorhead (Dem.), of Pennsylvania, Subcommittee chairman:

"The figures paint a very dark picture of the Government's attitude toward the public's right to participate in an important function of government. It is a dark picture of star-chamber meetings in clear violation of the law of the land."

Other members of Congress complain that the membership of most nongovernmental advisory committees is drawn from a narrow segment of the public—often the very group that the sponsoring federal agency is supposed to be regulating.

Critics point out that the National Industrial Pollution Control Council, which was appointed to advise the Commerce Department, is made up of officials from some of the nation's largest corporations—including companies accused of being major polluters.

Senator Lee Metcalf (Dem.), of Montana, charged that too many advisory committees are taken over by trade associations and transformed into lobbying groups operating within the Government itself. Said the Senator:

"Our hearings have shown all too clearly that the public—the consumer, the taxpayer, the small businessman, the small farmer, the youth of the nation—are the last to be considered for any advisory role."

Officials of Government departments, however, argue it is not only natural but necessary that their advisory committees be comprised of experts in the fields involved.

It would make no sense, they contend, to appoint a plumber to help the Food and Drug Administration regulate radioactive pharmaceuticals, or name a wheat grower to advise the Defense Department on nuclear weapon safety.

Witnesses at congressional hearings also defended closed-door meetings of advisory panels on the ground that members would not feel free to discuss matters frankly in an open session.

Sometimes, they added, the consultants consider untested products or preliminary proposals, and publication of such talks would only needlessly alarm or mislead the nation.

Often there would be nothing for ordinary citizens to witness, even if they were allowed to participate, because some advisory committees never seem to accomplish anything.

A study made by the Library of Congress turned up many such groups—one of them the Advisory Council on Quality Teacher Preparation that was authorized by a law passed in 1965.

The report showed no members were ever appointed to the council, no staff hired and no reports filed.

Some advisory groups have even demonstrated an astonishing ability to reproduce their own kind.

In 1967 President Lyndon B. Johnson named a Committee to Review Relationships Between the Central Intelligence Agency and Private American Voluntary Organizations.

The committee, operating with unusual dispatch, issued its report within six weeks.

The recommendation: appoint another committee to look into the problem. This was promptly done.

While some advisory committees are criticized for being too influential in Government, members of other consulting groups complain that their findings are ignored or rejected if they don't happen to fit in with official thinking.

Senator Charles Percy (Rep.), of Illinois, voiced this feeling when he said:

"There is a belief that advisory committees are stacked to give conclusions favorable to the very Administration that appoints them. It is believed that committee recommendations are shaped by political considerations—not facts and fair arguments—and that when there is a disagreement, the report of the advisory committee is then declared secret."

It is not unusual, of course, for a President to "file and forget" reports of advisory commissions he has appointed.

Mr. Nixon has given cool reception or outright rejection to reports made by experts he has appointed to look into urban problems, pornography, campus violence, narcotics addiction and population growth.

"The problem with advisory commissions," said a White House spokesman, "is that, in addition to their expert knowledge of a subject, the members bring in their own personal philosophies and political viewpoints. Also, some of them see what may be the only chance in their lifetime to zap the President."

Alexander Heard, chancellor of Vanderbilt University and adviser to Mr. Nixon on education affairs, said often people expect advisory commissions to come up with an instant solution to a complex problem nobody else has managed to solve. Asserted Mr. Heard:

"I think the test is, what contribution does the study commission make to the education of the nation as a whole and of public officials—what kinds of ideas does it stimulate on issues, how much forward does it advance consideration of problems and steps toward solution?"

Major recommendations of advisory groups, however, often do result in action. The Social Security system, draft lottery, federal aid to local law enforcement and many other innovations stemmed from studies made by citizen panels.

The executive order issued by President Nixon establishes a committee-control center in the Office of Management and Budget. The center will keep track of all advisory groups, their expenses and activities—and make the information available to the public in an annual report to Congress.

Committees will have to announce meetings in advance, allow the public to attend and make a public record of proceedings. Exceptions will be allowed in the national interest, as provided by existing law.

All advisory groups will be terminated not more than two years after formation, unless specifically continued by the establishing authority.

Administration officials believe that implementation of the executive order makes unnecessary the similar legislation that was passed May 9 by the House of Representatives. Another measure, which is also almost identical to the executive order, is being considered to the Senate. But some members of Congress insist that, regardless of the presidential action, putting a law on the books is the best way to guard against abuses by advisory committees.

Observers say chances are good that Congress will approve legislation before the year is over.

PARTY RESPONSIBILITY

Explained Representative John S. Monagan (Dem.) of Connecticut, sponsor of the bill passed by the House:

"Responsibility for the proliferation of advisory bodies cannot be placed on one political party or the other. They have grown in number, and their recommendations have at times been ignored under Presidents of both parties.

Nor can the accusing finger be pointed at the executive branch. Congress has created and forgotten its share of advisory committees and commissions.

"But the time is now ripe for change."

ART COLLECTORS' PROTECTION ACT

(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 number of works of art sold in this country has escalated markedly in recent years. The graphic arts in particular have experienced a colossal rise in sales. Last year over a million graphic productions were bought and sold in the United States. The estimated projections for this year are even greater.

Unfortunately, along with this boom, there has been an increase in the incidence of unscrupulous and sharp practices in art transactions. Some dealers and wholesalers have directly or indirectly misrepresented reproductions as original limited edition prints. In some cases, the artist's signature has been forged to make reproductions look like original prints. Photographic reproduction of original prints have also been made.

These sharp practices must be curbed in the public interest. The honest collector, dealer, and wholesaler must be protected. He has a right to expect that the artistic works which he purchases are what they were represented to be or what the purchaser was led to believe they were.

The States have failed to implement effective measures to curb the abuses which are occurring. Only three States have enacted any legislation regulating the sale of graphic prints and the other States extend absolutely no protection to the purchasers of these artistic works.

To correct this deficiency I am today introducing the Art Collectors' Protection Act. This bill would protect art collectors by requiring disclosures in connection with the sale of any fine print which is published in a limited, numbered, or signed edition. These prints would have to be accompanied by a receipt or certificate which accurately and clearly disclosed:

- First. The date of printing;
- Second. The name of the artist;
- Third. The name of the printer;
- Fourth. The size of the edition;
- Fifth. The total size of any previous editions;
- Sixth. The specific identification of the medium; and
- Seventh. An attestation of the authenticity of the artist's signature.

The legislation also would require that all reproductions are to be clearly marked as such so that errors of identification would not occur. Any violation

of these provisions would be deemed an unfair method of competition and an unfair or deceptive act or practice in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act. The provisions will apply equally to all sellers including the artist himself.

I urge my colleagues to support this necessary legislation and prevent the further victimization of the purchasers of these significant and increasingly important works of art.

TRIBUTE TO VICE PRESIDENT SPIRO T. AGNEW

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, few Vice Presidents in our history have had so significant an impact during their terms of office as SPIRO T. AGNEW. Whether in his efforts to lessen the amount of red tape that separates the average citizen from the Federal Government, or in highlighting areas that should be matters of national concern to all Americans, he has done a thoroughly outstanding job.

I was therefore stunned and dismayed albeit hardly surprised, when I learned that some of my fellow "Republicans" in the other body were apparently attempting to create a "dump-AGNEW" movement within our party. I have every confidence, of course, that this movement will, as one newscaster put it, remain at or below sea level. But, it is nonetheless disturbing that some "summertime Republicans" are not content to allow the President to make his own decision on his running mate this November.

Historically, presidential nominees—especially incumbent Presidents—have had considerable freedom of choice in selecting their Vice Presidents. There is almost no precedent for "open" conventions on this matter. Nor is there much precedent for attempting to oust an incumbent Vice President. Nothing can possibly be gained from dropping Mr. AGNEW. On the contrary, all reports that I have seen, indicate that the Vice President has enormous popularity throughout the country. His presence on our ticket this fall would greatly enhance our already bright prospects for a sizable victory. The Vice President has brought into our party large numbers of men and women who once considered themselves Democrats or Independents. As the only elected Republican on the national level from Missouri, I know he has responded on every occasion to party requests. It makes no political sense at all to break up the winning ticket our party is fortunate to have, and to turn away these new supporters of Republican candidates.

Our President has already expressed his confidence in Vice President AGNEW. I am certain that President Nixon's statement will once again choose to have Mr. AGNEW run with him this fall.

FULL DISCLOSURE LEGISLATION

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

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, legislation (H.R. 15662) has been introduced by my colleagues Mr. MIKVA and Mr. FREY which would require full disclosure of income, assets, and liabilities by all Members of Congress and professional staff earning more than \$22,000 a year.

This is an excellent proposal. I commend it highly and am most pleased to be a cosponsor. The House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct requires a partial disclosure of the financial holdings of the Members, but I consider this to be inadequate.

I have made it a practice in the past to periodically disclose my entire financial situation and publish it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I recently did so on April 27 of this year.

The partial public disclosure requirement of the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is, in my view, highly inadequate. Citizens are entitled to a more comprehensive financial statement from public officials.

Only with such a full disclosure statement can citizens assure themselves that officials are not subject to conflicts of interest which would prevent or deter them from performing their official duties in an objective manner.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that proposals such as this are met with such opposition within the Halls of Congress. Public trust in our institutions has declined in recent years because the average citizen feels that his Government pays more attention to special interests than it does to him.

This distrust is being reflected in the opinion polls and in Federal and local election campaigns. The passage of H.R. 15662 would not instantly solve all of our national traumas, but I believe it would be a beneficial reform and I feel it is long overdue.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, as we rise this week to observe Captive Nations Week, 1972—the 14th time, by the way, that I have had the privilege of doing so since I came to this House—we must all acknowledge that the shape of the world has been very dramatically affected since we last observed this occasion a year ago by the two visits of President Nixon to Peking and Moscow and by the ratification of the agreements between the Federal Republic of Germany and the U.S.S.R.

Needless to say all of us welcome any move that may genuinely serve to reduce international tensions and promote the chances for peace. The three events referred to above have in fact made some substantial strides in that direction, and

as such they have been deservedly welcomed by all Americans of good will.

But two words of caution need to be voiced, Mr. Speaker. The first is that the Soviet Union, on the basis of its track record, still needs to be regarded with a goodly measure of caution and suspicion. We simply cannot allow a feeling of euphoria to blunt our sense of reality. We must continue to keep our powder dry and we must continue to be alert to insure that agreements entered into are indeed carried out and not violated.

Second, Mr. Speaker, we need again to remind ourselves, especially in the light of the meetings in Peking, of the old proposition that the road to a lasting peace never leads through the graveyard of freedom. We cannot ever achieve real peace by bargaining away the freedom or the independence of any free peoples.

I make these observations because today in Asia we face two urgent problems. One is the future of the people of South Vietnam. Eager as we all are for peace, eager as we all are for bringing our troops back home, we can never hope to find an end to warfare on the Southeast Asian peninsula by conspiring to impose a Communist government forcibly on the people of South Vietnam.

Similarly, in our eagerness to open new bridges to the people of Mainland China we must remind ourselves again and again that we can never achieve peace in the Pacific by agreeing to the takeover of the Republic of China on Taiwan, against the wishes of the people themselves, by the Communist government of Mainland China. In our euphoria over the Peking meeting we have occasionally overlooked that point, however, I am sorry to say.

Second, switching our view toward Europe, we should remember that one of the agreements of the Moscow summit meetings was an early convening of a European security conference.

But such a conference must be carefully and cautiously approached. Simply because it is called a security conference is no guarantee that it will be geared to contribute to genuine security. Instead there is a very real possibility that its major purpose will be to lull the free nations of Western Europe into a false sense of security and then to hasten their so-called "Finlandianation."

Let us not forget that steps towards genuine military security in Europe by means of mutual and balanced force reductions between NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries have been seriously proposed now for some time by NATO. Indeed, the former Secretary General of NATO, Gen. Manlio Brosio, has been trying for more than a year to visit Moscow to discuss these reductions. But Mr. Brosio has been left rudely to cool his heels.

If the Soviets are so genuinely interested in security discussions, then how can they repudiate NATO's efforts so brusquely at the same time? Or is it that they are less interested in the reality of mutual security than they are in its appearance?

These are the thoughts we need to reflect upon this week, Mr. Speaker, as we contemplate the dramatic changes that have indeed taken place around us since we last stood here 1 year ago to pay tribute to the captive peoples and the captive nations of the world.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, for all these new developments, we were reminded just the other day that the light of freedom and the hope of freedom continue to burn brightly, even in the hearts of people living within the captive nations of the world, by the dramatic action of a citizen of Lithuania in burning himself to death in protest to the continued Soviet domination of that once-free country.

But let a recent editorial from the New York Times of July 6, 1972, express better than I can the dynamic power of the idea of freedom which this single act of self-immolation in Lithuania has suddenly presented so vividly to all the peoples of the free world.

RUSSIFICATION

Another Lithuanian has burned himself to death to protest Soviet occupation of his country, it is reported from Moscow. This is the latest sobering reminder of the wave of discontent that has broken out this year in the tiny Baltic country whose independence, along with that of her two neighbors, was extinguished by Stalin more than three decades ago as one of the side dividends of the Soviet-Nazi pact. It is a measure of the desperation many Lithuanians feel that three in the last several weeks have chosen self-immolation as a means of calling world attention to their plight.

The Catholic religion and Lithuanian nationalism are so intertwined that there is no point in debating whether it is religious or national oppression that is at the root of the current discontent. Rather, the protest petitions and other appeals for help that have been smuggled out of Lithuania suggest that Lithuanians believe that Moscow wishes to extirpate both the Catholic religion and Lithuanian language and culture. The purpose would of course be forcibly to assimilate the tiny Lithuanian nation into the vast sea of Russians—a practice known in czarist days simply as "russification."

What is most remarkable about the recent outburst of overt Lithuanian resistance is the role of the young, of those who were born and grew up under Soviet rule and have no memories of an independent Lithuanian state. The first Lithuanian to burn himself alive was a young worker, Roman Kalanta. His personal sacrifice in May ignited several days of massive riots during which thousands of young Lithuanians fought the police and troops in the streets of Kaunas.

So long as the Lithuanians protest alone, of course, Moscow has more than enough force to repress their discontent. But there is every reason to suppose that there is similar nationalist passion in the Ukraine, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan and other non-Russian republics, not to mention the other two Baltic states of Latvia and Estonia. If the non-Russian minorities were ever able to integrate their activities and present a united front against russification, Moscow would have a major challenge on its hands.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speak-

er, in the third week of June a 3-day National Action Conference on Intergovernmental Science and Technology Policy was held at Harrisburg, Pa. The conference drew over 200 people and it was my great privilege to serve as honorary chairman. Since the application of science and technology to the problems faced at the levels of State and local governments offers very notable promise, I would like to share with the Members of the House the main results of this conference.

The National Action Conference on Intergovernmental Science and Technology Policy was convened in response to a keenly felt need to identify specific steps and actions which can now be taken in order to speed the application of science and technology to public problems. The central objective of the conference was to provide a forum in which representatives from all levels of government and from other concerned public and private organizations could come together to formulate recommendations for workable policies, institutional arrangements, and action plans for intergovernmental science and technology.

The conference was infused with a sense of urgency. In part, this was attributable to the rapid increase in technically oriented matters with which the States and localities must cope. This same sense of urgency is also found in the words of the President in his message to Congress on science and technology. The President said:

We must appreciate that the progress we seek requires a new partnership in science and technology—one which brings together the Federal government, private enterprise, State and local governments and our universities and research centers in a coordinated, cooperative effort to serve the national interest.

Mr. Speaker, the Harrisburg conference was significant because it demonstrated a shared interest and determination to effect change within the realm of intergovernmental science and technology. It represented a concerted desire to remove obstacles and to initiate specific actions oriented toward further expanding the capability to apply science and technology to public, domestic problems. The most tangible accomplishment of the conference was its success in reaching a consensus on specific resolutions for action. The subjects singled out for immediate action form a basis for innovative efforts to further the realization of public technology policy and programs. The organizers of the conference expect shortly to publish the formal action resolutions resulting from the meeting.

The conference also served as a forum for the exchange of ideas and information among representatives of diverse organizational structures and interests. In so doing, it enabled the participants to become aware of the dramatically different sets of priorities and needs which must be accommodated if new intergovernmental science and technology policies and programs are to be effective.

The Harrisburg conference was attended primarily by those officials who are the consumers of public technology.

Next week in San Francisco the Urban Technology Conference will be held. This conference was organized primarily by those in industry who develop and market public technology. I have asked the staff of the Science and Astronautics Committee to prepare a staff report on the developments at both of these conferences, and this report will be available to all who are interested in this new and significant development.

In my opinion, these conferences mark a turning point in the growth of intergovernmental science and technology policy—one signaling a change from information gathering and discussion to the formulation of a firm basis for decisive action.

ADVICE TO THE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, I called attention on this floor to an editorial in the El Dorado, Kans., Times, written by one of the wisest political observers in Kansas. That editorial which was printed in the July 6 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, had some prudent suggestions for the President and in placing it in the RECORD, I offered the hope that perhaps in some manner it would get past the White House palace guard and be seen by an equally astute politician. Thus far, I have no evidence that this has taken place.

But nothing daunted, I am going to keep on making suggestions to our President. Yesterday, in the New York Times of July 19, appeared a memo to the next President of the United States, who I hope will be Richard Nixon. It was written by a shrewd and experienced man who himself was a White House adviser, an intelligent and observant political observer, by name Jack Valenti.

I command Mr. Valenti's "memo to the next President" to Mr. Nixon and most particularly to those of his advisers who, in the main, unfortunately have had no experience with Congress and appear to have difficulty in learning or wanting to learn how to deal with Congress. I ask that it be printed herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PRESIDENTIAL ADVISER

(By Jack Valenti)

(A memo to the man who takes the oath as President on January 20, 1973.)

Dear Mr. President:

May I, respectfully, offer you some advice, hard learned during my experience working in the White House?

Spend time outside Washington. Though you and your staff may rightfully claim you are sensitive to and conscious of what is really happening in the country, it is possible that you may not be. It is not isolation that does this, or even, as some piquantly declare, the aspect of monarchy that mantles the Presidency.

The problem is that Washington is incestuously embraced and though your appointments secretary may flood the oval office with visitors from all parts of the country, there is, and will be, lacking the immediacy of local opinion, the smell and grit of on-the-spot information.

My suggestion is to set up regional White Houses (nothing expensive—simply office space in Federal buildings) in six or seven communities widely spaced in the land. Visit them at least once a year for a three- or four-day stay. Foray into the adjoining countryside. Do not schedule set speeches in large halls before big audiences. Schedule no speeches. Literally get out among the people. I know it is difficult for a President to really visit, listen, see with a battalion of aides, Secret Service, press and assorted curious on-lookers crowding his every move. But you will, if you choose, be able to sense and touch as well as hear and see what the folks outside Washington are concerned about. It is good medicine for a President to gather in, through his own instincts and tactile senses, a microcosm of the people's views.

Instruct your staff in the never-to-be-forgotten importance of members of Congress. Let your staff accept with the graven fastness of ancient truth that no one will phone or importune the White House who will bear greater urgency to you than a Congressman or Senator. Challenge your aides to see how fast they can return the call. Let them compete in the race to give instant attention to the requests and needs of these members. Let respect and deference be the automatic response to every Congressman and Senator. Though you bear the tongue of angels, have the strength of ten, and though you are the Repository of All Truth, unless you have the support of the Congress you are nothing. You should allow no aide to serve you who has not signed in blood his dutiful acceptance of this rubric.

There is no known substitute for a Presidential laying-on-of-the-hands-and-voice to Congressmen and Senators. My suggestion is for you to call the Congress in, in small groups, say no more than twenty at a time, with the leadership, throughout the year until the entire 535 members have been warmed in your presence. Brief them on current issues. Let them ask question in quasi-duplicate of the British Prime Minister's Tuesday and Thursday in Commons. Let them ventilate their special causes and personal grievances. If there is a more valuable and splendid antidote to Congressional frustration and irritation than to hear personally from and talk to the President it is not yet invented by ingenious man.

This is time-consuming. Some of your staff may find a hundred reasons why it ought to be terminated or delayed. But there are few expenditures of your time that will reward you more generously.

Finally, you ought not neglect those political leaders who toll "out there," most of them in relative national obscurity. Organize, on a formalized basis, meetings with special groups of governors, state legislators, mayors, city councilmen. Again, this intrudes on your time. It may even occur during those moments (which will grow in frequency) when your mind and body cry out for surcease, and when your own personal desires collide with a fixed schedule. But, sir, with all due respect, this will be seeding time, in which you spread your programs and aspirations for your country and in due course they will spring up, robust, supportive, in city halls and state houses all over the nation.

May God grant you four years of peace and prosperity for our country, and a term unmarred by lingering dispute and rancor. Incidentally, God will work much better in your behalf if you are acutely aware of the national mood, and if Congress, governors, mayors, legislators and councilmen are on your side.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

Mr. MATSUNAGA (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, through Wednesday, July 26, on account of official business.

Mr. McKEVITT (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), on account of official business.

Mr. TERRY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for July 21, 24, and 25, 1972, on account of official business.

Mr. ROONEY of New York (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. KEE (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), from 2 p.m. today, through Friday, July 21, on account of official business.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for Friday, July 21, on account of death in his family.

Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), from 5 p.m. until adjournment today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MONAGAN, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CARLSON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HARVEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SKUBITZ, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENHOLM) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BOLAND, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. FLOOD, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ASPIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. ABZUG, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ST GERMAIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. PRICE of Illinois, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of Alabama and to include matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CARLSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHWENGEL in two instances.

Mr. STEELE in two instances.

Mr. QUILLEN.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. ESCH.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. VANDER JAGT.

Mr. BAKER.

Mr. BUCHANAN in two instances.

Mr. HILLIS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. TERRY.

Mr. RAILSBACK in two instances.

Mr. MINSHALL.

Mr. VEYSEY in two instances.

Mr. BURKE of Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. GUDE in five instances.

Mr. McKINNEY.

Mr. KING.

Mr. CRANE in five instances.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. SHOUP in two instances.

Mr. FRENZEL.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia.

Mr. McKEVITT in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENHOLM) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas.

Mr. DOW.

Mr. ADDABBO.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. JOHNSON of California.

Mr. FUQUA.

Mr. SEIBERLING in 10 instances.

Mr. GARMATZ.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON in 10 instances.

Mr. MOSS.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. SISK.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. WALDIE in three instances.

Mr. BOLLING in two instances.

Mr. DENHOLM.

Mr. DORN in three instances.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in three instances.

Mr. O'NEILL.

Mr. STOKES in three instances.

Mr. GIAIMO in two instances.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 520. An act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the closed basin division, San Luis Valley project, Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1798. An act to foster fuller U.S. participation in international trade by the promotion and support of representation of U.S. interests in international voluntary standards activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 473. An act to amend the Automobile Information Disclosure Act to make its provisions applicable to the possessions of the United States.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 24, 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:

2181. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Inter-American Affairs), transmitting a report on implementation of sec. 507(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2182. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide special pay to certain nuclear-trained and qualified enlisted members of the naval service who agree to reenlist, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2183. A letter from the Commissioner, The District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to increase salaries, to provide certain revisions in the retirement benefits of public school teachers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

2184. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the transfer to the Federal Power Commission of all functions and administrative authority now vested in the Securities and Exchange Commission under the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2185. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a copy of the Federal Register notice concerning children's sleepwear flammability standard to become effective on July 29, 1972; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2186. A letter from the Surveyor of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of plat showing exchange of jurisdiction between the House Office Building Commission and the District of Columbia of portions of Canal Street and E Street in Reservation 286, pursuant to law; to the Committee on Public Works.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2187. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on aspects of U.S. assistance to disaster-stricken East Pakistanis (Agency for International Development, Department of State, and Department of Agriculture); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2188. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of financial statements pertaining to insurance operations of the Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1971, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 841 (H. Doc. 92-327); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

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. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 15950. A bill to amend section 125 of title 23, United States Code, relating to highway emergency relief to authorize additional appropriations necessary as a result of recent floods and other disasters; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-1231). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 15951. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to undertake a na-

tional program of inspection of dams; (Rept. No. 92-1232). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1046. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 3542. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of travel and transportation allowances to certain members of the uniformed services in connection with leave (Rept. No. 92-1227). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1047. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 14538. A bill 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 (Rept. No. 92-1228). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1048. Resolution providing for the consideration of 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 (Rept. No. 92-1229). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1049. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 14911. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to authorize members of the Armed Forces who are in a missing status to accumulate leave without limitation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-1230). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 15959. A bill to permit a State to use funds from the highway trust fund for urban mass transportation projects, and to increase the Federal share of the cost of such projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BERGLAND:

H.R. 15960. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GARMATZ (for himself and Mr. PELLY):

H.R. 15961. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H.R. 15962. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 20-percent increase in annuities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 15963. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to prevent loss of veteran compensation and pension benefits as a result of increases in social security benefit payments under Public Law 92-336; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15964. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to \$3,000 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 15965. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to increase salaries, to provide certain revisions in the retirements benefits of public school teachers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 15966. A bill to further amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, to provide for the extension of certain leases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATHIS of Georgia:

H.R. 15967. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit making unsolicited commercial telephone calls to persons who have indicated they do not wish to receive such calls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 15968. A bill to protect art collectors by requiring disclosures in connection with the sale of certain fine prints and reproductions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 15969. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for tuition paid for the elementary or secondary education of dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 15970. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish national parks or national recreation areas in those States which presently do not have a national park or national recreation area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 15971. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to establish separate optometry services in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 15972. A bill to protect confidential sources of the news media; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15973. A bill to amend section 8345(a) of title 5, United States Code, to provide guaranteed annuity benefits equal to the minimum primary insurance amount authorized under section 215(a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 15974. A bill to provide increases in certain civil service retirement annuities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WALDIE (for himself, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. DANIELS, and Mr. BRASCO):

H.R. 15975. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize the payment of increased annuities to secretaries of justices and judges of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BLATNIK (for himself, Mr. THONE, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. FLOOD):

H.R. 15976. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to undertake a national program of inspection of dams; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLATNIK (for himself, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. GRAY, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. DORN, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. CAFFERY, Mr. ROE, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. GROVER, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. SCHWENGLER, Mr. ZION, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MIZELL, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 15977. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to undertake a national program of inspection of dams; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 15978. A bill to restore to Federal civilian employees their rights to participate, as private citizens, in the political life of the Nation, to protect Federal civilian employees from improper political solicitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 15979. A bill to amend the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970, title 39, United States Code, to eliminate certain restrictions on the rights of officers and employees of the

Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 15980. A bill to amend the age and service requirements for immediate retirement under subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 15981. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 20-percent increase in all annuities and pensions thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McDONALD of Michigan:

H.R. 15982. A bill to impose a moratorium on new and additional student transportation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MELCHER:

H.R. 15983. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Marias-Milk Unit of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin program in Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 15984. A bill to amend title III of the

act of March 3, 1933, commonly referred to as the "Buy American Act," with respect to determining when the cost of certain articles, materials, or supplies is unreasonable; to define when articles, materials, and supplies have been mined, produced, or manufactured in the United States; to make clear the right of any State to give preference to domestically produced goods in purchasing for public use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 15985. A bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1969 in order to promote freedom of emigration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GALIFIANAKIS:

H.J. Res. 1261. Joint Resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the first week beginning on a Sunday in April of each year as "National Textile Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEELE:

H.J. Res. 1262. Joint resolution designation of the month of July of each year as "National Drum Corps Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH:

H. Con. Res. 647. Concurrent resolution to collect overdue debts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. Res. 1050. Resolution regarding the transfer of rural letter carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 15986. A bill for the relief of Isabel Eugenia Serrano Macias Ferrier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKINNEY:

H.R. 15987. A bill for the relief of Apostolos Sederopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 15988. A bill for the relief of Raphael Gidharry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—Thursday, July 20, 1972

The Senate met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, we thank Thee for Thy mercies which are new every morning, when weariness has been dispelled by the blessed gift of physical rest and spiritual renewal. O Thou restorer of the soul lead us in paths of righteousness for Thy name's sake.

Prosper the counsels of those who confer for peace and strengthen those whose duty is yet to bear the burden of battle. Be with those here and everywhere who strive for a new age of justice, brotherhood, and peace.

May all men of good will be encouraged by the message of the prophet:

Fear thou not; for I am with thee; be not dismayed; for I am thy God; I will strengthen thee; yea, I will help thee; yea, I will uphold thee with the right hand of my righteousness.—Isaiah 41:10.

In the Redeemer's name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 19, 1972, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. TUNNEY) is now recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, to be followed by the distinguished Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS).

(The remarks that Mr. TUNNEY made at this point on the introduction of S. 3814, dealing with the Bank Secrecy Act, and the ensuing debate are printed in the RECORD under Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.)

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maryland desires time, I will yield my 3 minutes to him.

Mr. MATHIAS. I appreciate the generosity of the majority leader, but we have concluded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The period for the transaction of routine morning business will not extend beyond 9:40 a.m., and statements therein will be limited to 3 minutes.

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the season being what it is, it should not be surprising, I suppose, to hear suggestions from time to time that President Nixon should dump Vice President AGNEW as his running mate this year.

I do not profess to know what motivates such suggestions. I suppose it is just another form of midsummer madness in a presidential election year.

I have always understood that a presidential nominee, and not self-anointed kingmakers, should be responsible for selecting the man he would like to have on the ticket with him. Speaking for

myself, I am perfectly willing to leave this responsibility where it has long abided.

But I do want to say, in all candor, that I deplore the reflections on Vice President AGNEW which I believe are implicit in the suggestions that he should be replaced. No man has filled this office with more poise, and with more effectiveness, and with more credit to himself and his party.

As President Nixon said in an interview last January and repeated in a news conference as recently as June 29:

Mr. Agnew has conducted himself . . . with great dignity, with great courage, some controversy—which is inevitable when you have courage—and that under the circumstances, since he was a member of a winning team, I did not believe that breaking up a winning team was a good idea. That was my view then and that is my view now.

As far as I have been able to determine, that is still the prevailing opinion in the only place where it counts when it comes to choosing a candidate for Vice President.

The Vice President has had a very substantial role in this administration—far more, I believe, than any other Vice President has been called upon to play. I have been particularly impressed with his efforts to promote our federal system of government through his concern in improving relations between Washington and the State and local governments.

He has demonstrated his courage in many different ways. He has not been reluctant to meet with individuals and groups of differing political views, and he has not been afraid to voice criticism of the national news media and some of our ivy-towered universities which I believe is shared by a large segment of our people.

So it is not surprising that Mr. AGNEW should be the target of a political ambush, just as Mr. Nixon was the target of Harold E. Stassen's dumping efforts in the 1950's. He has been a strong Vice President and one is reminded of the refrain which goes something like this: