during the preceding Federal fiscal year and a description of those programs; (2) a listing of the states participating in the provisions of this title and a description of the status of each state's program and its accomplishments during the preceding Federal fiscal year; (3) an itemization of the allotment of funds to the various coastal states and a breakdown of the major projects and areas on which these funds were expended; (4) an identification of any state programs which have been reviewed and disapproved or with respect to which grants have been terminated under this title, and a statement of the reasons for such action; (5) a listing of all activities and projects which, pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) or subsection (d) of section 307, are not consistent with an applicable approved state management program; (6) a summary of the regulations issued by the Secretary or in effect during the preceding Federal fiscal year; (7) a summary of a coordinated national strategy and program for the Nation's coastal zone including identification and discussion of Federal, regional, state, and local responsibilities and functions therein; (8) a summary of outstanding problems arising in the adminstration of this title in order of priority; and (9) such other information as may be appropriate.

"(b) The report required by subsection (a) shall contain such recommendations for additional legislation as the Secretary deems necessary to achieve the objectives of this title and enhance its effective operation.

"RULES AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 315. The Secretary shall develop and promulgate, pursuant to section 553 of title 5, United States Code, after notice and opportunity for full participation by relevant Federal agencies, state agencies, local governments, regional organizations, port authorities, and other interested parties, both public and private, such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"PENALTIES

"SEC. 316. (a) Whoever violates any regulation which implements the provisions of section 312(c) or section 313(a) of this title shall be liable to a civil penalty of not more than $10,000 for each such violation, to be assessed by the Secretary. Each day of a continuing violation shall constitute a separate violation.

"(b) No penalty shall be assessed under this section until the person charged shall have been given notice and an opportunity to be heard. For good cause shown, the Secretary may remit or mitigate any such penalty. Upon failure of the offending party to pay the penalty, as assessed or, when mitigated, the Attorney General, at the request of the Secretary, shall commence action in the appropriate district court of the United States to collect such penalty and to seek other relief as may be appropriate.

"(c) A vessel used in the violation of any regulation which implements the provisions of section 312(c) or section 313(a) of this title shall be liable in rem for any civil penalty assessed for such violation and may be proceeded against in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction thereof.

"(d) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to restrain violations of the regulations issued pursuant to this title. Actions shall be brought by the Attorney General in the name of the United States, either on his own initiative or at the request of the Secretary.

"APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 317. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated—

"(1) the sum of $6,000,000 for fiscal year 1973 and fiscal year 1974 and $4,000,000 for fiscal year 1975, for grants under section 305 to remain available until expended;

"(2) the sum of $18,000,000 for fiscal year 1974 and for fiscal year 1975 for grants under section 306 to remain available until expended; and

"(3) the sum of $6,000,000 for fiscal year 1973 for grants under section 312 to remain available until expended.

"(b) There are also authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $3,000,000, for fiscal year 1973 and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, as may be necessary for administrative expenses incident to the administration of this title."

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House of Representatives on S. 3507, ask for a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HOLLINGS, and Mr. STEVENS conferees on the part of the Senate.

PROGRAM

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

The Senate will convene at 9 a.m. After the two leaders have been recognized under the standing order, the following Senators will be recognized, each for not to exceed 15 minutes and in the order stated: Senators JAVITS, PERCY, MATHIAS, PACKWOOD, and BUCKLEY.

After the recognition of Senators under the orders mentioned, there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to extend beyond 10:30 a.m. with statements limited therein to 3 minutes; at the conclusion of which the Chair will lay before the Senate S. 2507, the amendment to the Gun Control Act of 1968.

There is a time limitation thereon. Amendments will be called up. Yea-and-nay votes will occur on amendments; and, at no later than somewhere between 3:30 and 4 p.m. tomorrow, under the order entered, the majority leader or his designee will set aside the Gun Control Act and the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S. 945, a bill to provide for no-fault motor vehicle insurance.

There is a time agreement on a motion to be made by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA), the motion being to commit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A vote will occur on the motion by Mr. HRUSKA at no later than 8 p.m. tomorrow. Repeating: There will be yea-and-nay votes tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT TO 9 A.M.

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

The motion was agreed to; and at 7:20 p.m. the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 8, 1972, at 9 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, August 7, 1972*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Blessed be the name of God forever and ever; for wisdom and might are His.—Daniel 2: 20.

We come to Thee, our Father God, in this quiet moment of meditation to give voice to the longings of our hearts in prayer. In the pressure of perplexing problems and in the stress and strain of daily living we often forget Thee and in so doing stifle the noble impulses of our human nature. On the first workday of a new week and in this period of prayer we would realize anew the feeling of our oneness with Thee. Amid the labors and duties of each new day, help us to keep alive the sense of Thy presence and then eagerly and enthusiastically to work for the noble causes of freedom, justice, and peace in our Nation and in our world.

May it be Thy will that this prayer be answered and a new day of brotherhood begin to dawn upon the earth.

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on August 3, 1972, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 15950. An act 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 12652. An act to extend the life of the Commission on Civil Rights, to expand the jurisdiction of the Commission to include discrimination because of sex, to authorize appropriations for the Commission, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12828. An act to amend chapters 31, 34, and 35 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of vocational rehabilitation, educational assistance, and special training allowances paid to eligible veterans

and persons; to provide for advance educational assistance payments to certain veterans; to make improvements in the educational assistance programs; and for other purposes;

H.R. 15641. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15692. An act to amend the Small Business Act to reduce the interest rate on Small Business Administration disaster loans.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 15641) entitled "An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. DOMINICK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3726) entitled "An act to extend and amend the Export Administration Act of 1969 to afford more equal export opportunity, to establish a Council on International Economic Policy, and for other purposes," agrees to a conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. BROCK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 56) entitled "An act to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, to provide for a National Environmental Data System," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. HATFIELD, and Mr. BELLMON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 7378) entitled "An act to establish a Commission on Revision of the Judicial Circuits of the United States," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. BURDICK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. 3876. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide for the regulation of clearing agencies and transfer agents, to create a National Commission on Uniform Securities Laws, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that Mr. MCCLELLAN was appointed as a conferee on the bill (H.R. 15097) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes," in lieu of Mr. Ellender.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 16071, PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works have until midnight Monday, August 7, 1972, to file the report on H.R. 16071, to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 15097, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. MCFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 15097) making appropriations to the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day for the call of the Consent Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

AMENDING THE ACT OF JULY 4, 1955, AS AMENDED, RELATING TO THE CONSTRUCTION OF IRRIGATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9198) to amend the Act of July 4, 1955, as amended, relating to the construction of irrigation distribution systems.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I generally favor this bill. I only rise in quest of two points of information.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know why the requirement of the United States holding title to project rights of way is eliminated and if, in the thorough consideration of the committee this is equitable and will serve the long range best interests of the United States?

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

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to my friend, chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. ASPINALL. It has been found, may I say to my colleague, in the administration of the bill, H.R. 130, as we know it, the need to own the rights of way by the government is not necessary to protect the interests of the Federal Government in the administration of the act.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue, do they still have rights of ingress and egress along the canals for necessary inspection and/or maintenance, or whatever is necessary?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct. The government will be protected in its investment because this is a lending program, as my colleague understands.

Mr. HALL. Yes, I do understand.

Mr. ASPINALL. To see that the proper administration takes place.

Mr. HALL. I understand that there are actual savings in administrative costs to the taxpayer. I have only one further question. On page 8, line 13, the word "contractual" is inserted prior to the word "requirement"; and following the word "determine," and it omits the phrase, "by the Secretary." Who would then make the determination, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. ASPINALL. The Secretary will make it. He has that jurisdiction under the current law.

Mr. HALL. Then, I understand this is simply a technical correction of the law or a change in rhetoric.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

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

H.R. 9198

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of July 4, 1955 (69 Stat. 245), as amended by the Act of May 14, 1956 (70 Stat. 155), is hereby further amended as follows:

(1) Section 1 and section 2 are amended by changing the words "irrigation distribution systems" and "distribution systems" wherever they occur therein to the words "local project water supply works".

(2) Section 3 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. The Secretary shall require, as conditions to any such loan, that the borrower contribute in money or materials, labor, lands, or interests in land, computed at their reasonable value, a portion not in excess of 10 per centum, of the construction cost of the local project water supply works (including all costs of acquiring lands and interests in land) that the plans for the system be in accord with sound engineering practices and be such as will achieve the purposes for which the system was authorized, and that the borrower agree to account in full in regard to all disbursements of borrowed funds and to return at once for application toward amortization of the loan all funds which are not expended in the construction of the local project water supply works. Prior to the consummation of any loan under this Act, the borrower shall also be required to transfer to the United States any lands or interests in land which it then holds and which the Secretary finds are required for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the local project water supply works and to agree to transfer to the United States any lands or interests in land which it may thereafter acquire and which the Secretary may find are required for this purpose and the local project water supply works constructed, in whole or in part, with moneys lent under this Act for the construction thereof. Title to all such lands; interests in land and project works shall remain in the United States until the loan is repaid: *Provided*, That prior to full repayment of the loan the Secretary may exchange with the borrower portions of such lands or interests therein for lands of approximately equal value, or may reconvey to such borrower in accordance with rules and regulations established by him, portions of said lands or

interests therein upon the Secretary's determination that such lands or interests in lands are no longer required for the construction, operation, or maintenance of the project works or for security of the loan. Every borrower under this Act shall operate and maintain its project works in conformity with reasonable requirements determined by the Secretary to be appropriate for the protection of the United States. When full repayment has been made to the United States, the Secretary shall relinquish all claims under aforesaid repayment contracts and shall retransfer to the borrower title to the works and all remaining lands and interests in land which were transferred by it to the United States. The head of any department or agency of the Government within whose administrative jurisdiction are lands owned by the United States and the use of which is reasonably necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of project works under this Act may grant to a borrower or prospective borrower under this Act revocable permission for the use thereof in like manner as under the Acts of March 3, 1891, sections 18–21 (26 Stat. 1101), as amended (43 U.S.C. 946–949) January 21, 1895 (28 Stat. 635), as amended (43 U.S.C. 956), February 15, 1901 (31 Stat. 790), as amended (16 U.S.C. 79, 522; 43 U.S.C. 954), February 1, 1905 (33 Stat. 628; 16 U.S.C. 524), March 1, 1921 (41 Stat. 1194; 43 U.S.C. 950), May 9, 1944 (55 Stat. 183); (43 U.S.C. 931a), July 24, 1946, section 7 (60 Stat. 643), as amended (43 U.S.C. 931b), May 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 124; 38 U.S.C. 111), February 5, 1948 (62 Stat. 17; 25 U.S.C. 323–328) or September 3, 1954 (68 Stat. 1146; 43 U.S.C. 931c–931d) or any other similar Act which is applicable to the lands involved: *Provided*, That no such permission shall be granted in the case of lands being administered for national park, national monument, or wildlife purposes. No benefits or privileges under the Federal reclamation laws, including repayment provisions, shall be denied to a project because it has been constructed pursuant to this Act.

(3) Add section 5, as follows:

"SEC. 5. When the provisions of this Act apply to loans for irrigation purposes, including incidental domestic and stock water, the loan funds so allocated shall be interest free. When they apply to municipal, industrial, and domestic purposes incidental to irrigation purposes, the loan funds so allocated shall bear interest."

(4) Add section 6, as follows:

"SEC. 6. Unless otherwise provided in the Act authorizing construction of the project, the Secretary of the Interior shall allocate the loan funds between irrigation and municipal, industrial, and domestic purposes. Loan repayment contracts shall require that the borrower pay interest on that portion of the unamortized loan obligation allocated to municipal, industrial, and domestic purposes at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which the contract, or contract amendment entered into pursuant to section 7 hereof, is executed, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue, and by adjusting such average rate to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum."

(5) Add section 7, as follows:

"SEC. 7. The Secretary is hereby authorized to negotiate amendments to existing irrigation distribution system loan contracts to conform said contracts to the provisions of this Act."

(6) Add section 8, as follows:

"SEC. 8. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to repeal or limit the procedural and substantive requirements of section 8 of the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388)."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, beginning on line 3, strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the Act of July 4, 1955 (69 Stat. 244), as amended by the Act of May 14, 1956 (70 Stat. 155), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That distribution and drainage systems authorized to be constructed under the Federal reclamation laws may, in lieu of construction by the Secretary of the Interior (referred to in this Act as the 'Secretary'), be constructed by irrigation districts or other public agencies according to plans and specifications approved by the Secretary as provided in this Act. The drainage systems referred to in this Act are those required for collection and removal of excess irrigation water, either on or below the surface of the ground and do not include enlargement or alteration of existing waterways for disposition of natural runoff.

"SEC. 2.—To assist financially in the construction of the aforesaid local distribution and drainage systems by irrigation districts and other public agencies the Secretary is authorized, on application therefore by such irrigation districts or other public agencies, to make funds available on a loan basis from monies appropriated for the construction of such distribution and drainage systems to any irrigation district or other public agency in an amount equal to the estimated construction cost of such system, contingent upon a finding by the Secretary that the loan can be returned to the United States in accordance with the general repayment provisions of sections 2(d) and 9(d) of the Reclamation Project Act of August 4, 1939, and upon a showing that such district or agency already holds or can acquire all lands and interests in land (except public and other lands or interests in land owned by the United States which are within the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary and subject to disposition by him) necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project. The Secretary shall, upon approval of a loan, including any loan for a distribution and drainage system receiving water from the San Luis Unit, Central Valley Project, authorized by the Act of June 3, 1960 (74 Stat. 156), enter into a repayment contract which includes such provisions as the Secretary shall deem necessary and proper to provide assurance of prompt repayment of the loan within not to exceed 40 years plus a development period not to exceed 10 years. The term 'irrigation district or other public agency' shall for the purposes of this Act mean any conservancy district, irrigation district, water users' organization, or other organization, which is organized under State law and which has capacity to enter into contracts with the United States pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws.

"SEC. 3. The Secretary shall require, as conditions to any such loan, that the borrower contribute in money or materials, labor, lands, or interests in land, computed at their reasonable value, a portion not in excess of 10 per centum, of the construction cost of the distribution and drainage system (including all costs of acquiring lands and interests in land), that the plans for the system be in accord with sound engineering practices and be such as will achieve the purposes for which the system was authorized, and that the borrower agree to account in full regard to all disbursements of borrowed funds and to return at once for application toward amortization of the loan all funds which are not expended in the construction of the distribution and drainage system. Every organization contracting for repayment of a loan under this Act shall operate and maintain its distribution and drainage works in conformity with reasonable contractual requirements determined to be appropriate for the protection of the United States. The Secretary is hereby authorized to reconvey to borrowers all lands or interests in lands and distribution works transferred to the United States under the provisions of this Act: *Provided*, That any reconveyance shall be upon the condition that the repayment contract of the borrower be amended to include such provisions as the Secretary shall deem necessary or proper to provide assurance of and security for prompt repayment of the loan. The head of any department or agency of the Government within whose administrative jurisdiction are lands owned by the United States the use of which is reasonably necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of distribution and drainage works under this Act may grant to a borrower or prospective borrower under this Act revocable permission for the use thereof in like manner as under the Acts of March 3, 1891, secs. 18–21, 26 Stat. 1101, as amended (43 U.S.C., secs. 946–949), January 21, 1895, 28 Stat. 635, as amended (43 U.S.C., sec. 956), February 15, 1901, 31 Stat. 790, as amended (16 U.S.C., secs. 79, 522, 43 U.S.C., sec. 959), February 1, 1905, 33 Stat 628 (16 U.S.C., sec. 524), March 1, 1921, 41 Stat. 1194 (43 U.S.C., sec. 950), May 9, 1941, 55 Stat. 183 (43 U.S.C., sec. 931a), July 24, 1946, sec. 7, 60 Stat. 643, as amended (43 U.S.C., sec. 931b), May 31, 1947, 61 Stat. 124 (38 U.S.C., sec. 111), February 5, 1948, 62 Stat. 17 (25 U.S.C., secs. 323–238), or September 3, 1954, 68 Stat. 1146 (43 U.S.C., secs. 931c–931d), or any other similar Act which is applicable to the lands involved: *Provided*, That no such permission shall be granted in the case of lands being administered for national park, national monument, or wildlife purposes.

"SEC. 4.—Except as herein otherwise provided, the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws, and acts amendatory thereto, are continued in full force and effect.

"SEC. 5.—Unless otherwise provided in the Act authorizing construction of the project, the delivery and distribution of municipal and industrial water supplies shall be deemed to be an authorized project purpose under this Act, and where appropriate, an allocation of loan funds acceptable to the Secretary shall be made between irrigation and municipal and industrial purposes. Loan repayment contracts shall require that the borrower pay interest on that portion of the unamortized loan obligation (including interest during construction) allocated in each year to municipal and industrial purposes at the rate provided in the Act authorizing the project, or absent such an authorized rate, at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the beginning of the Fiscal Year in which the contract, or contract amendment entered into pursuant to Section 6 hereof, is executed, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue, and by adjusting such average rate to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum.

"SEC. 6.—The Secretary is hereby authorized to negotiate amendments to existing water service and irrigation distribution system loan contracts to conform said contracts to the provisions of this Act.

"SEC. 7.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to repeal or limit the procedural and substantive requirements of Section 8 of the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388).

"SEC. 8.—Works financed by loans made under this Act shall be subject to all procedural and substantive requirements of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (48 Stat. 401, as amended); the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, 33 U.S.C. 1151; and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (83 Stat. 852); 42 U.S.C. 4321."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given

permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 9198, to amend the act of July 4, 1955, as amended, relating to the construction of irrigation distribution systems, is a constructive piece of legislation in that it will actually simplify administration, save money, and enable broader realization of the benefits of the original legislation.

To understand more clearly what this legislation achieves, it is important to review the original legislation which is here being amended. The act of July 4, 1955, which is popularly known as Public Law 130, simply provides that irrigation districts and other qualified borrowers may receive loans from the Federal Government with which to design and construct already authorized irrigation distribution systems on Federal reclamation projects. Thus, Public Law 130 does not, in and of itself, authorize any work—it merely provides for an optional method of implementation.

The original sponsors of Public Law 130 believed that irrigation districts and other qualified borrowers could design and construct distribution systems less expensively than could the Bureau of Reclamation. Whether this is indeed the case or not, is very difficult to determine but over $70 million worth of irrigation distribution systems loans have been made under this law. The amendments to the program that will be accomplished by H.R. 9198 broaden the program to allow loans to be made for municipal and industrial water supply distribution systems and for drainage systems for the removal of surplus irrigation applications. The logic of these changes is evident.

H.R. 9198 also eliminates a requirement of Public Law 130 that obliged borrowers to acquire and convey all right-of-way interests to the United States for the life of the loan. Presumably, the authors of this requirement believed that such a procedure was necessary to furnish collateral for the loan. However, the entire experience of the Bureau of Reclamation in administering reimbursable water resource programs indicates that it is quite a simple matter to prepare contracts in such a way that collateral is assured without going through the real estate conveyance and reconveyance procedure. It is this aspect of H.R. 9198 which saves both the borrower and the United States substantial sums of money by relieving the requirement for preparation of extensive legal descriptions and conveyance documents.

H.R. 9198 also allows existing distribution system loan contracts to be amended to reflect changes in the programs authorized by this legislation, both with respect to the role of municipal and industrial water supply and the conveyance of right-of-way.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, there is considerable advantage that will accrue to all concerned through the enactment of H.R. 9198. There has been no opposition expressed from any source and the administration wholeheartedly supports the bill. I, therefore, urge that the House do pass this measure.

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

CLASSIFYING AS WILDERNESS THE NATIONAL FOREST LANDS KNOWN AS THE LINCOLN BACK COUNTRY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7295) to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to classify as wilderness the national forest lands known as the Lincoln Back Country, and parts of the Lewis and Clark and Lolo National Forests, in Montana, and for other purposes.

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

H.R. 7295

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to classify as wilderness those national forest lands containing approximately 240,500 acres in the Helena National Forest in Montana, known as the Lincoln Back Country, and parts of the Lewis and Clark and Lolo National Forests specifically described as bounded by a line on the southeast boundary of the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area at Deadman Hill running southeasterly to Bench Mark, then along the ridge of Wood Creek Hogback to the top of Crown Mountain and across Welcome Pass to the midpoint of Steamboat Mountain; thence running in a more southerly direction down the ridge between Milk and Pear Creeks, across the Dearborn River and up the Continental Divide to a point above Bighorn Lake; thence along the divide and down the ridge northwest of Falls Creek, across Landers Fork to the top of Lone Mountain; thence in a southwesterly direction to Heart Lake Trail, westward to the top of Red Mountain; thence southwesterly to Arrastra Peak; thence along Daly, Iron, and Echo Mountain Peaks, and across Windy Pass to Mineral Hill; thence across the North Fork of the Blackfoot River at the Big Slide to BM 8320, northwesterly across Canyon Creek (excluding the upper Conger Creek timber stand) to the top of Canyon Peak; thence more westerly to the top of Omar Mountain, and northward along the ridge to the southern boundary of the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area on a ridge west of Danaher Pass, and thence along the southern boundary of the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area to the point of beginning. The Secretary of Agriculture shall promptly after such classification transmit to the Congress a map and legal description of the wilderness area and such description shall have the same force and effect as if set forth in this Act. Upon its classification, such wilderness area shall be subject to the same provisions and rules as those designated as wilderness areas by the Wilderness Act of September 3, 1964 (78 Stat. 890).

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7295, as amended and approved by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7295, as amended, would designate some 240,000 acres of land within the Helena, Lolo, and Lewis and Clark National Forests as wilderness. This area is located in central-western Montana about 75 miles west of Great Falls and 75 miles northeast of Missoula, Mont. It straddles the Continental Divide and is contiguous to the southeastern boundary of the existing 950,000-acre Bob Marshall Wilderness.

This area was not a part of an existing Forest Service primitive area nor has it been managed as such by that agency. It does, however, meet all the criteria for wilderness designation and all the necessary reports by Forest Service and the mineral examination by the Department have been completed.

This area, known generally as the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country, is characterized by spectacular scenery, unique, and interesting geologic formations, unspoiled streams and small lakes, and broad expanses of alpine and subalpine country that display sparse vegetation as a result of long winters, deep snows, and steep and rocky terrain. Interspersed with these are broad mountain valleys with some heavy stands of timber.

Wildlife is abundant and varied within the area. Deer, elk, mountain goat, mountain sheep, black and grizzly bear, moose, wolverine, and other smaller animals are known to exist. Wilderness designation will help preserve the rare grizzly bear.

The committee adopted an amendment that excluded from wilderness designation some 5,870 acres in the vicinity of Benchmark, Mont., which shows the impact of man's presence. With this exclusion the proposed Scapegoat Wilderness meets all standards and criteria for wilderness designation.

I urge favorable action on H.R. 7295, as amended.

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

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 7295 as amended in committee.

I originally introduced H.R. 6398 on March 18, 1971, which evolved into the present bill, and am proud to have been a part of bringing the 240,500 acres of the Lincoln Back Country this close to wilderness classification. The entire area lies within my congressional district. It is an area rich in scenery and wildlife including rare and endangered species such as the grizzly bear. The timber and mineral resources that could be developed are relatively limited, and clearly, Mr. Speaker, the best use of this land area is as wilderness.

The history of the Lincoln Back Country legislation is crucial to this Chamber's consideration. It was originally introduced several years ago by Jim Battin, now a Federal judge in Montana. Then Congressman from the Second District of Montana, Battin introduced the legislation for himself and other interested Montanan's anxious to see one of the last truly wilderness areas preserved in its natural state.

This legislation has been firmly supported by varied interests including the U.S. Forest Service. Feeling in my district, a district whose economic life depends in great part on logging and mining, is that the Lincoln Back Country should be designated a wilderness. For that reason, I have strongly supported this legislation since originally introduc-

ing the proposal to Congress nearly a year and a half ago, just after becoming a Member of Congress, and I today ask the Members of this body to concur in passage of this important and needed legislation.

The entire Montana delegation supports the wilderness concept of this area.

(Mr. MELCHER, at the request of Mr. ASPINALL, was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7295, to authorize designation of 240,000 acres in the Lolo, Helena, and Lewis and Clark National Forests as the Scapegoat Wilderness Area is my bill, but it represents years of effort by the Montana congressional delegation to keep a beautiful, wild area of Montana in all of its natural beauty for future generations of Americans.

This proposal has been pending before Congress for several years now and has been delayed because of the necessity for mineral surveys and other studies.

As we pass the bill today, it represents a true team victory in the House not only for the present Montana congressional delegation but also for former Congressmen Jim Battin and Arnold Olsen who during the past years worked with Senators MANSFIELD and METCALF in its behalf.

Thousands of Montana citizens, aware of the magnificence of this area, have actively worked for passage of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation excludes from wilderness designation 5,800 acres in the Benchmark area for limited development day use because of its proximity to activities of a landing strip and summerhomes.

It also directs the Forest Service to provide alternate motorbike and snowmobile trails in adjacent forest areas where they will not infringe on the wilderness area or disturb livestock or wildlife.

This represents the first time that the Forest Service has received such instructions from Congress in connection with a wilderness area. We want to give attention and opportunity for the various forms of recreation.

Passage of the bill by the House will reserve and preserve the opportunity for all Americans to experience the unique and soul-satisfying aura of viewing this area still clothed in its pristine beauty.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, beginning on line 3, strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, the area known as the Lincoln Back Country as generally depicted on a map entitled "Proposed Scapegroat Wilderness", dated May 19, 1972, which is on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Chief, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, is hereby designated as the Scapegoat, Wilderness within and as part of the Helena, Lolo, and Lewis and Clark National Forests, comprising an area of approximately 240,000 acres.

"SEC. 2. As soon as practicable after this Act takes effect, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file a map and a legal description of the Scapegoat Wilderness with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, and such description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act: *Provided, however,* That correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal description and map may be made.

"SEC. 3. The Scapegoat Wilderness shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act governing areas designated by that Act as wilderness areas, except that any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the effective date of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "To designate the Scapegoat Wilderness, Helena, Lolo, and Lewis and Clark National Forests, in the State of Montana."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a similar Senate bill (S. 484), to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to classify as "wilderness" the national forest lands known as the Lincoln Back Country, and parts of the Lewis and Clark and Lolo National Forests, in Montana, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 484

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to classify as wilderness those national forest lands containing approximately 240,500 acres in the Helena National Forest in Montana, known as the Lincoln Back Country, and parts of the Lewis and Clark and Lolo National Forests specifically described as bounded by a line on the southeast boundary of the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area at Deadman Hill running southeasterly to Bench Mark, then along the ridge of Wood Creek Hogback to the top of Crown Mountain and across Welcome Pass to the midpoint of Steamboat Mountain; thence running in a more southerly direction down the ridge between Milk and Pear Creeks, across the Dearborn River and up the Continental Divide to a point above Bighorn Lake; thence along the divide and down the ridge northwest of Falls Creek, across Landers Fork to the top of Lone Mountain; thence in a southwesterly direction to Heart Lake Trail, westward to the top of Red Mountain; thence southwesterly to Arrastra Peak; thence along Daly, Iron, and Echo Mountain Peaks, and across Windy Pass to Mineral Hill; thence across the North Fork of the Blackfoot River at the Big Slide to BM 8320, northwesterly across Canyon Creek (excluding the upper Conger Creek timber stand) to the top of Canyon Peak; thence more westerly to the top of Omar Mountain, and northward along the ridge to the southern boundary of the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area on a ridge west of Danaher Pass, and thence along the southern boundary of the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area to the point of beginning. The Secretary of Agriculture shall promptly after such classification transmit to the Congress a map and legal description of the wilderness area and such description shall have the same force and effect as if set forth in this Act. Upon its classification, such wilderness area shall be subject to the same provisions and rules as those designated as wilderness areas by the Wilderness Act of September 3, 1964 (78 Stat. 890).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 484 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 7295, as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read, "An act to designate the Scapegoat Wilderness, Helena, Lolo, and Lewis and Clark, National Forests, in the State of Montana."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 7295) was laid on the table.

U.S. FRIGATE "CONSTELLATION" COMMEMORATIVE MEDALS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2499) to provide for the striking of medals commemorating the 175th anniversary of the launching of the U.S. frigate *Constellation.*

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

S. 2499

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in commemoration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the launching of the United States frigate Constellation, the Secretary of the Treasury shall strike and deliver to the Constellation Committee or the Star Spangled Banner Flag House Association, Incorporated, not more than one hundred thousand medals with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary after consultation with the committee. The medals, which may be disposed of by the committee at a premium, shall be delivered at such times as may be required by the committee in quantities of not less than two thousand, but no medals shall be struck after December 31, 1973. The medals shall be considered to be national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 368).

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such medals to be struck and delivered at not less than the estimated cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, and security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for the full payment of such costs.

SEC. 3. The medals authorized to be struck and delivered under this Act shall be of such size or sizes and of such various metals as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with the committee.

(Mrs. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the medals authorized by this legislation

would be struck by the mint at no cost to the Federal Government. The organization which would have control over the distribution of the medals is a nonprofit organization on which top public officials of Baltimore and of Maryland serve as ex-officio members. The Star Spangled Banner Flag House Association, Inc., has amply demonstrated its public responsibility by the work it has done in acquiring and restoring and maintaining the building in which was made the flag which now hangs in the Smithsonian Institution, the huge banner which flew over Fort McHenry and inspired the writing of the national anthem, and in doing the same thing as regards the Navy vessel, *Constellation*.

Congress, in 1954, entrusted the *Constellation* to the Star Spangled Banner Flag House Association, Inc. The association then set up a *Constellation* Restoration Committee which has been responsible for raising funds for and directing the restoration of, the vessel.

The *Constellation* is a national historic shrine, officially designated. I am aware of the fact that the Smithsonian Institution has published a scholarly debate on the question whether the ship in Baltimore is actually the same ship which was launched 175 years ago—the charge being made by some historians that the original *Constellation* was not merely rebuilt in 1853, as official records indicate, but was actually replaced. We did not go into that controversy at all in our consideration of this bill, and it is not relevant to the bill. There is nothing in the legislation which relates to that controversy one way or another.

I say that because some of those who have interested themselves in this historic argument say that by striking a medal honoring the launching of the *Constellation* 175 years ago, Congress might be in effect taking sides as between the defenders of the *Constellation* and those who question the ship's age. That would not be the case.

From all reports, the *Constellation* Restoration Committee has done an outstanding job in refitting and restoring and maintaining the ship turned over to the Star Spangled Banner Flag House Association, Inc., by the Navy under act of Congress. The legislation we are considering will assist the committee in raising funds to continue that work. The event which the medals commemorate—the 175th anniversary on September 7, 1972, of the first successful launching of one of six frigates authorized by Congress in 1794—was certainly an event of national significance worthy of this form of recognition.

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

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of H.R. 10550, a bill identical to S. 2499 by Senator J. GLENN BEALL, Jr., I commend this measure to the House and urge its approval. I deeply appreciate the cooperation of the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN of Texas, in arranging for committee consideration of the legislation and I thank the gentlewoman from Missouri, Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, for calling up the bill in committee as chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs.

The people of Maryland, and particularly those residing in the Third Congressional District which I have the privilege of representing, are most grateful for the opportunity this legislation will provide to raise additional funds for the preservation of the remarkable sailing vessel which first established America's naval prowess, the frigate *Constellation*.

September 7 will mark the 175th anniversary of the launching of the *Constellation* at David Stodder's shipyard on Harris Creek in Baltimore Harbor in 1797. It was the first warship authorized by Congress to take to the seas and won our first two naval victories. It brought a surge of national pride to an infant nation by defeating and capturing the formidable 40-gun French frigate *L'Insurgente* early in 1799. A year later, it defeated the 52-gun French frigate *La Vengeance*. In contrast, the *Constellation* at that time had 38 guns.

The *Constellation* then participated in the military actions which ended the depredations upon American shipping and the capture of American seamen by the Barbary pirates; it served with distinction in the War of 1812; while circumnavigating the globe, it was the first American warship to visit China; it played a key role in the prevention of British annexation of Hawaii; and served in important assignments throughout the Civil War in protecting Union merchant ships in the Mediterranean.

For most of the past 100 years, the *Constellation* served as a training ship, always as a symbol of U.S. Navy tradition. In 1880, it carried food to Ireland to help relieve famine. In 1914, it returned to Baltimore Harbor to participate in the Star-Spangled Banner Centennial Celebration. In 1926, it took part in the Sesqui-Centennial Celebration of American Independence at Philadelphia.

In the dark days of 1940, President Franklin D. Roosevelt designated the old ship as the flagship of the Atlantic Fleet, and it continued as an auxiliary flagship throughout World War II.

But old age and rot were taking their toll on the vessel and by 1953 the *Constellation* faced the end of its days. At that time, a public spirited group in Baltimore which had previously restored the Old Flag House where the original Star-Spangled Banner was made—the huge flag which flew over Fort McHenry when Francis Scott Key wrote the poem which became our national anthem—decided to try to save the *Constellation*, to restore it and preserve it in Baltimore Harbor.

The Star-Spangled Banner Flag House Association, Inc., a nonprofit organization formed in 1927, obtained the *Constellation* from the Navy in 1955, under an act of Congress approved July 23, 1954, Public Law 523 of the 83d Congress. The association then established the *Constellation* Restoration Committee to raise funds and undertake the restoration of the vessel. It is now one of the most visited attractions in Baltimore.

Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith the names of the officers and members of the *Constellation* Restoration Committee which will be assisted in carrying on its fine work by the sale of the national metals authorized by S. 2499 and H.R. 10550:

THE CURRENT MEMBERSHIP OF THE CONSTELLATION RESTORATION COMMITTEE

National Chairman—Admiral Arleigh A. Burke, USN, Ret. former Chief of Naval Operations.

Maryland State Chairman—Mr. Gordon M. F. Stick, retired President—Hooper Co.—Koppers Corp.

Vice Chairman—Mr. Charles Edward Scarlette Jr., Chairman of the Board, Ramsey-Scarlett & Company.

Treasurer—Mr. Jean Hofmeister, Pres. Star Spangled Banner Flag House Asso. and Harbormaster of Baltimore City.

Executive Secretary—RADM. Donald F. Stewart, Director of Constellation and Commander of the Maryland State Naval Militia.

Recording Secretary—Mrs. Alexander F. Jenkins, Retired Corporation Executive.

BOARD MEMBERS

RADM. Ernest N. Eller—Former Curator of the Navy and Director of Naval History.

Robert E. Michel—Former President, Flag House and Pres. Robert E. Michael Corp. of Baltimore.

John A. Pentz—Historian, former history instructor and author.

Naval Architect—Leon D. Polland—Naval Architect, Federal Maritime Administration.

Herbert E. Witz—Practicing Attorney for the Constellation and Star Spangled Banner Flag House Asso.

MEMBERS

RADM Judson L. Smith—C.O. U.S. Naval Reserve, Baltimore.

Neil H. Swanson—Noted Author and Editor, Balto. News American, former managing editor of the Baltimore Sun and first Chairman of the Constellation.

Hon. Theodore R. McKeldin—Former Mayor of Baltimore and Governor of Maryland.

Hon. J. Millard Tawes—Former Comptroller and Governor of Md.

Hon. Spiro T. Agnew—former Governor of Maryland.

Hon. Wm. Donald Schaefer—Mayor of Baltimore.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2499, to provide for the striking of medals commemorating the 175th anniversary of the launching of the U.S. frigate *Constellation*.

This 36-gun frigate, built in 1797, was the first U.S. Navy ship to capture a foreign warship. It captured the French frigate *L'Insurgente* on February 9, 1799, during the undeclared war between the United States and France.

The ship was restored in Baltimore in the early 1960's by the pennies collected by schoolchildren. On July 31, the members of the Baltimore chapter of the Painting and Decorating Contractors of America donated their men and supplies to repaint the *Constellation*. These contractors deserve the appreciation of Baltimore and of the entire Nation for their interest in preserving one of our precious historical landmarks. At this point, I should like to include a list of the firms participating in this project:

BALTIMORE CHAPTER—PAINTING AND DECORATING CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA, CHARITY PROJECT, PARTICIPATING MEMBER FIRMS

PAINTING CONTRACTORS

The Hudson Maintenance Corporation, 2125 Boston Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21231.

Keehnel-Wilson of Maryland, 733 E. Fort Avenue, Baltimore, Maryland 21230.

L & L Painting Company, Manor Woods,

Manor Woods Drive, Glen Arm, Maryland 21057.

H. Landergren Painting & Decorating Company, 5007 Arbutus Avenue, Baltimore, Maryland 21215.

Z. R. Lewis Painting Company, 8428 Willow Oak Road, Baltimore, Maryland 21034.

McDaniel's New Look Painting & Decorating Company, 68 Rumelia Circle, Essex, Maryland 21221.

O. T. Neighoff & Sons, 413 Crain Highway, N.E., Gen Burnie, Maryland 21061.

Security Painting Company, 5719 Johnson Street, Brooklyn Park, Maryland 21225.

Sexton Painting Company, 228 Old Padonia Road, Cockeysvile, Maryland 21030.

PAINT AND EQUIPMENT SUPPLIERS

Bruning Paint Company, Fleet & Havens Streets, Baltimore, Maryland 21224.

The Flood Company, 1600 White Oak Avenue, Batimore, Maryland 21234.

Intercoastal Corporation, 514 N. Crain Highway, Glen Burnie, Maryland 21061.

Marvelite, Inc., 3020 Nieman Avenue, Baltimore, Maryland 21207.

P. P. G. Industries, 8223 Thornton Road, Baltimore, Maryland 21204.

Paint City, 1517 Eastern Avenue, Baltimore, Maryland 21231.

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

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the eligible bills on the Consent Calendar.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 15692, AMENDING SMALL BUSINESS ACT TO REDUCE INTEREST RATE ON SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION DISASTER LOANS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 15692) to amend the Small Business Act to reduce the interest rate on Small Business Administration disaster loans, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PATMAN and BARRETT, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Messrs. REUSS, ASHLEY, STEPHENS, WIDNALL, JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, J. WILLIAM STANTON, and WYLIE.

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE INTEGRATED REGIONAL MASS TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

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

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, a recent letter from a constituent of mine in Montgomery County, Md., tells the tale of the writer's elderly sister who patiently waits on her street corner for a certain, regularly scheduled District of Columbia Transit bus. The problem is, that, with increasing frequency, the bus is either very late or, occasionally, simply does not arrive at all.

Another constituent, who resides in Rossmoor, a development exclusively for senior citizens, writes that in evenings, on Sundays and holidays, there is absolutely no bus service to their area, effectively stranding many elderly residents who cannot drive. This, despite the fact that a certain route does have buses running full time, and that a simple 5-minute extension of that route would relieve the isolation of literally hundreds of these people.

When, oh when, will the residents of the Washington area have at their disposal a good, efficient bus system?

I have introduced legislation with our colleague, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, to provide the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority with the power to purchase, by condemnation if necessary, all of the area bus lines. I am most pleased that last Wednesday, the President announced his full support for this effort. I wish to commend the administration highly for its consistent support for good public transportation in the Washington area.

Our objective is easily stated. It is the development of an integrated, regional mass transportation system which will efficiently and effectively serve the Nation's Capital. Such a system would be structured in a fashion to encourage new ridership—in short the kind of service which has been lacking for many years.

I would certainly hope that we can get hearings on this legislation in the near future and shall continue to push in that direction.

EQUAL TELEVISION TIME FOR ALL POLITICAL PARTIES

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who were watching national television last Saturday evening were treated to the spectacle of the so-called news conference by one of the nominees for President when he was going to announce the selection of a Vice President. Those of us watching were exposed to the most purely political speechmaking I have seen recently on television.

I think if the fairness doctrine is going to apply, the other parties should have the same prime time donated by the national television networks to all political parties, including the American Independent Party, the Peoples Party, the Communist Party of America, and the Socialist Workers Party. Let us let national television studios live up to their obligations to every political party running this year.

ANNUAL REPORT OF COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY— MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

To the Congress of the United States:

At the dawn of the twentieth century, almost as a voice in the Wilderness he loved, President Theodore Roosevelt proclaimed an environmental ethic for America. He said:

> I recognize the right and duty of this generation to develop and use our natural resources; but I do not recognize the right to waste them, or to rob by wasteful use, the generations that come after us.

At the dawn of the 1970's there was still no more significant challenge facing Americans than the task of wisely conserving our natural resources and leaving the Nation a cleaner and healthier place for our children and grandchildren.

In my 1970 state of the Union message I asked our people:

> Shall we surrender to our surroundings or shall we make our peace with nature and begin to make reparations for the damage we have done to our air, to our land, and to our water?

This year's report of the Council on Environmental Quality examines the environmental conditions of a dynamic and mature society. The report addresses some very complex issues—the need for indices of environmental quality and forecasting, the costs and impact on the economy of pollution control requirements, and the effects of environmental standards on international trade—and puts these issues in sharper perspective. The increasing sophistication which we are bringing to our perception of environmental problems is itself an encouraging indication of progress.

This Annual Report on Environmental Quality also offers an assessment of how we are faring. I am pleased that the data presented in the Council's report indicate that the quality of the air in many of our cities is improving. Across the nation, emissions from automobiles—a significant portion of total emissions—are declining. We can expect these welcome trends to accelerate as the new standards and compliance schedules called for by the Clean Air Act of 1970 become fully effective.

Although the Report shows that we still have a major battle ahead to restore the quality of our waters, and urgently need effective new legislation which I submitted to the Congress over a year and a half ago, impressive strides have been made under present authorities. these include a four-fold increase in enforcement actions under the Refuse Act of 1899 since 1968.

The private sector is performing far more effectively in environmental protection. Throughout the country, industry is developing and using new technology to reduce pollution. Surveys indicate that business has increased its spending on pollution controls by about 50 percent in each of the last two years.

The future will bring new challenges to both the private and the public sectors in arresting environmental decay. The Council's report estimates that in order to meet current environmental protection requirements, both the public and private sectors together will need to spend an annual amount of $33 billion in 1980. Cumulative expenditures of more than $287 billion are estimated over the 10 years from 1971 to 1980.

So—we have only just begun to face up to the environmental question, even though we may have awakened just in time for us to stave off catastrophe.

The encouraging news in this report by the Council—as well as the hope we have for mastering the many difficult problems that still persist—is the rapid step-by-step progress in institutionalizing and reorganizing the Federal environmental structure, the dramatic funding, the wide range of administrative actions that have been taken, the strict enforcement of pollution control laws, the new international agreements which have been forged, and the broad array of major new legislation which has been submitted to the Congress for action.

YEARS OF PROGRESS

With the creation of the Council on Environmental Quality and the Environmental Protection Agency, we have brought about a major institutional reform within the Federal Government and a far more effective organization for environmental policy-making and enforcement. This reform has produced major progress—evidenced, for example, by the broad legislative proposals for environmental improvement which I have submitted to the Congress and by the vigorous enforcement of our pollution laws. The establishment of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration gives us a focus on the marine environment. I have proposed a Department of Natural Resources, for coordinated resource management, and a Department of Community Development, for a systematic approach to both urban and rural growth. The Congress has yet to act on these two crucial reorganization proposals.

Under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), we have undertaken a fundamental reform in the requirement that Federal agencies give careful analysis to the potential environmental impacts of proposed Federal actions. Already this changed emphasis has led to reconsideration of some projects, improvements of many others, and, overall, a far more thoughtful and comprehensive planning process. Our requirement that this whole process of environmental analysis must be open to the public for examination and comments—well before proposed actions are taken—is providing a new and more open dimension to Government. We can be proud of this record of improved citizen participation in the vital process of public decision-making.

The level of Federal funding for environmental protection has never been higher. In the four years since fiscal year 1969, Federal outlays for environmental protection have increased fivefold. Funding for cleanup of pollution at Federal facilities has increased from a $52 million annual level at the outset of my Administration to my 1973 budget of $315 million.

Regulatory and enforcement actions have accelerated dramatically over the past four years. The number of criminal actions taken by the Justice Department against water polluters was increased fourfold—from 46 to 191—between 1968 and 1971. EPA has taken action to halt harmful discharges into Lake Superior and shut down major industries during an air pollution crisis in Birmingham, Alabama.

In our long-term determination to provide tangible benefits for our children and grandchildren, we have created the Legacy of Parks program. Over 140 Federal properties have already been made available for park and recreation use, covering more than 20,000 acres in thirty-nine states and Puerto Rico. Most of these natural retreats are located in and near cities where the need for open space is greatest. The estimated fair market value of these properties is almost $100 million. In addition, we proposed major urban parks at gateways to both of our coasts—New York City and San Francisco. These two parks would comprise almost 50,000 acres, including valuable cultural, historic, and recreation assets accessible to millions of people.

My administration has tackled a host of controversial issues of environmental protection. We have limited oil drilling in the Santa Barbara Channel off the California coast. We helped protect the Everglades in Florida by stopping a proposed jetport. In addition, I proposed legislation to acquire interests in the Big Cypress Swamp to protect the Everglades' water supply. We halted the Cross-Florida Barge Canal and are considering the inclusion of the Oklawaha River in the system of scenic and wild rivers. And we have restricted use of DDT almost solely to public health purposes. We stopped the use of poisons on public lands. And we stopped all commercial whaling by the United States as well as all imports of whale products into this country. These are examples of the rigorous executive action taken by my Administration to protect the environment.

NEW LAWS WE NEED

New legislation is still badly needed in a number of areas, and in a series of environmental messages to Congress I have set forth a comprehensive legislative program designed to clean up the inherited problems of the past and to deal with emerging problems before they become critical. Many of these problem areas are defined in this Annual Report. To date, much of the proposed legislation has been the subject of congressional hearings, where it has attracted heartening interest and support. However, the record of final congressional action is entirely inadequate, with more than 20 major environmental proposals still pending.

Last month, I signed an important Port and Waterways Safety Act into law. This new law, which I proposed in May 1970, will help protect our inland waters from oil and other hazardous pollutant spills. This is a welcome beginning, but passage of my other major proposals to give us effective tools to deal with the environmental challenge—together with creation of a new Department of Natural Resources—will be essential in my judgment, if we are to have an adequate base for improving environmental quality. I urge the Congress to complete final action on responsible legislation to give us authority to upgrade water quality and to control the dumping of wastes at sea. We urgently need the new controls I have proposed over the use of toxic substances such as mercury, over the increasing problem of excessive noise, and over the misuse of chemical pesticides.

I have proposed a Toxic Wastes Disposal Control Act under which the Environmental Protection Agency would establish Federal Guidelines and requirements for State programs to regulate disposal on or under the land of those toxic wastes which pose a hazard to health. The Act would provide for Federal enforcement action if a State should fail to establish its own program.

Legislation which I have proposed is urgently needed to protect the land from the potential ravages of mining, by imposing adequate standards of reclamation. Strip mining alone now disturbs almost 4,650 acres a week. My proposed Power Plant Siting Act, for which the need is more evident with each passing month, would allow us effectively to reconcile environmental protection and energy needs.

I have proposed new legislation calling upon the States to assume control over land-use planning and regulation in areas of critical environmental concern and to regulate land use around major growth-industry facilities such as highways and airports. I have asked the Congress for authority to initiate at the State level regulatory programs to control sediment affecting water quality from earth-moving activities such as building and road construction. Federal enforcement would be imposed in situations in which a State failed to implement such a program.

I proposed a new type of law for pollution control purposes—a charge on harmful sulfur oxides emissions. This proposal embodies the principle that the price of goods should be made to include the costs of producing and disposing of them without harm to the environment. I also proposed a law that would employ our tax structure to discourage potentially harmful development in our precious coastal wetlands.

I have asked for a new and more effective Federal law to protect endangered species of wildlife—by covering species likely to become endangered as well as those more immediately threatened, and by imposing Federal penalties for taking of such species.

These proposals, and others I have put forward, are vital to all Americans in the years to come. But the critical final steps have yet to be taken. The Nation needs these laws, and they should be enacted this year. The Congress has a splendid opportunity to leave an historic record of environmental achievement, an opportunity which it must seize. The time for deliberation has passed. It is now time for action.

NATIONS ACTING TOGETHER

While our most immediate concern must be for the quality of our national environment, it is clear that we are part of a global environment whose long-range protection must be achieved by a mix of national and international efforts. This past year witnessed three historic milestones in the field of international environmental activity.

On April 15, in Ottawa, Prime Minister Trudeau and I signed the Great Lakes

Water Quality Agreement providing a common commitment to work together to clean up these important, shared resources.

On May 23, in Moscow, President Podgorny and I signed a Co-operative Agreement on Environmental Protection which opens a new area of U.S.-Soviet cooperation and permits our two peoples to work together on the solution of environmental problems in eleven broad areas.

Between June 5–16, in Stockholm, the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment brought together the representatives of 113 nations representing nine-tenth's of the world's people to explore together the opportunities for national and international action on common environmental problems. The Conference achieved nearly all of the goals which the United States had urged in advance. Specifically, the nations:

—Reached agreement on the establishment of a permanent new organization within the United Nations to coordinate international environmental activities.

—Agreed to the establishment of a United Nations environmental fund to be financed by voluntary contributions from U.N. member governments. I shall ask Congress to authorize and appropriate $40 million as our Nation's share of a five-year $100 million fund.

—Endorsed completion of a convention proposed by the United States to control ocean dumping of shore-generated waste. The favorable prospect for international action heightens the urgency of passing the domestic legislation. I have proposed to curtail ocean dumping from our shores.

—Approved an "earthwatch" program for worldwide environmental monitoring.

—Endorsed in principle a convention on endangered species, designed to protect species of plants and animals threatened with extinction by imposing control in international shipment, import and export.

—Endorsed our recommendation for a ten-year moratorium on commercial whaling. (Despite vigorous U.S. efforts, this moratorium was not agreed to by the International Whaling Commission at its recent meeting, although we were successful in achieving substantially reduced quotas and other protective measures.)

In addition, a proposal which I made in 1971 for a World Heritage Trust—to give uniquely important historic, cultural, and natural areas of the world special international recognition and protection—was strongly supported at Stockholm. When established, the Trust will provide vital new international dimension to the national park concept.

Environmental problems do not distinguish between national boundaries or differing social and economic systems. Environmental cooperation offers nations an opportunity for dealing constructively with each other and for responding to the growing aspirations of ordinary people around the globe to live decently and well in healthful surroundings.

I am hopeful about the prospects of international cooperation in the environmental field. The U.S. will continue to provide leadership in developing such cooperation. I am encouraged—even more profoundly—that the common search for a better environment can be one of those activities which serves to unify nations.

THE ENVIRONMENT AND OUR PEOPLE

In October, 1971, I initiated the Environmental Merit Awards Program. Administered by the Environmental Protection Agency in cooperation with the Office of Education, this program gives national recognition to successful student projects leading to environmental understanding or improvement. Qualifications for the awards are determined by local boards. Each board consists of secondary school students, faculty, and representatives of the local community. Already thousands of high schools and summer camps from all fifty states are registered in the program. This Fall the program will be expanded to include junior high schools as well.

As I said in my 1972 Environmental Message to Congress:

> The starting point of environmental quality is in the hearts and minds of the people. Unless the people have a deep commitment to new values and a clear understanding of the new problems, all our laws and programs and spending will avail little. The young, quick to commit and used to learning, are gaining the changed outlook fastest of all. Their enthusiasm about the environment spreads with a healthy contagion. Their energy in its behalf can be an impressive force for good.

As we reflect upon the characteristics and problems of the dynamic and mature society that this Annual Report of the Council on Environmental Quality describes, there should be a sober realization that we have not done as well as we must, that changes in laws and values come slowly, and that reordering our priorities is difficult and complicated. But there is ample room for encouragement in the growing capacity of a people able to assess their problems, take stock of their situation and get on with the unfinished business of shaping the United States as a model of a satisfying and healthful environment.

I welcome and salute the lead that our young people are taking in this great endeavor.

Long before America was powerful or wealthy, we were already looked to for leadership in demonstrating the possibilities of a vigorous, free society. By the time of the Constitutional Convention this country had captured the world's imagination and stood high in international esteem, not for its material wealth, but for its ideals.

Today as nations around the globe strive to enhance the lives of their citizens, the effort directed toward a cleaner and healthier environment is a vital measure of a country's stature.

This is a hopeful sign that the productive pursuits of peace are coming gradually to command increasing attention in the discourse and competition among nations. In the 197th year of American Independence, the quality of life enjoyed by our citizens has become a new sign to the world of our progress as a people.

I am reminded of Benjamin Franklin's remark at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, when he pointed to the golden half-sun engraved on the back of General Washington's chair: "Now at length I have the happiness to know that it is a rising and not a setting sun."

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 7, 1972.*

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 299]

Abourezk	Findley	Passman
Archer	Fish	Patman
Ashley	Flynt	Pelly
Badillo	Gallagher	Pepper
Baker	Goldwater	Pryor, Ark.
Baring	Gray	Purcell
Biaggi	Griffiths	Rarick
Bingham	Hagan	Reid
Blanton	Halpern	Rooney, N.Y.
Blatnik	Hébert	Rosenthal
Bolling	Heckler, Mass.	Ruppe
Bow	Hungate	Ryan
Broomfield	Hutchinson	Scheuer
Brown, Mich.	Ichord	Seiberling
Burlison, Mo.	Jones, Tenn.	Stanton, James V.
Caffery	Keith	Stephens
Camp	Landrum	Stokes
Carey, N.Y.	Lennon	Stubblefield
Chamberlain	Long, La.	Stuckey
Clark	McClure	Talcott
Clay	McCormack	Teague, Calif.
Conte	McDonald, Mich.	Teague, Tex.
Conyers	McMillan	Vander Jagt
Davis, Ga.	Mathias, Calif.	Waggonner
de la Garza	Minshall	Wampler
Dingell	Murphy, Ill.	
Dowdy	Nedzi	
Dwyer	O'Hara	
Edmondson		

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 350 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

ANNUITIES OF WIDOWS OF SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 12101) to amend title 28, United States Code, relating to annuities of widows of Supreme Court Justices, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 12101

A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, relating to annuities of widows of Supreme Court Justices

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 375 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall pay to the surviving widow of a justice of the United States who died on or before the date

of enactment of this section, while in regular active service or after having retired or resigned under the provisions of this chapter, an annuity of $10,000.

"(b) The surviving widow of a justice of the United States who is in regular active service or is retired or resigned under the provisions of this chapter on the date of enactment of this section, shall, if the justice gives written notice to the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts within six months of the date of enactment of this section of his election to become subject to the provisions of section 376 of this chapter, be paid an annuity of $5,000 or an annuity in accordance with the provisions of section 376, whichever is the greater.

"(c) The surviving widow of a justice of the United States who is in regular active service or is retired or resigned under the provisions of this chapter on the date of enactment of this section, shall, if the justice fails to give timely written notice of his election to become subject to the provisions of section 376 of this chapter, be paid on annuity of $5,000.

"(d) The widow of a justice of the United States who is appointed after the date of enactment of this section shall be ineligible for an annuity under this section.

"(e) An annuity payable under this section shall accrue monthly and shall be due and payable in monthly installments on the first business day of the month following the month for which the annuity shall have accrued. Such annuity shall commence on the first day of the month in which a justice dies, and shall terminate upon the death or remarriage of the annuitant."

SEC. 2. Section 376 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting "justice or" or "justice's or" prior to the word "judge" or "judge's", as appropriate, wherever those words appear therein, except in subsections (q), (r), and (s).

SEC. 3. (a) The heading of chapter 17, title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Chapter 17.—RESIGNATION AND RETIREMENT OF JUSTICES AND JUDGES".

(b) The analysis of chapter 17 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the item relating to section 376 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"376. Annuities to widows and surviving dependent children of justices and judges of the United States."

(c) The catchline of section 376 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 376. Annuities to widows and surviving dependent children of justices and judges of the United States".

SEC. 4. Section 604(a)(7) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking "Regulate and pay annuities to widows and surviving dependent children of judges," and inserting in lieu thereof "Regulate and pay annuities to widows and surviving dependent children of justices and judges of the United States,".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, for some time now the press has been carrying stories pointing up the dire straits that some of the surviving widows of former Supreme Court Justice are in as a result of the meager pension provided for under existing law.

Until 1954, no provision was made for the payment of an annuity to a widow of a Justice of the Supreme Court. In that year, Congress enacted section 375 of title 28, however, providing that the widow of a Supreme Court Justice shall receive an annuity of $5,000 until she dies or remarries. The $5,000 figure was pegged at the amount which Congress had provided for the widow of former President Coolidge in a 1937 private law. In 1958, Congress made the Coolidge annuity applicable to all Presidential widows and increased the annuity to $10,000; in 1971 the pension for Presidential widows was again increased—to $20,000 per year.

The annuity payable to widows of Supreme Court Justices has never been increased. As a result, in 1972 the six present widows are trying to live on a pension pegged at a 1937 cost of living. These widows, who range from 64 to 82 years of age, are: Mrs. Hugo L. Black, 64; Mrs. Felix Frankfurter, 81; Mrs. Robert H. Jackson, 81; Mrs. Sherman Minton, 69; Mrs. Wiley Rutledge, 82; and Mrs. Fred M. Vinson, 74.

H.R. 12101 would increase to $10,000 the annual pension payable to each of these six widows. Each pension would terminate upon the death or remarriage of the recipient.

Beyond this, the bill would effect a long overdue change in the law. It would give to Supreme Court Justices the opportunity to participate in the judicial survivors annuity systems, a contributory system in which all Federal judges other than the Justices of the Supreme Court are eligible to participate.

This contributory system is much more sensible, equitable, and fiscally responsible than the noncontributory gratuity system now applicable to Supreme Court Justices. A judge electing to come under the plan is required to pay 3 percent of his salary into a judicial survivors annuity fund an the Government makes a matching contribution. For a widow to be eligible to receive an annuity, the judge must have had at least 5 years' creditable Federal civilian service, for the last 5 years of which he has contributed to the fund, and the widow must have been married to the judge at least 2 years and be at least 50 years of age, unless she has minor dependent children. Dea'h or remarriage terminates the widow's annuity.

The annuity payable to a judge's surviving widow may not exceed 37½ percent of the average of the judge's salary during his last 5 years of service, under existing salary scales and the prescribed formula for computing annuities, the surviving widow of a U.S. district judge may receive a maximum annuity of $15,000, and then only if her deceased husband had 30 years of creditable service. The surviving widow of a U.S. circuit judge would be eligible, also after 30 years of creditable service, for a maximum annuity of $15,937.50. The maximum that a surviving widow of a Justice could receive is $22,500. Of the approximately 500 active judges eligible to participate, as of June 1, 1972, 456 were in the contributory system. As of the same date, 135 of the 145 senior judges were participating.

We should note that the judicial survivors annuity system wisely recognizes the need for annuity payments for the benefit of minor children, just as do other retirement systems. The present law applicable to Supreme Court Justices provides only for widows.

We should also note that this legislation does nothing for former Supreme Court Justices who are not retired with pay. Under present law, upon their deaths their widows will not qualify for an annuity. Neither will they qualify under the law as proposed to be amended by H.R. 12101.

In its present form, the bill would afford the three who are retired with pay—former Chief Justice Earl Warren—Justice Tom C. Clark, and Justice Stanley F. Reed—and the nine sitting Justices, an option to continue under the present system, or to participate in the contributory system. If one of these 12 elects to participate in the contributory system, his surviving widow will receive the $5,000 annuity or the annuity due her from the judicial survivors annuity fund, whichever is the greater.

Finally, the gratuitous $5,000 annuity is phased out, primarily by making it inapplicable to widows of Justices appointed after enactment will have the option of participating in the contributory system or providing for their widows privately. The gratuitous annuity will not be available to them.

In summary, H.R. 12101 would effect three basic objectives the attainment of which is long overdue:

First. It would raise from $5,000 to $10,000 the annuity payable to the six surviving widows of former Supreme Court Justices who died while on active duty or while retired or resigned with pay.

Second. It would make Supreme Court Justices eligible to participate in the contributory system available to all other Federal jurists.

Third. It would phase out the noncontributory annuity payable to surviving widows of Supreme Court Justices. Justices appointed after the date of enactment who wish to provide a survivor annuity for their widows and dependent children would be required to contribute to the annuity system applicable to other Federal judges, just as Members of Congress and civilian officials and employees of the United States contribute to the survivor benefits applicable to their widows and dependent children.

The measure has been approved by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts and, as introduced by the U.S. Civil Service Commission. The members of the Supreme Court to whom the Justice Department deferred have advised the committee that H.R. 12101, as reported, is acceptable legislation.

For so long as the six existing widows remain eligible for a gratuity, and assuming all 12 eligible Justices elect to participate in the contributory system, the maximum cost of this legislation would be $51,600 a year. As each of the present widows dies or remarries, the annual cost would be reduced by $5,000. And, of course, if any of the 12 eligible Justices elects not to come within the

contributory system, the annual cost would be reduced by the $1,800 matching contribution which the Government would otherwise be required to make to the judicial survivors annuity fund.

In closing, let me advise you that this legislation was approved in subcommittee and full committee without dissent, and that similar legislation cleared the Senate Judiciary Committee and the Senate, also without objection.

I should like to express for the record my deep appreciation for the exceptionally able assistance given to my staff by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, particularly Miss M. Patricia Carroll, Chief of the Retirement, Insurance, and Payroll Section. The people of the United States should be proud of public servants as able and conscientious as Miss Carroll.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Most of these beneficiaries are of very advanced age, and I imagine have a very short life expectancy. Can the gentleman state what the total cost of the bill will be?

Mr. CELLER. Approximately $51,600 a year, at a maximum.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. A year?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. But probably for very few years.

Mr. CELLER. That is correct. As each of the six existing widows dies or remarries, the annual cost would be reduced by $5,000.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MONAGAN. Is it correct that this would not have any prospective operation? In other words, it applies to a specific group of beneficiaries. Is that right?

Mr. CELLER. Do you mean like former Justices Fortas, Goldberg, and Whittaker? Their widows would not participate in this survivors fund at all. They are out completely. Their widows would not participate because these Justices resigned and are not either Justices of the Supreme Court now or retired or resigned with pay.

The $10,000 provision applies only to the present six widows of former Justices of the Supreme Court.

Mr. MONAGAN. What is the proposal for our future contributions?

Mr. CELLER. The Justices will contribute 3 percent of their salary each year. Their salary being $60,000, they would contribute $1,800 each year. And the Federal Government would match that contribution. In that respect, it is not dissimilar to the very fund in which we as Members of Congress participate. The contributory system is already in operation as far as the lower court judges are concerned—the U.S. district judges, the judges of the U.S. circuit courts of appeals, the judges of the Customs and Patent Appeals Court, and so forth. Justices of the Supreme Court are not presently eligible to participate. The bill extends to the Justices of the Supreme Court the option to participate, just as all other Federal judges have that option.

Mr. MONAGAN. If the Justices wish to become members of the system and have their widows be beneficiaries in the future, they would have to contribute?

Mr. CELLER. They would have to contribute.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. Present Justices do not have to go into the contributory system. If they do not, their widows would get the $5,000, which is provided for in present law. Widows of Justices hereafter appointed would not be eligible for the $5,000 gratuity.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENT. I applaud the efforts of the gentleman to attempt to get some kind of participation on the part of the Justices of the Supreme Court, especially in their efforts to do something for the widows.

There is only one question that comes to my mind, in view of the action taken by the Senate last week in dealing with the disaster relief funds for flood victims where the Senate set a means test on how much they would give any kind of formula on disaster relief, I wonder if there is any kind of a means test on the conditions of the six widows that are now going to draw the $10,000.

Mr. CELLER. As a condition precedent for the widow to have the benefit of any annuity, she must be 50 years of age or older, or have dependent children.

Mr. DENT. In other words, it has nothing to do with how much income she has, or does not have, of income of any kind?

Mr. CELLER. That is correct.

Mr. DENT. That is all right, and I am not opposing the proposition. I just wanted to establish some kind of record here for the basis of our discussion when we come to the disaster relief bill.

Mr. CELLER. The maximum annuity that a widow would have after a Justice served for 30 years will be $22,500, and, as I said, she must be 50 years old or older, or have dependent children.

Mr. DENT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, does this bill apply or does it not apply to sitting Justices of the Supreme Court?

Mr. CELLER. This bill would make the contributory system now applicable to the other Federal judges applicable to the sitting Justices of the Supreme Court.

Mr. GROSS. If they elect to come into the survivorship program?

Mr. CELLER. Yes, if they elect to the contributing system.

Mr. GROSS. If they do not, what is the situation?

Mr. CELLER. If they do not enter the contributory system, their widows would still get the $5,000 that is provided for in the law that exists today.

Mr. GROSS. That is the present sitting justices—but what about the justices who may come on the bench hereafter?

Mr. CELLER. As to justices who are not now sitting, but who will be appointed after the enactment of this act, their widows will not get the $5,000. They either participate in the contributory system or get nothing.

The idea is to phase out that $5,000 provision so as to encourage future justices to enter the contributory system.

Mr. GROSS. So there would be no gratuitous survivor benefits for a justice after the enactment of this act?

Mr. CELLER. If he does not come into the contributory system, that would be the situation.

Mr. GROSS. Is it the opinion of the gentleman from New York that the system that has been established and in which they would enter; the system created for Federal district court judges as to the survivors—is it the opinion of the gentleman that this fund is presently sound?

Mr. CELLER. As I understand it, the contributory system applicable to U.S. district court judges and circuit court judges and judges of the Customs Court and others would be available to justices of the Supreme Court, and they would pay 3 percent of their salaries into the fund.

Mr. GROSS. Is it the gentleman's opinion that this fund now is actuarially sound?

Mr. CELLER. The fund has been in existence for a great many years—since 1956. We have heard no complaints with reference to what you mention.

Mr. GROSS. It is based upon a 3-percent contribution on the part of a Federal judge as compared to the 8-percent contribution on the part of Members of Congress. Of course, the Federal Government contributes another 8 percent in the case of Members of Congress and in the case of Federal judges, it would contribute 3 percent, or a total of 6 percent.

Mr. CELLER. There are very good reasons why we have that difference.

You must remember that the judges are contributing to only a survivor annuity.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I realize that.

Mr. CELLER. If the gentleman will permit me, it is very important that the Members know this—the judges are contributing only to a survivors' annuity.

The Members of Congress contribute for retirement as well. Also, judges' widows are eligible for survivor annuities only after reaching age 50; Members' widows are eligible irrespective of age. Judges' widows lose benefits on remarriage at any age; Members' widows lose benefits only upon remarriage before age 60. The formula for computing annuities for judges uses various percentage factors between 1¼ percent and three-quarters of 1 percent; for Members, percentage factors vary between 2½ and 1¾ percent. Judges may retire at age 70 with 10 years of service; and age 65 with 15 years of service; Members may retire at age 62 with 5 years of service, age 60 with 10 years of service, and age 55 with 30 years of service. The widow of a judge is entitled to an annuity only if the judge

had 5 years of civilian service and contributed to the Fund for the last 5 years; the widow of a Member is entitled to an annuity if the Member had 18 months of Government service.

Because of these disparities in benefits, among others, the amount contributed by judges is less than that contributed by Members.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield, the report goes on and on about annuities for the widows of deceased Supreme Court Justices.

These are not annuities; they are pensions. They are in fact gratuities. They pay nothing into any fund. I would hope the record would be cleared up in this respect. The $5,000 escrow being paid each year to widows of Supreme Court Justices, is an outright gift.

Mr. CELLER. May I say to the gentleman that is the very evil we are trying to get rid of by this bill. In other words, we are trying to put this on a level where the Justices buy insurance, as it were, by making a contribution. It is not a gratuity because they pay for it just as you pay for your pension and for the annuity for your loved ones. It is the same thing. In other words, it is just the reverse of what you are saying. We are trying to get away from this gratuity. Here we say to the Justices: "You cannot provide for your widow and your children unless you pay a certain amount into this fund." That is not a gratuity. It is just like insurance.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to see this reform, but I do not know why Congress ever embarked upon the business of giving $5,000 a year to the widows of Supreme Court Justices without the slightest evidence of need. Justices of the Supreme Court are paid $60,000 a year and they can well afford to provide survivor benefits for their families. I intend to vote against the bill for the reason that I am opposed to the pensions already in effect and which I opposed.

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

Mr. CELLER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have two simple questions on this current bill. My others have been adequately discussed, or answered.

My first question is: If a sitting Justice elects to opt for the $10,000 under this bill, will there be any deduction in his retirement, after he retires, pending his demise?

Mr. CELLER. A sitting Justice cannot opt for the $10,000. That figure applies to only the six existing widows of former Supreme Court Justices.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman. I think that is important in the legislative record.

My second question is, presuming one of the sitting Justices could opt for the $10,000, would it be applicable to all of his wives—after his demise—who might be living, because we do have some Justices that have been ofttimes married?

Mr. CELLER. If you read the law carefully, you will find that that annuity applies only to the surviving widow, not to additional former wives.

Mr. HALL. I understood that it applied only to the living widow. I did not know whether it applied to multiple widows.

Mr. CELLER. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 12101 is a bill to provide annuities to eligible survivors of Supreme Court Justices. The bill treats only with the Supreme Court and only with survivors annuities and not with retirement. The purpose of the bill is to phase out the present inadequate noncontributory program for Supreme Court Justices and to allow them to participate like other Federal judges in a contributory program.

This purpose is accomplished in the following way: First, the present $5,000 annuity for surviving widows established in 1954 is increased to $10,000. It should be noted that this increase takes effect only with regard to Justices who have died before the enactment of this bill and who were thus ineligible to participate in the contributory program and thereby earn a higher annuity than $5,000.

The increase would therefore only benefit six people at present—the widows of Justices Black, Frankfurter, Minton, Jackson, Vinson, and Rutledge.

Second, the present $5,000 annuity provision is retained for existing Justices who are in active service or who have resigned or retired under section 371 of title 28, United States Code. This group presently consists of 12 people—the wives of the nine active Justices plus the wives of Justices Clark, Warren, and Reed. It does not include the wives of Justices Fortas, Goldberg, and Whittaker.

However, the bill would allow any of this group to elect to participate in the Judicial Survivors Annuity System which was established for other Federal judges in 1956. This program is a contributory program providing benefits not only to eligible widows, but to eligible dependent children as well. For a widow to be eligible she must have been married to the Justice or judge for at least 2 years and must be at least 50 years of age, unless there are dependent children. For a dependent child to be eligible, he must be under 18 years of age and unmarried.

Thus in this transition stage the Justices have the option of choosing a noncontributory widows' annuity of $5,000 or a contributory annuity for both their widows and dependent children. If the Justice chooses the latter, but has not served a long enough time to accrue on his death an annuity of $5,000 or more for his widow, she will receive such annuity nonetheless. The bill thus removes what might be for some Justices a disincentive to participate in the contributory program.

Third, future Justices will not be given that option. Since they have not yet been appointed they cannot lay claim to the $5,000 annuity provision as an emolument of office. Rather, they will be permitted to participate in the contributory program. If they do not, that is their election, and they will accrue no benefits for their survivors. However, with 30 years of service, a participating Justice can accrue an annuity of $22,500, which is the maximum.

This bill has the support of the Judicial Conference of the United States and the members of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The bill provides a smooth transition from an inadequate noncontributory plan to an equitable contributory plan for Justices of the Supreme Court. I urge its adoption.

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

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

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me we may be establishing some precedents here that could come home to roost in future Congresses.

There is no doubt that there is going to be an inflationary toll which will continue to be extracted from those of us who reach retirement and, accordingly, we must have balanced plans to protect against that hazard.

The members of the judiciary are educated people. They not only know what the term "judicial" means but they should also know what the term "fiduciary" means. They should also know what the term "trustee" means and they are in effect fiduciaries and trustees for their own families, so they should have had, it seems to me, private plans to supplement any fringe benefits afforded them as Federal employees—and, it probably will be argued that if we do this—the State, county, and municipal judge and others will demand it of their respective legislatures.

Mr. Speaker, if we should do this for the members of the judiciary, why should we not do it for those who have been unfortunate enough to serve only for a short time in Congress or for those Congressmen who failed to avail themselves of life insurance or a retirement plan that would provide annuities for themselves and their wives.

I think the questions that have been raised by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) earlier made a great deal of sense. We are, in effect, going to take care of the dependents of members of the judiciary who, while well paid, failed to plan for their heirs. It is a bad practice for us to do this on a class basis of this sort.

So, it does seem to me we are going to find that other unfortunate civil servants come in with demands that we take care of their beneficiaries who may not be even as well situated as the members of the judiciary, and it may be that we have as great an obligation for them as we do for the judiciary. Based upon what I have learned here this afternoon it does not appear to be a good precedent to establish.

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

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. POFF) such time as he may consume.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise to endorse the remarks of my distinguished chairman and those of the equally distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. Between them they have clearly, succinctly, and cogently made the case for the legislation before the House.

Ninety percent of all civilian employees of the Federal Government and of the District of Columbia are covered by the Civil Service retirement system. This, of course, includes Members of this House and our staff personnel. All of our Foreign Service officers and various other personnel in our Foreign Service participate in a Foreign Service retirement system. Since 1939 employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority have had the TVA retirement system. Similarly, we have the Federal Reserve retirement system the District of Columbia public school teachers retirement system the District of Columbia Police and Fire Department retirement system, the District of Columbia judges retirement system, the Uniformed Services retirement system, and others. Our Federal jurists—other than the Supreme Court Justices—have the judicial survivors annuity system.

Without exception, every one of these retirement systems provides survivor benefits for widows and dependent children. With only one exception—the uniformed services system—the participants contribute from their earnings to finance their respective plans, and their employers make contributions as well.

There is no logical reason why Supreme Court Justices should be ineligible to participate in the judicial survivors annuity system along with other Federal judges. There is no logical reason why their surviving dependent children should be without benefits. There is no logical reason why Supreme Court Justices should not contribute toward the annuities their survivors receive. H.R. 12101 addresses these considerations in a rational, reasonable, workmanlike way.

In an orderly fashion it is directed to three principal groups—sitting Justices and those retired with pay, Justices appointed after enactment, and the six existing widows of former Justices.

As for the nine sitting Justices and the three who are presently in retirement with pay—former Chief Justice Warren, and Justices Clark and Reed—H.R. 12101 gives them 6 months within which to elect to participate in the contributory judicial survivors annuity system. As has been pointed out by the learned dean of the House, section 375 of title 28, United States Code, presently provides that the surviving widow of a Supreme Court Justice shall receive a gratuity of $5,000 until she dies or remarries.

H.R. 2101 provides that the surviving widow of any of these 12 Justices shall in no event receive less than the $5,000 to which she would be entitled if this legislation were not enacted. This provision eliminates the need for a Justice who wishes to enter into participation in the contributory system to gamble on whether he will live long enough to earn an annuity greater than that to which his wife is entitled under the present law.

Directing itself to Justices appointed after enactment, the bill treats such jurists as all other Federal judges—their widows will receive no gratuitous annuities; rather, each such appointee will have the option of joining the contributory system or making private arrangements for his survivors.

Finally, the bill addresses itself to the plight in which the six present widows find themselves in having to live on a pension established on a 1937 cost of living base. Under the bill, these six elderly ladies will each receive an annuity of $10,000 a year instead of $5,000 until she dies or remarries. It may be interesting to note that apart from any other service rendered the Government of the United States by former Chief Justice Vinson and Associate Justices Black, Frankfurter, Jackson, Minton, and Rutledge, their combined Federal judicial service exceeded 100 years.

Before relinquishing the floor, let me touch on several other considerations which should be borne in mind with respect to this legislation.

Present law makes no provision for surviving dependent children of Supreme Court Justices. Associate Justice Marshall has two such children, Associate Justice White has one, and Associate Justice Rehnquist has three. The bill corrects this inequity.

This is no giveaway legislation—a Justice who is appointed to the Court without any prior Government service would have to serve and contribute to the system approximately 7 years before his surviving widow would qualify for more than the $5,000 which present law affords her gratuitously.

The maximum annuity a Justice's widow may receive under the Judicial Survivors Annuity System is $22,500. But to qualify for this her husband must have had 30 years of creditable service.

Existing law affords a surviving widow her gratuitous annuity without regard to her age; under the contributory system she receives nothing unless she has attained 50 years of age or has dependent children. The wives of three of our sitting Justices are not yet 50 years of age, although at this time two of them have dependent children.

Under the contributory system, a surviving widow loses her annuity if she ever remarries; under the Civil Service System she loses it only if she remarries before reaching 60.

The widow of a Justice under the contributory system is eligible only if her husband has had 5 years of covered service and has contributed to the Fund for the last 5 years; the widow of a person in the Civil Service Retirement System is entitled to her annuity if her husband has had just 18 months of Government service.

H.R. 12101 is prudent, practical, and economically sound legislation. As the chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary has stated, H.R. 12101 was reported by subcommittee and full committee without dissent. It has executive branch endorsement and the endorsement of the judiciary, including the Justices of the Supreme Court. Many of us have received considerable mail from our constituents in support of the bill. Legislation virtually identical in substance passed the Senate on June 30 without debate.

I urge you, my colleagues, to send H.R. 12101 forward with a resounding vote of approval.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, we have no requests for further time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 12101, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. HALL. 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 281, nays 97, answered "present" 2, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 300]

YEAS—281

Abourezk	Derwinski	Koch
Abzug	Diggs	Kuykendall
Adams	Donohue	Kyros
Addabbo	Dorn	Leggett
Alexander	Dow	Lent
Anderson, Calif.	Drinan	Link
	du Pont	Lloyd
Anderson, Ill.	Dwyer	McClory
Anderson, Tenn.	Eckhardt	McCloskey
	Edwards, Ala.	McCollister
Annunzio	Edwards, Calif.	McCulloch
Arends	Eilberg	McDade
Aspin	Erlenborn	McEwen
Aspinall	Esch	McFall
Badillo	Evans, Colo.	McKay
Barrett	Fascell	McKevitt
Begich	Fish	McKinney
Belcher	Flood	Macdonald, Mass.
Bell	Foley	
Bennett	Ford, Gerald R.	Madden
Bergland	Ford, William D.	Mahon
Betts		Mailliard
Biaggi	Forsythe	Mallary
Biester	Fraser	Martin
Bingham	Frelinghuysen	Matsunaga
Boggs	Frenzel	Mazzoli
Boland	Frey	Meeds
Bow	Garmatz	Melcher
Brademas	Giaimo	Metcalfe
Brasco	Gibbons	Mikva
Bray	Gonzalez	Miller, Calif.
Brinkley	Goodling	Mills, Ark.
Brooks	Grasso	Minish
Brotzman	Gray	Minshall
Brown, Ohio	Green, Oreg.	Mizell
Broyhill, Va.	Green, Pa.	Mollohan
Burke, Mass.	Gubser	Monagan
Burleson, Tex.	Gude	Moorhead
Burton	Halpern	Morgan
Byrne, Pa.	Hamilton	Mosher
Byrnes, Wis.	Hammer-schmidt	Moss
Byron		Murphy, Ill.
Cabell	Hanley	Murphy, N.Y.
Carey, N.Y.	Hanna	Natcher
Carlson	Hansen, Idaho	Nelsen
Carney	Hansen, Wash.	Nix
Carter	Harrington	Obey
Casey, Tex.	Harvey	O'Hara
Cederberg	Hastings	O'Neill
Celler	Hathaway	Patten
Chisholm	Hawkins	Perkins
Clancy	Hays	Pettis
Clark	Hechler, W. Va.	Peyser
Clausen, Don H.	Heckler, Mass.	Pickle
	Heinz	Pike
Cleveland	Helstoski	Pirnie
Collier	Hicks, Mass.	Podell
Collins, Ill.	Hicks, Wash.	Poff
Collins, Tex.	Hillis	Powell
Colmer	Hogan	Preyer, N.C.
Conable	Holifield	Price, Ill.
Conover	Hosmer	Quie
Corman	Howard	Railsback
Cotter	Jacobs	Rangel
Coughlin	Jarman	Rees
Culver	Johnson, Calif.	Reid
Curlin	Johnson, Pa.	Reuss
Daniels, N.J.	Jones, Ala.	Rhodes
Danielson	Karth	Riegle
Davis, Wis.	Kastenmeier	Roberts
de la Garza	Kazen	Robison, N.Y.
Delaney	Keating	Rodino
Dellenback	Kee	Roe
Dellums	Kemp	Rogers
Dennis	King	Roncalio
Dent	Kluczynski	Rooney, Pa.

Rosenthal	Staggers	Veysey
Rostenkowski	Stanton,	Waldie
Roush	J. William	Ware
Roy	Stanton,	Whalen
Roybal	James V.	Whalley
Ruppe	Steed	White
Sandman	Steele	Widnall
Sarbanes	Stratton	Wiggins
Saylor	Sullivan	Williams
Scheuer	Symington	Wilson, Bob
Schneebeli	Teague, Calif.	Wolff
Schwengel	Teague, Tex.	Wright
Seiberling	Terry	Wyatt
Shipley	Thompson, N.J.	Wydler
Shriver	Thomson, Wis.	Wyman
Sikes	Thone	Yates
Sisk	Tiernan	Yatron
Skubitz	Udall	Young, Tex.
Smith, Iowa	Ullman	Zwach
Smith, N.Y.	Van Deerlin	
Springer	Vander Jagt	

NAYS—97

Abbitt	Gettys	Purcell
Abernethy	Griffin	Quillen
Andrews,	Gross	Randall
N. Dak.	Grover	Robinson, Va.
Archer	Haley	Rousselot
Ashbrook	Hall	Runnels
Bevill	Harsha	Ruth
Blackburn	Henderson	St Germain
Broyhill, N.C.	Horton	Satterfield
Buchanan	Hull	Scherle
Burke, Fla.	Hunt	Schmitz
Camp	Jonas	Scott
Chappell	Jones, N.C.	Sebelius
Clawson, Del	Keith	Shoup
Crane	Kyl	Slack
Daniel, Va.	Landgrebe	Smith, Calif.
Davis, S.C.	Latta	Snyder
Denholm	Long, Md.	Spence
Devine	Lujan	Steiger, Ariz.
Dickinson	Mann	Taylor
Downing	Mathis, Ga.	Thompson, Ga.
Dulski	Mayne	Vanik
Duncan	Michel	Vigorito
Eshleman	Miller, Ohio	Waggonner
Evins, Tenn.	Mills, Md.	Whitehurst
Findley	Montgomery	Whitten
Fisher	Myers	Wilson,
Flowers	Nichols	Charles H.
Fountain	O'Konski	Winn
Fulton	Passman	Wylie
Fuqua	Poage	Young, Fla.
Galifianakis	Price, Tex.	Zablocki
Gaydos	Pucinski	Zion

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Andrews, Ala.	Mitchell

NOT VOTING—52

Ashley	Flynt	Mathias, Calif.
Baker	Gallagher	Mink
Baring	Goldwater	Nedzi
Blanton	Griffiths	Patman
Blatnik	Hagan	Pelly
Bolling	Hébert	Pepper
Broomfield	Hungate	Pryor, Ark.
Brown, Mich.	Hutchinson	Rarick
Burlison, Mo.	Ichord	Rooney, N.Y.
Caffery	Jones, Tenn.	Ryan
Chamberlain	Landrum	Steiger, Wis.
Clay	Lennon	Stephens
Conte	Long, La.	Stokes
Conyers	McClure	Stubblefield
Davis, Ga.	McCormack	Stuckey
Dingell	McDonald,	Talcott
Dowdy	Mich.	Wampler
Edmondson	McMillan	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rooney of New York and Mr. Ryan for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Blatnik and Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Burleson of Missouri against.

Mr. Nedzi and Mr. Stokes for, with Mr. McMillan against.

Mr. Clay and Mrs. Mink for, with Mr. Lennon against.

Mr. Conyers and Mr. Pepper for, with Mr. Rarick against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Stephens with Mr. Goldwater.

Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Baker.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Hutchinson.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. McClure.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.

Mr. Hagan with Mr. Mayne.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Chamberlain.

Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Pelly.

Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Ichord with Mr. Brown of Michigan.

Mr. Blanton with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.

Mr. McCormack with Mr. Mathias of California.

Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Conte.

Mr. Caffery with Mr. Wampler.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Landrum.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Pryor of Arkansas.

Mr. Hungate with Mr. Gallagher.

Messrs. RUNNELS and DEVINE changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a similar Senate bill (S. 2854) to amend title 28, United States Code, relating to annuities of widows of Supreme Court Justices.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 2854

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, section 375 of title 28, United States Code is amended:

(a) By striking from subsection (a) the words "in the amount payable to the beneficiary under the Act of January 14, 1937 (50 Stat. 923, chapter 3)" and substituting in lieu thereof the words "of $10,000".

(b) By adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) If a Justice of the United States who was in regular active service on the date of the enactment of this Act or who resigned or retired under the provisions of this chapter prior to the date of the enactment of this Act and who on that date was receiving salary under section 371 of title 28, United States Code, gives notice in writing to the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts of an election to become subject to section 376, the widow of such Justice shall be ineligible to receive an annuity under this section after the date of such notice: *Provided, however,* That if such Justice does not elect to become subject to section 376, or, having elected to become subject to section 376, he fails to make a five-year deposit or, in the alternative, does not complete five years of service for which deductions were made under section 376(b), his widow shall be paid an annuity of $5,000."

SEC. 2. Section 375 of title 28, United States Code, as amended by section 1(a) of this Act, shall not apply to the benefit of a widow whose spouse became a Justice of the United States after the date of enactment of this Act or whose eligibility is determined under the first sentence of subsection (c) of section 375.

SEC. 3. Section 376 of title 28, United States Code, as amended, is amended by inserting "Justice or" prior to the word "judge" and by inserting "Justice's or" prior to the word "judge's" wherever those words appear therein, except in section 376(q).

SEC. 4. A Justice of the United States, in regular active service on the date of the enactment of this Act, or who resigned or retired prior to the date of enactment of this Act and who on that date is receiving salary under section 371 of title 28, United States Code, as amended, shall be entitled within six months after enactment of this Act to make the election authorized by and to receive the benefits of section 376.

SEC. 5. Section 604(a)(7) of title 28, United States Code, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(7) Regulate and pay annuities to widows and surviving dependent children of Justices and judges, Directors of the Federal Judicial Center, and Directors of the Administrative Office, and necessary travel and subsistence expenses incurred by judges, court officers and employees, and officers and employees of the Administrative Office, and the Federal Judicial Center, while absent from their official stations on official business."

SEC. 6. (a) Item 376 of the analysis of chapter 17 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"376. Annuities to widows and surviving dependent children of Justices and judges."

(b) The catchline to section 376 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 376. Annuities to widows and surviving dependent children of Justices and judges".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CELLER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 2854 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 12101, as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 12101) was laid on the table.

EXPANDED PROTECTION OF FOREIGN OFFICIALS

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 15883) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for expanded protection of foreign officials, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 15883

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Act for the Protection of Foreign Officials".

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress recognizes that from the beginning of our history as a nation, the police power to investigate, prosecute, and punish common crimes such as murder, kidnaping, and assault has resided in the several States, and that such power should remain with the States.

The Congress finds, however, that harassment, intimidation, obstruction, coercion, and acts of violence committed against foreign officials or their family members in the United States adversely affect the foreign relations of the United States.

Accordingly, this legislation is intended to afford the United States jurisdiction concurrent with that of the several States to proceed against those who by such acts interfere with its conduct of foreign affairs.

TITLE I—MURDER OR MANSLAUGHTER OF FOREIGN OFFICIALS

SEC. 101. Chapter 51 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"§ 1116. Murder or manslaughter of foreign officials

"(a) Whoever kills a foreign official shall be punished as provided under section 1111 and 1112 of this title, except that any such person who is found guilty of murder in the first degree shall be sentenced to imprisonment for life.

"(b) For the purpose of this section 'foreign official' means—

"(1) a Chief of State or the political equivalent, President, Vice President, Prime Minister, Ambassador, Foreign Minister, or other officer of cabinet rank or above of a foreign government or the chief executive officer of an international organization, or any person who has previously served in such capacity, and any member of his family, while in the United States; and

"(2) any person of a foreign nationality who is duly notified to the United States as an officer or employee of a foreign government or international organization, and who is in the United States on official business, and any member of his family whose presence in the United States is in connection with the presence of such officer or employee.

"(c) For the purpose of this section:

"(1) 'Foreign government' means the government of a foreign country, irrespective of recognition by the United States.

"(2) 'International organization' means a public international organization designated as such pursuant to section 1 of the International Organizations Immunities Act (22 U.S.C. 288).

"(3) 'Family' includes (a) a spouse, parent, brother or sister, child, or person to whom the foreign official stands in loco parentis, or (b) any other person living in his household and related to the foreign official by blood or marriage.

"§ 1117. Conspiracy to murder

"If two or more persons conspire to violate section 1111, 1114, or 1116 of this title, and one or more of such persons do any overt act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each shall be punished by imprisonment for any term of years or for life."

SEC. 102. The analysis of chapter 5 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new items:

"1116. Murder or manslaughter of foreign officials.

"1117. Conspiracy to murder."

TITLE II—KIDNAPING

SEC. 201. Section 1201 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1201. Kidnaping

"(a) Whoever unlawfully seizes, confines, inveigles, decoys, kidnaps, abducts, or carries away and holds for ransom or reward or otherwise any person, except in the case of a minor by the parent thereof, when:

"(1) the person is willfully transported in interstate or foreign commerce;

"(2) any such act against the person is done within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States;

"(3) any such act against the person is done within the special aircraft jurisdiction of the United States as defined in section 101(32 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1301(32)); or

"(4) the person is a foreign official as defined in section 1116(b) of this title,

shall be punished by imprisonment for any term of years or for life.

"(b) With respect to subsection (a)(1), above, the failure to release the victim within twenty-four hours after he shall have been unlawfully seized, confined, inveigled, decoyed, kidnaped, abducted or carried away shall create a rebuttable presumption that such person has been transported in interstate or foreign commerce.

"(c) If two or more persons conspire to violate this section and one or more of such persons do any overt act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each shall be punished by imprisonment for any term of years or for life."

SEC. 202. The analysis of chapter 55 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by deleting

"1201. Transportation.",

and substituting the following:

"1201. Kidnaping."

TITLE III—PROTECTION OF FOREIGN OFFICIALS

SEC. 301. Section 112 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 112. Protection of foreign officials

"(a) Whoever assaults, strikes, wounds, imprisons, or offers violence to a foreign official shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than three years, or both. Whoever in the commission of any such act uses a deadly or dangerous weapon shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both.

"(b) Whoever willfully intimidates, coerces, threatens, or harasses a foreign official, or willfully obstructs him in the performance of his duties, shall be fined not more than $500, or imprisoned not more than six months, or both.

"(c) Whoever within the United States but outside the District of Columbia and within one hundred feet of any building or premises belonging to or used or occupied by a foreign government or by a foreign official for diplomatic or consular purposes, or as a mission to an international organization, or as a residence of a foreign official, or belonging to or used or occupied by an international organization for official business or residential purposes, publicly—

"(1) parades, pickets, displays any flag, banner, sign, placard, or device, or utters any word, phrase, sound, or noise, for the purpose of intimidating, coercing, threatening, or harassing any foreign official or obstructing him in the performance of his duties, or

"(2) congregates with two or more other persons with the intent to perform any of the aforesaid acts or to violate subsection (a) or (b) of this section,

shall be fined not more than $500, or imprisoned not more than six months, or both.

"(d) For the purpose of this section 'foreign official', 'foreign government', and 'international organization' shall have the same meanings as those provided in sections 1116 (b) and (c) of this title."

SEC. 302. The analysis of chapter 7 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by deleting

"112. Assaulting certain foreign diplomats and other official personnel."

and adding at the beginning thereof the following new item:

"112. Protection for foreign officials."

TITLE IV—PROTECTION OF PROPERTY OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 401. Chapter 45 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 970. Protection of property occupied by foreign governments

"(a) Whoever willfully injures, damages, or destroys, or attempts to injure, damage, or destroy, any property, real or personal, located within the United States and belonging to or utilized or occupied by any foreign government or international organization, or by a foreign official, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(b) For the purpose of this section 'foreign official', 'foreign government', and 'international organization' shall have the same meanings as those provided in sections 1116 (b) and (c) of this title."

SEC. 402. The analysis of chapter 45 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"970. Protection of property occupied by foreign governments."

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to indicate an intent on the part of Congress to occupy the field in which its provisions operate to the exclusion of the laws of any State, Commonwealth, territory, possession, or the District of Columbia on the same subject matter, nor to relieve any person of any obligation imposed by any law of any State, Commonwealth, territory, possession, or the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 15883 amends title 18 of the United States Code so as to provide protection for diplomats and foreign officials. It is a fundamental fact that under international law every country has the obligation to protect foreign officials who perform diplomatic or consular functions within that country. This obligation has been very clearly defined in the case of *Frend* v. *United States*, 100 F. 2d 691, which involved the District of Columbia statute protecting embassies. The Court stated in that case:

As in war the bearers of flags of truce are sacred, or else wars would be interminable, so in peace ambassadors, public ministers, and consuls, charged with friendly national intercourse, are objects of especial respect and protection, each according to the rights belonging to his rank and station. The law of nations, therefore, requires every government to take all reasonable precautions to prevent the doing of the things which the [D.C. statute protecting embassies] make unlawful. The rule arises out of the necessity of the protection of nations in their intercourse with each other, and imposes on the Government of the United States responsibility to foreign nations for all violations by the United States of their international obligations. *United States* v. *Arjona*, 120 U.S. 479, 483–485 * * *. This responsibility includes the duty of protecting the residence of an ambassador or minister against invasion as well as against any other act tending to disturb the peace or dignity of the mission or of the member of the mission. (100 F. 2d at 693) (Footnotes omitted).

It is also pointed out that the continued validity of the Frend holding has been reaffirmed by three opinions in 1970: by the District of Columbia Court of Appeals (*Zaimi* v. *United States*, 261 A.2d 233); the United States District Court for the District of Columbia (*Jews for Urban Justice* v. *Wilson*, 311 F. Supp. 1158); and by the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, in an unreported opinion (*United States* v. *Travers*, Crim. No. U.S. 42935–69).

The bill, H.R. 15883, is based upon the recommendations of an executive communication from the Department of State and Justice. A bill H.R. 10520, was introduced in accordance with the recommendations of the executive communication. That bill would have covered both foreign officials and public officials of the United States. After considering the

legislation the committee concluded that the changes in the law proposed as to Federal officials and employees should be considered separately from that proposed for foreign officials and diplomatic personnel. The present bill, H.R. 15883, was introduced to cover foreign officials in this manner and includes provisions recommended by the executive communication as to foreign officials. It should be noted that the penalty provisions in new section 1116 and revised 1201 as contained in this bill differ from those proposed in the executive communication and revised section 112(c) contains modified language.

At a hearing on the earlier bill on March 16, 1972, Hon. William B. Macomber, Jr., Deputy Under Secretary of State for Management, testifying in support of the bill, referred to the fact that recently there has been a disturbing increase of violence directed against diplomats. Throughout the world diplomats are not only the victims of crimes to which average citizens are subject, but now crimes are being committed against diplomats for new reasons. They may be the victims of crimes committed by terrorists who disagree with the policies of a country. Obviously, making diplomats into political pawns is gravely damaging to the conduct of relations among States.

Political violence directed against diplomats and diplomatic missions has occurred in the United States. The U.S. Federal Government needs the authority to cope with it. The executive communication itself stated:

> Review of resources available to the Federal Government to meet these new and substantial threats to foreign . . . officials has disclosed alarming omissions and inconsistencies in existing federal criminal jurisdiction over such matters. Correction of these deficiencies need not and should not await the actual occurrence of a tragedy.

As I noted at the outset the United States has an obligation under international law as a host country to provide protection for diplomatic, consular, and other foreign government and international organization personnel and their families, and the property of foreign governments and international organizations. This obligation is fundamental to the consideration of this bill. Passage of the amended bill would enable the United States to take a direct part in the discharge of these international obligations as a host country. Of course, in most instances, the Federal Government can press for the cooperation of local authorities. However, in dealing with other countries the Federal Government has no way to assure them or to guarantee that such cooperation will be forthcoming. It follows from the accepted rule of international law that the host country is under a special duty to protect the diplomatic and consular premises of a foreign government, that the host country has a duty to take all appropriate steps to prevent any attack on the person of a diplomatic or consular agent. The United States has, in fact, had a law on the books since 1790 making it a criminal offense to infract the law of nations by offering violence to the person of a foreign minister. See, for example, 18 U.S.C. 112; *United States* v. *Ortega*, 248 U.S. 466 (1826). While the United States has always recognized this responsibility, the committee notes that the present Federal law does not give the Government the authority to carry that responsibility out fully. While local authorities are, in fact, cooperative in providing protection for diplomatic personnel, when diplomats become the object of political violence, the situation is somewhat changed, particularly in those areas where there is a high concentration of diplomats. Local resources may not be adequate to this special situation.

From the standpoint of our country, this is a most difficult situation since such acts of violence directly affect the foreign relations of the United States. The provisions of the amended bill make it clear that authorities of the States and their subdivisions will continue to have responsibility for vigilant efforts to provide adequate protection. At the same time enactment of the provisions in the amended bill will also provide the Federal Government with the necessary tools to take action when required. This makes sense, for when such incidents occur the Nation whose diplomat or property has been injured approaches the Department of State directly, through diplomatic channels, with the facts relevant to the incident. Federal authorities would, therefore, in certain cases, be in a position to deal more quickly and appropriately with the matter.

As has been outlined in the report on the bill, two categories of foreign officials are covered by the proposed legislation in new section 1116. The first contains those officials of very high rank—a chief of state or the political equivalent, president, vice president, foreign minister, ambassador, or other officer of cabinet rank or above.

The second category of foreign officials covered by section 1116 includes officials of lower rank who must be duly notified to the United States and who must be here on official business. This class includes officers and employees of embassies and consulates, of missions of their governments to international organizations, and of trade and commercial offices of foreign governments. It also includes officers and employees of international organizations who are not U.S. citizens.

The provisions of title 18 added by the amended bill would cover murder, or manslaughter, and conspiracy to murder, kidnaping, and conspiracy to kidnap; assault; and harassment of foreign officials. Federal law—specificially section 112 of title 18 of the United States Code—currently covers only assaults against visiting heads of foreign states, heads of government and foreign ministers, as well as ambassadors and other public ministers. This coverage is clearly insufficient at the present time. It is not clear that the present statute covers embassy personnel in Washington below the rank of minister, or that it covers representatives to international organizations. Furthermore, the statute is limited in that it covers only various forms of assault. The committee notes that long standing accepted status of this statute does demonstrate both that there is clearly no impediment to the enactment of Federal criminal law for the protection of diplomats and that the enactment of such legislation is entirely appropriate as a policy matter.

In its amended form section 112 of title 18 would proscribe assaults on specifically designated foreign officials and would be co-extensive in coverage with new section 1116 of the title pertaining to homicides of foreign officials. As was outlined in the explanation of the amended bill, as amended, section 112(a) makes it a Federal offense to assault, strike, wound, imprison, or offer violence to a foreign official, subject to a fine up to $5,000 or imprisonment up to 3 years, or both. If a deadly weapon is used the fine may be increased to $10,000 and the term to 10 years. Identical penalties may be imposed under existing section 112.

Section 112(b) makes it a misdemeanor to willfully intimidate, coerce, threaten, or harass a foreign official or to willfully obstruct him in the performance of his duties.

In its amended form, section 112(c) bars, within 100 feet of buildings or premises belonging to, or used or occupied by a foreign government for the specific uses stated in the subsection, parades, signs, placards, or devices or sounds or picketing, the display of flags, banners, noises—including words or phrases—when the activity is:

> For the purposes of intimidating, coercing, threatening, or harassing any foreign official or obstructing him in the performance of his duties, . . .

The subsection further provides penalties for persons who within that 100-foot area congregate with two or more other persons with the intent to perform any of those acts or who congregate with the intent to violate the provisions of subsections (a) or (b) of section 112.

The purpose of subsection 112(c) is to protect the peace, dignity, and security of foreign officials when they are at their place of work. This provision would not apply to the District of Columbia because the District law already affords protection to foreign officials in the Nation's Capital—D.C. Code 25–1115. While the District law has a "500-foot rule," the narrower radius has been adopted for the more general provision of this bill in order to minimize interference with the freedom of ingress and egress of individuals in the vicinity of foreign government offices in congested metropolitan areas.

At the beginning of the report it was stated that the provisions of the bill have the purpose of extending protection to diplomatic representatives of foreign nations. The committee feels it is relevant to note that the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit has indicated that the Government has an affirmative duty to give diplomatic representatives of foreign nations a degree of protection from harassment which is greater than it owes to its own citizens or officials. (*Frend* v. *United States*, 100 F. 2d 691 (D.C. Cir. 1938), cert. denied, 306 U.S. 640).

In connection with the amendments

extending protection to foreign officials the bill H.R. 15883, as amended, by the committee in title II would make a number of changes in the Federal kidnaping statute—18 U.S.C. 1201. Under existing law, the gist of the offense is the transportation of a person in interstate or foreign commerce, rather than the actual kidnaping. As contained in the amended bill the section would make the kidnaping itself the gist of the offense. This change will assist in extraditing kidnapers from foreign countries. Under extradition treaties, an offense is extraditable only if the crime for which extradition is sought is listed in the treaty. Because most countries do not have a federal system such as ours, the treaties do not recognize the crime of interstate transportation of a kidnaped person. By redrafting the section in terms of kidnaping rather than transportation, extradition for these offenses will be facilitated.

Additional bases of Federal jurisdiction over kidnaping have been added, consistent with the general purpose of the bill. Consistent with the basic purpose of this bill to protect foreign officials, kidnaping of foreign officials and members of their families would be covered by Federal laws. At the hearing it was noted that there has been a rash of kidnapings of diplomats in a number of countries throughout the world in the past few years. While they have not occurred in this country, the committee agrees that it is advisable to insure that the Federal Government could act promptly if such a thing should happen here.

Jurisdiction is asserted also over kidnaping occurring in the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States. The jurisdiction already exists with respect to other crimes against the person, such as murder—18 U.S.C. 1111—and assault—18 U.S.C. 113.

It is anomalous that kidnaping is not covered in the same manner. Jurisdiction would also be extended by H.R. 15883 to kidnaping occurring in the special airspace of the United States. This would cover, for example, kidnapings incident to aircraft hijackings and would permit extradition in those cases where a treaty covers kidnaping but not aircraft hijacking. While it is true that the Senate has ratified the Convention for Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft. Congress has not yet enacted the implementing legislation—S. 2280, H.R. 9354. Moreover, it is relevant to note that extradition under the convention and legislation would only be available as between nations that are parties to the convention.

The amended bill in adding a new section 970 to title 18 would also make it a Federal offense willfully to injure, damage, or destroy any real or personal property located in the United States and belonging to or utilized or occupied by any foreign government or international organization, or by a foreign official. Attempts are also covered. Thus embassies, consulates, missions to international organizations, the residences of foreign officials, and trade and commercial offices of foreign governments would be covered. The provision also covers real and personal property, including automobiles and other vehicles, used for official or unofficial purposes.

Section 3 of the bill expressly states that nothing contained in the enactment of the provisions of the bill shall be construed to indicate an intent on the part of Congress to occupy the field in which its provisions operate to the exclusion of the laws of any State, Commonwealth, territory, possession, or the District of Columbia on the same subject matter. It is further provided that nothing in the provisions added by the bill is to be construed in a manner which would relieve any person of any obligation imposed by any law of any State, Commonwealth, territory, possession, or the District of Columbia.

It is, therefore, made clear that this legislation is intended to provide the U.S. criminal jurisdiction which is to be exercised in a manner which may be concurrent with that of the several States.

The amended bill provides for revisions in Federal criminal law which are both necessary and desirable. The passage of this legislation would provide the Government with authority necessary to protect foreign officials in accordance with our international obligations. It is recommended that the amended bill be considered favorably.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONOHUE. I will be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding.

Is a foreign official, in this country legally and in an official status, not protected by the laws of the United States?

Mr. DONOHUE. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa he is protected. He is protected under a treaty existing between our Government and foreign governments, and the foreign governments extend that same protection to our diplomatic and consular personnel that might be residing in a foreign country. However, this legislation is merely to implement existing treaties.

Mr. GROSS. I just wonder if this is not implementing the law so as to make second-class citizens out of Americans kidnaped within their own country. If the foreigner here legally and on official business is not protected by the laws of the United States, then something is wrong with the system in this country.

Mr. DONOHUE. I might repeat to the gentleman they are in the general sense protected by treaty and they are also protected by the laws of the particular State or territory in which they might be residing. This merely confers concurrent jurisdiction on the United States along with the individual States.

The exercise of Federal jurisdiction would be quite similar to the situation that existed in connection with the attempted assassination of Mr. Wallace. Of course, the State of Maryland had jurisdiction to prosecute the person accused of the attempted assassination, but under the law that was passed by this Congress the U.S. Government also acquired jurisdiction to prosecute him for the attempted murder. Up until that time the Congress acted the United States had no jurisdiction over prosecuting such people.

Mr. GROSS. In the case of the kidnaping of a foreign official legally in this country, would not the Lindbergh law be invoked upon the kidnaper?

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONOHUE. I will be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MAYNE. The answer to the question propounded by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) is that the Lindbergh law would be invoked only if interstate or foreign commerce were involved.

Mr. GROSS. That would also be true with a U.S. citizen, would it not?

Mr. MAYNE. Well, yes, but this bill would give jurisdiction whenever a foreign official is kidnaped, whether interstate or foreign commerce is involved in the perpetration of the crime or not.

Further, we think it is essential that we furnish this additional protection to foreign officials in the United States if our own officials in foreign countries are going to be similarly protected. And I would add many of our Ambassadors and foreign service personnel are rendering outstanding service to this country under the most difficult circumstances and are very much in need of additional protection.

Mr. GROSS. That is precisely the point I am making. Why special legislation for foreigners in this country? Why not provide the same protection for U.S. citizens?

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

Mr. DONOHUE. I will be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, in response to the question posed by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS), I think it should be understood that the kidnaping provision in this bill relating changes the Lindberg law substantially and in some respects the consequences are the same for foreign officials as domestic citizens. The changes are ones of defining the Federal jurisdiction of the offense. The present Lindbergh law takes as the gist of its definition the movement of the victime in interstate commerce. The title in this bill changes the gist to be the wrongful conduct—the seizure and taking away of the victims and then fixes several jurisdictional bases in addition to movement of the victim in interstate commerce, such as seizures within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, or within the special aircraft jurisdiction of the United States. The kidnaping of a foreign official would be a separate jurisdictional base.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman from Virginia saying that there is the same protection provided an American citizen?

Mr. POFF. I am.

Mr. GROSS. In this bill?

Mr. POFF. It is.

Mr. GROSS. Then the title is not quite right because it applies to foreigners, or it leads you to believe that it does.

Mr. POFF. The gentleman is correct, but the gentleman will also notice that

in the title of the bill it says "and for other purposes."

Mr. GROSS. Which covers a multitude of sins.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DONOHUE) about the demonstration provision. Why in the District of Columbia is it within 100 feet, let us say, of an embassy, but this bill provides outside the District of Columbia for an area of 500 feet or more?

Mr. DONOHUE. It is 100 feet.

Mr. GROSS. Outside the District of Columbia?

Mr. DONOHUE. It is 500 feet within the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. Five hundred feet in the District of Columbia?

Mr. DONOHUE. That is correct, and 100 feet outside the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. You say it is 100 feet in the District of Columbia, is that correct?

Mr. DONOHUE. No, it is 500 feet in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. And 100 feet outside the District?

Mr. DONOHUE. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. Why that difference?

Mr. DONOHUE. The reason for it, as presented to us in the committee, was because while a degree of protection must be provided outside the District, it was felt that the smaller area should apply in congested metropolitan areas. An example is New York where there are a considerable number of diplomats residing in the area that are here with the United Nations.

In reply to the gentleman I would point out that applies everywhere—it might be a consular office in Chicago.

Mr. GROSS. And it would apply equally there; would it not, outside the District of Columbia?

Mr. DONOHUE. It would.

Mr. GROSS. That is exactly the point. Why one distance in one place and a much greater distance in another?

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

Mr. DONOHUE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, in response to the question of the gentleman from Iowa, it is true that the District of Columbia statute fixes a zone with a radius of 500 feet, whereas this bill fixes the zone at a radius of 100 feet.

The reason the radius was changed is to accommodate the realities of the metropolitan areas in which diplomatic and consular personnel from abroad are typically concentrated in this country.

The executive communication from the Departments of State and Justice specifically said that a narrower radius has been adopted in order to minimize interference with the free ingress and egress of individuals upon public property in the vicinity of diplomatic missions and consulates, residence of foreign officials and officers of international organizations located in congested metropolitan areas in such cities as New York, San Francisco and Chicago.

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

Mr. DONOHUE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, first I would like the gentleman to tell me what sections 1111 and 1112 provide because the bill recites a manslaughter charge of a foreign official shall be punished as provided in sections 1111 and 1112.

Could the gentleman enlighten me as to that?

In other words, I assume that sections 1111 and 1112 would define the punishment for manslaughter?

Mr. DONOHUE. Section 1111 reads as follows:

> Murder is the unlawful killing of a human being with malice aforethought. Every murder perpetrated by poison, lying in wait, or any other kind of willful, deliberate, malicious, and premeditated killing; or committed in the perpetration of, or attempt to perpetrate, any arson, rape, burglary, or robbery; or perpetrated from a premeditated design unlawfully and maliciously to effect the death of any human being other than him who is killed, is murder in the first degree.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, does not this section provide a definite sentence for murder 1 or for manslaughter and mandates such a sentence as compared to the conviction of an individual who is an American citizen who is convicted of killing some 12-year-old little girl, who may not get equal treatment?

Mr. DONOHUE. In the bill before us, it provides that whoever kills a foreign official shall be punished as provided in section 1111 and 1112 of this title except that any such person who is found guilty of murder in the first degree shall be sentenced to imprisonment for life.

Mr. PODELL. In other words, if you kill a 12-year-old girl, you may not get life imprisonment; you may get 10 years. But if you kill the brother of a foreign official who may just live here and live in the same house as the foreign official, you might get life imprisonment. Is that not what it says—really?

Mr. DONOHUE. The wording of the bill before us in this particular respect was arranged because of the recent Supreme Court decision in the case of Furman against the State of Georgia.

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

Mr. DONOHUE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POFF. In response to the gentleman's hypothetical question—the answer is "No." A mandatory sentence of life imprisonment would apply in the case of first degree murder of a 10-year-old child also, because of the Furman decision.

Mr. PODELL. And manslaughter?

Mr. POFF. I did not understand the gentleman's hypothetical question to include manslaughter.

Mr. PODELL. Should the conviction be for manslaughter, would there be any distinction between the sentence in connection with manslaughter of a foreign official and an American citizen?

Mr. POFF. There would be no distinction.

Mr. PODELL. There would be none at all?

Mr. POFF. No, sir.

Mr. PODELL. There would be none at all and if the gentleman would yield further, will the gentleman tell me why your bill would include the brother or brother-in-law of a foreign official, regardless of whether or not he is employed on foreign business, merely because of the fact that he may reside with his brother or brother-in-law at this embassy house?

Mr. DONOHUE. Well, of course, as in all criminal cases, you must establish jurisdiction as provided in the statute, if the brother-in-law or brother comes within the provisions of section 1116(b) and (c). I would point out that under section 1116(b)(2) the family member would be one "whose presence in the United States is in connection with the presence in the United States" of a diplomatic officer.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIELSON).

Mr. DANIELSON. I should like to respond to the gentleman from New York, if I may, that the definition of "family," which is included in this proposed law, is set forth in subsection (3) of section 101 on page 3, starting at line 20, and this would include spouse, parent, brother or sister, child, or person to whom the foreign official stands in loco parentis, or any other person living in his household and related to the foreign official by blood or marriage. I should think that would include, under at least one of the gentleman's hypothetical situations, the brother-in-law.

Mr. PODELL. That would include a brother-in-law.

Mr. DANIELSON. I would think so. That is the way it reads.

Mr. PODELL. Would the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. DANIELSON. I would be glad to yield.

Mr. PODELL. Under the harassment provision of this bill, a foreign official need not be present to testify to harassment allegedly performed against that foreign official; is that correct?

Mr. DANIELSON. I cannot tell you just what the rule would be as to the attendance and testimony of a foreign official, but the rules of evidence which would apply and govern the introduction of evidence in prosecutions under this bill would be the same rules of evidence that govern all criminal proscutions in the Federal courts. As a person who has done a considerable amount of that prosecuting, I can assure you that if you do not have witnesses to prove your case, you are not going to prove your case.

Mr. PODELL. There is no distinction between necessary evidence that an American citizen would require and that of a foreign official?

Mr. DANIELSON. No. It simply makes the Federal law apply to foreign diplomats who are accredited here, who are notified by the Department of State. The same laws of evidence apply as would apply if you were dealing with American citizens.

Mr. CELLER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIELSON. Yes; I would be delighted to yield.

Mr. CELLER. I would like an answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. GROSS. I would like to call attention to the case of *Frend* v. *United States*, 100 F. 2d 691. There the U.S. Court of Ap-

peals for the District of Columbia, D.C. Circuit, has indicated that the Government has an affirmative duty to give diplomatic representatives of foreign nations a degree of protection from harassment which is greater than owed to its own citizens or officials of the United States.

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

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that the purpose of this legislation is to protect foreign officials. Perhaps it is more accurate to say that the purpose of this legislation is to promote the conduct of the foreign affairs of the United States by protecting the property and the personnel of foreign governments while they are present in this country. Such a purpose is not only the right of the Federal Government, it is not only within its proper constitutional domain and power, but such a purpose is also the responsibility of the Federal Government under the accepted law of nations.

The exercise of the power necessary to discharge that responsibility involves the use of police powers. Under our Constitution the police power resides permanently in the powers reserved to the States. Let me hasten to assure the Speaker that this bill leaves that power where it is. It does not preempt State power.

As the learned gentleman from Massachusetts so well explained, this legislation simply fixes in the Federal Government jurisdiction concurrent with that of the individual States.

I think it is important too, Mr. Speaker, to understand that this is not the first time the Congress has ventured into this legislative area.

It has long been a Federal crime to assault or wound certain high officials of foreign governments, even though such an assault would also constitute an offense against the laws of the particular State in which it is committed. H.R. 15883 would give the Federal Government a similar power, concurrent with that of the several States, to prosecute and punish other acts of violence directed against foreign officials or their property, including murder, manslaugster, kidnaping, willful harassment, and willful destruction of property.

In no case will the several States be ousted of whatever jurisdiction they may now exercise over such offenses. Rather, as in cases of assassination or attempted assassination of presidential candidates, the investigative and prosecutorial resources of the Federal Government may be brought to bear in apprehending and punishing the perpetrator whenever the Department of Justice, in consultation with the Department of State, deems such action to be in the national interest.

The principal differences between H.R. 15883, the bill before us today, and H.R. 10502, which I introduced a year ago along with several other members of the Committee on the Judiciary, as reported to the House this past June are to be found in the penalty provisions for murder and kidnaping. The same day that H.R. 10505 was reported, the Supreme Court of the United States rendered its decision in the case of Furman against Georgia. My reading of the nine separate opinions in that case convinces me that the Supreme Court would probably hold unconstitutional any death penalty provision, such as those contained in H.R. 10502, which vests in the sentencing authority an absolute discretion whether to impose the death penalty or some lesser offense in any particular case. I am informed that the Department of Justice shares this view.

Accordingly, I introduced H.R. 15883 as a clean bill, amending the penalty provisions to avoid facial invalidity and also incorporating other amendments to H.R. 10502 which had been made by the committee before reporting it favorably to the House in June.

The conforming of the penalty provisions of this bill to the apparent requirements of the Furman decision is nothing but a stopgap handling of the death penalty question. A more lasting determination of how, and whether, the death penalty might be prescribed for the offenses covered by this bill, or for any other Federal crime, is an important and complex matter in itself, and passage of this otherwise relatively noncontroversial measure should not await a permanent resolution of that issue.

The committee reported H.R. 15883 to the House with two amendments, both pertaining to the antipicketing provision of section 301 of the bill.

The first refines the definition of the premises to which the prohibition of harassing demonstrations relates. I accept and support that amendment, since it more clearly limits the coverage of the subsection to those premises which are ordinarily and regularly used to carry out the official business of the foreign government's embassy, consulate, or mission—whether those premises are annexed to or separated from the main consular building—or as official residential property. Of course, any premises which might be temporarily used on an emergency basis in substitution for the premises in which such diplomatic or consular activities are normally carried out would likewise be covered.

The second amendment struck from the subsection the flat, evenhanded prohibition against expression of views, whether critical or laudatory, about the policies or personnel of a foreign government by public picketing or demonstrations within 100 feet of that government's diplomatic or residential property. What remains is a proscription of demonstrations within that zone for the purpose of intimidating, coercing, threatening, or harassing a foreign official or of obstructing him in the performance of his duties. Congregations with the intent to conduct such a demonstration would likewise be prohibited.

To be frank, this limitation of the scope of the antipicketing provision leaves it scarcely more effective in creating a small area of sanctuary from political controversy for our foreign diplomatic guests than is the general prohibition against intimidation, coercion, threats or harassment, applicable anywhere, which is contained in the preceding subsection.

While I would much prefer to see the language deleted from this portion of H.R. 15883 restored, my objection to the committee amendment does not outweigh my sense of urgency that the House pass the bill today as reported. We can thereby make a major advance toward enactment in this session of Congress of legislation which both the Department of State and the Department of Justice consider necessary to meet a pressing national need.

Finally, title II of the bill reformulates the jurisdictional bases of the Federal kidnaping statute, making it more understandable to our foreign friends for purposes of extradition.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 15883 provides the Federal Government with the means of avoiding the embarrassment and potentially dangerous repercussions which may arise from a foreign government's misunderstanding of our national government's motivations in failing to respond appropriately to some future incident involving one of its officials.

Because the headquarters of the United Nations organization was located on our shores at our request, this country plays host to an unusually large number of foreign diplomats to whom we owe a special duty of protection. This legislation is intended to benefit all of such guests, with neither favor nor slight to any of them. Those who today appear to need such added Federal protection least may tomorrow need it most, so swiftly do events move in today's world.

Mr. Speaker, this is a measure with strong bipartisan support. I urge the House to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 15883.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, section 112 of this bill is entitled "Protection of foreign officials." and it states, in part:

> Whoever . . . parades, pickets, displays any flag, banner, sign, placard, or device, or utters any word, phrase, sound, or noise, for the purpose of . . . intimidating, coercing, threatening, or harassing any foreign official . . .

Let me ask the gentleman this question: Do the same penalties apply for other demonstrations against the Government? Am I to understand that this section goes to violations and penalties outside the District of Columbia?

Would the same penalties apply for this same sort of thing on the Washington Monument grounds?

Mr. POFF. The gentleman first spoke of jurisdiction outside the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. I could conjure up a situation or a site outside the District of Columbia, if that is important. I just want to know whether the same penalties apply across the country for the same acts, growing out of demonstrations, as contained in this bill.

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

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute to respond to the gentleman.

I am candid to tell the gentleman I am not familiar with all the penalty clauses

which might apply to every conceivable fact situation. However, I can say without fear that I will be contradicted that the same penalties or greater than those provided by this bill will apply to similar conduct wherever it occurs.

This penalty makes the crime a petty offense, drawing only a maximum 6-month jail term, and as such could be tried by a magistrate.

Mr. GROSS. There is also a $5,000 fine.

Mr. POFF. The gentleman is correct as to assaults, but there is only a maximum $500 fine for demonstrations.

Mr. GROSS. There is a $5,000 fine provided in this section of the bill, and apparently for these violations.

Mr. POFF. It is a maximum penalty of a $500 fine or 6 months in jail.

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

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

Mr. DANIELSON. I should like to point out that there are three different penalties in section 112.

Section 112(a) relates to an actual act of violence against the person of a foreign diplomat. There we have a $5,000 maximum fine and a 3-year maximum imprisonment. If a dangerous weapon is used, the penalty goes up to $10,000 or 10 years. That is the maximum.

As to the acts which the gentleman from Iowa has described, such as parading, picketing, and the like, those are misdemeanors, and the maximum fine is $500, and the maximum jail term is 6 months.

Mr. POFF. I thank my colleague.

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

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLORY).

Mr. McCLORY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Virginia for his very eloquent, very logical and clarifying statement in support of this bill, and I wish to indicate my strong support of it.

The very offensive behavior that has been practiced in this country and in many other countries throughout the world, of course, gives rise to this type of legislation.

What we are doing, it seems to me, is to assure the kind of protection for foreign nationals we expect them to provide for our representatives when they are on official business in other foreign countries.

It is true that the District of Columbia appears to have adequate laws to protect the embassies and those appropriately in the embassies and embassy properties.

At the same time, there are many other foreign establishments—foreign premises and offices in this country—which require a national law for their protection. So it is true we are providing additional protection by this legislation.

This is consistent, nevertheless, with principles we have adhered to since the earliest times, since 1790, when we first enacted a law to protect foreign diplomats.

Of course, we are applying here the law of nations which applies to all foreign nationals. Even in time of war when a representative of a belligerent nation would appear with a flag of truce, he was provided with complete protection.

So certainly, with respect to representatives of friendly nations, we need to provide this kind of protection.

The principal discussions which took place in the executive sessions of the full committee were related to the subject of congregations of persons within 100 feet of these offices of foreign countries. We revised that part of the bill so that it is limited to conduct or speech which intimidates or harasses or threatens the safety of foreign officials or their property.

It seems to me this is good legislation in respect to our foreign affairs. To even contemplate the conduct of foreign affairs on the streets with threats and brickbats and all kinds of offensive behavior is, of course, completely unthinkable. So, we in the Committee on the Judiciary are attempting to respond to the need for new laws consistent with the high ideals and principles of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 15883 is appropriately titled "An Act for the Protection of Foreign Officials."

International law obligates the United States—as it does all nations—to provide protection for diplomatic, consular, and other foreign government and international organization personnel and property located within its boundaries. This principle can be traced to the earliest relations between nations. As I mentioned earlier, since 1790, the United States has made threats of violence to the persons of a foreign minister a criminal offense. Through the years since that date, we have enacted other laws in the same spirit.

Recently, however, Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed a growing increase of violence directed against foreign officials throughout the world. In our own country, for example, embarrassing and sometimes violent protests have been mounted by some persons affiliated with the Jewish Defense League against the Soviet mission to the United Nations in New York.

The need for new laws to protect foreign officials and those representing international organizations was raised recently by the State Department when it was discovered that existing Federal statutes are wholly inadequate to protect these representatives against murder, kidnaping, or assaults. In providing a prompt response to this legislative need, the Judiciary Committee has recommended enactment of an act for the protection of foreign officials. Such a Federal law would expand the foreign officials' protection against every type of offensive conduct—including threatening demonstrations within a distance of 100 feet of the buildings or premises used or occupied by foreign governments and officials for diplomatic or other official purposes.

Many Americans might like to display their antagonism toward the Soviet Union by picketing every building and residence where Soviet Union representatives have their residences or offices. Other Americans might like to display similar hostility toward the Governments of Rhodesia and South Africa, where policies of apartheid prevail, or even the Government of Greece, where it is alleged that constitutional government has been replaced by a government of the colonels.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that a statute which would prevent an American from parading or picketing against another American individual or business would be a violation of the constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech and of assembly as contained in the first amendment. However, the U.S. courts have given their approval to identical language when directed against actions in opposition to foreign diplomats and foreign embassies.

Mr. Speaker, in upholding the supremacy of the law of nations, an earlier Federal court sustained the proposed congressional restriction upon the freedoms of speech and of assembly by declaring that such restrictions are applicable "only when such offensive conduct is committed upon the public streets immediately adjacent to embassies, legations, consulates, and other buildings used for official purposes by such governments." (*Frend* v. *U.S.*, 69 App. D.C. 281, 100 F.2d 691 (1938), cert. den. 306 U.S. 640.)

Mr. Speaker, resort to the streets may be tolerated to influence a political convention—or even as a protest against policies of our own Government. However, as a means of taking over the conduct of our foreign affairs, such tactics must be rejected. I urge the Congress to give effect to the law of nations by enacting this bill to protect foreign officials.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE).

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. As one of the original sponsors of this legislation when it was first introduced, I rise again in its strong support. I have previously had the privilege of testifying in its behalf at hearings before the subcommittee and gave it my strong support when it was considered by the full Judiciary Committee on which I have the honor to serve.

When Ambassador George Bush testified before the subcommittee on March 16 he very strongly emphasized the urgent and pressing need for this legislation. Certainly that urgency has in no way diminished in the 5 months that have gone by since he gave his testimony.

It is extremely important that our country be a safe place in which representatives of foreign nations can operate and particularly so by reason of the fact that the United Nations is situated in New York City.

We not only have the obligation of all civilized nations to extend protection to the emissaries of other countries but also the very special responsibility which arises out of our being the site of the U.N. As Ambassador Bush very accurately testified:

There can be no question that the United States, as the host country to the United Nations, is responsible for its physical security and for that of the foreign representatives to it. When the situation is such that the United Nations cannot function at top efficiency because of acts of violence, or when certain representatives to the United Nations feel so threatened by the atmosphere in this country that they do not believe they can function properly, then that reflects adversely on the United States. We also lose politically because, as the violence continues, and as we continue to reassure other countries that we are making all efforts we can, other countries slowly begin to lose confidence in our credibility."

There have been a number of incidents which have been extremely embarrassing to us as the host nation to the U.N., some seriously endangering the lives of foreign diplomats and their families. That of last October 20 is perhaps the most shocking of all, when a high-powered rifle was fired into the Soviet mission in the United Nations. Four shots were fired from a high-powered rifle into a room in which a number of small Russian children were sleeping at the time. Fortunately none was actually struck by the fusillade but all were rudely awakened and terrified. Neither the city of New York nor the State of New York, although both are charged under our laws with the responsibility for preserving the peace and the safety of all people within their borders, has as yet been able to solve this reprehensible crime which can only be classified as attempted murder.

This is a great embarrassment not only to New York City and New York State but also to the entire American people. Yet under existing law the investigative expertise of the FBI cannot be applied to the fullest extent because there is no showing that the assailant or assailants crossed State or National boundaries.

We should now with this legislation take steps to see to it that Federal authority is readily available to protect foreign diplomats and their families from such attacks before the event, and to investigate and solve such crimes promptly when they cannot be prevented altogether. The prosecution and conviction of those who violate this new law should be given the highest priority in our Federal courts. We cannot expect our own diplomats to receive any better protection than the emissaries of other countries are receiving here.

Some of the other violent incidents in New York City which were outlined by Ambassador Bush are also very shocking. On March 2 of last year, a firebomb was thrown at the Mission of Iraq causing property damage. On April 20 demonstrators tried to force their way into police lines and tried to break into that mission. On April 12, 1971, a pipe bomb was thrown and tore a hole in the wall of the 14th floor Madison Avenue office of the Consulate General.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MAYNE. On September 20, 1971, a pipe bomb exploded at the Mission of Zaire, causing property damage and injuring the daughter of an American citizen passing by. A few hours later, another pipe bomb was found at the Malawi Mission to the U.N. On December 28, 1971, the Syrian Mission was broken into by young people who sprayed red paint over the walls, bookcases, and rugs, and harassed the Syrian Ambassador by scattering leaflets in his presence.

Mr. Speaker, I feel we should act upon the urgent request of our Ambassador to the U.N., George Bush, who is well known to all of us, and pass this much-needed legislation promptly today. He also testified about the wives of Soviet diplomats being insulted and harassed while shopping in supermarkets and department stores. They were cursed in Russian and their feet trod upon. The Soviet Ambassador to the U.N. has been followed and the backs of his shoes stepped upon by hecklers. Bricks have been thrown through windows, paint has been thrown against the walls of buildings, motor oil has been placed in car radiators, burning rags in gas tanks and molotov cocktails have been thrown at mission vehicles. This is the kind of climate the United Nations has been living in.

As a result, Ambassador Bush had to conclude:

There is a general and, I am sad to say, a justified consensus among the representatives of members of the United Nations that their physical security is threatened.

I share his strong view that the least we can do as a country is to pass this legislation, to assure those foreign representatives of governments who find themselves in the United States that we, in the United States, are concerned for their safety here and that we will do what we can to protect it.

This issue—the issue of protecting foreign officials in the United States—has become a major one in the United Nations. It has an impact on other areas of substantive work of the United Nations and it is detrimental to the United States achieving its goal in that organization. Ambassador Bush made this very clear indeed in the following strong summation to the subcommittee:

In trying to persuade or convince another representative to support a U.S. position, I am obviously at a disadvantage if he carries the memory of a recent case of harassment or other incident which jeopardized his safety or that of his colleagues in his mission.

One step we can take to help alleviate the problem is the speedy passage of the legislation before you today. Like Mr. Macomber, I do not pretend that the passage of this legislation will solve all our problems in New York, or even solve most of them, but it is a concrete step we can take now. And it is an important step. Taking this step would give the Federal Government new tools. It would allow my staff more effectively to deal with certain crisis situations that occasionally occur and thus, I believe, would have substantive benefits in increasing the protection of foreign officials in New York. In addition, another benefit of enactment, from my perspective, would be to show the good faith of the United States. We have promised to do all we can to improve the situation. If we do not take this step, we not only give new ammunition to our enemies but we seriously risk the disillusionment of our friends.

I would also note that we expect—indeed demand—protection by the host country of our personnel stationed abroad. We should do no less than what we expect others to do. Otherwise we might be confronted with something less than adequate protection for our own people.

Mr. Speaker, we must not shirk our responsibility to make the United States a reasonably safe place for foreign diplomats to live and work and most especially those who come here to perform vital functions of the United Nations. I urge all my colleagues to vote "aye."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DONOHUE), that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 15883, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 380, nays 2, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 301]

YEAS—380

Abbitt	Clausen, Don H.	Fulton
Abernethy	Clawson, Del	Fuqua
Abourezk	Cleveland	Galifianakis
Abzug	Collier	Garmatz
Adams	Collins, Ill.	Gaydos
Addabbo	Collins, Tex.	Gettys
Anderson, Calif.	Colmer	Giaimo
Anderson, Ill.	Conable	Gibbons
Anderson, Tenn.	Conover	Goldwater
Andrews, Ala.	Conte	Gonzalez
Andrews, N. Dak.	Corman	Goodling
Annunzio	Cotter	Grasso
Archer	Coughlin	Gray
Arends	Crane	Green, Oreg.
Ashbrook	Culver	Green, Pa.
Aspin	Curlin	Griffin
Aspinall	Daniel, Va.	Gross
Badillo	Daniels, N.J.	Grover
Barrett	Danielson	Gubser
Begich	Davis, S.C.	Gude
Belcher	Davis, Wis.	Haley
Bell	de la Garza	Hall
Bennett	Delaney	Halpern
Bergland	Dellenback	Hamilton
Betts	Dellums	Hammer-schmidt
Bevill	Denholm	Hanley
Biaggi	Dennis	Hanna
Biester	Dent	Hansen, Idaho
Bingham	Derwinski	Harrington
Blackburn	Devine	Harsha
Boggs	Dickinson	Harvey
Boland	Diggs	Hastings
Bow	Donohue	Hathaway
Brademas	Dorn	Hawkins
Brasco	Dow	Hays
Bray	Downing	Hechler, W. Va.
Brinkley	Dulski	Heckler, Mass.
Brooks	Duncan	Heinz
Brotzman	du Pont	Helstoski
Brown, Ohio	Dwyer	Henderson
Broyhill, N.C.	Eckhardt	Hicks, Mass.
Broyhill, Va.	Edwards, Ala.	Hicks, Wash.
Buchanan	Edwards, Calif.	Hillis
Burke, Fla.	Eilberg	Hogan
Burke, Mass.	Erlenborn	Holifield
Burleson, Tex.	Esch	Horton
Burton	Eshleman	Hosmer
Byrne, Pa.	Evans, Colo.	Howard
Byrnes, Wis.	Evins, Tenn.	Hull
Byron	Fascell	Hunt
Cabell	Findley	Jacobs
Caffery	Fish	Jarman
Camp	Fisher	Johnson, Calif.
Carlson	Flood	Johnson, Pa.
Carney	Flowers	Jonas
Carter	Foley	Jones, Ala.
Casey, Tex.	Ford, Gerald R.	Jones, N.C.
Cederberg	Ford, William D.	Karth
Celler	Forsythe	Kastenmeier
Chappell	Fountain	Kazen
Chisholm	Fraser	Keating
Clancy	Frelinghuysen	Kee
Clark	Frenzel	Keith
	Frey	Kemp
		King

Kluczynski	O'Konski	Smith, Calif.
Koch	O'Neill	Smith, Iowa
Kuykendall	Patman	Smith, N.Y.
Kyl	Patten	Snyder
Kyros	Perkins	Spence
Landgrebe	Pettis	Springer
Latta	Peyser	Staggers
Leggett	Pickle	Stanton,
Lent	Pike	J. William
Link	Pirnie	Stanton,
Lloyd	Poff	James V.
Long, Md.	Powell	Steed
Lujan	Preyer, N.C.	Steele
McClory	Price, Ill.	Steiger, Ariz.
McCloskey	Price, Tex.	Steiger, Wis.
McCollister	Pucinski	Stokes
McCulloch	Purcell	Stratton
McDade	Quie	Sullivan
McEwen	Quillen	Symington
McFall	Railsback	Taylor
McKay	Randall	Teague, Calif.
McKevitt	Rangel	Teague, Tex.
McKinney	Rees	Terry
Macdonald,	Reid	Thompson, Ga.
Mass.	Reuss	Thompson, N.J.
Madden	Rhodes	Thomson, Wis.
Mahon	Riegle	Thone
Mailliard	Roberts	Tiernan
Mallary	Robinson, Va.	Udall
Mann	Robison, N.Y.	Ullman
Martin	Rodino	Van Deerlin
Mathis, Ga.	Roe	Vander Jagt
Matsunaga	Rogers	Vanik
Mayne	Roncalio	Veysey
Mazzoli	Rooney, Pa.	Vigorito
Meeds	Rosenthal	Waggonner
Melcher	Rostenkowski	Waldie
Metcalfe	Roush	Wampler
Michel	Rousselot	Ware
Mikva	Roy	Whalen
Miller, Ohio	Roybal	Whalley
Mills, Ark.	Runnels	White
Mills, Md.	Ruppe	Whitehurst
Minish	Ruth	Whitten
Mink	St Germain	Widnall
Minshall	Sandman	Wiggins
Mitchell	Sarbanes	Williams
Mizell	Satterfield	Wilson, Bob
Mollohan	Saylor	Wilson,
Monagan	Scherle	Charles H.
Montgomery	Scheuer	Winn
Moorhead	Schmitz	Wolff
Morgan	Schneebeli	Wright
Mosher	Schwengel	Wyatt
Moss	Scott	Wydler
Murphy, Ill.	Sebelius	Wylie
Murphy, N.Y.	Sieberling	Wyman
Myers	Shipley	Yates
Natcher	Shoup	Yatron
Nelsen	Shriver	Young, Fla.
Nichols	Sikes	Young, Tex.
Nix	Sisk	Zablocki
Obey	Skubitz	Zion
O'Hara	Slack	Zwach

NAYS—2

Drinan	Podell

NOT VOTING—50

Alexander	Flynt	Mathias, Calif.
Ashley	Gallagher	Miller, Calif.
Baker	Griffiths	Nedzi
Baring	Hagan	Passman
Blanton	Hansen, Wash.	Pelly
Blatnik	Hébert	Pepper
Bolling	Hungate	Poage
Broomfield	Hutchinson	Pryor, Ark.
Brown, Mich.	Ichord	Rarick
Burlison, Mo.	Jones, Tenn.	Rooney, N.Y.
Carey, N.Y.	Landrum	Ryan
Chamberlain	Lennon	Stephens
Clay	Long, La.	Stubblefield
Conyers	McClure	Stuckey
Davis, Ga.	*McCormack	Talcott
Dingell	McDonald,	
Dowdy	Mich.	
Edmondson	McMillan	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Pelly.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Talcott.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Mathias of California.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Hutchinson.

Mr. Blanton with Mr. Chamberlain.

Mr. Ichord with Mr. McClure.

Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Baker.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Passman.

Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Miller of California.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. McMillan.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Brown of Michigan.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Long of Louisiana.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.

Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Ryan with Mr. Baring.

Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Hungate.

Mr. Clay with Mr. Pepper.

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Alexander with Mr. Lennon.

Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Pryor of Arkansas.

Mr. Stephens with Mr. Rarick.

Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Hagan.

Mr. Burlison of Missouri with Mr. McCormack.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks on the bill just passed and, further, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 15641, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 15641) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. FISHER, NEDZI, LENNON, HAGAN, LONG of Louisiana, DANIEL of Virginia, MONTGOMERY, BRAY, PIRNIE, CLANCY, and POWELL.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 15586, PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tonight to file the conference report on H.R. 15586, public works appropriations, 1973.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LINK. Mr. Speaker, on August 3 I was absent during rollcall No. 298. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY AUTHORIZATION

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3645) to further amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 3645

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 703 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 703. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State $38,520,000 for fiscal year 1973 to provide grants, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate, to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. Except for funds appropriated pursuant to this section, no funds appropriated after the date of this Act may be made available to or for the use of Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty in fiscal year 1973.".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the bill S. 3645 authorizes an appropriation to the Secretary of State for grants to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty for the fiscal year 1973.

The amount involved is $38.52 million.

This authorization for the fiscal year 1973 was previously approved by the House on November 19, 1971, by a vote of 271 to 12. It was a part of a 2-year authorization which the Senate, unfortunately, would not accept. That is the reason why we bring this matter before the House for the second time. The funding level has not changed, however. The amount which the House authorized in 1971, and the amount contained in the bill presently before the House, are identical.

Mr. Speaker, the bill S. 3645 is a stopgap measure requested by the executive branch. It will allow Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty to operate during the current fiscal year while certain studies relating to their future funding are completed and analyzed by the Congress. These studies include one by a special Presidential Study Commission and others by the General Accounting Office and the Library of Congress.

The amount proposed to be authorized is the full amount requested by the executive. This amount has been justified to the authorizing and the appropriations committees of both Houses. It does not contain any fat. It will simply allow the two radio stations to keep their activities at the 1971 level, without any program expansion or general salary increases.

Mr. Speaker, the appropriations for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty for the fiscal year 1973 have already been approved by both Houses of the Congress, subject to the passage of this authorization. In both instances, the full amount was granted.

Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty have done good work during the past 20 years. They have been a vital communication link between the West, and the peoples of Eastern Europe and Russia. This link must continue until the Congress has an opportunity to study its future, and make an intelligent decision about it.

One more thing: Our allies in NATO recognize the value of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. They do not want to see these operations closed. But more time is needed for negotiations to see if our NATO partners can contribute to the upkeep of these stations—and how much.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, and since this is an interim measure which was previously approved by the House, I urge the approval of the bill before us.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this legislation which would authorize $38.5 million for fiscal year 1973 for the operation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

Members will remember that last year the House by a vote of 271 to 12 approved a 2-year authorization for the radios. Unfortunately, we encountered an extremely difficult conference with the Senate, which resulted in agreement to authorize funding for only 1 year. That authorization expired June 30.

This year the Senate acted expeditiously, passing S. 3645 on June 16 by a vote of 59 to 2. The legislation for fiscal year 1973 is in reality a stop-gap measure. It will enable the radios to continue their activities while a study commission to be named by the President studies the relevance of the radios to the current objectives of U.S. foreign policy.

The excellent work of both Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty in the past has been widely recognized. The Presidential study commission, together with studies made by the Library of Congress and the General Accounting Office will give the Congress the information it needs to make a longer term decision regarding the future role of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

I urge your support of this legislation.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN).

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation.

I introduced a bill myself along the lines of this bill, and I think it is in the interest of the United States to continue the operation of these free radios. In fact, I believe we should not have an interim authorization, but a more permanent one because of what I consider to be the value of these two broadcasting systems. These are not systems for the dissemination of news or primarily factual information—that is the function of the Voice of America. These are stations which disseminate programs which have to do with opinion and discussion of the broader implications of world events. They have permitted people behind the Iron Curtain not only to know what is going on but also to have mature, pertinent, and balanced interpretations of world affairs that otherwise would not come to them.

This is not an invasion of sovereignty as sometimes has been charged, but it is an attempt on our part to promote the free trade of ideas through these media as we would do through the broad dissemination of newspapers or magazines or of any other media of information.

One of the unfortunate effects of the way in which this legislation has been handled through the reservations of the other body has been to affect the morale of the people of these organizations, and I should like to say we have a priceless team of people who are experts with reference to the countries involved and their political and social problems. I hope the passage of this legislation and the study and recommendations which will be made by the commission which will act thereafter will be a source of encouragement to these faithful employees and some guarantee of the future continuation of these important activities.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

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

Mr. MONAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I should like to commend the gentleman for his comments. In my opinion, both Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe are proven vehicles, of value to this country. I think the vote last November in favor of continuing these programs is an indication of the solid support which they have in Congress.

The bill that we have before us today would not have been necessary had we not been obliged to reach some kind of agreement with the other body, as the gentleman has just pointed out. It is unfortunate that this should have happened, and I agree with the gentleman that the stopgap measures by which we have continued these programs is damaging to the morale of the employees.

My guess is that a presidential commission will surely make recommendations to continue these programs. My guess also is that a presidential commission would not really be necessary, that we could make such a determination ourselves. However, regardless of the merits, we know now that there is going to be a commission. It is to report at the end of February next year. It is my hope that we will repeat what we already did almost 9 months ago, that is, authorize continuation of these programs for the current fiscal year.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MONAGAN. I think it is rather ridiculous for us to be so concerned about the sensitivity of these other nations, who themselves have even more extensive systems of disseminating propaganda from their sources than this operation that we are proposing to continue here.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I, too, would like to commend him for the attitude he has taken with respect to this important operation and the emphasis that he places upon the morale of the people who are engaged in the program. I trust that the action of this House will be an encouragement to them so that this activity can be maintained on the high level of objectivity which has been followed heretofore.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN).

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, associate myself with the gentleman's remarks. I think it ought to be underlined that while as the gentleman has indicated, Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe are not confined to merely reporting of the news, they do, in fact, operate in countries where there is a controlled press and where the only knowledge——

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

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. MONAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I thank the gentleman.

They operate in countries where there is a controlled press and where the only knowledge the people of the Soviet Union may have of certain domestic events might come through Radio Liberty, or in the case of other countries, the reports of Radio Free Europe, so they are helping to disseminate news that probably would not be heard in many instances by the people within the country except from these sources. They do, in addition to giving a larger picture of what is going on in the world, have an editorial content. They also do some very fine news reporting, and much-needed news reporting, from the point of view of the people behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. MONAGAN. And ultimately they will bring about, we hope, a peaceful progression to more democratic governments in these areas.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL).

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill, S. 3645.

I have actively supported the necessary funding for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, and I hope that this authorization for fiscal year 1973 will receive overwhelming approval of the House.

There are two basic reasons why this legislation should be approved. First, from all the evidence available to us, the two radio stations have performed a valuable function over the years, penetrating the curtain of censorship imposed by the governments of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union in order to deny the people of their countries accurate, factual information about conditions in their own homelands and in the West. Under those conditions, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty have served as a vital link of communication among the peoples of Eastern Europe, and between them and the West.

The second reason which argues for the enactment of S. 3645 is that the Congress needs additional information about these broadcasting activities, and their relevance to our foreign policy undertakings of the 1970's. Without such informa-

tion, we cannot make an intelligent decision about how these operations should be conducted and funded in the future.

The House last year recognized the need for this information by approving, by a vote of 271 to 12, a proposal which I advanced, calling for the establishment of a Presidential Commission to inquire into these matters and to report on them to the Congress. Unfortunately, that proposal did not survive the conference with the other body.

The issue, however, has not been buried. Earlier this year, taking the lead from our actions, the President announced that he will appoint a Presidential Commission to evaluate Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty in the context of our present and future foreign policy. This was a wise decision, and I hope that the Commission will be appointed promptly and get started with its assignment.

In the meantime, funds are needed to continue Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty activities through the fiscal year 1973, and the passage of the bill before us will assure the availability of such funds.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I again urge the House to approve S. 3645.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for S. 3645. This legislation authorizes funds for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty for fiscal year 1973.

I must say that what we are doing here today would have been accomplished a year ago had the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee not tried to kill the radios. Members of this body will recall that last year the House overwhelmingly passed a 2-year authorization bill for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. However, an extremely difficult conference followed, in which the House conferees had to struggle long and hard to save the radios from extinction.

As most of my colleagues know, the battle for the minds of men is not yet over. So long as censorship prevails in the Soviet bloc, their citizens will seek to know the truth.

The radios are doing an excellent job of broadcasting information to people in the Soviet bloc about events in their own countries. They must have information other than that which those in control wish to make known.

While the radios are doing a good job with existing resources, I would not only continue their work, but expand it. For example, I believe that Radio Liberty should explore the possibility of broadcasting to the Baltic States in the languages of the three countries—Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania. The people of these small countries have never accepted their conquest and subjugation by the Soviet Union. Like others within the Soviet bloc they want to know what is happening within the world, including what is happening in their own countries.

I urge approval of this legislation.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my support of S. 3645, which will provide the funds necessary to keep Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty in operation for the fiscal year 1973.

Since the inception of the two radios following World War II, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty have continued to function as agents of free communication among nations which do not readily exchange ideas. Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are voices of freedom in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union; they are not government spokesmen but rather representatives of the independent free press. The service which they perform is indispensable to the continuation of open communication between the people of the United States and those in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, and therefore indispensable to increasing detente between East and West and liberalization within the Soviet bloc countries.

Our favorable action here today would provide for the continuation of the two radios while the Presidential Commission studies the future role and importance of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. The bill deserves our full support.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to associate myself with my chairman, the Honorable THOMAS E. MORGAN, in urging House approval of S. 3645, the bill to authorize funding for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty during the current fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that it is not necessary to review the record of accomplishments of these two radio broadcasting activities. For many years, during a dark period in the history of Eastern Europe, these stations provided the people of those countries with information about what was happening at home and abroad. On many occasions, Radio Free Europe was the only source of information available to the people of Eastern Europe about developments in their own homelands. Radio Liberty provided the same kind of service in the area to which it was broadcasting. These informational activities, together with factual reporting about U.S. actions and policies, earned for the staffs of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty the gratitude of many who were then living behind the Iron Curtain.

Today, more information is available to the people of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union than even a few years ago. Nevertheless, much information is still being denied to the people of that area. The mass media of communication are government-controlled and somewhat selective in presenting the news. And so the role of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, even though considerably changed, remains valid.

I, therefore, support this authorization of funds to keep these stations operating during the current fiscal year. I hope that before the year is finished, we will have more information on which to base our decision about future financing of these operations. Until that happens, however, this legislation is necessary and consistent with our foreign policy undertakings.

I again urge the approval of S. 3645.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 3645.

The question was taken.

Mr. ASHBROOK. 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 376, nays 7, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 302]

YEAS—376

Abbitt	Daniels, N.J.	Heckler, Mass.
Abernethy	Danielson	Heinz
Adams	Davis, S.C.	Helstoski
Addabbo	Davis, Wis.	Henderson
Alexander	de la Garza	Hicks, Mass.
Anderson, Calif.	Delaney	Hicks, Wash.
Anderson, Ill.	Dellenback	Hillis
Anderson, Tenn.	Denholm	Hogan
Andrews, Ala.	Dennis	Holifield
Andrews, N. Dak.	Dent	Horton
Annunzio	Derwinski	Hosmer
Archer	Devine	Howard
Arends	Dickinson	Hull
Ashbrook	Diggs	Hunt
Aspin	Donohue	Jacobs
Aspinall	Dorn	Jarman
Badillo	Dow	Johnson, Calif.
Barrett	Downing	Johnson, Pa.
Begich	Drinan	Jonas
Belcher	Dulski	Jones, Ala.
Bell	Duncan	Jones, N.C.
Bennett	du Pont	Karth
Bergland	Dwyer	Kazen
Betts	Eckhardt	Keating
Bevill	Edwards, Ala.	Kee
Biaggi	Edwards, Calif.	Keith
Biester	Eilberg	Kemp
Bingham	Erlenborn	King
Blackburn	Esch	Kluczynski
Boggs	Eshleman	Koch
Boland	Evans, Colo.	Kuykendall
Bow	Evins, Tenn.	Kyl
Brademas	Fascell	Kyros
Brasco	Findley	Landgrebe
Bray	Fish	Latta
Brinkley	Fisher	Leggett
Brooks	Flood	Lent
Brotzman	Flowers	Link
Brown, Ohio	Foley	Lloyd
Broyhill, N.C.	Ford, Gerald R.	Long, Md.
Broyhill, Va.	Ford, William D.	Lujan
Buchanan	Forsythe	McClory
Burke, Fla.	Fountain	McCloskey
Burke, Mass.	Fraser	McCollister
Burleson, Tex.	Frelinghuysen	McCulloch
Burton	Frenzel	McDade
Byrne, Pa.	Frey	McEwen
Byrnes, Wis.	Fulton	McFall
Byron	Fuqua	McKay
Cabell	Galifianakis	McKevitt
Caffery	Garmatz	Macdonald, Mass.
Camp	Gaydos	Madden
Carey, N.Y.	Gettys	Mahon
Carlson	Giaimo	Mailliard
Carney	Gibbons	Mallary
Carter	Goldwater	Mann
Casey, Tex.	Gonzalez	Martin
Cederberg	Goodling	Mathis, Ga.
Celler	Grasso	Matsunaga
Chappell	Gray	Mayne
Chisholm	Green, Oreg.	Mazzoli
Clancy	Green, Pa.	Meeds
Clark	Griffin	Melcher
Clausen, Don H.	Gross	Metcalfe
Clawson, Del	Grover	Michel
Cleveland	Gubser	Mikva
Collier	Gude	Miller, Ohio
Collins, Ill.	Haley	Mills, Ark.
Collins, Tex.	Hall	Mills, Md.
Colmer	Halpern	Minish
Conable	Hamilton	Mink
Conover	Hammer-schmidt	Minshall
Conte	Hanley	Mitchell
Corman	Hanna	Mizell
Cotter	Hansen, Idaho	Mollohan
Coughlin	Hansen, Wash.	Monagan
Crane	Harsha	Montgomery
Culver	Harvey	Moorhead
Curlin	Hastings	Morgan
Daniel, Va.	Hathaway	Mosher
	Hawkins	Moss
	Hays	Murphy, Ill.
		Murphy, N.Y.

Myers	Roush	Teague, Calif.
Natcher	Rousselot	Teague, Tex.
Nelsen	Roy	Terry
Nichols	Roybal	Thompson, Ga.
Nix	Runnels	Thompson, N.J.
Obey	Ruppe	Thomson, Wis.
O'Hara	Ruth	Thone
O'Konski	St Germain	Tiernan
O'Neill	Sandman	Udall
Patman	Sarbanes	Ullman
Patten	Satterfield	Van Deerlin
Perkins	Saylor	Vander Jagt
Pettis	Scherle	Vanik
Peyser	Scheuer	Veysey
Pickle	Schneebeli	Vigorito
Pike	Schwengel	Waggonner
Pirnie	Scott	Waldie
Podell	Sebelius	Wampler
Poff	Seiberling	Ware
Powell	Shipley	Whalen
Preyer, N.C.	Shoup	Whalley
Price, Ill.	Shriver	White
Price, Tex.	Sikes	Whitehurst
Pucinski	Sisk	Whitten
Purcell	Skubitz	Widnall
Quie	Slack	Wiggins
Quillen	Smith, Iowa	Williams
Railsback	Smith, N.Y.	Wilson, Bob
Randall	Snyder	Wilson,
Rangel	Spence	Charles H.
Rees	Springer	Winn
Reid	Staggers	Wolff
Reuss	Stanton,	Wright
Rhodes	J. William	Wyatt
Riegle	Stanton,	Wydler
Roberts	James V.	Wylie
Robinson, Va.	Steed	Wyman
Robison, N.Y.	Steele	Yates
Rodino	Steiger, Ariz.	Yatron
Roe	Steiger, Wis.	Young, Fla.
Rogers	Stokes	Young, Tex.
Roncalio	Stratton	Zablocki
Rooney, Pa.	Sullivan	Zion
Rosenthal	Symington	Zwach
Rostenkowski	Taylor	

NAYS—7

Abourezk	Harrington	Schmitz
Abzug	Hechler, W. Va.	
Dellums	Kastenmeier	

NOT VOTING—49

Ashley	Gallagher	Mathias, Calif.
Baker	Griffiths	Miller, Calif.
Baring	Hagan	Nedzi
Blanton	Hébert	Passman
Blatnik	Hungate	Pelly
Bolling	Hutchinson	Pepper
Broomfield	Ichord	Poage
Brown, Mich.	Jones, Tenn.	Pryor, Ark.
Burlison, Mo.	Landrum	Rarick
Chamberlain	Lennon	Rooney, N.Y.
Clay	Long, La.	Ryan
Conyers	McClure	Smith, Calif.
Davis, Ga.	McCormack	Stephens
Dingell	McDonald,	Stubblefield
Dowdy	Mich.	Stuckey
Edmondson	McKinney	Talcott
Flynt	McMillan	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Mathias of California.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. McKinney.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Hutchinson.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. McClure.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Burlison of Missouri with Mr. Edmondson.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Stubblefield.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Miller of California.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Hagan.
Mr. Ryan with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. McCormack.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Baring.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

UNIFORM RELOCATION ASSISTANCE

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1819) to amend the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 to provide for minimum Federal payments after July 1, 1972, for relocation assistance made available under federally assisted programs and for an extension of the effective date of the Act, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1819

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 207 of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1898) is amended by striking out "July 1, 1972," and by inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1974,".

(b) Section 211(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "July 1, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1974".

(c) Title II of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"INTERIM RELOCATION ASSISTANCE AND REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION EXPENSES

"SEC. 222. During the period from July 1, 1972, through June 30, 1973, the head of a Federal agency is authorized to advance to a State which is not in compliance with this Act such sums in excess of the first $25,000 of cost as may be necessary to make all payments and provide all assistance required by this Act. All sums advanced to a State under this section shall be repaid by such State as soon as practicable in accordance with regulations adopted by the head of such Federal agency.".

(d) Section 101(3) is amended by inserting immediately after "means" the following: "a State,".

(e) Section 101(6) is amended by inserting immediately after "personal property from real property," the following: "which he lawfully occupies,".

(f) Title II of such Act, as amended by subsection (c) of this section, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS UNDERTAKEN DIRECTLY BY NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS AND PERSONS

"SEC. 223. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, whenever a program or project to be undertaken (A) by a nonprofit organization furnished Federal financial assistance for such program or project under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, under title VI of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 291), or under the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 (20 U.S.C. 701), or (B) by a State agency furnished Federal financial assistance for such program or project under the second proviso of section 10(a) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 for the rehabilitation of public housing, and the Federal financial assistance is furnished by a Federal agency pursuant to a grant, contract, or agreement and such program or project will result in the forced displacement of any person on or after the effective date of this section, the head of the Federal agency furnishing such financial assistance shall require the organization, or the State agency, as the case may be, to provide—

"(1) fair and reasonable relocation payments and assistance to or for such displaced persons, as are required to be provided by a Federal agency under sections 202, 203, and 204 of this title;

"(2) relocation assistance programs offering the services described in section 205 to or for such displaced persons; and

"(3) within a reasonable period of time prior to displacement, decent, safe, and sanitary replacement dwellings to such displaced persons in accordance with section 205(c)(3).

"(b) Notwithstanding any provision of law, whenever a program or project to be undertaken by a person furnished Federal financial assistance for such program or project under section 236 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1715Z–1), by a Federal agency pursuant to a grant, contract, or agreement will result in the forced displacement of any person on or after the effective date of this section, the head of the Federal agency furnishing such financial assistance shall require the person receiving such assistance to provide—

"(1) fair and reasonable relocation payments and assistance to or for such displaced persons, as are required to be provided by a Federal agency under sections 202, 203, and 204 of this title;

"(2) relocation assistance programs offering the services described in section 205 to or for such displaced persons; and

"(3) within a reasonable period of time prior to displacement, decent, safe, and sanitary replacement dwellings to such displaced persons in accordance with section 205(c)(3).

"REMOVAL OF VACANT IMPROVEMENTS

"SEC. 224. No department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government administering any program providing Federal financial assistance shall, for the purpose of assuring compliance with this Act, impose any limitation on the removal of vacant improvements located on real property acquired in connection with such a federally assisted project."

SEC. 2. Section 202(a)(2) of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon a comma and the following: "except that in any case where it is impracticable to determine such relocation expenses the payment shall be for the actual direct losses".

SEC. 3. Title III of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1898) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"DONATIONS

"SEC. 307. Nothing in this title shall be construed to prevent a person, after he has been tendered the full amount of estimated just compensation as established by the approved appraisal of the fair market value of the subject property, from making a gift or donation of such property or any part thereof or of any of the compensation paid therefor, to a Federal agency, a State or a State agency, as such person shall determine.".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill extends and in minor respects amends the Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1970. Primarily it extends the effective date of Federal payments under that act for 2 additional years or until July 1, 1974. In addition to that it makes several minor changes in the existing statute. Some of them are in the nature of corrections.

First, it provides that if a business has been required to be moved but the owner wishes simply to discontinue the business instead of moving it to another place, he shall not receive more than the cost of relocation. This was inserted to account for certain few abuses that had occurred in the past.

Second, it defines "a State" in such a way to make it clear that the Federal law intends for the government of a State to be included under the defintion of "a State" in the earlier act.

Third, it amends the existing law by adding the words "which he lawfully occupies" to the definition of displaced persons. This has been done to make sure that people who unlawfully occupy property involved should not receive the benefits.

Fourth, it extends the act to take care of nonprofit organizations, and those are defined as organizations and operations such as housing for the handicapped and elderly, private hospitals, higher education facilities, and certain others.

Finally, it adds a new section to allow persons to donate or make a gift of real property to any Federal agency, State or State agency for the purposes of carrying forth any of the programs authorized in the act.

That is in essence all the bill does, Mr. Speaker. I reserve the balance of my time and yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, S. 1819, as amended. I offer my support to the legislation, but I must qualify that support. The provisions of S. 1819, which amends the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, include an extension until July 1, 1974, of the 100 percent Federal funding of the first $25,000 for any relocation payment. The bill, as passed by the Senate, extended the Federal participation indefinitely. I was opposed to this proposal. Accordingly, my colleagues of the Committee on Public Works agreed to a 1-year extension of the 100 percent Federal funding for relocation in subcommittee action and ultimately the full committee agreed to a 2-year extension of this provision.

The intent of Public Law 91-646 was to provide uniform and equitable treatment of persons displaced from their homes, businesses, or farms by Federal and federally assisted programs and to establish uniform and equitable land acquisition policies for these programs. Public Law 91-646 provides for fair relocation payments, advisory assistance, assurance that comparable, decent, safe, and sanitary replacement housing will be available for displaced persons prior to displacement, economic adjustments, and other assistance to owners and tenants displaced from their homes, businesses, or farms. The law provided for a transition period until July 1, 1972, to enable the States to implement the act. During this period the Federal Government contributed the first $25,000 of the cost of providing each relocation payment and assistance and other new acquisition payments required by title III of the act.

I hasten to point out that the 100 percent Federal funding of section 211(a) was for the interim adjustment period, during which States could enact necessary legislation and prepare for this added responsibility for federally assisted programs. The committee, however, recognizes that extra time is now needed by some States to fully comply with the Uniform Relocation Assistance Act as to all federally assisted programs, and projects could be halted in some of these States. By the Federal Government paying the full $25,000 of each relocation payment for the 2 years, projects can proceed on schedule with the State acting as a conduit for those Federal funds.

The committee also included a provision authorizing Federal agencies to advance to States not in compliance with the law such sums in excess of the first $25,000 for any single relocation payments until July 1, 1973, as may be needed to provide all assistance required by the Federal law, with repayment of such sums to be made by the receiving State as soon as practicable. I wish to emphasize that States are not allowed additional time to come into compliance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance Act. However, they may act as conduits for Federal funds until they conform to provisions of the act by enactment of necessary State legislation.

Other provisions included in S. 1819 are refinements to the current law, where executive interpretation required clarification or legislative language needed modification. In each case the refinements were desirable for a more smooth and orderly operation of relocation and acquisition under the law. Section 222(d) amends secton 101(3) of the act to include a State in the definition of a State agency. The committee's intent was to include a State in this definition, however the definition was interpreted incorrectly and a State was not included.

Section 222(e) amends section 101(6) to restrict those receiving relocation assistance to those displaced persons who legally occupy real property. The amendment is designed to exclude tenants illegally occupying dwellings from receiving the benefits of the act.

Section 223 of S. 1819 enumerates the following Federal programs under which the Uniform Relocation Assistance Act should apply. These programs undertaken by a nonprofit organization currently do not provide assistance to displaced persons. They are, section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, which provides home loans to the elderly and the handicapped, title VI of the Public Health Services Act which provides for the construction of hospitals, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, which provides for Federal grants to universities for certain programs, section 10(a) of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 for the rehabilitation of public housing by a State agency pursuant to a grant, contract, or agreement which results in the forced displacement of any person, and, finally, as to any person receiving Federal funds to undertake a project under the authority of section 236 of the National Housing Act, as amended, which results in the forced displacement of any person.

Section 202 removes the limitation on the payment of the actual direct loss of a business or farm operation as a result of forced moving if that business or farm operation would be discontinued.

Section 224 deals with a situation in Cleveland, Ohio, where many vacant buildings have stood in the right-of-way land for Interstate 90, causing an eyesore to the surrounding neighborhood, as well as contributing to unsafe conditions in the immediate area. The section prohibits departments, agencies or instrumentalities of the Federal Government to impose limitations on the removal of vacant improvements located on real property acquired in connection with a federally assisted project. It is the intent of this language to have removed as soon as possible any vacant building such as those in Cleveland, Ohio.

Finally, the committee added a new section which will allow any individual to donate property or any part thereof to any State, State agency, or Federal agency for use in a federally assisted project. Currently, individuals could not do so even if they so desired.

While we all desire fair and equitable treatment for any person or business displaced by a Federal or federally assisted program or project, we must recognize that the ultimate responsibility of such relocation lies with the State in which the project takes place. There are other federally imposed restrictions on federally assisted projects, such as adherence to civil rights provisions, Davis-Bacon wage scales, and the like. The State or State agency funds these projects and all requirements contained therein on a matching basis according to grant conditions. Relocation must become a part of the requirements for States to meet for federally assisted programs.

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

Mr. HARSHA. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1819, the bill to amend the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, now under consideration. I know that the Public Works Committee has worked diligently on the very complex and difficult problems created by the act, and I congratulate them on reporting a bill which clearly corrects the situation confronting many States which are making a "good faith" effort to comply with the law.

My own State of Georgia has been unable to comply with the present law because of a prohibition in our State

constitution against granting relocation payments as required by the present act. The amendments which the committee has brought forth provide relief in that the first $25,000 of relocation payments will be paid by the Federal Government and for any State that is not yet in compliance, the Federal agency will extend to that State the funds needed to make all relocation payments.

As a primary supporter of fiscal responsibility, I am comforted to note that the bill requires the head of the Federal Agency involved to make arrangements for the repayment of the funds extended to the States by the Federal Government.

I congratulate the Public Works Committee for this fine piece of legislation and I know that the people of Georgia have been greatly assisted by this action.

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

Mr. HARSHA. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering S. 1819, Uniform Relocation Assistance Amendments, which will extend the Uniform Relocation Amendment Act of 2 years beyond the July 1, 1972, deadline and will provide relocation benefits to persons displaced by nonprofit organizations carrying out Federal programs.

The provisions which are contained in today's legislation do not deal with a problem which has come to my attention concerning the payments made under the Uniform Relocation Amendment Act to tenants who are relocated.

Basically, the problem deals with payments made to relocated tenants in excess of the actual expense that tenants incur in moving into new rental quarters.

I find that under present HUD regulations the following situation may occur:

Tenant lives in three-bedroom apartment in substandard dwelling, paying $65 per month. Tenant is relocated as part of an urban renewal program and therefore is entitled to payments under Uniform Payments Relocation Assistance Act. Tenant's new quarters are in public housing where tenant is required to pay $18 per month. However, according to HUD regulations, tenant's rental payment under chapter 6, section 4, is the difference between the $65 he was formerly paying and the cost of a comparable unit in a decent, safe, and sanitary dwelling. In Cincinnati a comparable unit, according to the schedule, for a medium-sized three-bedroom apartment is $206. The cash payment to the tenant is, therefore $141 per month—the difference between the $65 and the $206—although the tenant's obligation is to pay only the amount charged by the public housing unit, in this case, $18 per month.

In my opinion, payments made to relocated tenants should relate directly to the needs of the tenants and not some hypothetical schedules. I have outlined in some detail this problem in a letter to Secretary Romney which I would like to include in the RECORD at this point. I am asking the Public Works Committee and the Committee on Banking and Currency to review this problem to see if the Congress can resolve it by appropriate legislative amendment.

This is a nationwide problem and involves a large expenditure of funds. In fiscal year 1972 some $500 million were appropriated for relocation purposes. Again, I emphasize that money saved through appropriate application under this program can be better used to enable more families to relocate decent housing or in additional rehabilitation of housing.

I urge your attention to this problem.

The letter referred to follows:

AUGUST 3, 1972.

HON. GEORGE W. ROMNEY,
Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 became effective January 2, 1971. It is my understanding that the Department of Housing and Urban Development administers this Act under regulations contained in Regulation Handbook 1371.1, dated July 30, 1971.

It has come to my attention that there are significant problems in the implementation of this legislation that relate to the payments made to tenants who are relocated. The legislation under Section 204 of P.L. 91-646 calls for payments in the "amount necessary" to relocate a person in standard housing with a maximum limitation of $4,000 on such payments. It is clear that the intent of the legislation is to provide payments necessary to enable a tenant to relocate without a large financial burden being placed upon him.

Regulations contained in the relocation handbook mentioned above in Chapter 6, Section 4, entitled "Replacement Housing Payments for Tenants and Certain Others," call for the payment of rental assistance moneys according to a detailed formula. According to the formula, such payment may be made according to a schedule devised by the local FHA or by determining the cost of a comparable unit for the displaced person. The effect of these HUD regulations is to allow a tenant to receive a cash payment from the relocation moneys in excess of the amount the tenant may actually need in his new rental quarters.

The potential for abuse under this payment system is limited only by the $4,000 figure prescribed in Section 204 of the legislation itself. An example under this method that no doubt will occur is as follows:

Tenant lives in three bedroom apartment in substandard dwelling, paying $65 per month. Tenant is relocated as part of an urban renewal program and therefore is entitled to payments under Uniform Payments Relocation Assistance Act. Tenant's new quarters are in public housing where tenant is required to pay $18 per month. However, according to HUD regulations, tenant's rental payment under Chapter 6, Section 4, is the difference between the $65 he was formerly paying and the cost of a comparable unit in a decent, safe, and sanitary dwelling. In Cincinnati a comparable unit, according to the schedule, for a medium-sized three bedroom apartment is $206. The cash payment to the tenant is, therefore, $141 per month—the difference between the $65 and the $206—although the tenant's obligation is to pay only the amount charged by the public housing unit, in this case $18 a month.

Needless to say, this will be attacked as a windfall, and surely does not fulfill the purposes of the legislation.

I am informed by relocation officials in the City of Cincinnati that some 1,200 to 1,300 families are going to be entitled to rental assistance payments. To date approximately thirty claims have been adjudicated under the regulations HUD now uses, and the average total payment for these families for moving costs, dislocation payment, and rental assistance, is in the neighborhood of $3,800 per family. This is very close to the maximum amount allowable under the legislation and it seems clear that tenants will choose that method of payment which allows them the greatest financial benefit.

It is my understanding that Congress has set aside $500 million for the implementation of the Uniform Relocation Assistance Act; and, therefore, the problem I describe is now limited to the Cincinnati area. You will no doubt be receiving many complaints concerning the methods now employed. It is clear that the present method does not really relate to the needs of those people who are required to relocate. I am asking the Housing Committee to review this legislation to see if amendments are necessary to remedy the situation. I am also requesting that you review the present regulations to see what changes should be made to prevent excessive payments to relocated tenants.

I would also like to know why the rental payments and moving expenses cannot primarily be based upon actual expenses and not some general formula.

The City of Cincinnati is anxious to proceed in its efforts to develop decent, safe, and sanitary housing for all of its citizens. Money saved through realistic application of relocation assistance can be used to enable more families to move into better housing or can be used in rehabilitation of additional housing.

I deeply appreciate your immediate attention and response to this inquiry.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM J. KEATING,
Member of Congress.

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

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

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of amending the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970. It would continue full Federal funding of the first $25,000 of any single relocation payment for 2 additional years after the July 1, 1972, deadline that was established in section 207 of Public Law 91-646.

As a cosponsor of the original bill which would have continued full Federal funding indefinitely, I now believe that the committee has struck a reasonable compromise to give 2 years further time for compliance of State and local agencies. I have had several urban renewal agencies located within my congressional district telling me of the hardships and delay that the 1970 act requirement would be creating for their community. I believe that this legislation is in the best interest of not only the citizens of Arkansas but of the Nation. I strongly recommend its passage.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker. I yield to the gentlemen from Illinois (Mr. KLUCZYNSKI).

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) for yielding to me.

I rise in support of S. 1819.

Mr. Speaker, the provision of relocation assistance to citizens whose lives and occupations are disrupted because of Federal programs, particularly in the areas of housing and highway construc-

tion, is an obligation that the Federal Government cannot and should not avoid.

This assistance was authorized for the first time in the 1968 highway bill, and I am proud of the fact that, as chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee on Roads, I had a hand in shaping this humane legislation.

We have now upgraded and strengthened this legislation, greatly improving the cooperation between State and Federal agencies which we must have if the relocation assistance program is to be really effective, and extending Federal assistance into areas that had heretofore been neglected.

The 1970 act allowed the States 18 months to bring their programs into compliance with the law, but, unfortunately, a few of them still need more time. In this new bill, therefore, we have tried to insure that individuals will not be harmed by the lack of State action. We have continued the Federal funding for another 2 years.

The Committee on Public Works has been advised that certain programs were not being included within the provisions of the Uniform Relocation Act. We have taken steps to insure that all people who are displaced by these programs will receive the benefits of the Relocation Act in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have played a part in the beginnings of this program, and I am proud today to see it being continued.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY).

Mr. GRAY. I thank my distinguished friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this very important legislation.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. EVANS).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas a question.

In the third district of Colorado, which is the one I represent, a few years ago a dam was approved for the protection of the city of Trinidad. Upstream from this city was a small community, named Sopris, which had several families in it, which city was going to be flooded by the waters backed up by this dam.

Many people who lived there settled the claims they had for the taking of their homes and businesses under the old law. They received very little compensation for their properties, and in some instances only $400 of relocation assistance.

Several people held out. They were not satisfied with the amounts offered by the Government, feeling they were not fair.

During this period of time a new law was passed, and greater benefits were provided. Those who delayed settlement of their claims were therefore entitled to sometimes as much as twice the amount offered to the people who settled under the old law.

It would seem to me that we ought to address ourselves to this unfair situation, for I am sure it exists in other parts of the Nation as well as at Sopris, Colo.

I wonder if the gentleman from Texas can give us any assurance that at least the gentleman from Texas will be willing to encourage the committee to look into this situation, to see whether or not the law can be amended to bring in those people who had their homes taken under the old law, while others who were under the same project were compensated in greater amounts under the new law.

Would the gentleman be able to give us any such assurance?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes. The gentleman from Colorado raises a thoroughly valid question. The situation which he describes is manifestly inequitable.

As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Colorado appeared before our subcommittee at the time it was considering this legislation, and he brought this situation to the attention of the committee. It appeared to the committee that there probably exist throughout the country other projects in respect to which a similar inequity has occurred, but the gentleman from Colorado was the only Member who appeared before us and testified as to such a situation. This being the case, the members of the committee determined it would be wise if we were able to have a somewhat more general review and ascertain with some greater certainty exactly how many projects and exactly how many beneficiaries would be involved in such a situation.

Next year we would expect to look at this entire act with a view to somewhat broader revisions in the act, to compensate for such situations as the gentleman from Colorado just mentioned.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. I certainly appreciate that assurance very much.

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

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARSHA. I should like to join my distinguished friend from Texas in commending the distinguished gentleman from Colorado. As the distinguished gentleman from Texas indicated, the distinguished gentleman from Colorado did appear before the committee, and he prosecuted the claims and vested interests of his constituents in an effective and forceful manner. He did bring to the attention of the committee this inequity that existed because of the time element involved and the time the act became effective.

In addition to that, there are some other areas similar to that which the gentleman called to the attention of the committee.

I certainly would join with my distinguished friend from Texas in urging the chairman of the full committee to conduct broad-scale hearings into the general aspects of what the gentleman brought to our attention, so that we can deal with these inequities, which should be corrected.

I commend the gentleman from Colorado for so effectively representing his constituents and for bringing this matter to our attention.

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

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to my colleague from Texas (Mr. PICKLE).

Mr. PICKLE. I commend the gentleman for bringing to us this Urban Relocation Assistance Act. I am and have been in support of it.

This matter has been a particular problem to some cities in my district actively trying to pursue urban renewal, and to keep it going, so I am glad the dates are being changed.

May I ask the gentleman: Is the extension for 2 years?

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman is correct. The authorizations contained in the basic law will be extended until July 1, 1974.

Mr. PICKLE. This would then give us time to see whether we want to continue that approach or take another look at the whole program?

Mr. WRIGHT. That is correct. The committee felt an additional 2 years would give some States that have not as of now been in current compliance an opportunity to do so and then gives the Congress further opportunity prior to the expiration of this act to determine whether it is in the interest of the country to continue the authorizations of this act in its present form.

Mr. PICKLE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUYKENDALL) a cosponsor of this legislation and one who has helped to explain the problems that are inherent in this legislation and the lack of legislation in his own home State.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Texas and the ranking minority Member for the work they have done on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1819, the Uniform Relocation Assistance Act amendments. Since this bill is substantially identical to a bill which I introduced, I urge its passage today.

The purpose of this bill is to amend the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 which the President signed into law in January 1971—Public Law 91-646. This act represents a major step toward the fair and equitable treatment of individuals, families, and businesses displaced by federally assisted projects. The amendment is designed to extend for 2 years until July 1, 1974, the full relocation assistance benefits.

The act of 1970 provides, in part, that the Federal Government will bear 100 percent of the first $25,000 of any single relocation payment paid under the act where the property acquisition or displacement occurs prior to July 1, 1972. After July 1, 1972, State and local project agencies are required to participate in the cost of relocation payments mandated under the new act to the same degree that they share in other project costs. It is important to note that the act of 1970 as passed by the Congress, affects all federally assisted programs which displace persons, such as highway programs, certain agricultural development programs, federally assisted private programs, as well as housing and urban renewal programs. The intent of the law was to establish a uniform policy for the fair and equitable treatment of persons

so displaced, and I maintain that to achieve that uniformity, because of the lack of local resources, the Federal Government must continue to bear the expense of relocation assistance.

Local governments already share in a substantial proportion of relocation costs. There is evidence from many local communities that they will not be able to meet this share requirement within their limited resources and the result will be one that I believe was certainly never intended by the Congress that wrote this legislation. Existing programs in many cases will be faced with crippling cutbacks and desperately needed new programs will never get off the ground. In my opinion, this financial burden on our cities and communities is the single most important item for this committee's consideration.

The fate of our Nation's cities is a much publicized, talked about, and even politically potent item. Our increasingly expanding cities have in the past, been considered a sign of the economic strength and fast-paced but productive growth of this country. But this picture is now changing, and some would say that it is already changed. The threats to our urban areas are many—the exodus of productive, economically self-sufficient citizens to the suburbs with the resulting loss of an adequate tax base and the decay in our inner cities which breeds violence and despair are at the heart of their problems. Please consider the more a city needs help, the more deteriorated it is, the less able financially it is to help itself. If it must share costs with the Federal Government, it may have only as much assistance as it can afford. Thus, those who need the least will get the most, and those who need the most, will qualify only for the least. This is not uniformity, and I do not believe that this was the intention of the members of the 91st Congress.

Urban renewal is not a "one shot deal," or perhaps I should say, the greatest need for urban renewal is in the future. As our downtown and inner cities become so old and dilapidated that private enterprise is no longer willing or able to manage there, the Federal Government with its myriad resources, must step in to provide assistance. I am proud of the success that a progressive housing authority has achieved in Memphis. Extensive urban renewal projects are now underway in our downtown area, and already life on Main Street is revitalized. Memphis, however, like most large cities, has severe financial problems, and must continue to meet rising costs in nearly all city services. I think it would be safe to say that if more city financing were required for our urban renewal projects, we would be faced with a discontinuation of many of these programs, and certainly a veto of many proposed programs.

So today, I am speaking not only as a U.S. Congressman with the best interests of my country at heart, but also as a Tennessean and a Memphian, who is concerned about the welfare, both present and future, of my State and city.

The Senate passage of this bill, as well as the 19 consponsors of the bill which I introduced, testify to the fact that this is legislation of broad concern and interest. I strongly urge that it be enacted today.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the subcommittee chairman whether he could state on the record what protections there are in this bill for those people whose homes are being displaced by federally assisted projects, to make sure that the necessary funds are available at the time that they must purchase their replacement homes when it becomes clear that they are required to move out of their old homes?

We have had a situation, in fact it has become a burning issue, in my district where people who are about to be displaced by highway building in the inner city cannot get the funds to purchase their new residences until after the old one is actually taken by the authorities. Yet until these people move into the new residences, the highway authorities refuse to complete action to pay for the old residences.

I wonder if there is anything in this legislation which requires the cities and States to see to it that people are not placed in these intolerable situations where they are stuck for months and even years because of delays in the administrative process.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would say to the gentleman that the situation he describes and its alleviation is the basic purpose of this legislation. Those who are forced to move and uproot themselves and dislocate their lives were the forgotten people of these programs. It was because of them that the committee initially brought the Relocation Act of 1970 to the House and it was because of the hope of treating them with equity that that act was passed.

Under the law it is provided that a project may not go forward until such time as these people are adequately and duly compensated. To the extent that delays have occurred I am inclined to believe this is a result of the failure adequately to fund the programs rather than a failure of the law itself.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Then, it comes down to this: The State highway administrations create their own sets of rules under which they will not issue funds until such time as they are ready to proceed with acquisition. At the same time the people who own the homes cannot rent them and they cannot move out because the funds are not available for them to acquire their replacement property.

I am just wondering if there is anything in the policy of this act that would enable citizens to put pressure on State administrations for federally funded highway projects, and other federally funded projects, to make them revise their rules so that they will take into consideration the equities of the people placed in that kind of a situation.

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

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Ohio to section 210 of the law which says:

SEC. 210. Notwithstanding any other law, the head of a Federal agency shall not approve any grant to, or contract or agreement with, a State agency, under which Federal financial assistance will be available to pay all or part of the cost of any program or project which will result in the displacement of any person on or after the effective date of this title, unless he receives satisfactory assurances from such State agency that—

(1) fair and reasonable relocation payments and assistance shall be provided to or for displaced persons, as are required to be provided by a Federal agency under sections 202, 203, and 204 of this title;

(2) relocation assistance programs offering the services described in section 205 shall be provided to such displaced persons;

(3) within a reasonable period of time prior to displacement, decent, safe, and sanitary replacement dwellings will be available to displaced persons in accordance with section 205(c)(3).

So that under the laws as we have written them, before a State receives any payment from the Federal Government these assurances have to be made to the Federal Government.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would ask the gentleman from Ohio whether the law he is referring to is the law that already exists, or the proposed new law?

Mr. HARSHA. These are the laws that already exist.

Mr. SEIBERLING. And this bill does not alter the provision of the present law on that point?

Mr. HARSHA. And this provision shall remain in perpetuity.

Mr. SEIBERLING. I thank the gentleman. May I add the suggestion that the committee consider whether additional legislation should be considered to insure that homeowners to be displaced by federally funded projects not be left holding their property for unreasonable lengths of time after decision to acquire their property has been made by the local authorities.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in support of the bill S. 1819, the Uniform Relocation Assistance Act.

Mr. Speaker, I support S. 1819, to extend the Uniform Relocation Assistance Act for 2 years beyond the July 1, 1972, deadline and to provide relocation benefits to persons who are displaced by nonprofit organizations carrying out Federal programs.

The landmark Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 set forth the goal that all persons displaced by governmental action would receive uniform and equitable treatment. No person could lose his home, business, or farm without being provided advisory assistance, help in moving, or in purchasing a new home or property at least as good as the one he had to vacate. The Federal Government was to cover 100 percent of the first $25,000 of any single relocation payment and 18 months later the States through the enactment of appropriate

enabling legislation were to pay the same proportion of relocation assistance as they pay of the project costs.

However, many States have been unable to comply with the law and face the termination of Federal funding for displacement assistance. Requiring already hardpressed local governments to bear an even more substantial portion of relocation can at this time only have a negative effect. Many communities are now only barely able to keep their heads above water and adding to their fixed contract costs will in many instances result in cutbacks, delays, or even cessation of ongoing programs. If this is allowed to happen, the uniformity, the fair and equitable treatment of displaced persons we seek to help under the act will be seriously jeopardized.

S. 1819 gives us the respite we need to iron out local fiscal problems and permit the various highway, housing, and community development programs to continue without further straining local treasuries.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure which would continue full Federal funding of the first $25,000 of any single relocation assistance payment until July 1, 1974.

The legislation I introduced on this subject would have removed the cutoff entirely and I am somewhat disappointed that the bill before us merely extends, rather than removes, this cutoff date. Nevertheless, the additional 2-year period provided for in this bill will allow the States the time they need to adjust to the requirements of the basic legislation which passed the Congress in 1970.

The Federal Government has made a firm commitment of support to the localities with regard to the model cities and urban renewal programs. Strong Federal assistance, at least for the time being, is essential if the localities are to carry out their plans in this area successfully.

Localities throughout the country have indicated that these valuable programs are in danger of termination should the Federal Government summarily shut off these $25,000 payments.

I do not think it right for the Federal Government to pull the rug out from under our cities by asking them to shoulder a financial burden that could destroy the underlying programs themselves. Passage of this legislation would insure a necessary grace period to prevent this from happening.

I urge that S. 1819 be approved.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 1819, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER. 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 373, nays 10, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 303]

YEAS—373

Abbitt	Devine	Kastenmeier
Abourezk	Dickinson	Kazen
Abzug	Diggs	Keating
Adams	Donohue	Kee
Addabbo	Dorn	Keith
Alexander	Dow	Kemp
Anderson, Calif.	Downing	King
	Drinan	Kluczynski
Anderson, Ill.	Dulski	Koch
Anderson, Tenn.	Duncan	Kuykendall
	du Pont	Kyl
Andrews, Ala.	Dwyer	Kyros
Andrews, N. Dak.	Eckhardt	Landgrebe
	Edwards, Ala.	Latta
Annunzio	Edwards, Calif.	Leggett
Archer	Eilberg	Lent
Arends	Erlenborn	Link
Aspin	Esch	Lloyd
Aspinall	Eshleman	Long, Md.
Badillo	Evans, Colo.	Lujan
Barrett	Evins, Tenn.	McClory
Begich	Fascell	McCloskey
Belcher	Fish	McCollister
Bell	Fisher	McCulloch
Bennett	Flood	McDade
Bergland	Flowers	McEwen
Bevill	Foley	McKay
Biaggi	Ford, William D.	McKevitt
Biester		McKinney
Bingham	Forsythe	Macdonald, Mass.
Blackburn	Fountain	
Boggs	Fraser	Madden
Bow	Frelinghuysen	Mahon
Brademas	Frenzel	Mailliard
Brasco	Frey	Mallary
Bray	Fulton	Mann
Brinkley	Fuqua	Martin
Brooks	Galifianakis	Mathis, Ga.
Brotzman	Garmatz	Matsunaga
Brown, Ohio	Gaydos	Mayne
Broyhill, N.C.	Gettys	Mazzoli
Broyhill, Va.	Giaimo	Meeds
Buchanan	Gibbons	Melcher
Burke, Fla.	Gonzalez	Metcalfe
Burke, Mass.	Goodling	Michel
Burleson, Tex.	Grasso	Mikva
Burton	Gray	Miller, Ohio
Byrne, Pa.	Green, Oreg.	Mills, Ark.
Byrnes, Wis.	Green, Pa.	Mills, Md.
Byron	Griffin	Minish
Cabell	Grover	Mink
Caffery	Gubser	Minshall
Camp	Gude	Mitchell
Carey, N.Y.	Haley	Mizell
Carlson	Halpern	Mollohan
Carney	Hamilton	Monagan
Carter	Hammer-schmidt	Montgomery
Casey, Tex.		Moorhead
Cederberg	Hanley	Morgan
Celler	Hanna	Mosher
Chappell	Hansen, Idaho	Moss
Chisholm	Hansen, Wash.	Murphy, Ill.
Clancy	Harrington	Murphy, N.Y.
Clark	Harsha	Myers
Clausen, Don H.	Harvey	Natcher
	Hastings	Nelsen
Clawson, Del	Hathaway	Nichols
Cleveland	Hawkins	Nix
Collier	Hays	Obey
Collins, Ill.	Hechler, W. Va.	O'Hara
Conable	Heckler, Mass.	O'Konski
Conover	Heinz	O'Neill
Conte	Helstoski	Passman
Corman	Henderson	Patten
Cotter	Hicks, Mass.	Perkins
Coughlin	Hicks, Wash.	Pettis
Crane	Hillis	Peyser
Culver	Hogan	Pickle
Curlin	Holifield	Pike
Daniel, Va.	Horton	Pirnie
Daniels, N.J.	Hosmer	Podell
Danielson	Howard	Poff
Davis, S.C.	Hull	Powell
Davis, Wis.	Hunt	Preyer, N.C.
de la Garza	Jacobs	Price, Ill.
Delaney	Jarman	Price, Tex.
Dellenback	Johnson, Calif.	Pucinski
Dellums	Johnson, Pa.	Purcell
Denholm	Jonas	Quie
Dennis	Jones, Ala.	Quillen
Dent	Jones, N.C.	Railsback
Derwinski	Karth	Randall
Rangel	Shoup	Ullman
Rees	Shriver	Van Deerlin
Reid	Sikes	Vander Jagt
Reuss	Sisk	Vanik
Rhodes	Skubitz	Veysey
Riegle	Slack	Vigorito
Roberts	Smith, Calif.	Waggonner
Robinson, Va.	Smith, Iowa	Waldie
Robison, N.Y.	Smith, N.Y.	Wampler
Rodino	Snyder	Ware
Roe	Spence	Whalen
Rogers	Springer	Whalley
Roncalio	Staggers	White
Rooney, Pa.	Stanton, J. William	Whitehurst
Rosenthal		Whitten
Rostenkowski	Stanton, James V.	Widnall
Roush		Wiggins
Rousselot	Steed	Williams
Roy	Steele	Wilson, Bob
Roybal	Steiger, Ariz.	Wilson, Charles H.
Runnels	Steiger, Wis.	
Ruppe	Stokes	Winn
Ruth	Stratton	Wolff
St Germain	Stubblefield	Wright
Sandman	Sullivan	Wyatt
Sarbanes	Symington	Wydler
Satterfield	Taylor	Wylie
Saylor	Teague, Calif.	Wyman
Scherle	Teague, Tex.	Yates
Scheuer	Terry	Yatron
Schneebeli	Thompson, Ga.	Young, Fla.
Schwengel	Thompson, N.J.	Young, Tex.
Scott	Thomson, Wis.	Zablocki
Sebelius	Thone	Zion
Seiberling	Tiernan	Zwach
Shipley	Udall	

NAYS—10

Ashbrook	Findley	Hall
Betts	Ford, Gerald R.	Schmitz
Collins, Tex.	Goldwater	
Colmer	Gross	

NOT VOTING—49

Abernethy	Edmondson	McFall
Ashley	Flynt	McMillan
Baker	Gallagher	Mathias, Calif.
Baring	Griffiths	Miller, Calif.
Blanton	Hagan	Nedzi
Blatnik	Hébert	Patman
Boland	Hungate	Pelly
Bolling	Hutchinson	Pepper
Broomfield	Ichord	Poage
Brown, Mich.	Jones, Tenn.	Pryor, Ark.
Burlison, Mo.	Landrum	Rarick
Chamberlain	Lennon	Rooney, N.Y.
Clay	Long, La.	Ryan
Conyers	McClure	Stephens
Davis, Ga.	McCormack	Stuckey
Dingell	McDonald, Mich.	Talcott
Dowdy		

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Mathias of California.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Ryan with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. McClure.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Hutchinson.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Edmondson.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Miller of California.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Burlison of Missouri with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. McCormack.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Hagan.
Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Abernethy.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Patman.
Mr. McFall with Mr. Dowdy.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read:

"A bill to amend the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 to provide for minimum Federal payments for two additional years, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WRIGHT. 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.

COVERAGE OF NONPROFIT HOSPITALS UNDER THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 11357) to amend the National Labor Relations Act to extend its coverage and protection to employees of nonprofit hospitals, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 11357

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2(2) of the National Labor Relations Act is amended by striking out the phrase: "or any corporation or association operating a hospital, if no part of the net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill represents a logical extension of the trend toward covering nonprofit hospitals under other Federal laws.

In 1964, they were covered by the Equal Employment Opportunity Act. In 1966, they were brought under the Fair Labor Standards Act. In 1970, they were covered by the Employment Security Amendments of 1970, calling on States to provide coverage under employment insurance laws.

The subcommittee had rather extensive hearings on this legislation and it is very widely supported, including support by the administration.

The typical hospital strike is a "recognition strike," which is called usually as a last resort because there is no other way the workers can get recognition.

The National Labor Relations Board machinery will virtually eliminate these strikes as the Secretary, Mr. Hodgson, points out in his letter. It can be expected that hospital strikes over economic issues will continue at their present very low levels because the unions are most reluctant to call them because of adverse public reaction.

We learned some rather amazing things about those hospitals which are organized by unions. In the case, for example, of the Mount Sinai Hospital in New York, which is one of these hospitals, and it has agreed to having a union there—prior to the organization of the employees, that had the incredible turnover rate of 1,500 percent per year for nonprofessional employees.

Over a short period of years, the turnover is down to 2 percent per month.

One can imagine what it must be like to try to administer a hospital where you have a more than 100-percent turnover in personnel each month.

A similar experience was had in the Johns Hopkins Hospital in Baltimore, except that the rate there was 1,200 percent per year.

The same experience was had in California and in other States that were reviewed.

Now the only reason the nonprofit hospital employees were excluded from the act under the Taft-Hartley amendment, as they had been covered under the Wagner Act, was doubt in the mind of the late senior Senator Tydings of Maryland that hospitals were in interstate commerce.

That doubt has been dissipated by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Butte Medical Properties case and in the Supreme Court of the United States by the case of Maryland against Wirtz in 1968.

Proprietary hospitals, in other words profitmaking hospitals, have for some time been included in the act. They represent about one-fourth of the number of hospitals in the United States.

Nonprofit hospitals have 48 percent of all hospitals—and have 66 percent of all admissions. They employ 1 million, if you please, 1,387,000 full time and full time equivalent workers.

In the fiscal year 1970, the total national health expenditures was $67.2 billion, constituting 7 percent of the gross national product.

The American Medical Association neither supports nor opposes the legislation.

The Catholic Hospital Association is not opposed and we have a number of letters from Catholic hospital employers favoring it.

The American Hospital Association is the only opposition—and they have a split in their ranks because both the New York and Massachusetts groups of that distinguished association favor this law.

A number of labor unions, of course, support it, as do professionals, such as the American Nurses Association and a number of others.

There was some doubt in the mind of officials of the Minnesota Bureau of Mediation Services, and we have taken care of that with language in the report, as we have with some doubts of the nurses groups.

At the moment, nine States provide some degree of coverage for hospitals under their labor laws, but it is very limited.

Federal hospitals, of course, are not and will not be covered by this amendment.

All of the statistics available—and all of the data available—and all but 2 percent of the testimony available to us indicates strong support, and justifiable support, for this legislation.

As has been pointed out by a number of hospital administrators and doctors during the course of the hearings, it is terribly difficult for the professional in the medical field to provide continuity of the type of good medical care to which they are committed when they must rely on the supporting services of a majority of the people in the hospital who are underpaid and unhappy, namely, those who are not professionals—the kitchen help, the clean-up people, and others. Both the Mount Sinai people and the Hopkins people, as well as the people at the Kaiser Hospital in California, have pointed out to us that when they have a degree of stability among their nonprofessional employees, patient care increases dramatically, making the job of the nurse, of the physician, of the surgeon, and the other professional people much easier.

This is, in my judgment, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, a long overdue and a perfectly justifiable action, and I hope that the House will approve it.

Mr. Speaker, the National Labor Relations Act extends its protections and prohibitions to all industries "affecting commerce", or burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce. It thus covers virtually every aspect of our national economy; and I might say that over the years the Labor Act—despite some flaws—has worked, and worked well.

However, we in Congress have exempted certain industries and categories of employees from the protections and prohibitions of the Labor Act.

We have exempted the U.S. Government and any wholly owned government corporation or any Federal Reserve Bank.

We have exempted the States, and the political subdivisions thereof.

We have exempted the industries covered by the Railway Labor Act.

We have exempted farm laborers, domestic employees, and individuals employed by a parent or spouse.

We have also exempted the nonprofit hospital.

In addition, we have authorized the Labor Board to decline to exercise jurisdiction when, in the opinion of the Board. "the effect of such labor dispute on commerce is not sufficiently substantial to warrant the exercise of its jurisdiction." Sec. 14(c)(1).

The Labor Board has experimented with this authority, first declining jurisdiction and later reimposing its jurisdiction, in a number of areas:

First. Colleges and universities privately owned and operated;

Second. Radio stations operated by religious organizations;

Third. Gambling casinos;

Fourth. Professional sports;

Fifth. Privately owned profit hospitals;

Sixth. Privately owned profit nursing homes, and

Seventh. Nonprofit nursing homes.

In all these and other situations, it was the experience of the Labor Board that the abstention of jurisdiction resulted in strikes and labor unrest; and that the imposition of jurisdiction was necessary to eliminate the causes of certain substantial obstructions to the free flow of interstate commerce. Currently, the Labor Board has under reconsideration its earlier decision to decline jurisdiction over the horse- and dog-race industries.

The purpose of 11357 is to apply the experiences of the past 25 years and repeal the statutory exemption given the nonprofit hospital industry in the Taft-Hartley Amendments of 1947. This is beyond the power of the Labor Board, but the selfsame type of experience that moved the Labor Board to repeal its self-imposed abstention in the areas mentioned above, particularly in the areas of the private hospital, the private rest home, and the nonprofit nursing home, compel us to move this bill.

THE LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND OF THE NONPROFIT HOSPITAL EXEMPTION

There is nothing magical or ordained about denying the protections and prohibitions of the Labor Act to the nonprofit hospital industry.

In the 1935 Wagner Act, Congress did not think such an exception was either wise or desirable; and neither the Labor Board nor the courts were willing to write such an exception into the law by implication.

In the early 1940's, a union—the Building Service and Maintenance Workers—organized the nonprofessional employees at the Central Dispensary and Emergency Hospital in the District of Columbia, and asked the Board for a secret ballot election. The hospital resisted, because it was nonprofit and charitable. The Labor Board, however, ordered that the election be held and commented that "employees of hospitals, like employees of automobile factories, must live upon their wages".

The hospital then appealed, as was its right, to the Court of Appeals. Then Judge Thurman Arnold wrote for a unanimous court that "neither the spirit or policy of the act is such" as to create an exemption for charitable hospitals. To the contrary, the Court wrote that "We cannot understand what considerations of public policy deprive hospital employees of the privilege granted to the employees of other institutions." The Court cited and relied upon the decisions of the supreme courts of several States which had construed State labor laws as not to exclude the employees of charitable hospitals from the protections given all other employees under these State laws.

There the matter stood until 1947, when we in Congress were considering novel, sweeping, and drastic alterations in the National Labor Relations Act. Our attention was focused on such matters as the "closed shop," the "secondary boycott," the "jurisdictional dispute" and other major concerns. It was at that time that the exemption for the nonprofit hospital slipped into the law.

There were proposals that nonprofit hospitals be exempted from the law, and there were hearings on these proposals on the Senate side. Senator Taft, for his committee, rejected these proposals, and did not recommend or report these proposals to the Senate. However, during the floor debate, Senator Tydings introduced an amendment exempting nonprofit hospitals, the debate was limited and sparse. Senator Tydings argued in support of his amendment that nonprofit hospitals:

> Cannot keep open, in certain cases, unless relief is afforded. The people who are affected are the poor people of the country. The amendment affects only charitable institutions, which do not derive a cent of profit, but are maintained by donations almost entirely.

The amendment passed the Senate, and came to the House. Here there was even less debate. Congressman Klein was the only Member to speak on the subject—against it. He commented that it was "ironical that organizations devoted to the social welfare should be exempted from bargaining with their own, often underpaid employees". The House passed the amendment, and it became part of section 2(2) of the 1947 Taft-Hartley amendments and reads as follows:

> The term "Employer" . . . shall not include . . . any corporation or association operating a hospital, if no part of the net earnings insures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

THERE IS WELL-NIGH UNIVERSAL AGREEMENT THAT THE 1947 EXEMPTION FOR THE NONPROFIT HOSPITAL SHOULD NOW BE REPEALED

The amendment exempting the nonprofit hospital industry was part of the 1947 Taft-Hartley amendments. Twenty-five years later, the Special Subcommittee on Labor commenced hearings on this subject. Hearings were held in Washington, D.C. and in the field. Representatives of the administration, the public, labor and management were all invited to submit their views. There was well-nigh uniformity of agreement that the exemption has long since served any usefulness it might once have had.

The administration supports the amendment, Secretary of Labor James Hodgson wrote the committee on July 19, 1972 as follows:

> In many instances, lack of ground rules for union recognition and collective bargaining in this sector has resulted in uncontrolled tests of strength in which the public as well as the parties suffer heavily. These issues will continue to arise, probably with increasing frequency. It is far better that they should be resolved through the orderly procedures of the National Labor Relations Act than through bitter and wasteful confrontations.

Labor unions support the amendment. The committee heard supportive testimony from a number of union spokesmen including: George Hardy, general president of the Service Employees International Union; Henry Wilson, on behalf of President Peter Fosco of the Laborer's International Union of North America; and Elliott Godoff, director of organization of the National Union of Hospital & Nursing Home Employees. Like the Secretary of Labor, these labor union spokesmen stressed the necessity for the orderly processes of the National Labor Relation Act as a substitute for the present "law of the jungle" where disputes must now be resolved "on the street."

Professional organizations support the amendment. We received supportive testimony from Michael Browne, chairman of the Association of Hospital Personnel Administrators of Greater New York; from Muriel A. Poulin, of the American Nurses Association; and from the American Society of Medical Technologists, representing 21,000 persons engaged in such specialties as microbiology, biochemistry, hematology, histology, and so on. The spokesmen for these groups stressed that "patient care" would be improved by upgrading—through unionization—the standards and working conditions of the nonprofessional employees.

Informed representatives of the public testified in support of the amendment: Ronald Cameron, a former Congressman and now a public accountant in California with many hospitals among his clients; Prof. Ted Ellsworth of the Institute of Industrial Relations at the University of California at Los Angeles—himself a director of two hospitals; the Honorable WILLIAM F. RYAN; and Prof. Anne Somers of the Rutgers Medical School and also a research associate at Princeton University's industrial relations section. These "public" experts were concerned about patient care, and the generally low status of the industry. Professor Somers, for example, testified that one-third of the registered nurses in the United States are not actively employed in nursing, in large part because of the poor salary levels. She also commented on the indifference or resentment sometimes expressed by the orderlies and maids, and said:

> It would be naive to assume that removal of the Taft-Hartley exemption will automatically result in better morals and more conscientiousness on the part of the typical employee.
>
> At the same time, it would be hard to conceive of a situation more conducive to feelings of resentment than the present one. Not only are tens of thousands earning only $1.60 an hour, the legal minimum, but they know that some individuals in the same institution are making $40,000, or even $100,000.

The only witness to oppose the bill was Henry J. Kutsch, president of the Ravenswood Hospital Medical Center in Chicago, Ill. He appeared on behalf of the American Hospital Association, some 7,000 nonprofit hospitals throughout the United States. He testified that enactment of the bill would result in, first, inefficiency in the operation of hospitals; second, strikes, and third, increased costs of hospital care. In addition, he testified that the hospitals themselves have made "tremendous strides" in providing good working conditions for their employees, and thus, by implication, that unions were not necessary.

At the close of his testimony he was asked if the Service Employees Union undertook to organize the Ravenswood Hospital fairly recently. Dr. Kutsch replied "no, sir."

Dr. Kutsch was technically correct. A

subsequent letter of the Service Employees Union recited that help organizers began to organize the Ravenwood Hospital in August of 1971, and that "help" is an organizing association comprised of the Service Employees Union and the Teamsters Union. Incidentally, the organizers were told by the hospital attorneys that the hospital would oppose any voluntary election, even if the union submitted proof that 100 percent of the employees belong to the union.

Representatives of management who testified, supported the bill. All the segments of management were invited to testify. The American Medical Association declined. The Federation of American Hospitals—representing 500 investor-owned hospitals—declined. However, many management groups did testify, and in favor of the bill.

The Catholic Hospital Association supported the bill, on the simple issue of morality. This association believes that all workers should have the right to voluntarily join a union.

The League of Voluntary Hospitals and Homes of New York testified for the bill, primarily because of the protection it would afford them in the way of "closed shop," secret ballot elections, jurisdictional disputes, and so on.

The Greater New York Hospital Association supports the bill, primarily for the reasons advanced by the Secretary of Labor.

The Hospital Association of New York State and the Massachusetts Hospital Association both supported the bill because of the need for some strong and expert impartial body to administer orderly procedure in the field of labor relations.

The Reverend John Simmons, the administrator of the Pacoima Memorial Lutheran Hospital in California, testified for the bill, out of his experience in administering a hospital since 1960 with a union contract.

I urge my colleagues here to support this bill.

ENACTMENT OF H.R. 11357 WOULD STABILIZE THE WORK FORCE AND IMPROVE THE STANDARDS OF MEDICAL CARE

Hospital workers work long hours with little reward. Consequently, there is constant turnover with a consequent lowering of the standards of medical care. This was emphasized over and over again by many of the witnesses.

Professor Somers testified that "Hospital employment is notoriously low paid." She said that the average annual salary in 1970 was $5,920; but "don't forget, this figure includes everyone on salary, the well-paid doctors and administrators as well as the underpaid nurses and nurses' aides." She added that the "relatively poor pay in the hospitals" is the principal reason why one-third of the registered nurses have left the profession.

This fact of "low pay" was borne out time and again.

Elliott Godoff testified that when the National Union of Hospital and Nursing Home employees called a "recognition" strike in New York in 1959, "Fully 55 percent of the workers who went out on strike were at that time receiving supplementation from the welfare department, for while they held full-time jobs in the hospitals, they were not able to earn a living. They had to be on welfare in order to be able to make ends meet."

President Hardy testified that in the nonprofit hospitals in Los Angeles, "the wage scale is $1.80 an hour," less than $100 a week.

Henry T. Wilson told of a "recognition" strike by the Laborers' Union at the St. Lukes and Childrens Medical Center in Philadelphia where the 300 kitchen personnel, nurses' aides, janitors, housekeepers, and so on "were fed up with their miserly wages—new employees were hired at $1.40 an hour—total lack of fringe benefits, and the hospital management's arrogant treatment."

Richard Liebes, research director of the Service Employees International Union gave a "profile" of a group "which desperately needs the benefits of collective bargaining."

> We are talking about a group which is pretty well toward the bottom in the wage category. We are talking about a group which is heavily minority. We are talking about a group which is heavily female.

Not only is this group poorly paid, but it is also denied most fringe benefits common in most industries. For example, the hospital employee typically has no health benefits. If he comes to work with a cold, he is sent home untreated—so as not to contaminate the patients—is not paid any sick leave, and quite often he is discharged to make way for a new and healthy employee.

One shocking bit of testimony was the repeated reference to turnover.

We learned that in 1959 at the Mount Sinai Hospital in New York there was a turnover of nonprofessional employees of 1,500 percent a year. This was before union recognition and a union contract. Now the turnover is less than 2 percent a month.

At Johns Hopkins Hospital in Baltimore, among the so-called nonprofessional workers, the turnover was approximately 700 percent per year: "that is, for every 10 workers who took a job, within a month's time six of these people would go to look for other jobs, because they made very little money. They had no benefits, no security whatsoever. So working in a hospital was just something you did until you could find something better."

Since union recognition, and a union contract, turnover at that hospital is less than 10 percent. The average wage at Johns Hopkins now is $100 per week.

The same testimony was heard on the west coast.

Reverend Simmons testified that he had recently attended a meeting of registered nurses to discuss the turnover problem, "which was in excess of 200 percent."

Professor Ellsworth testified that at the hospital of which he is a member of the board:

> We had 63 out of around 200 turnover between September 1 and December 1 of this year; and this excludes the department where hospitals have the most turnover, or at least a very high rate of turnover. This is in the maintenance department. We contract for this work through a maintenance company.

There is no question but that union organization, and improved standards of working conditions, cuts down on the rate of turnover.

We have the Mount Sinai experience: 1,500 percent before unionization, 24 percent after unionization.

We have the Johns Hopkins experience: 700 percent before unionization, 10 percent after unionization.

Reverend Simmons, who administers the only nonprofit hospital in the San Fernando Valley with a union contract, testified that the average turnover was in excess of 200 percent, at his hospital it "is way under 100."

Officials of Local 250 of the Service Employees Union, which has had union contracts with almost all the hospitals in San Francisco for a good many years testified that there was little turnover. The union has "retirement benefits" and a pension plan, with many employees eligible. He said that "in local 250 you will find it is not uncommon to have people 20, 25, 30 years in a hospital."

This is a major factor stressed by the professional organizations to support the termination of the nonprofit hospital exemption. Thus, the American Society of Medical Technologists testified:

> Absent the legal protection of the NLRA many job related problems arise that remain unresolved. These unresolved problems are a major contributing factor to the large employee turnover in the health care field. This turnover phenomenon creates a hardship on the patient: both from the increased health care costs incurred in replacing and reorienting new employees and from the reduced quality of care which is a direct result of only lesser qualified personnel being willing to tolerate the undesirable working conditions.

I ask all those who want improved health care to support this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11357, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, which would permit employees of nonprofit hospitals to come under the protection of the National Labor Relations Act. Considered in perspective it is a minor amendment to that act which will correct an inequity which has arisen in the coverage of the National Labor Relations Act. Under recent decisions of the National Labor Relations Board, employees of other nonprofit institutions, for example, employees of nonprofit nursing homes, nonprofit colleges, in fact almost every nonprofit organization which has an impact on commerce is now covered by the National Labor Relations Act. Employees of nonprofit hospitals are expressly excluded from coverage by the statute. The bill here merely deletes that exclusion.

I have attended and participated in the hearings on this bill. There are two basic reasons why I support this bill. One—the hearings held established that recognition strikes are an outgrowth of the lack of NLRB jurisdiction. Employers of nonprofit hospital employees are not required by law to recognize or bargain

with organizations representing such employees. In a number of instances, hospitals have voluntarily chosen to recognize and bargain with representatives of such employees. Where they refuse, however, employees are often forced to strike—not for better wages or fringe benefits, but merely to obtain recognition. In effect, current law denies such employees access to election procedures of the National Labor Relations Board. This bill would grant such employees access to the NLRB's election processes and should reduce if not eliminate the "recognition strike."

It should be noted, however, that the bill extends all the protections of the National Labor Relations Act to such employees. Thus, if an employee is fired for organizing a union, such employee can file charges with the NLRB. Conversely, the employer will get all the protections afforded him under the act that will protect him against unfair labor practices by a labor organization.

The second reason for my support of this bill—is simply a question of equity. Why should we continue an unwarranted discrimination against this one category of employees—the employees of nonprofit hospitals? There is no justification for permitting nurses, nurses aides, and other hospital employees to be covered under the National Labor Relations Act if they are employed anywhere but in a nonprofit hospital.

EVENHANDED PUBLIC POLICY

The continued exemption from Taft-Hartley of the voluntary nonprofit hospital can no longer be defended on moral grounds. When a hospital accepts a public policy which grants tax exemption, it is entirely wrong for them to support a public policy which excludes their employees from exercising the same rights as all other employees enjoy under Taft-Hartley.

It is difficult to find rationality and pragmatism in a labor policy which permits an employer to refuse to deal with employees on collective bargaining terms chosen by the employees. The consequences of such refusal, in the form of recognitional strikes and open strife, is then inflicted upon the public.

A hospital is a business enterprise, whether organized as a proprietary or nonprofit corporation. Consequently, if all hospitals are to serve the public health-care needs, they must be governed by a public policy which is evenhanded.

The committee members know that tax dollars have been given to build most nonprofit community hospitals, under Hill-Burton, since 1946. You also know that medicare and medicaid pay for hospital care services rendered to citizens. This money is tax money. Therefore, public policy, under Taft-Hartley, should apply equally to profit and nonprofit hospitals.

In sum, I support this bill because I believe that extending coverage of the National Labor Relations Act to this category of employees will result in greater labor stability by largely eliminating the recognition strike by providing access to the election procedures of the NLRB and just as important, this bill will correct the inequity now existing with respect to such employees.

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois such time as he may consume.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, my views in opposition to H.R. 11357 are expressed on page 11 of the committee's report but I would like to summarize them briefly for the benefit of the Members present.

Let me say that the original Taft-Hartley Act exempted nonprofit hospitals from coverage and I believe there are many valid reasons for continuing this exemption. As a businessman, I do not see how collective bargaining in its usual sense can be applied to hospitals. The nonprofit community hospital is not a factory or store; in fact, it has no true analogy in private industry. It does not manufacture or sell products. It deals in human beings. No part of its net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual. The hospital exists only for the good of its patients, not to make a product or a profit.

The essential relationship of hospital workers to the successful care and treatment of patients also clearly differentiates hospitals from business and industry generally. This relationship must not be interfered with by any outside influence if hospitals are to provide the assurances which the public must have for uninterrupted and constantly available high quality health services. In the final analysis the effectiveness of labor unions is based on strikes and certainly no community could tolerate widespread strike activity in its hospitals. In delivering patient care and services, hospitals are wholly dependent on their employees. I am sure a hospital suffering a strike would make every effort to provide for the needs of its patients but there would inevitably be delays or interruptions in the treatment of some patients with irreversible consequences.

In summary, I would like to reiterate my strong belief that enactment of H.R. 11357 or any amendment to the National Labor Relations Act which would bring about the general unionization of hospital employees would be inimical to the best interest of every individual in the community for we must all rely on the services of hospitals in time of need. I hope that these views will be given careful consideration in the vote on this legislation.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HICKS).

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor which has held exhaustive hearings on this matter, all of which I attended.

In 1947, Congress for the first time excluded the employees and employers in the nonprofit hospital industry from the protection and prohibitions of the National Labor Relations Act for two major reasons: First, because the health industry was not in interstate commerce; and second, because the nonprofit hospitals were "charitable" in nature.

Whatever the facts and law might have been in 1947, neither of those rationales are applicable today.

When the proposal to exempt nonprofit hospitals was made to the Senate committee in 1947, Senator Taft rejected it as unnecessary. He commented that:

The committee felt that hospitals were not engaged in interstate commerce: and that their business should not be so construed.

In 1947, there were approximately 350,000 persons employed in hospitals, and whether Senator Taft was then correct in his legal assessment of "interstate commerce" is no longer relevant.

The annual U.S. health bill is now $75 billion; and almost 3 million persons are employed in hospitals.

Number of workers in hospitals equals or exceeds the number of workers in such other industries as aircraft, motor vehicles, textile products, apparel and related products, printing and publishing, chemicals and allied products, railway transportation, communications, department stores, banking, and hotels.

There are approximately 7,123 hospitals in the United States with combined assets of $36.2 billion. They spent more than $25 billion in providing services to their patients, and have a payroll of over $15 billion.

In 1969, HEW Secretary Finch reported at a White House conference Federal expenditures for health exceed the entire budgets for each of the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Housing and Urban Development, Interior, Justice, Labor, Post Office, State, Transportation, and Veterans' Administration.

The U.S. Federal Health Budget exceeds the total national budgets of all but eight nations in the world.

It is no wonder, then, that all courts and agencies which have passed upon the subject of late have ruled that hospitals are in interstate commerce, and hence subject to regulation by Congress.

The National Labor Relations Board so held when it successively exercised jurisdiction over private proprietary hospitals; over private proprietary nursing homes; and over nonprofit nursing homes.

The Supreme Court so held when in Maryland against Wirtz it sustained the power and authority of Congress to bring hospital employees under the 1966 amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act.

There is simply no constitutional barrier to exercising jurisdiction over the gigantic nonprofit hospital industry, and thereby eliminating some 3 million employees from second-class citizenship.

Senator Tydings urged enactment of the nonprofit hospital exemption on the theory that they are "charitable institutions, which do not derive a cent of profit, but are maintained by donation almost entirely."

That is certainly not the situation today.

The American Nurses Association informed the committee that:

The growth of the Blue Cross System and other forms of hospital expenses prepayment and insurance plans created a new financial

base for the industry. In 1940, barely one in ten Americans had hospital insurance; by 1970, at least eight in ten were protected for the costs of hospital care. Total expenditures for hospital care in fiscal year 1970 amounted to $25.6 million. About seventy per cent of the consumers' share of the bill was covered by insurance payments. Of the total expenditures, 1.4 per cent was derived from sources other than consumer payments and public funds.

This testimony was reinforced by all other witnesses who spoke on the point.

The Reverend Simmons, who heads the Pacoima Memorial Lutheran Hospital in the outskirts of Los Angeles, testified that:

There is just no way to operate a hospital on charitable contributions. I could keep open maybe 1 day in a year, maybe, you know, if I was lucky.

He continued to say:

The committee members know that tax dollars have given to build most nonprofit community hospitals, under Hill-Burton, since 1946. You also know that medicare and medicaid pay for hospital care services rendered to citizens.

In short, the day of the charitable hospital operating by donations from wealthy patrons for the benefit of the poor is over. The only "eleemosynary" hospital any witness could identify today is the City of Hope. It was described as a "purely-charitable organization," the "only one I know of," supported by subscription the country over, which has never charged a patient for any care, treatment, or service. We also learned that the City of Hope has a union contract.

There are several categories of hospitals in the United States. There are the Federal, State, or public hospitals operated by tax funds. There are the profit or proprietary hospitals. And there are the nonprofit hospitals. The largest of these categories is the nonprofit group. In 1970, it accounted for 48 percent of all hospitals, 66 percent of all admissions, and 55 percent of total expenditure and number of employees. According to the American Hospital Association, the nonprofits employed 1,387,000 full-time employees in 1970.

The employees at the U.S. hospitals enjoy the rights to self-organization and collective bargaining under Presidential Executive order.

The employees of the State and municipal hospitals enjoy the right to self-organization and collective bargaining under the laws of many of our States.

The employees of the private or proprietary hospitals enjoy the right to self-organization and collective bargaining under the decisions of the National Labor Relations Board.

Only the employees of the nonprofit hospitals are excluded from these rights.

And for no good reason.

Reverend Simmons, the director of the Pacoima Memorial Lutheran Hospital, testified that:

The philosophic ground for excluding nonprofit hospitals is because they are charitable or nonprofit. This is absurd. A voluntary nonprofit hospital, whether sectarian or nonsectarian in its affiliation, is a business operation.

We have studied area comparisons of rates between nonprofit and proprietary hospitals, and there are no differences. The rates charged the patients by both types of hospitals are the same.

Similarly, when nonprofit and proprietary hospitals deal with third-party vendors or suppliers of goods and services, there are no differences in costs.

Doctors and the professional staff, when hired by either nonprofit or proprietary hospitals, have the natural expectation that they will be paid on the basis of the going rate of compensation.

Michael McDermott, assistant to President Hardy of the Service Employees International Union, summed it all up when he testified as follows:

Service to the community is the basic purpose of both proprietary and nonprofit hospitals, and they perform this service in near-identical fashion.

The proprietary hospital has a board of directors controlling operations of the hospital. The nonprofit hospital also has a board of directors controlling operations of the hospital.

The proprietary hospital belongs to an employer's association . . . the nonprofit hospital belongs to the same employers' association—Southern California Hospital Council.

The proprietary hospital requires verification of medical insurance from incoming patients. The nonprofit hospital also requires verification of medical insurance from incoming patients; and they have been known to refuse admission to patients if somebody did not have the money or they did not have insurance coverage.

The charges for semiprivate rooms and intensive care costs are the same for both proprietary and nonprofit hospitals.

Mr. McDermott also related several instances where nonprofit hospitals were purchased by private parties, and where proprietary hospitals reorganized and became nonprofit—all without change in any way which concerned the patient. In one situation—Queen of Angels Hospital—the hospital was originally nonprofit and its employees were excluded from the protection of the Labor Act. The hospital was then purchased by an insurance company out of Philadelphia, and the employees were thereby brought within the protection of the Labor Act—and the employees joined his union.

Mr. McDermott asked, and rightfully so:

Now, what kind of logic is it that, because of the sale, the employees received rights previously denied them? By what rationale should the rights and responsibilities of both the employers and employees be shifted because of a mere shift in the type of ownership?

Professor Ted Ellsworth of UCLA, who serves as a director on several nonprofit hospitals, reinforced the testimony outlined above. He said that the so-called nonprofit hospitals "certainly are not charitable hospitals," and told of several instances—which prompted lawsuits—wherein nonprofit hospitals refused to give admission without payment by the person seeking admission.

Professor Ellsworth continued to give several other examples where there are no differences between nonprofit and proprietary hospitals. He testified:

We compete in every way at our hospital with the proprietary hospitals, and they compete with us.

We compete for doctors—we compete for employees, especially registered nurses. There is a shortage of nurses; and we compete for those nurses.

We compete for the community support, and by that I mean the support of the various organizations that influence hospitalization.

We compete for government work and emergency work. In every other respect we compete with them.

Professor Ellsworth gave even further illustrations of how the two types of hospitals are identical:

In the hospital industry, there is a polling of all sorts of resources, both proprietary and nonprofit hospitals. Insurance—there is a poll through the hospital council of health insurance and other insurance plans.

There is an organization set up known as Cash, which does buying for both types of hospitals?

There is an organization set up to do the laundry work, and this sort of thing.

In form, there is a difference between proprietary and nonprofit hospitals. The former operate for profit; the latter as a matter of theory operate without profit. But listen to the testimony of former Congressman Ronald Cameron:

As a certified public accountant who has done a lot of auditing in hospitals, I can assure you that there is absolutely no distinction between a nonprofit and a proprietary hospital except where the profits go. They just get channeled in a different vein, but, nevertheless, a nonprofit hospital does in fact make a substantial profit for the benefit of special people.

When asked if there were any differences between the two types of hospitals, he replied "Absolutely none at all," and explained:

The proprietary hospital does pay income tax to the extent that they show a profit. However, most show very little profit; because what they do is lease out the pharmacy, lease out the X-ray equipment, lease-purchase agreements, this type of thing.

So that the bottom line on any hospital income statement is virtually nil. And it makes no difference what the organizational structure of the hospital is.

The Labor Board and the courts have recognized that the form of organization makes no difference whatsoever in the health-care field. It has been mentioned earlier that in 1967 the Labor Board asserted jurisdiction over proprietary hospitals—Butte Medical Properties, 168 NLRB Home, 168 NLRB 53. The Board concluded in these cases that experience indicated that the theretofore withholding of NLRB jurisdiction did not cut down on the number of strikes or of labor unrest. However, in 1968 the Labor Board refused to assert jurisdiction over the nonprofit "nursing home" industry—the Labor Act denies it jurisdiction over the nonprofit hospital industry. The affected union filed suit, and the Federal court in Illinois held that it was "arbitrary" for the Labor Board to exercise jurisdiction over the proprietary nursing homes, and to withhold jurisdiction over the nonprofit nursing homes—because there were no distinctions between the two which had any effect on the subject matter of Labor Board jurisdiction. *Council 19* v. *NLRB*, 296 F. Supp. 1100 (N.D. Ill. 1968). The Labor Board did not appeal to the court of

appeals, but readily asserted jurisdiction over the nonprofit nursing home industry. *Drexel Home, Inc.*, 182 NLRB No. 151 (1970).

Just as there is no distinction between the proprietary and nonprofit segments of the nursing home industry, there is no distinction between the proprietary and nonprofit segments of the hospital industry. But since the matter is beyond the power of the Labor Board or the courts to remedy, it is time for us in Congress to end this artificial distinction. I urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA).

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support—enthusiastic and unqualified support—of H.R. 11357, the bill to extend the National Labor Relations Act to nonprofit hospitals and their employees.

It is not necessary for me to expand upon the able presentation of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON). He has persuasively and fully explained the purpose of this legislation, and the justification for it.

However, since I have filed concurring views, together with seven very distinguished members of the committee, I think I should seek to explain those views, in the hope of clarifying the legislative history of this bill.

H.R. 11357, in its terms, seeks to bring the employees of nonprofit hospitals under the terms of the National Labor Relations Act, in the same manner, and under the same conditions as other employees who are already covered. No other explanation of the provisions of the bill can be offered. The bill is clear. It is unequivocal. It does what it sets forth to do without the slightest confusion.

The committee report, however, if read independently of the bill itself, and without a thorough airing of the history, might be used to give the color of legitimacy to a cession by the Board of the jurisdiction which the bill confers upon the Board.

There is a provision in section 10 of the basic statute which gives the Board the authority to cede jurisdiction over certain types of industries:

> Unless the provision of the State or territorial statute applicable to the determination of such cases by such agency is inconsistent with the corresponding provision of this act or has received a construction inconsistent therewith.

This provision has been in the law for 25 years, Mr. Speaker, and in all those 25 years no Board majority has ever seen fit to use that authority. When a provision of law remains unused for a quarter of a century this fact itself may be deemed to be a part of our labor law. I do not assert that the cession authority has lapsed due to its long history of nonuse, but there is certainly a presumption that it is an authority which should only be revived after long and careful consideration.

The committee report does contain language which would seem to put the committee on record as encouraging that use. On my own behalf, and on behalf of seven other members of the committee, including three of the five majority members of the subcommittee which reported this bill, I would like to vigorously dissent from the proposition that "the committee urges the Board" to take such an unprecedented step.

I readily acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, that some very respected and able members of the committee do feel that the jurisdiction should be ceded. They have every right to that opinion. But I am sure that they would agree that the cession of jurisdiction is something that may not be done lightly. I would urge the Board to continue to weigh such proposals with the same care that it has shown for a quarter ecntury, and as a supporter of H.R. 11357, as a member of the subcommittee that drafted it, I would express the hope that the Board would refrain from changing its longstanding practices in this area without further consultation with the legislative branch.

The same caveat, Mr. Speaker, applies to those portions of the report in which the committee appears to be instructing the Board in the application of the very complex case law governing the question of who is and who is not a supervisor. These decisions, Mr. Speaker, are left by the basic statute, to the Board. That was the intention of the Congress, and I think it should be adhered to unless and until the Congress expressly, by legislation, instructs the Board to change its ways.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLORY).

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask one question. I have been concerned about strikes of hospital employees and municipal officials who perform essential services of a public nature. I am wondering whether this change in the law will affect strikes of hospital employees, or prevent strikes, or have anything to do with supporting or condoning strikes by hospital employees?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would say on the basis of the hearings—I attended all of them and I traveled a number of places—yes, there is always a chance of strikes, just as there is always a chance of strikes as far as policemen and there is a chance of strikes as far as teachers and there is a chance of strikes as far as firemen are concerned. But the clear weight of the evidence in our hearings is that the overwhelming majority of strikes, 95 percent of strikes were on something as fundamental as recognition and not on money or fringe benefits. It would seem implicit in the evidence that this would eliminate the major cause for strikes affecting hospitals in the country today. I would say that in answer to the gentleman.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I might amplify by saying strikes in those areas are already legal. This proposes the right of recognition and to sit down and argue. This specifically does not include municipal or State or Federal hospitals nor has it anything to do with any other public employees.

Mr. McCLORY. Then in the gentleman's opinion this does not affect the right to strike one way or the other, does it?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. No, quite frankly.

Mr. McCLORY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BADILLO).

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. I commend the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, as seven of my colleagues on the Education and Labor Committee and I noted in separate views of this measure, although we support H.R. 11357, we oppose the language in the report, pertaining to section 10 of the NLRA, which urges the Labor Board to cede jurisdiction to the States if it determines that State law is substantially equivalent to Federal law. As we observed:

> This report language . . . goes beyond the language of the bill, and could be interpreted as implying a change in the basic Act itself . . . in a way that the language of H.R. 11357 will not support.

The Board has had this authority for some 25 years and has never taken steps to use it and cede jurisdiction. The legislative history should be made clear that the Congress does not intend that a regulatory agency depart from 25 years of precedent and chart some new course in labor law, particularly without full consideration by the Congress

Naturally, all members of the committee were deeply concerned about the problem of strikes at hospitals. We do not want to pass any laws which will result in leaving sick patients unattended while the nurses, technicians, and nonprofessional employees picket in the streets outside the hospital.

If we thought this might be the consequence, we would not report this bill. However, we are almost unanimous in our recommendation that this bill be passed.

All the witnesses, with but one exception—Henry J. Kutsch of the Ravenswood Hospital Medical Center—testified in favor of the bill because it would eliminate the principal cause of strikes, and thereby greatly diminish the number of strikes.

There have been hospital strikes, far too many of them, at Mount Sinai Hospital in New York City, at Cedars of Lebanon in Los Angeles, and in many hospitals between the two coasts—at the Medical College of South Carolina Hospital in Charleston; at the Presbyterian University and Mercy Hospitals in Cleveland; at the Memorial Hospital in Cumberland, Md.; at the Good Samatarian Hospital in Dayton, Ohio; at the Wesley Memorial Hospital in Chicago; at the Notre Dame Hospital in San Francisco; at the Masonic Home in Alameda, and elsewhere.

These strikes caused inconvenience, but no danger, to the public. The hos-

pital employees take great pain to insure that there will be no danger.

Lionne Conta, executive director of the California Nurses Association, gave an analogy to the airline pilots. She testified that:

When the airline pilot goes on strike, he doesn't walk into the cabin at 30,000 feet with a parachute on and say, Ladies and gentlemen, the strike begins now, too bad for you.

Similarly, the Nurses Association takes a lot of trouble to avoid any inconvenience before going on strike. Miss Conta testified that:

Management is alerted, medical staff is alerted, the date is set, the time is known; it is possible to refuse admissions to hospitals. Both planned admissions and the ones that are not emergency nature can be postponed. Some patients who are ready for going home can go home earlier. Transfers to other facilities are possible. There is a way to reduce patient loads before the time comes. *And there are plans for emergency staffing.*

Miss Conta said that "other employee groups in hospitals" take the same precautionary steps, and we heard direct testimony to this.

President Hardy of the International Service Employees Union testified:

When we strike a hospital, we advertise to all patients and doctors prior to the strike that there is going to be a strike. *We furnish ambulances to move any patients* that might have to be moved out of the hospitals. We don't strike a hospital to say, "All right, we will strike you tomorrow morning", but we give ample notice and generally put a sign out in front of the hospital informing them there will be a strike in the hospital and notify every doctor when the strike comes. . . . President Hardy testified that he did not like strikes:

We don't like to hurt patients because they are generally our own members in many cases. We give them ample warning and notify the administration and we "pamphlet" the hospital saying there is going to be a strike. We ask the doctors not to put their patients there. We do everything we can to warn them.

President Hardy concluded that:

Invariably a lot of doctors won't move their patients and are not going to do it, but we have no choice. It is either them or us. We have to face up to our responsibility that these people are not getting decent wages and we have to strike.

Why do the unions strike? Because there is no other way to get the management to the bargaining table and discuss employee grievances.

The tale was told over and over again—the union would organize a large majority of employees, write letters asking for a conference, and inevitably get no answer. The only way to make the hospital administrator listen was by going out on strike.

Here is the testimony of President Hardy on this score. He told Mr. ASHBROOK that the main cause for strikes was "recognition":

You organize the workers, you go out and you work hard and you set up your organization committees in the nurses department, the housekeeping department, and when you get a majority and feel you have the majority of the workers, then you write a letter to the hospital management. Then there is a constant delay and you write another letter. Usually, you get no answer, so then you go through the central labor council and they, in turn, write a letter and you still get no answer.

You finally call upon somebody else. It might be a religious hospital and you go to the various persons who are the heads of the religious organization in the community and you try to use them. You check the board of directors and we make every effort to work with them.

Finally, either the union got through to the hospital administration and there was an election in the appropriate unit; or the union did not get through and there was a strike.

Other unions repeated the same story. Elliott Godoff, the director of organization for the National Union of Hospital & Nursing Home Employees testified that there was a 46-day strike by 7,000 hospital workers in New York City in 1959—to get recognition at eight different hospitals.

In 1962, there was another series of strikes in New York City—also for recognition.

In 1963, New York passed a law requiring the hospitals to recognize and bargain with any unions selected by employees in secret ballot election since that time, there have been no strikes in any hospital in New York.

Mr. Godoff testified:

The law was passed and in 1963 it went into effect and I can tell you that there has not been a strike in the city of New York on the question of representation and there certainly has been no strike on the question of collective bargaining in this field where, in New York City, we now represent 50,000 hospital workers in the voluntary non-profit field".

Mr. Godoff testified about the long and bitter strike in Charleston—for recognition—and then contrasted the situation in Baltimore.

When his union began to organize in Baltimore, it anticipated a repeat of the Charleston situation; but Governor Mandel and the mayor got together with the hospital administrators; and it was decided to "grant elections to the hospital workers to determine whether or not they wanted collective bargaining rights."

The union won some elections, lost a few elections, and the question of representation was resolved in a peaceful and orderly fashion. As Mr. Punch, the organizer in charge of the Baltimore drive, testified:

There were no strikes, there were no interruptions in patient care, disturbance in the community, polarization on other questions. There was none of this in the city of Baltimore, where representation elections were granted.

The union organizers gave other similar examples: In Pittsburgh where there was a bitter strike for recognition which resulted in a State law; and thereafter a peaceful organizing drive in Philadelphia with some wins and some losses.

But the point driven home by all witnesses is that when the hospitals refuse recognition, there is no alternative to the strike; but when the hospitals either voluntarily, or pursuant to State law are required to negotiated with a duly elected union, strikes become a thing of the past.

As Mr. Godoff summarized his experiences along the east coast:

We never really, in dealing with hosiptals, had to engage in strikes over an economic package.

One reason for the absence of strikes in contract negotiations—after recognition is achieved—is that all the unions and professional organizations who testified are in the practice of signing "no strike" clauses, and substituting other techniques for the resolution of economic disputes.

The Secretary of Labor, the unions, the professional organizations, the management witnesses, the informed and concerned public witnesses—all testified that enactment of the bill would eliminate the major cause for strife. Without this bill, Secretary Hodgson told us:

Uncontrolled tests of strength will continue to arise; and it is far better that they be resolved through the orderly procedures of the National Labor Relations Act than through bitter and wasteful confrontations.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the committee for bringing to the floor the kind of legislation which has been described by the ranking minority member and the chairman.

I should like, in addition to giving my support to this measure, after looking down the list of the matters to come before this body today, to suggest that perhaps not everybody would entertain the same assessment of the values of all these pieces of legislation, and perhaps some might have a different attitude in terms of all the rollcalls that may be coming.

I have the feeling that perhaps somebody would like to have a rollcall on every one of these matters, and, of course, I would be highly disappointed, having been here on Monday, that they do not keep me here until the middle of the night considering, by votes, some of these important matters, such as the Fossil Butte, Wyo., National Monument; the Grant-Kohrs Ranch, Mont., National Historic Site; and in the motels around Disneyland, from which I come, the people can speak of little else.

I trust we will treat these other matters with the heavy concern they deserve.

I certainly want to emphasize I believe it is wise consideration we are giving this measure, which is wholly justified, and I hope every Member of the House will hold the same minimum of high excitement as I entertain for some of these other measures for which rollcall votes are so zealously sought.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RANDALL. The gentleman mentioned a moment ago that this is a category of jobs that serve the sick who when hospitalized are many times helpless and at the mercy of the hospital attendants. Would this bill give a new "opportunity"

to strike? Also I would ask the gentleman whether any of these hospitals are now organized, in the sense unions exist in these hospitals?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. A great many of them are already organized, on a voluntary basis. There are the two I have mentioned, and any number of others, which have found that it is in the best interests of the hospitals and of the patients to have unions, and they are there on a voluntary basis. About 95 percent of the conflict in this field has been the strike for recognition.

Mr. RANDALL. Of course I know we have the operating or stationary engineers that run the heating and cooling systems. Nurses are not organized, nor a majority of the employees?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The majority of the nurses, I say to my colleague from Missouri, are already organized.

Mr. RANDALL. Have you any figures as to how many of these hospitals would be covered by this legislation?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Forty-three percent of all hospitals.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, while I have not carefully studied this bill because it was scheduled or programed under suspension of the rules and was therefore presumed to be of a noncontroversial nature, I must state straightforwardly I have some misgivings about involving our hospitals under the National Labor Relations Act.

As I have said repeatedly, I support the principle of collective bargaining in most industrial disputes. However, I do have reservations concerning such things as a nationwide transportation strike which would affect the entire country. I have reservations about strikes of unlimited duration in such vital public service jobs as firemen and policemen.

I must state frankly that there also exists some reservation concerning labor stoppages by hospital employees. It seems to me that if there were a total strike at a hospital, leaving out of account possible loss of life, there could nonetheless be many helpless patients, not ambulatory who would suffer if left without sorely needed hospital attention.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 11357.

The question was taken.

Mr. ASHBROOK. 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 285, nays 95, answered "present" 1, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 304]

YEAS—285

Abourezk	Forsythe	Moss
Abzug	Fraser	Murphy, Ill.
Adams	Frelinghuysen	Murphy, N.Y.
Addabbo	Frenzel	Myers
Anderson, Calif.	Fuqua	Natcher
	Garmatz	Nelsen
Anderson, Ill.	Gaydos	Nix
Anderson, Tenn.	Giaimo	Obey
	Gibbons	O'Hara
Andrews, N. Dak.	Goldwater	O'Konski
	Gonzalez	O'Neill
Annunzio	Goodling	Patten
Arends	Grasso	Perkins
Ashbrook	Gray	Peyser
Aspin	Green, Pa.	Pickle
Aspinall	Grover	Pike
Badillo	Gubser	Podell
Barrett	Gude	Poff
Begich	Haley	Preyer, N.C.
Belcher	Halpern	Price, Ill.
Bell	Hamilton	Pucinski
Bennett	Hanley	Quie
Bergland	Hanna	Railsback
Biaggi	Hansen, Idaho	Rangel
Biester	Hansen, Wash.	Rees
Bingham	Harrington	Reid
Boggs	Harsha	Reuss
Boland	Harvey	Rhodes
Bow	Hastings	Riegle
Brademas	Hathaway	Robison, N.Y.
Brasco	Hawkins	Rodino
Bray	Hays	Roe
Brooks	Hechler, W. Va.	Roncalio
Brotzman	Heckler, Mass.	Rooney, Pa.
Brown, Ohio	Heinz	Rosenthal
Broyhill, N.C.	Helstoski	Rostenkowski
Burke, Fla.	Hicks, Mass.	Roush
Burke, Mass.	Hicks, Wash.	Roy
Burton	Hillis	Roybal
Byrne, Pa.	Hogan	Runnels
Byron	Holifield	Ruppe
Carey, N.Y.	Horton	St Germain
Carney	Hosmer	Sandman
Cederberg	Howard	Sarbanes
Celler	Jacobs	Saylor
Chisholm	Johnson, Calif.	Scheuer
Clancy	Johnson, Pa.	Schwengel
Clark	Jones, Ala.	Seiberling
Collins, Ill.	Karth	Shipley
Conover	Kastenmeier	Shoup
Conte	Keating	Shriver
Corman	Kee	Sikes
Cotter	Keith	Sisk
Coughlin	Kemp	Skubitz
Culver	King	Slack
Curlin	Kluczynski	Smith, Iowa
Daniel, Va.	Koch	Smith, N.Y.
Daniels, N.J.	Kyl	Springer
Danielson	Kyros	Staggers
Davis, S.C.	Leggett	Stanton, J. William
Davis, Wis.	Lent	
de la Garza	Link	Stanton, James V.
Delaney	Lloyd	
Dellenback	Long, Md.	Steed
Dellums	Lujan	Steele
Denholm	McCloskey	Steiger, Wis.
Dent	McCollister	Stokes
Devine	McDade	Stubblefield
Dickinson	McFall	Sullivan
Diggs	McKevitt	Symington
Donohue	Macdonald, Mass.	Teague, Calif.
Dow		Thompson, N.J.
Downing	Madden	Thone
Drinan	Mahon	Tiernan
Dulski	Mailliard	Udall
Duncan	Mallary	Ullman
du Pont	Matsunaga	Van Deerlin
Eckhardt	Mazzoli	Vander Jagt
Edwards, Ala.	Meeds	Vanik
Edwards, Calif.	Melcher	Veysey
Eilberg	Metcalfe	Vigorito
Erlenborn	Michel	Waldie
Esch	Mikva	Wampler
Eshleman	Miller, Ohio	Ware
Evans, Colo.	Mills, Ark.	Whalen
Evins, Tenn.	Minish	Whalley
Fascell	Mink	White
Findley	Minshall	Whitehurst
Fish	Mitchell	Widnall
Flood	Mollohan	Wiggins
Foley	Monagan	Williams
Ford, Gerald R.	Moorhead	Wilson, Bob
Ford, William D.	Morgan	Wilson, Charles H.
	Mosher	
Winn	Wydler	Young, Tex.
Wolff	Wyman	Zablocki
Wright	Yates	Zwach
Wyatt	Yatron	

NAYS—95

Abbitt	Flowers	Powell
Alexander	Fountain	Price, Tex.
Andrews, Ala.	Frey	Purcell
Archer	Galifianakis	Quillen
Betts	Gettys	Randall
Bevill	Griffin	Roberts
Blackburn	Gross	Robinson, Va.
Brinkley	Hall	Rogers
Broyhill, Va.	Hammer-schmidt	Rousselot
Buchanan		Ruth
Burleson, Tex.	Henderson	Satterfield
Byrnes, Wis.	Hull	Scherle
Cabell	Jarman	Schmitz
Caffery	Jonas	Schneebeli
Camp	Jones, N.C.	Scott
Carlson	Kazen	Sebelius
Carter	Kuykendall	Smith, Calif.
Casey, Tex.	Landgrebe	Snyder
Chappell	Latta	Spence
Clausen, Don H.	McClory	Steiger, Ariz.
	McEwen	Stratton
Clawson, Del	McKay	Taylor
Cleveland	McKinney	Teague, Tex.
Collier	Mann	Terry
Collins, Tex.	Martin	Thompson, Ga.
Colmer	Mathis, Ga.	Thomson, Wis.
Conable	Mayne	Waggonner
Crane	Mills, Md.	Whitten
Dennis	Mizell	Wylie
Derwinski	Montgomery	Young, Fla.
Dorn	Nichols	Zion
Dwyer	Pettis	
Fisher	Pirnie	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Hunt

NOT VOTING—51

Abernethy	Fulton	McMillan
Ashley	Gallagher	Mathias, Calif.
Baker	Green, Oreg.	Miller, Calif.
Baring	Griffiths	Nedzi
Blanton	Hagan	Passman
Blatnik	Hébert	Patman
Bolling	Hungate	Pelly
Broomfield	Hutchinson	Pepper
Brown, Mich.	Ichord	Poage
Burlison, Mo.	Jones, Tenn.	Pryor, Ark.
Chamberlain	Landrum	Rarick
Clay	Lennon	Rooney, N.Y.
Conyers	Long, La.	Ryan
Davis, Ga.	McClure	Stephens
Dingell	McCormack	Stuckey
Dowdy	McCulloch	Talcott
Edmondson	McDonald, Mich.	
Flynt		

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rooney of New York and Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Blatnik and Mr. Ryan for, with Mr. Lennon against.

Mr. Pepper and Mr. Nedzi for, with Mr. McMillan against.

Mrs. Griffiths and Mr. McCormack for, with Mr. Passman against.

Mr. Clay and Mr. Conyers for, with Mr. Abernethy against.

Mrs. Green of Oregon and Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Rarick against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Burleson of Missouri with Mr. Mathias of California.

Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Baker.

Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Pelly.

Mr. Fulton with Mr. Brown of Michigan.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Chamberlain.

Mr. Stephens with Mr. McClure.

Mr. Hungate with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Ashley with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.

Mr. Blanton with Mr. Hutchinson.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Hogan.

Mr. HUNT changed his vote from "yea" to "present."

Messrs. NICHOLS, WHITTEN, BLACKBURN, BROYHILL of Virginia, KUYKENDALL, RUTH, DON H. CLAUSEN, FLOWERS, and FOUNTAIN changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. 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.

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

There was no objection.

SERVICE CONTRACT ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 15376) to amend the Service Contract Act of 1965 to revise the method of computing wage rates under such act, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 15376

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 2(a)(1) of the Service Contract Act of 1965 is amended by striking out all after "locality," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "or, where a collective-bargaining agreement covers any such service employees, in accordance with the rates for such employees provided for in such agreement, including, if the Secretary so elects, prospective wage increases provided for in such agreement as a result of arm's-length negotiations. In no case shall such wages be lower than the minimum specified in subsection (b)".

(b) Section 2(a)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out the period after "locality" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", or, where a collective-bargaining agreement covers any such service employees, to be provided for in such agreement, including, if the Secretary so elects, prospective fringe benefit increases provided for in such agreement as a result of arm's-length negotiations."

SEC. 2. Section 2(a) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) A statement of the rates that would be paid by the Federal agency to the various classes of service employees of section 5341 of title 5, United States Code, were applicable to them. The Secretary shall give due consideration to such rates in making the wage and fringe benefit determinations specified in this section."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 4(b) of such Act is amended by striking out all after "Act" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(other than section 10), but only in special circumstances where he determines that such limitation, variation, tolerance, or exemption is necessary and proper in the public interest or to avoid the serious impairment of government business, and is in accord with the remedial purpose of this Act to protect prevailing labor standards."

(b) Section 4 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) No contractor or subcontractor under a contract, which succeeds a contract subject to this Act and under which substantially the same services are furnished, shall pay any service employee under such contract less than the wages and fringe benefits, including accrued wages and fringe benefits, and, if the Secretary so elects, any prospective increases in wages and fringe benefits provided for in a collective-bargaining agreement as a result of arm's-length negotiations, to which such service employee would have been entitled if he were employed under the predecessor contract.

"(d) Subject to limitations in annual appropriation Acts but notwithstanding any other provision of law, contracts to which this Act applies may, if authorized by the Secretary, be for any term of years and exceeding five, if each such contract provides for the periodic adjustment of wages and fringe benefits pursuant to future determinations, issued in the manner prescribed in section 2 of this Act no less often than once every two years during the term of the contract, covering the various classes of service employees."

SEC. 4. Section 5(a) of such Act is amended by inserting before the first comma of the second sentence the words "because of unusual circumstances" and by adding at the end of such section 5(a) the following: "Where the Secretary does not otherwise recommend because of unusual circumstances, he shall, not later than thirty days after a hearing examiner has made a finding of a violation of this Act, forward to the Comptroller General the name of the individual or firm found to have violated the provisions of this Act."

SEC. 5. Such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 10. It is the intent of the Congress that determinations of minimum monetary wages and fringe benefits for the various classes of service employees under the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 2 should be made with respect to all contracts subject to this Act, as soon as it is administratively feasible to do so. In any event, the Secretary shall make such determinations with respect to at least the following contracts subject to this Act which are entered into during the applicable fiscal year:

"(1) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, all contracts under which more than twenty-five service employees are to be employed.

"(2) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, all contracts under which more than twenty service employees are to be employed.

"(3) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, all contracts under which more than fifteen service employees are to be employed.

"(4) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, all contracts under which more than ten service employees are to be employed.

"(5) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977, all contracts under which more than five service employees are to be employed.

"(6) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1978, and for each fiscal year thereafter, all contracts subject to this Act."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 15376, a bill to amend the Service Contract Act of 1965. This bill was reported out unanimously by the Committee on Education and Labor and is a product of intensive bipartisan study and investigation.

The Special Subcommittee on Labor, which I have the privilege to chair, conducted 9 days of legislative oversight hearings during this Congress on the administration of the Service Contract Act. We heard testimony from administration officials, representatives of organized labor, representatives of the service industry, and some service workers themselves. We undertook these hearings under the impetus of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, which called upon legislative committees to intensify their oversight activities.

The Service Contract Act was enacted to provide wage and safety protections for employees working under Government service contracts. It makes the Department of Labor responsible for assuring that service employees are paid at least the prevailing wages and fringe benefits for the same work in their locality as others are paid, so that this is simply a wage standards protection statute.

The hearings and our subsequent markup sessions were conducted in a completely bipartisan fashion. Each member of the subcommittee and the full committee was intent on finding out whether there were any problems in the administration of this act and what we in the Congress could do to correct any deficiencies we discovered. There were five serious problems which became apparent during the course of the hearings.

First. The Department has failed to make wage and fringe benefit determinations for almost two-thirds of the contracts subject to the act;

Second. A substantial disparity in wages and fringe benefits has developed between Federal wage board employees and their counterparts employed by service contractors;

Third. A great deal of labor-management instability has arisen because of a failure to take the existence of collective-bargaining agreements into account in the wage and fringe benefit determination process;

Fourth. A section of the act giving the Secretary of Labor discretion in administering the act has been stretched far beyond what the Congress had intended;

Fifth. The practice of rebidding contracts yearly either without wage and fringe determinations or with unrealistically low determinations is creating chaos for reputable contractors and great hardships for employees.

We have addressed each one of these problems in H.R. 15376. In effect, what we have done is to strengthen the hand of the Secretary of Labor in assuring that full coverage of all contracts subject to this act is eventually achieved. We have given the Secretary 6 years to gradually achieve full coverage, beginning by mandating full coverage during fiscal year 1963 of all contracts subject to the act which propose to employ more than 25 employees, and achieving full

coverage of all contracts subject to the act by fiscal year 1978. We believe that this is a fair and equitable mechanism for allowing the Department to gradually evolve the best techniques for making wage and fringe benefit determinations at the lowest possible cost to the taxpayer. There are a number of other technical and clarifying amendments to the act which are explained at some length in the report accompanying H.R. 15376.

I think this is an excellent bill, and I want to especially commend the ranking Republican on the subcommittee, Mr. ASHBROOK, of Ohio, for his complete cooperation during our investigation. I also wish to commend the ranking member of the full Committee on Education and Labor, Mr. QUIE, of Minnesota, for his cooperation and support in our efforts to fashion a legislative vehicle to remedy the problems we found in the operation of the act.

I also wish to commend my colleague, Mr. O'HARA of Michigan, a member of the subcommittee and the author of the Service Contract Act of 1965 in the House, for the diligent manner in which he has pursued the problems that have arisen under the act since it was first passed.

I think we have an excellent bill here, and it is a bipartisan bill which will not only protect service employees, but give reputable service contractors a fairer set of ground rules under which to operate. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I was present at all of the hearings on this bill. I could echo many of the things that the gentleman from New Jersey just said. But I would like to call your attention to the statement in part II of the hearings on page 24 by our former colleague and now senior Senator from Florida.

The thing that is most unfortunate about the way the law is carried out and interpreted by the Department of Labor at present is that employees continually in bases throughout the country, particularly military bases, find themselves pawns in a contract struggle.

I will read to you what Mr. GURNEY indicated happened in Florida, as an example, and I quote him directly:

> As you will notice, I represented the Cape Kennedy area as a Congressman, and it is now part of my constituency as a Senator.

I hope everybody will listen to this very closely because this is the very heart of the bill.

To continue:

> Last year we had a rebidding of a NASA service contract. The only material thing bid was wages; and able, loyal workers found themselves earning, a day after the contract was awarded, one-quarter, one-third, even as high as 50-percent less than before, doing precisely the same job the day before.
>
> Now we have another service contract out for bid at Patrick Air Force Base. This is the service contract now held by Pan American and RCA, and exactly the same thing will happen in this case. Only wages will be bid, and the worker's pay and his ability to feed and clothe and house his family is now out on the auction block. I firmly believe that an average wage should be determined by the Labor Department, after a thorough wage study today in these service contract cases, a wage below which a bidder may not go, and I have requested the Labor Department to do this.
>
> In fact, I have requested it twice. The request was denied the first time, and I have not heard from the second request as yet. I certainly hope that your committee will help in drafting legislation to accomplish this goal in this service contract area.

This is precisely what we are talking about. It makes no sense in equity and it certainly is bad policy to allow contract bidders to come into these areas to underbid and then give a take-it-or-leave-it basis to the employee who is doing vital work for our country.

I support this on the basis of equity. I support it because I do not believe the Department of Labor has issued the determinations that they should, and has not determined, as Mr. GURNEY pointed out, wages below which a bidder may not go.

This, supposedly, should be the law. But bidders can come in and they can, as we saw in our hearings, if you study our hearings, particularly through the Southwest, go from one base to another and have a contract 1 year—and then go in and underbid—and possibly make some money. Maybe that is free enterprise, but the result is to squeeze the employee and pay him less for the same thing that he was doing in the previous year—and then go to another base next year. I think it is completely wrong.

Supposedly, the Department of Labor should protect these employees. But I would say to the Members of this House, the Department of Labor is not doing this. So I support this bill wholeheartedly on the basis of equity.

This bill merely requires that a successful bidder cannot pay less to employees than they were receiving from their former employer pursuant to a contract with respect to wage and fringe benefits. That certainly does not seem to be radical to me.

It has been indicated that prospective wage increases will be included in wage determinations. The committee saw this as a possible pitfall. Every member of our committee recognizes you can have a situation where bids of contracts going into the future would be very high and there would be no way of bringing them under control. That is why the bill specifically gives the Secretary of Labor—and, if you will look at pages 5 and 6, we have added this language—"* * * if the Secretary so elects" the Secretary of Labor may choose to include any prospective wage increases in his determination.

Certainly, I cannot foresee on the basis of their handling up to now, that they would agree to any exhorbitant increase.

I happen to feel, in all equity, that this bill is long past due. Many employees have been taken advantage of.

The other thrust of the bill is to require the Secretary of Labor to increase the number of wage determinations yearly until at the end of a 6-year period, wage determinations must be made where any Government contract is awarded subject to the Service Contract Act. That is all we are doing, these two major items, making sure that an employee cannot be reduced—you cannot have bidding which would reduce their wages and make the Secretary of Labor by statute increase the number of wage determinations until all wage determinations are issued where contracts are subject to the Service Contract Act. I do not think you can quibble with those two parts of the bill and I wholeheartedly support it.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is precisely right. The bill in essence is extremely simple, and you have very carefully made clear its two essential ingredients. It might be said in passing that when we had the Department back a second time they thought that the requirement that they make determinations within a year or two would be unreasonable in terms of administrative costs. The fact is that they have a maximum of five people working on this act now after 7 years of its operation, so in order to accommodate them, we stretched it out another 6 years.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would add to what the gentleman said we are not asking them to do anything that they do not already do under the Davis-Bacon Act.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. You are exactly correct—or under the Walsh-Healey Act.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Or under the Walsh-Healey Act.

I cannot possibly convey to the Members of this House how personally repugnant I found the activities of many contractors dealing with what frankly must be the low, marginal employees on most of these bases; and for the Government to sanction a policy putting these people in a squeeze, I found personally repugnant.

I think most of you know I do not exactly get a whole lot of union support. The only union that ever supported me was the WCTU, so I am certainly not motivated by any pressures that might come from unions. I am talking merely in terms of what is in the best interests of these employees and how the Government can possibly hold up its head when it is in effect the employer.

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. HUNT. I take the opportunity to commend the committee, the chairman of the subcommittee, and you (Mr. ASHBROOK) for bringing this bill, H.R. 15376, to the floor and speaking out as you have.

Several years ago I had a situation with a corporation in my district who had a bid situation up in Alaska. They had had this bid for a number of years, and their employees were there with all of their equipment. They were underbid by another contractor. It resulted in a loss of wages and in certain places a little less money, but the fellows stayed there because they were located up there in the vast barren stretches and did not want to come home. The only thing they

did was to take over the equipment, as it were, for less money, and still maintain the job.

Fortunately, this year when the bids came out, the company which had the bids originally regained them and put the wage scale back where it had been in the first place. So it is about time this manipulation of underbidding by contractors for their own personal corporate gain came to an end.

I wish to commend you and your committee for bringing this to the attention of Congress.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. We will later hear from the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FREY) who has had similar experience and who will speak for this bill. I think those who have seen the operations of this contract process certainly must question the Government's role, which, of course, would be part of our role, in sanctioning this type of squeezing. It is incredible, if you could read the testimony, if you could hear the testimony, how people had their wages reduced, wages which already by most scales are not high. As indicated, they are probably at the lower economic level, mostly custodial employees, those who work in laundries, those who work in dispensaries, those who work in cafeterias and to have these real low wages undercut as a part of the supposed fair and free bidding process in something which should not be sanctioned.

I certainly voice my very strong approval of this bill as a means of rectifying the situation.

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is the second bill in succession from the Committee on Labor and Education that carries no departmental report, no report of any kind. Can the gentleman advise me as to why there is nothing from the Department of Labor, or any other agency in Government?

Mr. ASHBROOK. First of all, I can say to the gentleman is not it a wonderful day late in the session when we can get bills out of the Committee on Labor and Education that do not have to be totally rewritten on the floor of the House?

I will say in all candor the administration favored the previous bill, but the administration does not favor this bill. I would say that if you study the hearings, Mr. Silberman, the Under Secretary of Labor who testified for the Department of Labor, indicated to the committee that, because the members of our committee were so unanimous on this bill and were so unanimous in our realization that there was an inequity, he would investigate them further, but a year and a half has gone by. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa they have not done anything. They did not keep their word. Their position is simply they want no change in the law.

I do not accept that as a valid position. That is why the committee in this case, and I think every member on the minority side except the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CARLSON), agreed to this proposal, because we thought something needed to be done.

Mr. GROSS. I see no Department position in the report and I do like to know what position the Department is taking.

Mr. ASHBROOK. The Department of Labor is opposed to this bill. They want no change in the act as it now stands, and I think most of the Members after hearing the testimony do not agree with that position in all candor.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman respond to this argument, that it is administratively infeasible and filled with all kinds of ambiguities because it would require the Department of Labor to see whether any of these employees were covered by collective-bargaining agreements, and if they were, the employees could not be paid at lower than the rates in that agreement. How is the Secretary to know before the contract has been awarded or before particular specifications have actually been issued which employees are ultimately going to be employed by the successful contractor? He does not even know who will be successful, which contractor it is going to be, and therefore how would he know the employees, and therefore how would he comply with the requirements, and how could he come up with a contract containing terms and conditions that are not contrary to a collective-bargaining agreement covering the employees? I am simply desirous of getting information, because even though it is difficult to change people's minds on a bill under a suspension of rules with only 20 minutes on either side, still if the gentleman could relieve my mind on that point it would satisfy some fears we have.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I think if they do nothing else than require that they did at least include the wage level for the previous one, we would have accomplished a great deal.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Does the gentleman mean they have to consider the wage level that was used in a preceding contract?

Mr. ASHBROOK. If they have a successor contractor, they would have to consider the wage of the predecessor contractor.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. If the gentleman will yield further, is there not a Supreme Court decision somewhere that says something on this point?

Mr. ASHBROOK. The Burns decision?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Is there not a decision that it is not required that a successor contractor be bound by the terms and conditions of a labor contract entered into by his predecessor? I do not have the citation handy, but it seems to me there is a decision to that effect and therefore this would rewrite existing law as interpreted by the U.S. Supreme Court. I think it was a National Labor Relations Board against Burns Security Services case.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would say to the gentleman from Illinois, who is learned in this area, as I understand it the Burns case dealt with a private employer, and the Congress time and time again has set standards for people who do contract business with the Government, and the Walsh-Healey Act has set different standards, and the Davis-Bacon Act has set different standards, and the Service Contract Act has set different standards. It is like comparing apples with oranges. A contract with a person in the private sector is totally different from a contract in a situation where the contractor is doing business with the Government. We have always made a difference in Walsh-Healey and in Davis-Bacon and in the Service Contract Act. So the same thrust of law relating to predecessor and successor contracts would apply to the public sector but not necessarily the private sector.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. To return to the point, does not this pose some administrative difficulties when we cannot tell to whom the contract will be awarded? How does one administer this provision which says we have to take into consideration previous bargaining conditions?

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

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

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, we are talking about whether the old contractor had an effective bargaining agreement, and the way the act works, the contracting agency has to supply certain information to the Department of Labor and then the Department of Labor makes its determination. All we have to do is have the contract agency supply one additional piece of information and that is whether a collective bargaining agreement now covers those employees and what it applies to, and then the Department of Labor will know.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HICKS).

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor for bringing this matter before the House.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 15376, a bill to amend the service contract of 1965.

The Special Subcommittee on Labor, on which I serve, conducted exhaustive oversight hearings on the way this act has been administered since 1965. We found problems under both Democratic and Republican administrations, and tried to take a completely bipartisan approach to solving these problems.

I believe that the bill we have reported out, and it was reported out unanimously from our subcommittee and the full Committee on Education and Labor, will go a long way toward making the Service Contract Act an effective vehicle for protecting the wages and fringe benefits of service workers.

These service workers are among the

lowest-paid workers in the United States. They are the laundry workers, busboys, dishwashers, guards, janitors, and other workers performing housekeeping functions under Government service contracts. These workers on the bottom rung of the economic ladder are the ones the Congress tried to protect in 1965 when it enacted the Service Contract Act.

The Service Contract Act simply provided a method for protecting the wages and fringe benefits being paid service workers, by directing that they be paid at least the prevailing rates in their local area.

For various reasons the act has not worked as well as was originally intended, and we discovered countless instances where faulty wage determination procedures had worked great hardships on service workers and their families.

I believe the bill we have devised will prevent the tragic economic hardships which are visited upon these workers under the present operation of the act, and will make it clear that the Congress meant business when it set out to protect these workers.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is rather unique that I yield to a distinguished opponent of the legislation, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN) 3 minutes.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to suspend the rules. The bill before us seeks to improve the lot of service contract workers, but it would not accomplish that purpose. It is confusing on its face, and if it were enacted it would vastly complicate the Service Contract Act, which in turn would lead to delay and abuse in the service contracting process. Let me briefly mention some of the problems of the bill.

First, the Secretary of Labor, who is charged with the responsibility of making the wage and fringe determinations, would be forced to make a determination for each individual contract in many cases where he now may make a single determination which applies to many service contracts in a particular locality. This single determination procedure permitted under the present law conserves valuable resources, saves time and prevents duplication of effort. If this bill is enacted, many more determinations will be required, resulting in delays and confusion in the service contracting process. Service employees have nothing to gain and much to lose by this amendment.

Second, the bill would foreclose, within a few years, the existing authority to omit making wage and fringe determinations in those cases of minimal impact and importance in the application of the statute. It would thus limit and ultimately eliminate the present administrative flexibility to allocate resources available for making wage determinations in those areas and contracts where substantial needs for wage and fringe protections exist.

Third, sections 2(a)(1) and (2) provide that minimum wage rate and fringe benefit determinations may include prospective increases provided for in a collective bargaining agreement.

Is it intended by this provisions to permit acceleration of deferred wage and fringe benefit increases? If so, it seems to us that this could seriously jeopardize the national effort to curb inflation—particularly insofar as the provision could have a precedential effect for other areas of Government contract work or, indeed, might "spillover" as a practical matter to the public and private employment sectors generally.

At the very minimum, this provision would clearly benefit by clarification and rephrasing to assure that it does not authorize acceleration of deferred increases. Under the suspension of the rules, however, this will not be possible.

Fourth, section 3(c) provides that, in the case of successor contracts under which substantially the same services are furnished, the minimum wage rates and fringe benefits to be paid by the successor contractor may not be less than those paid under the predecessor contract—and may also include any prospective increases which were provided for under the predecessor contractor's collective bargaining agreement. This is so even if the successor contractor employs his own work force and does not retain any of the predecessor contractor's employees.

At a time when the American taxpayers are demanding—and deserve—economy in Government, this provision would serve to guarantee ever-increasing labor costs in service contracts. Beyond this, it introduces a major new concept into our national labor policy.

In NLRB against Burns International Security Services, Inc.—decided May 15, 1972—the U.S. Supreme Court ruled unanimously that a successor contractor is not obligated to observe his predecessor's collective bargaining agreement. Section 3(c) of H.R. 15376 would in net effect overturn this decision.

If it is the will of the House that our national labor laws should now be rewritten to provide for compulsory imposition of the terms of collective bargaining agreements on employers and employees who were not parties to the agreement, we respectively suggest that this is a decision to be made only after the most thorough and extensive debate with full opportunity for Members participation through the amendment process. It is not, in our opinion, a decision to be made in summary fashion as part of a package deal in which the hands of the Members are tied.

Fifth, the bill limits the Secretary of Labor's discretion and flexibility in two important respects. Under these proposed amendments, he may grant a variation or exemption only in special circumstances, and he may act to relieve a contractor from being listed as ineligible only in unusual circumstances. Unfortunately, the bill does not define either of these terms and the Secretary and everyone else who has an interest in this legislation is left without any guidance. This is yet another example of how this legislation fails to do the job it purports to do. Legislation is supposed to serve as a guide to conduct, and that requires thoughtful and careful preparation and drafting. It would be a shame for this House to suspend the rules and bring this bill to a vote because it clearly needs more careful consideration. As it stands now, it can only honor the interests of service workers by saddling them with a mandate for confusion.

Last, the proposed amendments raise serious due process questions because it requires that a contractor who has violated the act, unless relieved due to the unexplained unusual circumstances I just mentioned, must be listed as ineligible within 30 days after a hearing examiner has made his finding. This gives a contractor virtually no time to pursue his existing appellate remedies or seek review which might exonerate him. Bear in mind that this hard and fast rule would apply even if the violation were de minimis and involved no element of willfulness. Such violations are common, and therefore would not seem to allow for relief as unusual circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, no one will claim that the present Service Contract Act is perfect in either conception or administration. But the bill before us is confusing and would only complicate and confuse matters.

In this regard, it is significant to note that the committee was unable to arrive at an estimated cost of administering the act as it is proposed to be amended because of uncertainties over the best technique for making wage and fringe benefit determinations—House Report No. 92–1251, page 6. Yet the committee has nonetheless taken steps to assure that the Department of Labor will make such determinations for each and every contract subject to the act. It seems to us that a valid question may be raised as to whether the committee has not put the cart before the horse. Would it not be better to first ascertain improved techniques for making wage and fringe benefits determinations before sending the Labor Department out with a blank check to apply admittedly poor or unevaluated techniques to an even greater number of contracts than at present?

The report of the Committee on Education and Labor states that H.R. 15376 is designed to bring about more equitable and more efficient administration of the Service Contract Act. We, of course, fully support this highly desirable goal.

However, it seems to us that it would be far more consistent with that avowed purpose to subject the legislation to the sounding board of full and complete debate, including the amendment process, rather than to have it come up, as scheduled, on a take it or leave it basis.

For our part, the issues posed in this legislation are too serious to treat in such an abbreviated fashion. The bill should be referred back to committee so that it may be brought to the floor at a later time in accordance with the usual procedures of the House allowing Members the fullest freedom to work their will on its various provisions.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey for granting me this time.

I rise merely to support this bill and to urge its enactment because of its overdue need.

Those of us who cosponsored and otherwise helped as to the passage of the 1965 act were certainly under the impression then that the thing this present amendment leads to correcting had been taken care of.

All this bill will do, regardless of the scare talk about administrative costs and the like, is to substitute for the law of the jungle as it now exists a rule of reason and equity and justice.

In my district for 10 years, since I have been in the Congress, I have had repeated specific occasions of abuse that have given rise to an urgent need to enact this legislation. I so urge my fellow Members.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLENBORN).

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, this bill has several objectionable features. It presents a seemingly impossible administrative mandate by requiring that the Secretary of Labor make wage determinations in accordance with collective bargaining agreements covering service workers at a point in time when there is no way to tell whose service workers they may be, let alone whether any of them are covered by a collective bargaining agreement. It severely limits the administrative flexibility in dealing with violators of the act and raises a substantial question of the rights of due process for those accused of violations. It incorporates a successor contractor doctrine that could lead to inflationary wages, much higher than the true prevailing wages and could result in unnecessary and unjustified expense to the Government and, thence to the taxpayers.

But perhaps most importantly, it would require that within a few years the Secretary will have to make a wage determination with respect to each and every contract subject to the act. On initial consideration, this requirement might not sound unreasonable, but it takes only a few seconds to realize that this requirement places an enormous burden on the Secretary. Indeed, one does not have to be an expert in either labor relations or the science of effective government to recognize that such a requirement is unrealistic and impractical. The administrator of a program must have sufficient flexibility to allocate his resources efficiently. Under this particular amendment, there is no such flexibility. A determination would have to be made for every single contract even those involving only one or two employees. It appears that the sponsor of the bill, well-intended though he may be, has lost sight of the forest in his quest to protect each individual tree.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that this requirement is an extraordinarily unusual one. The major labor-relations legislation in this country, the Taft-Hartley Act, allows the National Labor Relations Board to exercise flexibility in its coverage. The Cost of Living Council, for example, also has rules excluding small businesses.

Presently, the Secretary receives about 21,000 notices of service contracts each year. Under the present law, he has sufficient latitude to allocate his limited resources in the most efficient fashion, making wage determinations for those contracts covering the substantial majority of workers.

This bill is touted as being strongly in the workers' interest, but it is not in the interest of the service employees to tie the administrator of the law to a wasteful and rigid requirement such as this. The Secretary must have sufficient latitude to allocate his resources to those contracts and localities where the need is greatest.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this motion to suspend the rules will be defeated so the bill may be brought back under a rule for full debate and subject to amendment.

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

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. I will say to the gentleman while I support the principle of the bill, I would prefer to have it here under a rule. I agree with the gentleman's remarks on that. I always like us to have an opportunity for amendment. I will still support the principle.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I thank the gentleman for that observation.

I think bills that are as important as this and which are controversial certainly ought to come out under a rule where amendments can be offered. This sort of gag rule is not good practice.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Does he not think there is a distinct possibility that competitive bidding on Government contracts may be decreased because the potential bidders may be scared off by the provisions of this bill? They are not sure what the obligations may be when they take over an existing contract.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Obviously the potential bidder will be bound by the determinations made by the predecessor. The predecessor may negotiate several increases that are unreasonable just to protect his competitive advantage. We may find it will work not only to the disadvantage of those desiring to compete but also to the disadvantage of the Government as well.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have one comment and then I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA) for 5 minutes.

The major contractors involved in this industry including Sperry Rand, TWA, Boeing, Pan Am, Brown Root, and Northrop, all support this bill.

I might say to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLENBORN) that this bill was not sneaked out of the committee in the dark, and it does not come here without a report. The only amendments offered in the committee were those by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE). The committee reported this bill unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA).

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I think this bill is unique, and I would like to explain just why.

H.R. 15376, is the result of bipartisan oversight hearings, generating a bipartisan reaction to a problem which had, I regret to say, bipartisan roots.

H.R. 15376 does not represent a quarrel between Democrats and Republicans, or between liberals and conservatives. Rather, it represents an effort by the Congress to reassert its policymaking primacy over the bureaucracy.

This is a bill that was put together by Democrats and Republicans in the committee. It was not put together by the agencies downtown. It was not put together by any outside group. It was put together in hard bargaining and discussion sessions following oversight hearings by the members of the committee. There is not a member of the committee who participated in those hearings who does not have some imprint on this bill. We worked it out together. We tried to take seriously our responsibilities for legislative oversight, and we sat down with the Department, and with witnesses, and we asked how has this act been administered? What is right about it? What is wrong about it?

After we had heard all of that then we sat down and tried to work out together our responsibilities as a committee, to this House, and to the people of the United States. I think that is the way the Congress ought to work.

The Service Contracts Act of 1965, of which I was one of the authors, was an effort to apply to employees of Government service contractors the same protections that have long applied to employees of Government construction contractors and Government procurement contractors.

That act, to state it simply, set forth a determination by the Congress that the employees of these contractors must be paid not less than the prevailing wage paid to other employees engaged in similar work in the same area. To enforce this obligation, covered contractors had to agree to meet these standards as a part of their contract, and if they were found not to have done so, they were to be barred from further contracting for periods up to 3 years, except when unusual circumstances warranted the Secretary of Labor in lifting the penalty.

The principle of law involved was a simple one, and it had long been a part of the Federal statutes with respect to other contractor employees.

Unfortunately, in our oversight hearings we discovered that it had not been working as intended. We found widespread exploitation of service employees by "contractors" who were little more than labor brokers, and we found—and this, Mr. Speaker, was far more reprehensible—widespread indifference or even hostility to the intent of the Service Contract Act among agencies of the Government itself. This was compound-

ed by an attitude on the part of the enforcing agency—the Labor Department—which seemed to overlook no opportunity to render the act nugatory.

We found the Department refusing, at the behest of other Federal agencies, to make prevailing wage determinations when such refusal had the clear effect of depressing those wages.

We found interpretations of the law, which served to undercut legitimate labor-management agreements.

We found the Department willing to ignore the clear language of the act with regard to the penalty—disbarment from contracting—and willing instead to accept partial restitution as though it were in and of itself a penalty.

We found, in short, a serious lack of enforcement of, and lack of commitment to, the Service Contract Act of 1965. We found this throughout the agencies involved, including, if I must say so, the General Accounting Office, which is supposed to be the agency primarily charged with the enforcement of the will of the Congress.

And, in all fairness, I must reiterate, we did not find that this problem began with this administration.

I am grieved to find my friend, the able gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLENBORN) coming in here and reiterating the Labor Department's arguments. We are not a part of the executive branch. We do not need the Labor Department's permission to legislate, Mr. Speaker. That branch does not have the right to tell us what to do, especially when it involves something that they have bungled as badly as they have bungled the administration of this act.

It was suggested by members of the committee on both sides, that we should take a look at this act and see if we could not improve its administration. That is what we have done. There is no insurmountable difficulty imposed on the bureaucrats in the administering of this law. They will be able to do a better job of achieving the purposes of the Service Contract Act with these amendments than they have done thus far without them.

The only ones who are going to be hurt are the fly-by-night contractors, not the reputable contractors, not the people who are in the business year in and year out, and who were there yesterday and who intend to be there tomorrow, but the two-bit operators who are out to make a quick killing. They are the ones who are going to be hurt by this legislation.

Many of the amendments made by H.R. 15376 are clarifying amendments. They clarify the original intent of the Congress and reiterate, for the attention of the executive branch agencies and the GAO, that our intention is to prevent the use of Government procurement power to depress wages and exploit service employees—who have it tough enough, Mr. Speaker, even when the act is working as it is supposed to work.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FREY).

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, speaking for myself, I am as familiar with this problem as any Member in the House in that my district is in the cape area.

About a year ago I contacted, along with some others, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) to ask the subcommittee to hold hearings on this problem.

We have heard a great deal today about the burden on the Department of Labor, but I think that really what all of us are concerned with is the burden on the individual, with the individual who is working for his living and ends up, as many people in my district did, by losing their jobs, or who end up with a new contractor who comes in and who fires about one-third of the people in a wage bid process, and then reduce the pay for the others on an average of about 17 percent, and some of them up to 50 percent.

Nobody really wants to bid one company against another when only the wages of the workers are involved, and reduce them as much as possible so that they can get a contract they can live with.

All of us I am sure seek efficiency in Government contracts, but we should also take into account the effect this type of bidding has in terms of the cost of closing out, in terms of the cost of worker morale, in terms of the cost of labor-management strife. In the long run, I think it costs more than is saved by reducing salaries. But I think there is a lot more involved here than the economics; I think you have to include the human element also. And for those of you who have not experienced something like that, then I would like to see you try to explain to somebody how one day they can be doing a job and earning x amount of money, and the next day doing the same work but with a different contractor their salaries are reduced by 50 percent. It does not make sense. I think this is wrong. I think this is a good piece of legislation, and I urge its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 15376, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. ERLENBORN. 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 274, nays 103, not voting 55, as follows:

[Roll No. 305]

YEAS—274

Abbitt	Anderson, Ill.	Badillo
Abourezk	Andrews,	Barrett
Abzug	N. Dak.	Begich
Adams	Annunzio	Bennett
Addabbo	Ashbrook	Bergland
Alexander	Ashley	Bevill
Anderson,	Aspin	Biaggi
Calif.	Aspinall	Biester
Bingham	Halpern	Pickle
Boggs	Hamilton	Pike
Boland	Hanley	Podell
Brademas	Hanna	Preyer, N.C.
Brasco	Hansen, Idaho	Price, Ill.
Brinkley	Hansen, Wash.	Pucinski
Brooks	Harrington	Quie
Brotzman	Harsha	Railsback
Broyhill, N.C.	Harvey	Randall
Burke, Fla.	Hastings	Rangel
Burke, Mass.	Hathaway	Rees
Burleson, Tex.	Hawkins	Reid
Burton	Hays	Reuss
Cabell	Hechler, W. Va.	Riegle
Carey, N.Y.	Heckler, Mass.	Roberts
Carney	Heinz	Rodino
Casey, Tex.	Helstoski	Roe
Cederberg	Hicks, Mass.	Rogers
Celler	Hicks, Wash.	Roncalio
Chappell	Hillis	Rooney, Pa.
Chisholm	Hogan	Rosenthal
Clark	Holifield	Rostenkowski
Clausen,	Horton	Roush
Don H.	Howard	Roy
Cleveland	Hunt	Roybal
Collier	Jacobs	Runnels
Collins, Ill.	Johnson, Calif.	Ruppe
Conover	Jones, Ala.	St Germain
Conte	Jones, N.C.	Sandman
Corman	Karth	Sarbanes
Cotter	Kastenmeier	Saylor
Coughlin	Kazen	Scheuer
Culver	Keating	Schwengel
Curlin	Kee	Seiberling
Daniel, Va.	Kemp	Shipley
Daniels, N.J.	King	Shoup
Danielson	Kluczynski	Sikes
Davis, S.C.	Koch	Sisk
de la Garza	Kyros	Skubitz
Delaney	Leggett	Slack
Dellenback	Lent	Smith, Iowa
Dellums	Link	Smith, N.Y.
Denholm	Lloyd	Snyder
Dent	Long, Md.	Springer
Diggs	Lujan	Staggers
Donohue	McCloskey	Stanton,
Dow	McCollister	J. William
Downing	McDade	Stanton,
Drinan	McKay	James V.
Dulski	McKevitt	Steed
du Pont	Macdonald,	Steele
Dwyer	Mass.	Stokes
Eckhardt	Madden	Stratton
Edwards, Ala.	Mailliard	Stubblefield
Edwards, Calif.	Matsunaga	Sullivan
Eilberg	Mazzoli	Symington
Esch	Meeds	Taylor
Eshleman	Melcher	Teague, Calif.
Evins, Tenn.	Metcalfe	Thompson, N.J.
Fascell	Mikva	Tiernan
Findley	Mills, Ark.	Udall
Fish	Minish	Ullman
Flood	Mink	Van Deerlin
Flowers	Minshall	Vanik
Foley	Mitchell	Veysey
Ford,	Mollohan	Vigorito
William D.	Monagan	Waldie
Forsythe	Moorhead	Wampler
Fraser	Morgan	Whalen
Frelinghuysen	Mosher	White
Frenzel	Moss	Whitehurst
Frey	Murphy, Ill.	Whitten
Fulton	Murphy, N.Y.	Widnall
Galifianakis	Myers	Williams
Garmatz	Natcher	Wilson,
Gaydos	Nelsen	Charles H.
Giaimo	Nichols	Wolff
Gibbons	Nix	Wright
Gonzalez	Obey	Wyatt
Grasso	O'Hara	Wydler
Gray	O'Konski	Wyman
Green, Pa.	O'Neill	Yates
Griffin	Patten	Yatron
Grover	Perkins	Young, Tex.
Gubser	Pettis	Zablocki
Gude	Peyser	Zwach

NAYS—103

Andrews, Ala.	Caffery	Devine
Archer	Camp	Dickinson
Arends	Carlson	Dorn
Belcher	Carter	Duncan
Betts	Clancy	Erlenborn
Blackburn	Clawson, Del	Fisher
Bow	Collins, Tex.	Ford, Gerald R.
Bray	Colmer	Fountain
Brown, Ohio	Conable	Fuqua
Broyhill, Va.	Crane	Gettys
Buchanan	Davis, Wis.	Goldwater
Byrnes, Wis.	Dennis	Goodling
Byron	Derwinski	Green, Oreg.

Gross	Mathis, Ga.	Scott
Haley	Mayne	Sebelius
Hall	Michel	Shriver
Hammer-schmidt	Miller, Ohio	Smith, Calif.
Hosmer	Mills, Md.	Spence
Hull	Mizell	Steiger, Ariz.
Jarman	Montgomery	Steiger, Wis.
Johnson, Pa.	Pirnie	Terry
Jonas	Poff	Thompson, Ga.
Keith	Powell	Thomson, Wis.
Kuykendall	Price, Tex.	Thone
Kyl	Purcell	Vander Jagt
Landgrebe	Quillen	Waggonner
Latta	Rhodes	Ware
McClory	Robinson, Va.	Whalley
McEwen	Robison, N.Y.	Wiggins
McKinney	Rousselot	Wilson, Bob
Mahon	Ruth	Winn
Mallary	Satterfield	Wylie
Mann	Scherle	Young, Fla.
Martin	Schmitz	Zion
	Schneebeli	

NOT VOTING—55

Abernethy	Evans, Colo.	McMillan
Anderson, Tenn.	Flynt	Mathias, Calif.
Baker	Gallagher	Miller, Calif.
Baring	Griffiths	Nedzi
Bell	Hagan	Passman
Blanton	Hébert	Patman
Blatnik	Henderson	Pelly
Bolling	Hungate	Pepper
Broomfield	Hutchinson	Poage
Brown, Mich.	Ichord	Pryor, Ark.
Burlison, Mo.	Jones, Tenn.	Rarick
Byrne, Pa.	Landrum	Rooney, N.Y.
Chamberlain	Lennon	Ryan
Clay	Long, La.	Stephens
Conyers	McClure	Stuckey
Davis, Ga.	McCormack	Talcott
Dingell	McCulloch	Teague, Tex.
Dowdy	McDonald, Mich.	
Edmondson	McFall	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rooney of New York and Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Nedzi and Mr. Pepper for, with Mr. Passman against.

Mr. Ryan and Mr. Blatnik for, with Mr. Lennon against.

Mr. Clay and Mrs. Griffiths for, with Mr. Henderson against.

Mr. Conyers and Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Rarick against.

Mr. McCormack and Mr. McFall for, with Mr. McMillan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.

Mr. Hungate with Mr. Chamberlain.

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Baker.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Hutchinson.

Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Mathias of California.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Burlison of Missouri with Mr. Pelly.

Mr. Ichord with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Stephens with Mr. McClure.

Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Baring.

Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Brown of Michigan.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Blanton with Mr. Abernethy.

Mr. Landrun with Mr. Long of Louisiana.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Hagan.

Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Pryor of Arkansas.

Messrs. JONES of North Carolina, SCHWENGEL, and DON H. CLAUSEN changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to insert their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TESTIMONY ON BUSING AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

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

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules has taken the unprecedented step of discharging the Committee on the Judiciary of a proposed amendment to the Constitution—the so-called antibusing amendment—House Joint Resolution 620. Earlier this year I placed in the RECORD letters from six nationally respected constitutional law authorities commenting on House Joint Resolution 620—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 118, part 4, pages 4625–29.

In order further to assist Members to assess the many far-reaching legal and social consequences of the proposed constitutional amendment, I offer for printing in the RECORD excerpts from "School Busing" hearings before Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary. The excerpts include testimony from: Secretary Elliot L. Richardson, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Attorney General Richard G. Kleindienst, Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, Chairman, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights; constitutional law authorities; civil rights leaders; educators and representatives of national civic organizations.

The excerpts follow:

ELLIOT L. RICHARDSON—SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

I would say simply for myself, as I have said before, that I find the various resolutions pending before the subcommittee to be highly ambiguous. One reading of this resolution introduced by Congressman Lent would be simply that it is merely declaratory of the *Brown* case and all of those which have followed it. A more extreme reading on the other side would conclude that it intended a complete reopening or could bring about a complete reversion of any or all desegregation orders. Probably neither of these interpretations is within the intent of the sponsors and, yet, the fact that they are possible interpretations is illustrative of the difficulty of dealing with this problem by means of a constitutional amendment rather than through the comprehensive legislative approach which the administration has recommended.

Chairman CELLER. At a press conference which you held on February 16, 1972, you were quoted as saying with respect to House Joint Resolution 620:

"This amendment, and other amendments, could have the effect of actually undercutting and rolling back the measures that have been taken to dismantle the dual school systems even in situations that did not involve massive transportation * * * and certainly I do not believe that the Administration wants to bring about that result."

Is that your view today?

Secretary RICHARDSON. Yes; as I said a moment ago, that is a possible interpretation of the amendment. It could also be interpreted to have no effect at all because it was merely declaratory of *Brown* and all subsequent decisions.

I am simply making a point I made a moment ago that it is ambiguous.

Chairman CELLER. I take it, therefore, that you do not think too well of this amendment.

Secretary RICHARDSON. I do not.

Chairman CELLER. Would you advise that we vote against it?

Secretary RICHARDSON. If I were a member of the subcommittee, I would vote against it, but I do not believe I am necessarily the best source of advice to the subcommittee.

* * * * *

Mr. Chairman, I think I should make clear that we are not urging the elimination of busing as a remedy for unconstitutionally segregated schools. What we are urging is a temporary stay on new busing pending a determination by the Congress of reasonable limits for the use of the remedy. As we have pointed out earlier, the objective of desegregation can be accomplished to a very large extent without additional busing in most situations and so what we are saying in effect is that although busing is and will continue to be a necessary tool for desegregation in many situations, it can be made subject to rational and consistent limits such as those we have proposed in our substantive legislation.

RICHARD G. KLEINDIENST—ACTING ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Chairman CELLER. Isn't that the situation in all types of litigation? In antitrust cases you may have differing decisions in different sections of the county. That is our judicial system. The Supreme Court makes the final decision.

Mr. KLEINDIENST. I think what is happening here, as a result of the fact that the Congress has avoided this problem, is that some 400 Federal district judges are doing the legislating and that was not contemplated by our Constitution. The courts are there to enforce and effectuate the laws of the Congress and ultimately to determine whether those laws are constitutional. I do not think it was contemplated to have 400 legislators appointed by the Presidents of the United States with the advice of the Senate who call themselves Federal judges. That is the reason why the National Labor Relations Act had a great impact on the solution to a very serious social problem in the United States. It created a standard.

Chairman CELLER. You don't give an answer to the question as to whether or not you agree or do not agree with the pending resolution, House Joint Resolution 620, providing for a constitutional amendment for which there is a discharge petition on the Speaker's desk. Do you still insist on refusing to give your opinion on that?

Mr. KLEINDIENST. Yes, sir; I do.

Chairman CELLER. Why do you do that? Suppose that discharge petition obtains the requisite number of signatures? We have no such luxury in delaying a decision on that. The Members of the House are confronted with a very serious situation here and we are asking for the advice of the administration. Why shouldn't we get that advice as to whether the administration approves or disapproves the proposed constitutional amendment?

Mr. KLEINDIENST. I think in my remarks this morning, Mr. Chairman, I have indicated that the preferable approach to the solution of this problem from the standpoint of the executive branch is something short of a constitutional amendment and that is the enactment, by the Congress of the United States, of substantive legislation that will give a national standard for pro-

viding a solution to this problem all over the United States.

* * * * *

Chairman CELLER. I understand what you are saying but I again repeat, we have not the luxury of delay here. We are confronted with a discharge petition now with over 150 signatures and we would like to get an opinion from the administration on that proposed amendment.

Mr. KLEINDIENST. We have given it, Mr. Chairman. We do think you have the luxury of delay for a reasonable period of time to address yourselves to legislation. The moratorium proposal is a proper function of the Congress of the United States to provide the time needed for thoughtful consideration of a national standard with respect to education.

Chairman CELLER. Do I understand by inference that one can say that the President approves the constitutional amendment but, because of the length of time it would take for ratification, that he does not wish to have it processed now?

Mr. KLEINDIENST. Well, I think he feels, as I interpret his statements and the message that he sent to the Congress on March 17 this conviction: Something less than a constitutional amendment can be the solution to this problem, that is to say, the act of the Congress of the United States and that is something that you can do now. A constitutional amendment is something that realistically could not be brought to bear on this problem for several years, until the legislators of the requisite number of States adopted it.

* * * * *

Mr. HUNGATE. Pardon me. You are not necessarily opposed to increased busing in every case?

Mr. KLEINDIENST. No, all we want to do is to have every Federal district judge apply a list of remedies on a priority basis in order to achieve two things: First, quality education and, second, the elimination of segregation in our schools. The last remedy is busing. If you cannot accomplish those objectives without busing, then you use it. I can see hypothetically in some cases you might have more busing and you might have less. The significant thing is that with respect to the use of busing, it would be pursuant to a standard that would apply equally all over the United States.

THEODORE M. HESBURGH—CHAIRMAN, U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The Commission on Civil Rights has conducted a thorough study of the proposed amendment and its effects. Our analysis leads us to conclude that its enactment would be a major step backward in the quest for equal rights for all Americans—that it would undermine what progress we have made in race relations, both in our schools and in society as a whole.

* * * * *

Over the years strong national leadership has proven essential in guaranteeing the constitutional right of racially nondiscriminatory schooling. The proposed constitutional amendment not only places the Congress against school integration and reverses the gains made in this area, but would strip away the constitutional right of all children of whatever race or ethnic background to equal educational opportunity, and an equal place in society.

On its face, this amendment seems to embody a neutral principle—no child shall be assigned to any school on the basis of his color.

In this context in which it is proposed, it can have no other effect than to outlaw all of of the remedies which have been found effective to desegregate schools. Although proponents of the amendment have stated over and over that what they oppose is extensive busing, their attack reaches just about every form of remedy which brings black and white children together in a school.

Let me cite for you those remedies that school boards, superintendents, educators, and Federal judges have been implementing in district after district for the past two decades, and which would be outlawed by passage of this amendment.

After enactment of this amendment, there could be no pairing of schools, even nearby schools, for integration.

There could be no closing of segregated schools of inferior quality in order to integrate their student bodies.

For the same reasons, there could be no transfer provisions that allow a child whose race is in the majority to transfer to schools in which his race is in the minority.

There could be no redrawing of attendance lines to desegregate schools, no matter how fair or equitable such lines might be to all children in the district.

There could be no busing of children for desegregation—whether the bus trip takes 5 minutes or 30.

Finally, this amendment, of its own force, invalidates every voluntary action taken by a State legislature, State or local board of education or school official for the purpose of redressing racial segregation in the schools.

I would submit, gentlemen, this is the situation we are facing at the moment, a long history of racial segregation throughout the Nation in our schools.

* * * * *

The amendment could have the effect of resegregating school districts which have desegregated, voluntarily or involuntarily.

* * * * *

There are those who call this amendment an antibusing amendment. Nothing could be further from the truth. For the amendment has effects which go far beyond merely outlawing schoolbusing. First, it is an anti-school-desegregation amendment. But even this is an understatement of the effect of House Joint Resolution 620. It is also fundamentally an antiblack amendment. Its effects greatly transcend the walls of the classroom. We are really asking whether we are going to give minority citizens an opportunity to learn, to earn, and to live at the same level as the rest of society, or whether we are going to forget about the future of generations of minority children.

DONALD E. MORRISON—PRESIDENT, THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

The effect of the amendment may well be to enshrine this type of discrimination into the supreme law of the land and to roll back measures already taken to correct it, whether pursuant to Federal court order, HEW directive, or State law.

Presumably desegregation already achieved in many communities under voluntary desegregation programs would also be vulnerable to challenge as a result of the amendment.

* * * * *

Indeed, although pupil transportation has been gradually increasing in recent years there is no statistical proof that desegregation has substantially increased pupil busing either nationally or regionally.

* * * * *

Several states, concluding that racial isolation in the public schools is harmful regardless of its origins, have taken steps to require desegregation of schools. "These states include California, New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania." The amendment would appear to nullify these measures and roll back the desegregation achieved pursuant to them. Finally, the amendment can be construed to forbid school systems to undertake a voluntary desegregation program where the school board—whether appointed or democratically elected—has determined that the program will provide educational benefits to the children in the district. Presumably, the desegregation already achieved in many communities under such voluntary programs would be vulnerable to challenge as a result.

* * * * *

Black and white youngsters almost inevitably will have to deal with each other sooner or later. There is no better place for that encounter than the very institutions responsible for educating our youth. And there is no better time than childhood, when attitudes have not yet hardened, and biases, if they exist, are easier to dispel. The schools have long borne the role of preparing youth for participation in American democracy. It is therefore entirely appropriate for the schools—indeed indispensable to their mission—to exemplify the principles of fairness and equality which they would seek to inculcate in the nation's children.

* * * * *

Chairman CELLER. You are of the view that these amendments would cause a rollback to the situation we had before the *Brown* decision, is that correct?

Mr. MORRISON. That is the interpretation that our legal counsel's office would put on it, sir.

Chairman CELLER. So that it would be inconsistent for one to favor this constitutional amendment and the *Brown* decision?

Mr. MORRISON. That would be our interpretation, sir.

MRS. BRUCE B. BENSON—PRESIDENT, THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE UNITED STATES

I speak in opposition to all proposed constitutional amendments which would either prohibit outright the use of busing as a tool for school desegregation or would in other ways effectively limit the various means to achieve the goal we seek: Integrated, quality education for all children.

* * * * *

The league contends that the proposed constitutional amendments offer only a nonsolution to a very real educational problem: that we as a nation have failed to provide quality education to all children regardless of residence, race, class, creed, sex, or national origin.

* * * * *

Besides opposing House Joint Resolution 620 for its substance and intent, we oppose it and others like it because we share the alarm of leaders like Governor Askew who warns:

"It is very dangerous under emotional circumstances to tamper with the U.S. Constitution."

* * * * *

Leadership must be exercised by our public officials to guide the present discussion along rational lines. To act favorably on House Joint Resolution 620 could only imply withdrawal of congressional support, under emotional pressure, for efforts already undertaken to integrate our schools.

The League of Women Voters, therefore, urges members of this committee and of the entire Congress not to be a party to such a disaster.

* * * * *

We feel that busing is an essential tool to be used by communities, either by itself or along with other methods of bringing about integrated schools. There are many other methods in addition to busing. Sometimes busing is used by itself. Sometimes in combination with other methods such as center schools, and this sort of thing, or changing school district lines, which is done all of the time for other reasons as well.

Busing is a method, one of the methods of integrating schools.

Chairman CELLER. Would you say it is an important method?

Mrs. BENSON. Yes, sir; we would say it is very important, and in some communities the only way in which they can manage to bring about integrated schools depending on the geography of the school.

ALEXANDER M. BICKEL—PROFESSOR OF LAW, YALE UNIVERSITY

In my opinion, the issue raised by House Joint Resolution 620 and by most of the related measures that the committee has before it is not busing. The issues, in my judgment, are constitutionalism, and the very survival of the basic rule in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*.

If, as House Joint Resolution 620 would seem to me to require, race may not be taken into account in assigning students to particular public schools, then the administration of the rule in the *Brown* case would be rolled back to the stage before tokenism. It is possible formally to abolish a system of segregation by simply wiping the laws that enforced it off the books. But if that had been all that the *Brown* decision demanded, it would have been a rule of constitutional law that made nothing happen, and that ended by mocking itself. For it is not possible to uproot the settled practices of a century, or to counteract the attitudes these practices bespoke, which are still widely held, without undertaking some reassignment of pupils to particular schools with a view to the racial composition of the school population.

Moreover, and perhaps most astonishingly, having regard to principles of federalism, House Joint Resolution 620 would invoke the Federal Constitution to forbid voluntary action by local school boards aimed at alleviating conditions of racial concentration in the public schools. What business is it of the Federal Government so to limit the authority of local officials?

* * * * *

So a great deal of the unpopularity of busing seems to me justified. But in some areas busing is essential if any desegregation at all is to be achieved, and in many areas segregation itself was, of course, maintained by busing. I would think it wrong, therefore, for Congress by constitutional amendment to forbid all busing, and thus to hamper the continuing work of desegregation, just as it nears completion. And quite aside from recent busing orders, I would think it disastrous to roll back the desegregation that has been achieved, to undo the great work of 17 years, which would be the effect of the bulk of the proposals now before this committee. Nearly all of them would provide in effect, as I have indicated, that the decision in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, while not necessarily to be reversed, is not be enforced.

I think, moreover, that it is almost certainly beyond the wit of the cleverest draftsman to write, in the two or three sentences which are all the Constitution can possibly be burdened with, an amendment that would fail to throw the baby out with the bathwater, in the fashion I have indicated; an amendment that would not, that is to say, reach the catastrophic result of the radical rollback. For the busing problem varies in myriad ways from one community to another among the thousands of school districts in the country. A constitutional generalization that treats it with the necessary discrimination seems to me beyond the possibilities of drafting.

But even the most carefully drafted constitutional amendment would constitute the wrong, the very wrong way to deal with busing.

* * * * *

Nothing more preposterously out of place than busing has to my knowledge been proposed for treatment in the Constitution since prohibition and its repeal. We must not set our foot on the road to trivializing the American Constitution by converting it into a code of detailed regulation, dealing with the grievances of each passing day, after the fashion of so many State constitutions, which are then amended semiannually and replaced in their entirety every other decade.

But there's yet another reason, as important as any, why an antibusing amendment would constitute a grave error. No matter how carefully drafted, and no matter that antibusing sentiment may come increasingly to be shared by blacks, an antibusing amendment, precisely because it deals with busing as a subject of constitutional dimension, will inevitably be read as a repudiation of *Brown* v. *Board of Education* itself. The symbolic significance of the *Brown* decision cannot be overestimated, and the same is true of the symbolic significance of any attempt to deal with the consequences of that decision by constitutional amendment. It would not matter what the precise language of the amendment says to the legally trained mind. Courts that order busing purport to be implementing the *Brown* case. A constitutional amendment that forbade busing would be viewed as a renunciation of *Brown*.

We live by symbols, said Justice Holmes, and the symbol that Congress would be communicating to the country would be the end of the second reconstruction, a reprise of the Compromise of 1877. The action would be inescapably symbolic, and no amount of analysis or resort to facts could dispel its shock. In my judgment, so to dash the just expectations, previously raised by the Federal Government, of millions of people would be an inexpiable act.

* * * * *

Chairman CELLER. Professor Bickel, in your opinion, what effect would the provisions of House Joint Resolution 620 have on school districts which are desegregating pursuant to court order or on a voluntary basis?

Mr. BICKEL. Mr. Chairman, you will know better than I, that there are ways to attempt to construe out of it. I have seen some papers that others have written that attempt various constructions of it. As I read it, plainly on its face, with due notice of its intent, and I think I am in good faith forced to read it that way, it says: Whatever you are doing as of this moment on the basis of race, voluntary or pursuant to court order, stop.

* * * * *

I know of no desegregation plan anywhere, voluntary or by court order, which has gone beyond—tokenism is too mild a word—which has gone beyond just tearing some pages out of a statute book, which does not assign children to school by race or which doesn't at the very least draw district lines with regard to the racial composition of the student body. So I would think desegregation enforcement would simply stop dead in its tracks.

Chairman CELLER. Not only would it stop desegregation in its tracks but you might even have the effect of going further—rolling back desegregation to where it was before the *Brown* decision.

Mr. BICKEL. Certainly. It would be a radical rollback.

Chairman CELLER. So for these 17 years, we would have labored for nothing.

Mr. BICKEL. That is the way it seems, Mr. Chairman. I don't speak for the point of view that thinks busing is the be-all and the end-all and we ought to take the schools and mix them up. I am not of that view and I think my public record shows it, but I think this amendment in particular goes well beyond any busing problem that would bother me. It goes back to *Brown* v. *Board of Education* and without reversing it, makes it unenforceable.

WILLIAM T. COLEMAN, JR.—PRESIDENT, NAACP LEGAL DEFENSE AND EDUCATIONAL FUND, INC.

The above proposal (H.J. Res. 620) is useless, innocuous, and unnecessary if its purpose is to eliminate public schools where pupils are assigned solely based upon their race, creed or color; it is pernicious, harmful, repressive, and would turn the clock back 18 years if such proposal directly or indirectly overrules in whole or in part *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954), or last year's unanimous affirmance in *Swann* v. *Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education*, 402 U.S. 1 (1971). For these two decisions, as well as other decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, correctly interpret the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States as (1) prohibiting "State-imposed segregation by race in public schools," and (2) placing an affirmative duty on each State to "take whatever steps may be necessary to convert to a unitary system in which racial discrimination would be eliminated root and branch."

* * * * *

Mr. COLEMAN. This legislation, if passed by the requisite two-thirds majority of each House of Congress and thence by three-quarters of the State legislatures, will nullify the beneficial provisions of the 14th amendment to our Constitution, not only as to public education but also with untoward effect in other fields.

* * * * *

I do not believe it stretches principles of constitutional interpretation to say that, just as the courts have held that an individual child has a present and personal right to attend a public school system which in its entirety is operated upon a unitary basis, so a single individual objecting parent could, under this amendment, thwart the implementation of the most modest steps toward desegregation on a voluntary basis.

* * * * *

. . . to strip courts of their power to utilize busing as part of a desegregation plan or to make assignments with knowledge of the race, creed, or color of students, where to do so without such knowledge will result in maintaining a racially dual school system, would be a tragic mistake which could in one fell swoop end the progress which has thus far been achieved toward quality of educational opportunity.

Burke Marshall—(Deputy Dean, Yale University, on behalf of Common Cause)

This is an issue grown out of political rhetoric, out of inflamed fear of steps that have not been taken and never will as far as the cases now on the books are concerned, out of imagined rather than real threats to family life and family ties to communities. This is therefore the worst possible of atmospheres in which serious men should seriously consider changing the Constitution.

As to the first of these points, it seems plain that whatever the intent of the sponsors of the Lent and similar amendments and however mild-sounding the language—"no public school student shall, because of his race, creed, or color, be assigned to or required to attend a particular school"—their net effect would be to destroy court implementation of the Brown rule. The amendment on its face does not deal only with the transportation of students—that is, busing; it is nothing less than a resegregation amendment.

Thus, the amendment would not merely end the use of busing as a means to eliminate dual, unequal systems of public schools and halt deliberate school segregation, although it would do that. It would also foreclose the use of a variety of techniques brought into use by skilled educators throughout the country aimed at equalizing educational opportunity, providing better use

of school resources, and enhancing educational quality for all students in their communities—voluntary transfers, rezoning, the pairing of schools, magnet schools, educational parks, and the like.

And it would force the dismantling of all those systems of school busing—and there are a great many of them—where the educational climate has improved substantially as a result of school integration and student performance has been heightened for black and white students alike.

Dozens of school systems all over the country have integrated their schools thoroughly and successfully. In Berkeley, Calif., the largest city in the Nation to integrate its entire school system voluntarily, average achievement of black students has increased by 60 percent, and white student achievement is still greater. Harrisburg, Pa., has instituted a voluntary desegregation program, and its superintendent describes the results as "dramatic." Parents in Tulsa, Okla., have taken the lead in instituting desegregation programs involving transportation of their children.

Similar progress has been made in Riverside and Sacramento, Calif.; Dayton, Ohio; Baldwin, Mich.; and in Project Concern in Connecticut. Even school districts in Pontiac, Mich., and San Francisco, the scene of protests and even violence over the initiation of busing plans a few months ago, are now proceeding well enough that the officials in HEW and the U.S. Civil Rights Commission consider the programs in those districts successful.

But by far the greatest progress has been made in the South. It is noteworthy that President Nixon's decision last August to seek a ban on the use of Federal funds for busing was protested by school superintendents throughout the South—in Winston-Salem and Greenville, N.C., in Columbia, S.C., in Nashville, Tenn., in Birmingham, Ala., and in Jackson, Miss.—superintendents who, in effect, told the President that they were making the experience work and he should leave them alone.

The white business leaders of Jackson, once a citadel of segregationism, have been running full-page newspaper ads urging the community to back the local school program—ads which read "We are sticking with our public schools to help make them the best in the Nation."

If the Lent amendment were to be adopted, all of this would end—all of it. And worse than that, it would compel a retreat from what the courts are concerned with under *Brown*—the development of unitary school systems out of the structure of dual schools—a structure which has served through so much of this country's history not merely to deprive and even destroy black children but to isolate white children and dull their experiences as well.

That brings me to my second basic point: Whether there is really any demonstrated need for all the emotional and political attention being given this matter. In my view, the amendment we are discussing is a product of nothing less than a misreading and misunderstanding of the court decisions which have required busing and the rationale behind those decisions.

DAVID SELDEN—PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS, AFL–CIO

. . . We also believe that to pass such a constitutional amendment will inevitably lead to a separate and unequal school system—a separate and unequal school system that will begin the process of apartheid in America.

The schools are the last chance to bridge the gap of misunderstanding and hatred between black and white in our society. Bigotry is an adult disease. It can continue to poison our national life, consume us all in the process, or we can stand up at this time and say we intend to put an end to it once and for all. In large part, the answer depends upon what you gentlemen decide.

DR. MICHAEL BAKALIS—ILLINOIS SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Of the roughly 18,000 school districts in this country, school busing for the purpose of desegregation has taken place in 1,445 districts across the Nation, either under court order or under the U.S. Civil Rights Act—in other words, in about 8 percent of the school districts in this country. (Office of Civil Rights, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1972.)

* * * * *

"By the deliberate omission of any specific provisions for public education, the U.S. constitution reserved the authority and responsibility for providing a common school education to the State. Not even by implication does the Federal constitution treat this authority, and yet voices are now raised in a call for repeal of a non-existent provision. To propose a constitutional amendment aimed at 8% of the school districts in this country is the height of over-reaction."

ROY WILKINS—CHAIRMAN, LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The truth of the busing controversy, in the light of the Negro's history of forcible relegation to ghetto existence, is that the opponents still want to confine him to the black neighborhoods and they still want his children to have no escape from inferior education. They are not a bit concerned that opposition to busing practically nullifies the Supreme Court's unanimous opinion in the *Brown* case in 1954. Their opposition, if successful in this election year, will also repeal or nullify legislation on equal rights.

Once a section of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is effectively bypassed, the incessant effort to make a dead letter of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and of the Fair Housing Act of 1968 will proceed with new ingenuity and new vigor.

Antibusing is but another way of restating racial segregation.

* * * * *

As for the proposed constitutional amendment prohibiting busing, Dr. Kenneth B. Clark of the faculty of the College of the City of New York, has well written that it would make the Constitution "an instrument for the perpetuation of racism . . ."

EWALD B. NYQUIST—N.Y. STATE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

. . . it is sometimes necessary to bus students in order to achieve school desegregation. About 40 percent of all American school children ride buses to the schools to which they are assigned, and nearly 50 percent of all children in New York State do so.

Transportation which will enhance educational opportunity is an accepted practice across this land. The portion of this transportation used to bring about desegregation is very small. Indeed, it is estimated that about 3 percent of pupils transported ride school buses to achieve desegregation.

Neither Federal law nor the Federal Constitution should restrict local or State decisions regarding transportation for education. Well-planned programs in integrated settings have produced better results for children than were achieved when they were in separate schools.

* * * * *

Chairman CELLER. What would be the effect in New York State and in the communities which have undertaken voluntary desegregation plans if the amendment became part of the Constitution?

Mr. NYQUIST. I think we would move backwards toward a resegregation.

* * * * *

Mr. MCCULLOCH. If House Joint Resolution 620 were to become a part of the Constitution, do you believe it would be possible to offer quality education equally to all the students?

Mr. NYQUIST. I do not believe it would be possible.

MRS. ROBERT E. WOLF—MEMBER, BOARD OF EDUCATION OF PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY, MD.

The field in which you are asked to legislate has been well plowed and disked this year. However, the seed Congressman Lent and his associates ask you to plant, like all seed, looks innocent. These seed peddlers promise a pretty flower like the poppy. This pretty flower however will produce a poisonous substance; as destructive to our body politic and social as heroin. I urge that you reject their pretty seed—and the poison it exudes. Let us plant those seeds that make a hardy, strong, united America. Let us not cultivate the flower that poisons our minds, divides our people and destroys our National purpose.

Not one word in the Lent type proposals deal with their real purpose. Congressman Lent says he wants to give us: "relief from these sweeping court-ordered busing edicts". Not one word in his proposal will (1) "return control of education to local school boards", (2) "preserve the neighborhood school system", (3) "eliminate forced busing and the threat of school consolidation to achieve purely arbitrary racial balance".

These proposals will, rather, take away the present authority of each school board to manage its own affairs. They will foster segregated neighborhoods. They will promote arbitrary racial imbalance. They will create a National policy of racially separate schools.

* * * * *

The Lent type proposals would take away every desegregation tool—even those the Administration opted for in *Swann*.

NATIONAL NEWSPAPER WEEK

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a Joint Resolution which proclaims the week of October 8–14, 1972, as National Newspaper Week, and October 14 as National Newspaper Carrier Day.

The news media in America, in freely disseminating information and opinions to the public, represent one of the strongest pillars of democracy. Without the free and uncensored reporting of news and the opportunity to voice the wide range of views generated by our democratic society, individual freedom and choice would quickly grind to a halt. Information is the lifeblood of democracy, and the news media is the heart of this life system.

Newspapers—whether they are the mass circulation "national" dailies or the small country weeklies—are the bedrock of the news media. They are in every city and almost every village in the Nation. They print the news and opinions as an indestructible record which mirrors so-

ciety itself. Newspapers cover the broadest spectrum of society without regard to the clock or the calendar that restrict other forms of the media. It is only the newspaper, as every American knows so well each time he or she opens it up, that has the information most likely needed, in detail and in a form which can be skimmed through or pondered over—and which will wait until the next day, if necessary, for one to read.

Mr. Speaker, it would be impossible for most Americans to imagine waking up tomorrow and knowing that a newspaper would not be available again. Think how difficult it would be for us in this Chamber to carry out our responsibilities.

It is appropriate, therefore, that Congress take the lead in initiating the proclamation of National Newspaper Week 1972. I ask that this Joint Resolution be given prompt action.

REPORT BY TASK FORCE OF NATIONAL COUNCIL ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. McKevitt) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McKEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues a report which was prepared by the Task Force of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency and relates to the citizens of Denver.

Dr. Albert Fay Hill, a board member of the Colorado Council of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency was asked to form an Organized Crime Task Force that could undertake a research project which would include a study, report, and recommendations. The number of people who have contributed time and service to the task force has varied during the course of the study, but stabilized at about 12 in number, mainly women.

This work is neither the product of trained professional investigators, nor is it the result of covert operations. The methods employed in gathering data were those which are usual to the average student:

First. Court files and other public records are reviewed in different parts of Colorado.

Second. News reports concerning topics and persons of interest to this study were gathered and analyzed.

Third. Sworn testimony in court trails and before legislative committees and the reports of such committees were utilized.

Fourth. The reports and consultants' papers of the Organized Crime Task Force of the President's Crime Commission were studied.

Fifth. More than 100 interviews are conducted with Colorado police officers, prosecutors, judges, court personnel, and members of the business, civic, and social communities.

Sixth. Research libraries and the Colorado Historical Museum provided materials of interest.

Seventh. The offer of contributed time in the use of a computer to collate our data was of particular help in the early stages of our study.

Their goal was to accomplish several ends:

First. To undertake the most comprehensive, objective look at organized crime in the State of Colorado that had ever been undertaken by anyone, in or out of government.

Second. To transform ourselves into a body of interested and educated citizens, knowledgeable and concerned about the effect of this pernicious form of criminal activity.

Third. To present our findings, conclusions, and recommendations to the officials and the people of Colorado for their consideration and further action.

Having spent a number of years in law enforcement, I was extremely impressed with the great amount of work that went into the report. It is one of the most comprehensive reports of its kind on organized crime which I have seen. The report is particularly noteworthy because of the fact that it was made by citizens of Denver under Dr. Hill.

Dr. Hill is rector of the Montview Boulevard Presbyterian Church in Denver and has already received national recognition for his efforts to curb the growing crime rate in the United States. He should be highly commended for not only the hours he gave this project but for his concern and leadership.

Mr. Ralph Salerno, a nationally known expert on organized crime, was also of great assistance in the preparation of this report. He spent many hours working with the group to organize the material, point the direction the report should take and edit sections of the report. His expertise and great knowledge enabled him to guide the task force in its work.

The report is loaded with a number of specific facts and does not "pull any punches." It names people in the community who were and are involved and it points out judicial decisions which were held open to criticism regarding the sentencing of various individuals in organized crime.

The report succinctly points out that organized crime is not a new problem to Colorado or the Nation and has been in existence in my State for the last 40 years.

At this point, I include the conclusions of the report:

CONCLUSIONS

I. Organized crime is the most profitable business in the State of Colorado.

II. Syndicate gambling is the foundation for organized crime in Colorado. It is the largest volume money-maker, fosters public tolerance and finances other criminal activities. The people and the money of illegal gambling are connected to loansharking, burglary, hijacking, fencing, narcotics, con games and crimes of violence.

III. Organized crime has flourished in Colorado for more than 40 years, unidentified, unchecked, and unmolested. There has been little sustained effort to combat organized crime during this period, and this is true of governors, attorneys general, district attorneys, sheriffs and police chiefs.

IV. In recent years there has been some beneficial change in addressing organized crime in Colorado in the form of legislative action and the formation of law enforcement units.

V. Colorado's organized crime hoodlums are not the glamorous, benevolent figures portrayed in the fiction of movies and books. They are cruel, self-serving, brazen, pernicious and repulsive. More than 20 murders in Colorado can be directly attributed to organized crime.

VI. Paradoxically, the public is both the victim and the supporter of organized crime, by active participation in or passive acceptance of its activities. In some parts of this state the community attitude of tolerance encourages the growth of organized crime.

VII. Organized crime has followed a classic national pattern of movement beyond illegal activities to legitimate areas of business where its effect can be observed and felt.

VIII. Organized crime in Colorado is connected to organized crime groups all over the United States, including the Mafia or Cosa Nostra.

IX. Narcotics and prostitution in Colorado are operated by diverse organized criminal groups and not dominated by any one.

X. The courts in Colorado have not been particularly effective in combating organized crime. Sentencing patterns often reflects naivete, at best, and dereliction at worst, although there are refreshing exceptions to this general pattern.

Mr. Speaker, I consider the content of this report extremely interesting and worth the attention of my colleagues and add that it is available in my office for your inspection.

It is the first report of its kind in the country to be conducted by a citizen group. I certainly commend them for their great contribution.

HIJACKING SPEECH

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. Bell) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this measure, to provide for the suspension of air transportation between the United States and foreign countries in cases of international aircraft hijacking.

The crisis in both domestic and international air transportation is well known to every citizen. Daily we witness accounts in radio, television, and newspapers of the current progress of the "hijacking of the day." One might even say that it is rapidly becoming one of our most avid spectator sports.

Yet we obviously cannot afford to treat this subject lightly. The spiraling costs of hijacking, measured not only in terms of dollars and cents, but in the far more precious terms of human deaths and injuries, are more than we can tolerate.

Air service is constantly disrupted. Would-be passengers are becoming leery of air travel. We have even witnessed the disastrous effects of an international pilot's strike to protest the inaction of the world's governments.

During the 19-month period from January 1, 1971, to July 31 of this year there have been 58 hijackings. This is better than one every 10 days or over 36 per year. As of August 1, the total ransom outstanding is $6,503,000. Furthermore,

there have already been more hijackings in the first 7 months of 1972 than in all of last year. How many more times must we be forced to witness incidents such as that which occurred this past Tuesday, August 1? A Delta Airlines flight out of Detroit, bound for Miami, was hijacked and forced to fly to Algeria, after the hijackers had first stopped in Boston to extort a million dollars in ransom. Even more tragically, there have been five fatalities and 11 serious injuries to innocent American civilians as a result of hijacking episodes.

In short, Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Congress to act, in a positive and constructive manner, to curtail any further such incidents. This bill will permit the President to suspend air transportation between the United States and any foreign country when a hijacking has occurred and where that country has either failed to return the hijacker to the United States within 30 days, or failed to return the passengers, crew, aircraft, and any extorted ransom moneys within 5 days. This suspension shall remain in effect until the President determines that the resumption of air traffic will not endanger the safety of any aircraft or its passengers, crew, and cargo.

In conjunction with this bill, Mr. Speaker, I also offer the following resolution, expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to an international conference on air piracy. It calls on the President to take such steps as necessary to convene a conference for the purpose of establishing new and improved international policies and procedures designed to facilitate the apprehension and punishment of hijackers, as well as assure the safety of aircraft, passengers, and crews. It is further hoped that the conference will consider specific measures directed against international aircraft hijacking which should at least include, but not be limited to, the sanctions proposed in the bill which is companion to this resolution.

The purpose of these measures is evident. The suspension of air traffic will invoke economic pressure on foreign countries to refrain from aiding or abetting international air hijackers. If, through the aegis of an international conference, we can induce other governments to enact similar sanctions, then a great step will have been made toward curbing the dangerous spread of hijacking.

We of the Congress are extremely familiar with the expression "power of the purse" and all that it implies. If the responsible countries of the world join ranks in the cause of eliminating hijacking, and exercise their cumulative powers, then those countries who currently harbor these international fugitives will have to contend with pressures which are far more substantial than the somewhat ephemeral force of world opinion. The first step in this process, of course, is for our body to resoundingly endorse the bill and resolution which have been introduced today.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to support this bill and the attendant resolution:

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE SUSPENSION OF AIR TRANSPORTATION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND FOREIGN COUNTRIES IN CASES OF INTERNATIONAL AIRCRAFT HIJACKING

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) title XI of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1501–1512) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SUSPENSION OF AIR TRANSPORTATION IN CASES OF INTERNATIONAL AIRCRAFT HIJACKING

"SEC. 1113. In any case in which an aircraft registered in the United States is operating in interstate, overseas, or foreign air transportation and is hijacked to a foreign country and the President determines that such foreign country—

"(1) has willfully failed to return the hijacker to the country in which the hijacking originated within thirty days; or

"(2) has failed to take adequate steps to assure the safety of the hijacked aircraft, together with its passengers and crew, and provide for their safe return to the country from which the flight originated within five days; or

"(3) has willfully failed to return all funds or other valuable items extorted by the hijacker within five days;

the President shall suspend all air transportation to such foreign country by any aircraft registered under this Act and shall suspend all air transportation to the United States by any aircraft registered in such foreign country. Such suspension shall continue until the President determines that the resumption of air transportation suspended under this section will not result in danger to the safety of any aircraft operating in interstate, overseas, or foreign air transportation (including its passengers, crew, and cargo).".

(b) That portion of the table of contents contained in the first section of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 which appears under the center heading "TITLE XI—MISCELLANEOUS" is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 1113. Suspension of certain air transportation in cases of international aircraft hijacking.".

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON AIR PIRACY

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President should take such steps as may be necessary to call for an immediate international conference on air piracy for the purpose of establishing new and improved international policies and procedures designed to facilitate the apprehension and punishment of individuals guilty of international aircraft hijacking and to assure the prompt and safe return of the aircraft, together with its passengers and crew.

SEC. 2. It is further the sense of the Congress that the President should take such steps as may be necessary to assure that the international conference referred to in the first section of this concurrent resolution will consider specific measures directed against international aircraft hijacking, which measures should include, but not be limited to—

(1) a requirement that any individual guilty of international aircraft hijacking must be returned to the country in which the hijacking originated within thirty days;

(2) requirements that each country must take adequate steps to assure the safety of the hijacked aircraft, together with its passengers and crew, and provide for their safe return to the country from which the flight originated within five days; and

(3) appropriate provisions requiring that all funds or other valuable items extorted by the hijacker must be returned together with the hijacked aircraft, its passengers and crew.

POLICE MANPOWER ACT REINTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing the Police Manpower Act of 1972 with 18 cosponsors.

The Police Manpower Act, which was originally introduced on June 12, would authorize $2 billion per year for 6 years to underwrite the costs of recruitment, training, and salary for 140,000 additional policemen. This Federal assistance would be distributed on a community by community basis, in accordance with the findings of comprehensive analyses of the needs and requirements of the individual communities. The program is expected to provide for a nationwide increase of approximately 40 percent in the manpower of our local law enforcement agencies.

There is no area in which the Nixon administration's record is any weaker than in the area of law enforcement and the provision of public safety. We have seen Federal anticrime expenditures soar to an estimated $2.3 billion for the current fiscal year. Yet, according to the FBI's indices, since President Nixon's inauguration crime has risen by an incredible 30 percent. Thus, the same citizens who must bear the burden of crime have seen increasingly large sums of their tax dollars wasted on misguided efforts that have had little or no impact on the level and incidence of criminal activity. In short, the present anticrime program is a continuing boondoggle of significant proportions which has resulted in the squandering of hundreds of millions of dollars on gimmickery and unnecessary equipment.

A whole new philosophy for the Federal effort to combat crime is needed. The "war on crime" has failed for the simple reason that much of the money is being spent for the wrong things. It is clear that the Federal Government can spend its anticrime funds much more wisely by increasing police presence in high crime areas than by buying, say, fancy riot control gadgetry which may never be used. The whole thrust of the Police Manpower Act is to spend the money where it is needed, and to spend the money on the one variable which has demonstrated a very high impact on criminal activity: the patrolman on his beat.

This proposal does not denigrate efforts to improve the performance of the entire criminal justice system, nor does it deny the urgent need for far-reaching socio-economic reforms to attack the problems which breed crime. Obviously, increasing the number of police is not the sole answer to the short-run prob-

lems of crime, but it is the place to begin. There is abundant evidence to support this argument, and I have been gratified by the enthusiastic response from police chiefs throughout the country. I wish to share with my colleagues some of their comments on the Police Manpower Act:

"I applaud your action in introducing the Police Manpower Act of 1972 in the Congress of the United States and enthusiastically endorse your opinion that increased police manpower is essential for the prevention or reduction of crime, particularly street crimes . . . the increased manpower that would be provided by your measure is obviously only one of the major benefits that would accrue to any participating community. I view the planning studies to be conducted by qualified analysts as another major contribution afforded by the Act."—Colonel Walter A. McQueeney, Chief of Police, City of Providence, Rhode Island.

"I fervently congratulate your efforts to upgrade law enforcement in its most critically needed area—an area which has been virtually ignored by the laws regulating the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration."—J. Lawrence Riley, Executive Secretary, Department of Public Safety, City of Fort Wayne, Indiana.

"The proposal you submitted for legislation (HR 15441) "Police Manpower Act of 1972" is the proper approach for short-range crime reduction with immediate results. The shortage of personnel and the increased demand for police services has drastically reduced law enforcement's ability to cope with an ever-increasing crime rate"—H. E. Britton, Chief of Police, City of Fresno, California.

"The other branches of our criminal justice system (courts, corrections) will also need improvement but there is no question that police departments must be substantially increased to cope with our crime problem."—Michael D. Roy, Chief of Police, City of Elizabeth, New Jersey.

"We would agree that the most effective method of reducing crime in the streets is by placing more policemen in those streets . . . we the two hundred and twenty-one (221) sworn police personnel or the Warren Police Department support your proposed legislation."—Milford S. Gilliam, Commissioner of Police, City of Warren, Michigan.

"I am in total agreement that it is time that federal funds be used for additional manpower in police agencies. There is a definite correlation between the size of the police department in manpower and the increase or decrease of crime as a result."—Colonel Edgar Paul, Chief of Police, City of Louisville, Kentucky.

"As police administrator I am pleased with the prospect of having more federal resources allocated nationwide to the short-term and immediate needs of local law enforcement agencies. The proposed plan, if it can be implemented as intended, should provide the means of reducing crime in many cities which have very high, and rapidly increasing, crime rates and which are in severe fiscal difficulties. Unfortunately, the two conditions seem to coexist."—John P. Howard, Chief of Police, Wauwatosa, Wisconsin.

"Your Police Manpower Act of 1972 (H.R. 15441) hits the nail on the head in the true understanding of the crime problem and your no nonsense solution to same."—Myron R. Ratkowski, Chief of Police, Greendale, Wisconsin.

"It is a tremendous concept . . . I certainly believe the federal government should do everything they can to assist local law enforcement. It is with a great deal of pleasure that I note that the Congress of the United States is making serious efforts to assist in local problems."—Richard A. Andersen, Chief of Police, City of Omaha, Nebraska.

"I have wondered for some time why the Congress did not approach the crime problem and the police manpower problem more realistically, and your H.R. 15441 finally approaches both of these problems in a very practical manner."—C. J. Staylor, Chief of Police, City of Norfolk, Virginia.

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, later this week we will be taking up a bill dealing with the American Revolution Bicentennial an important event for America and we all look to 1976 with great hope.

A constituent of mine, Larry Spinelli, who is presently a student at Drew University, is very concerned about the bicentennial and expressed his concern to me. I want to call to the attention of my colleagues Mr. Spinelli's letter as an expression of interest and concern by a young American.

The following is a text of the letter:

AUGUST 2, 1972.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RODINO. In 1976 the United States will proudly celebrate its 200th birthday. It is an event that could be used to strengthen and unify America. It is an event that could help to spotlight the problems facing America and to initiate the efforts needed to solve these problems. The Bicentennial could be used as a focal point to bring together young and old, rich and poor, black and white.

All this is possible, but it is not what now exists. Instead, we see 1976 moving closer and constructive activity at a minimum. The Commission which is responsible for coordinating the Bicentennial, the American Bicentennial Commission, is currently surrounded by doubt and controversy.

Rep. Fred Schwengel, President of the U.S. Capitol Historical Society, stated that "the present Bicentennial leadership is woefully inadequate and doesn't really understand what it should do, nor have they developed a program that will make a very significant contribution." The Democratic National Committee has expressed the feeling that the ARBC is a "haven for Nixon cronies," and Senator Charles Mathias, the person largely responsible for legislation creating the Commission, stated "the fact remains that the Bicentennial is upon us and the Commission has, thus far, come forth with nothing—no plan, no program—capable of genuinely arousing and involving the entire nation in the celebration of its 200th anniversary."

This Bicentennial celebration, that could have worked to unify and bring together the many segments of American society, has instead led to further divisions. A twenty-five member youth conference, which was to serve as ARBC's Youth Advisory Commission, resigned en masse last summer in protest of Bicentennial inactivity and the ARBC's lack of representation of all groups in America. A group in Cleveland has formed the Afro-American Bicentennial Corporation because of the lack of activity by the ARBC in regard to black America. Thus far, the Bicentennial has led to deeper division rather than creating more unity.

My generation will reap most of the benefits of a *successful* Bicentennial. Most of us will not be around in 2076 to be given a second chance. The Bicentennial is a time to create a renewed interest in the past, to instill in people a respect and deep concern for our heritage. The 200th birthday of America is a time for reevaluating the America of today, to focus attention on our problems and frailties that so desperately need our attention. It is also a time to look ahead and plan the best future for all Americans.

I implore Congress, as representatives of the people, not to let America down. I hope that they will evaluate the ARBC and all the Bicentennial programs to make certain that they are relevant and effective. Congress must insure that 1976 is a date that will long be remembered as the beginning of the end of many problems that are evident today.

The Bicentennial must give hope to the generations of today and promise to the generations of tomorrow.

Sincerely,

LARRY SPINELLI.

EFFORTS TO BLOCK AID TO THAILAND EXCEPT THAT CONNECTED TO NARCOTICS CONTROL

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will begin debate on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1972. As many of my colleagues are aware, the bill contains a suspension of aid provision to Thailand because of its major role in the heroin traffic in Southeast Asia.

The fact that this provision is a part of the bill is in no small measure due to the great sense of urgency that the Members of this body attach to stopping the flow of heroin into our country. Congressional pressure both on the administration and on the Thailand Government has had a very positive effect. The executive has, in the past few months, geared up an increasingly effective antinarcotics program. Seizures in Thailand are running well ahead of last year's miniscule totals of 645 pounds of opium and 97 pounds of heroin.

However, only a start has been made. The adoption of this part of the foreign aid bill will serve notice on other nations that the United States considers the halting of drug traffic to be its No. 1 priority. The Thai Government, with continued U.S. antinarcotics assistance, will, I feel sure, improve on its records of arrests and seizures.

Mr. Speaker, this provision in no way ties the President's hands. He may resume the aid programs whenever he feels that Thailand has taken positive steps to prevent their country from being used, as it is now, as a conduit for opium traffic. I hope that the Congress will adopt this provision so that it can, in fact, strengthen the President's position by showing a united determination by both branches to curtail drug traffic.

At this point in the RECORD, I am listing the names of the Members of this body who have endorsed the original resolution to halt aid to Thailand. I am also including the report of the committee on this measure. I share its view and

hope that a prompt restoration of aid will follow the anticipated positive action on this problem.

The list and report follows:

THAILAND

New subsection 620(x) prohibits the furnishing of assistance, other than that which is related to international narcotics control, to Thailand. This restriction, which also applies to sales of military equipment and of agricultural commodities, may be waived when the President determines that the Government of Thailand has taken adequate steps to prevent the illegal production of and traffic in narcotics.

The committee recognizes that Thailand is a friend and ally of the United States and that it provides important base facilities for U.S. forces engaged in the Vietnam war. It is of the opinion, however, that the problem of drug addiction in the United States has reached epidemic proportions and every effort must be taken to stop the illegal international traffic in narcotics, particularly heroin.

Thailand is both a source and conduit for opium and its derivatives: morphine and heroin. Quantities of these narcotics have been smuggled into South Vietnam and sold to U.S. forces in that country. An increasing amount is also being smuggled into the United States. In view of the fact that the Government of Turkey has agreed to discontinue the growing of poppies in that country, there is the danger that the countries of Southeast Asia will replace those of the Middle East as the primary source of heroin for the United States.

The committee is hopeful that the Thai Government will take the strong and positive action required to stop the illegal production of and traffic in narcotics and that it will be possible for the President to exercise the waiver authority contained in this section.

LIST OF MEMBERS ENDORSING RESOLUTION

Abourezk, Abzug, Addabbo, Aspin, Barrett, Biaggi, Bingham, Brasco, Burke of Mass.

Burton, Byrne, Carey, Clay, Conyers, Dellums, Denholm, Dent, Derwinski, Donohue.

Drinan, Dow, Eilberg, Harrington, Hawkins, Hechler, Helstoski, Howard, Kastenmeier.

Koch, Bennett, Mikva, Mink, Mitchell, Mix, Obey, O'Neill, Patten, Podell.

Pucinski, Rangel, Rees, Roe, Rosenthal, Rostenkowski, Roybal, James V. Stanton, Stokes, Tiernan.

Yates, Yatron, Karth, Daniels of N.J., Moss, Van Deerlin, Chisholm, Madden, St Germain, Link.

Pepper, Delaney, Collins of Ill., Ryan, Kluczynski, Diggs, Green of Penna., Vanik, Hanley, Annunzio, Nedzi.

Sarbanes, Terry, Alexander, Seiberling, Scheuer, Hicks, Danielson, Anderson of Tenn., Charles H. Wilson, Wolff, Murphy.

NORTHEAST TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

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

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to put a stop to the continued Federal nursing of a private corporation, the Penn Central Transportation Co. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee was asked in the spring of 1969 to bail out a railroad operated by officers, 15 of whom had recently sold about 70 percent of stock they owned at the time of the merger of New York Central and Pennsylvania Railroads. As the SEC has now reported in its 800-page report dated August 3:

These officers had apparent access to information concerning the state of Penn Centrals' assets, which was reaching the public only with a serious amount of distortion.

Federal law, of course, prohibits stock sales by corporate officers based on inside information that is not available to the public.

Before the bankruptcy occurred, we on the committee were asked by the Secretary of Transportation and urged by the administration to guarantee a $200 million loan to the corporation, to be controlled by corporate officers—without, of course, court control under bankruptcy or reorganization. I actively opposed this and the committee did not approve.

Later that year, however—and after reorganization—we did extend a $125 million loan guarantee to the Penn Central Transportation Co.

Now the report of the trustees in bankruptcy, dated February 15, 1972, takes the position that any reasonable prospect of organizing the railroad as a private corporation must be accompanied by abandonment of more than 40 percent of its roads and large reductions in its work force, and, as late as July 1, 1972, the trustees' interim report indicates that they are developing for inclusion in their October report to the court a range of alternatives to a conventional earnings-based reorganization.

I supported the $125 million loan guarantee upon the basis that such money pumped into a reorganized railroad would restore it to a viable position as a conventional earnings-based corporation. David C. Bevan, the former chief financial officer of the Penn Central Co., said on August 6, 1969, before the Senate Commerce Committee, that when dividends were paid in 1969 "I was still completely confident we were going to come through." Now it is disclosed in the SEC's report that as the price of Penn Central stock declined, Bevan sold 15,000 shares of Penn Central stock in the first half of 1969 at prices ranging between $80 and $66, paying off a $680,000 stock option loan and managing to keep his personal fortune intact.

In 1971 the House Banking and Currency Committee issued a report in which they indicated that the same Mr. Bevan "manipulated the financial resources, the assets and the credit" of the corporation for the benefit of Penphil Co., an investment club established in 1962 whose members consisted mainly of Penn Central officials and their associates.

It now appears that we were sold a bill of goods as massive as was our loan guarantee. Penn Central's assurances of returning to a conventional earnings-based corporate operation was as fanciful as Bevan's "confidence" that the railroad "was going to come through."

I do not believe the railroad is ever going to come through under this private management. Yet, I feel that it is of utmost importance that the railroad operations in the Northeast be continued not for the prime objective of profitmaking but to provide the public with necessary and safe railroad transportation service. Of course, it would be an utter anomaly if standards of railroad operations in this area undercut the nationwide standards with respect to safety rules, working conditions, rates of pay, and general conditions of service. It is the genius of our economic system that, in a competitive profit and loss economy, deficit ridden enterprises must eventually face a day of reckoning. Penn Central has been postponing such a day for almost 5 years. The time has come for this day of reckoning.

The bill I introduced today simply provides that at such time as it appears that there is no reasonable prospect of Penn Central achieving a traditional income-based reorganization consistent with the public interest, such will trigger the acquisition of Penn Central by a Federal corporation. The Federal corporation, to be known as the Northeast Transportation Authority, would be authorized to maintain and operate the railroad with the prime objective of providing the public with safe, useful railroad transportation service under those standard conditions of employee working conditions and pay as prevail in the railroad industry in the United States.

I offer this bill because all of the standard arguments in support of a private enterprise system fail in a situation where no risk remains except to the public. Though it is true that the top officers who were guilty of violating SEC regulations have been removed from control, second rung officers trained by them, still run the railroad. Also, under such management, it now becomes apparent that Penn Central is not being maintained as a profitmaking corporation in a free enterprise system and will never be without adopting standards which are below that of railroads throughout the Nation.

It is necessary not to shut down this system which could lead to a reduction of national production by 3 percent and raise unemployment by 60 percent. If we are to continue its operations by further loan guarantees, the railroad should be operated wholly as a service system. The alternative which seems to be proposed by the trustees is another kind of subsidy: further reduction of services, curtailments in the manning of the railroads necessary for safety and reasonable working conditions, and the effective erosion of the collective bargaining position of the workers.

I think my bill is a reasonable alternative. It would be a means of maintaining and improving services in the Northeast and of maintaining reasonable standards of wages and working conditions. It is not intended as a step toward nationalization of railroads but would afford a yardstick for railroad operations very similar to public power programs like TVA, which have certainly not ousted private production of electric power. Such a public corporation also has prece-

dent in Comsat and Amtrak. I recommend it as a prudent means of protecting a very large Federal commitment and of guaranteeing an intact system of railroad services in the Northeast.

NATIONAL LAND POLICY, PLANNING, AND MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1972

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on H.R. 7211, as amended, is being filed today.

This legislation, identified as the National Land Policy, Planning, and Management Act of 1972, is clearly one of the most significant matters of truly national importance considered by the committee since I have been a Member of Congress. I commend the report to the careful attention of my colleagues.

As is customary when a bill is amended by the substitution of entirely new language below the enacting clause, the report contains the text of the bill in its amended form. Since the report is being filed only today, it is only at this time that the full text of the bill as developed by the committee is made available to the Members, and through them to the public, together with the section-by-section analysis explaining what the committee has in mind in recommending this legislation to you.

I emphasize this because I know some Members have received mail wherein the writers have indicated they are familiar with the bill. Some of them proceed to misrepresent its provisions and urge upon Members some of the most strained interpretations of statutory language that I have ever witnessed. After some 24 years membership in this body, I am of the opinion that it is virtually impossible to know the contents of a piece of legislation as complex as this is until it is put into its final form. Only then can it be studied along with the committee report so that consideration may be given to all of its integrated and related provisions. I say this even though our full committee markup sessions are open to the public—and there were six such sessions in this case—and there has certainly been no effort to keep any stage of the development of this bill a secret.

H.R. 7211, as amended, may perhaps best be described as an omnibus or "umbrella" bill, the purposes of which are to:

1. Establish congressional policy with respect to the public lands;

2. Provide a grant-in-aid program for the States to develop land use planning processes with respect to the non-Federal lands; and

3. Set forth guidelines for the administration of both the grant-in-aid program and management of the public lands.

Although it is, of course, possible to treat these matters separately, in my opinion, there is much to be gained by relating these various elements to each other as they will undoubtedly have to be related in their administration, whether in an omnibus bill or separately.

A major reason for combining the several elements referred to into one piece of legislation is that I do not believe Congress should impose a land use planning process upon the private lands of this Nation—even indirectly by working with the States, and that is all this bill provides for—without at the same time facing up to our own responsibility. One-third of the Nation's land is owned and controlled by the Federal Government. Although the Constitution of the United States places certain obligations upon the legislative branch of Government as to this priceless heritage, the Congress has, whether by intention or inadvertance, on occasion abdicated this responsibility.

The executive branch has attempted to fill the void, but in the absence of statutory guidelines, a piecemeal approach often has been taken rather than the development of a consistent program. H.R. 7211 would, in my opinion, remedy this situation. The bill accomplishes this by giving the executive general direction in the establshment of policy, and by giving specific direction in the form of broad, new authority to classify the lands generally for retention and management for the maximum benefit of the general public. The policymaking responsibility, however, is reserved to the Congress as the Constitution provides.

Placing the basic policy responsibilities in the hands of the people themselves—acting through their duly elected Representatives of the legislative branch—will enable the executive land management agencies to direct their attention where it should be placed—to the management of the public lands.

I think it should be mentioned that in the past much emphasis was given to the disposal of our public lands as a means of encouraging development. The lands were literally given away to homesteaders, to railroad companies, and to States in the form of land grants. H.R. 7211, as amended, discontinues the practices and establishes for the public domain a policy of retention of such lands in public ownership unless in specified instances it is found to be of a better use by being disposed to a State or one of its subdivisions, or, in a very few and limited instances, for private enterprise development. I can assure my colleagues that these instances will be very few indeed. The present policy that public lands are held by the Federal Government pending final disposal is reversed entirely.

With respect to the non-Federal lands, H.R. 7211, as amended, provides incentives to encourage each State to undertake a comprehensive land use planning process.

What planning and control that has existed in this area up to the present time has been exercised by local zoning boards, subject to frequent exceptions called variances as development has taken place. Under H.R. 7211 as amended, for the first time, all of the land in a State—and indeed all the land in the United States—will be subject to a planning process. The bill does not, however, impose Federal authority as to nonpublic lands as long as decisions having a substantial impact beyond their jurisdiction are subject to review at the State level.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7211 is, as I have stated heretofore, a detailed and intricate piece of legislation. It is presented in its present form with the hope that the people of the United States may become better acquainted with their heritage and may be better able to see to it that it is used wisely and for the benefit of all the people.

HIGHER EDUCATION: WHO NEEDS IT

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, for a Nation which prides itself on its egalitarian ideals, we remain strangely addicted to educational snobbism. In my view, there are few more unjust examples of this essentially antidemocratic ethic than the draft deferments granted young men attending college while their peers, who perhaps preferred to be auto mechanics or carpenters or plumbers or policemen or firemen or any other countless vocations not requiring a college degree, are told their services here are expendable and they are candidates for duty in Vietnam. This policy of deferment for college students was justified on the basis that the national interest required this supply of university-trained manpower. Not only is the justification faulty in principle, it has now become abundantly clear that it is pragmatically faulty also. The harsh truth is there simply are not jobs for the young people we are running through the degree mill. This fact makes even more irrational the recent action of the Congress in approving a provision in the higher education legislation in entitling each young person to $1,400—less expected family contribution—to attend the college or university of his choice.

A couple of months ago the CBS Television Network produced a superb documentary entitled "Higher Education: Who Needs It?" In dramatic fashion, recent college graduates themselves describe the disillusioning and unsuccessful experience in attempting to find jobs for which their recent training prepared them. The college degree—that supposed passport to economic security—was found valueless in case after case. Not only that, but we have all been reading in recent months of the numerous Ph. D.'s swelling the unemployment ranks. I suggest that it is well past time we reexamine the national mania for bachelors and masters and doctoral degrees. It is my guess that millions of young people in college now are not there because they genuinely want to be but because they and their parents have, in good faith, accepted the dictum that there is more prestige and greater economic benefits for college graduates than non-college graduates. Once, perhaps, that was true, but there is now ample evidence to indicate that those expectations may well remain unfulfilled.

The CBS documentary quotes a Department of Labor study which concludes that fewer than 20 percent of the jobs in the next decade will require the equivalency of a bachelor's degree. The other remaining 80 percent can be filled by those with a high school education or vocational and technical training subsequent to high school.

Although this reprint of the script in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD cannot hope to be as persuasive as the original vivid television presentation, I hope its timely and critical message, reprinted here, will reach others who have had no opportunity to see the television production. For it is my belief that if we, as a nation, persist in this unwarranted downgrading of vocational and technical training, and at the same time continue this slavish bondage to academic degrees, we may end up with the most scholarly unemployment lines in the world, filled by unhappy men and women who, had they but known the truth, would have originally chosen vocations in which they would now find themselves happily employed.

The CBS transcript follows:

CBC REPORTS "HIGHER EDUCATION: WHO NEEDS IT?" AS BROADCAST OVER THE CBS TELEVISION NETWORK, THURSDAY, MAY 25, 1972

HUGHES RUDD. This is supposed to be a happy time for the young: graduation from college at last, with the world waiting out there as their oyster.

MAN. Dorothy Badmer, Jeffrey Bamford . . .

RUDD. It's the season when almost a million young men and women on more than 2,000 campuses take their synthetic sheepskins and leave the academic nest. The college degree has been part of the American Dream, a passport to success, money and the better life. But it may not work that way anymore.

How about you? Have you got a job lined up yet?

MAN. No, I haven't. I've applied to 35 places, I've had two interviews and I haven't heard from any yet. But all the rest have been no vacancies.

WOMAN. Anybody that needs an excellent phys. ed. teacher, here I am.

MAN. With a bachelor's, it's almost impossible to find a job.

RUDD. When you started in school four years ago, did you think it would be this tough when you got out?

WOMAN. No, not at all.

RUDD. Have you got any jobs lined up?

MAN. No, not even close.

RUDD. Have you got a job lined up?

WOMAN. No. I hope I do. I don't know yet. I have another interview Tuesday. I doubt it.

RUDD. Have you got a job lined up?

MAN. Nope.

MAN. What is available is just something you could have gotten without much of an education before, and opportunities are not so great, that any optimistic outlook now is a bit of a sham.

ANNOUNCER. CBS Reports: "Higher Education: Who Needs It?"

(Announcements).

ANNOUNCER. And now, here is CBS News Correspondent Hughes Rudd.

RUDD. Americans, of course, like nothing better than success; the bigger the better. Our national motto says we place our trust in God, but we're considerably more pragmatic than that. In our pursuit of success, we place an incredible amount of trust in higher education. It's an article of faith in this country that the more education you have, the more money you can make. As a result, the vast machinery of higher education in the United States is behaving like a runaway factory, producing ever-increasing numbers of graduates. We are exposed to more education than any people in history and proud of it.

Today just about any American can go to college. Next year some nine million students will be on the nation's college and university campuses, and we're spending some $31-billion on higher education this year. Twenty years ago there were not quite 2,000 institutions of higher learning in this country; today there are more than twenty-five hundred. The boom in two-year community or junior colleges is especially remarkable: in 1960 there were about 400, today there are almost 900, with two and a half million students enrolled—and a new community college opens every week.

All this seems very American, somehow, very democratic: anybody who wants a college education should be allowed to have it and plenty of it. Degrees, we believe, equal dough: you can exchange the sheepskin for shekels in the marketplace. But it turns out that ain't necessarily so.

This is a recent gathering of college graduates, but they haven't gotten together to sing the old college fight song or to brag about how well they're doing in the real world. This is an employment agency in New Jersey, and the young men are not doing well at all.

THOMAS PITOSCIA. Well, I was trained basically in biology and chemistry, and it's very difficult. The market is very tough.

RUDD. Not having any luck?

PITOSCIA. I've been trying since May, or even before that, before I graduated. I have about 50 applications out, been to about six employment agencies, and it's really a wild goose chase.

KEN KENSINGER. I've had numerous employment agencies tell me, "Well, it's going to be much better in six months." Six months isn't going to do me any good. I'm living with my in-laws right now. I've got a three-month-old baby and a wife to support. Where do you go? I've tried to remain flexible and not finding a place to live so that I could relocate. But sooner or later you've just got to take something.

MARK WILENSKY. I have to drive a taxicab to support myself. And every time I drive a taxicab I take along a batch of resumes. I hand them out to anybody who sounds—anybody who seems interesting and anybody who seems interested in what I'm doing. And this is one way of looking. I have to do this on weekends. I have to drive that taxicab and I drive it all around New York, and I pick up interesting people and I ask them, "Do you have a job for me?"

ALAN RUDOLPH. I've been looking for a job full-time now about a month and a half. I worked for a while doing various jobs just to get some money and now I'm out looking for something in management or marketing or sales or just about anything I can find at this point, and it's rough anywhere you go.

EDWARD GABRIELSKI. Well, I've been looking pretty hard since January. I've sent over 60, 70 résumés out to the major companies and I've answered all the ads in the paper, anything close to what I'm looking for. I'm looking for maybe even a management trainee job and I'd see any employment agency just about, and just anybody, talk to anybody who thinks they might know of a place where there's a job open.

RUDD. Would you take anything?

GABRIELSKI. Anything, anywhere, just about.

RUDD. Youth must be full of hope, of course: one condition defines the other. So these young men hope, deep down, that things will get better. But older and perhaps wiser heads are often pretty gloomy. They certainly are about the employment prospects for today's graduates. Economist Joseph Froomkin used to be assistant commissioner of the United States Office of Education and he's made a study of college graduates and the job market.

FROOMKIN. I'm afraid that the difficulty of college graduates in finding jobs is going to last for at least the next 10 years and probably longer if present college-going rates stay at the present level. As a matter of fact, I feel that by 1980 roughly eight percent of all college graduates will be either looking for jobs or will be in jobs which college graduates have usually not filled up to now.

RUDD. Why? What's causing that?

FROOMKIN. Look there are some very simple figures which will show you what the problems are. There were 6.8 million college graduates in the labor force in 1960. Today there are about 9.2 million college graduates in the labor force, which means that those are the people who either have jobs or are looking for jobs. In other words, one out of 12 workers in 1960 was a college graduate. Today it is one out of nine. By 1980 one out of six workers will have a college degree. Now this is a tremendous increase.

RUDD. Dr. Froomkin is also concerned about what's happening to young women in our educational system.

FROOMKIN. By the end of this decade there is going to be a real crisis with respect to females. Right now, you see, most women go into female-dominated professions. One out of two is either a teacher or a nurse. By 1980 only one out of three is going to be a teacher or nurse, and they too will start competing for those jobs.

RUDD. Won't jobs keep pace with the increase in graduates?

FROOMKIN. I have grave doubts that our technology is developing that fast and that the skill mix of the labor force by 1980 will justify the employment of one college graduate for every six workers.

RUDD. Do you feel that the whole college experience was a waste of time, then, or what?

WILENSKY. I don't think it's a waste of time. However, I think that the colleges should have prepared us. They should have been more efficient in preparing us for the outside world. I think that the academic world and the business world operate totally differently.

GABRIELSKI. I feel the only good—best background that college gives you is to go on for your master's or your doctorate. I mean that's what they actually train you for. They train you for more education. Now someplace along the line somebody is going to have to decide either to train you after you come out of school or during the last few years of your school—your schooling to go out and get a job, or persuade or force the companies to offer programs such as that.

RUDOLPH. In my situation, it wasn't a question of going to college, it was simply assumed that, like on a commercial, "Without that sheepskin you're not going anywhere."

FRANK NEWMAN. What is it that we have told people about college, over and over again—and almost all of us are guilty of this: to go to college is essential to your career. What we've said is: college is the vehicle for getting to the good life. And you may think that this argument is dead, but it isn't. Think of the arguments about—for example, the Yale argument about the contingent repayment loan plan. What was the thing they said? They said: "You can afford to pay this higher tuition. We'll give you a loan and you can pay it back over a very long perod of time, because for the rest of

your life, you're going to make a much higher income."

RUDD. Frank Newman is a Stanford University administrator who heads a group looking into the problems and promises of higher education, at the behest of the Federal Government. The first Newman report came out last year and immediately ruffled a lot of academic feathers, although many educators thought it was "right on." The report accused the universities and colleges of "lukewarm interest in innovation and self-reform." Mr. Newman and his associates are still in the gadfly businesss, telling it the way they at least think it is. Here he is before a recent educators' convention in Chicago.

NEWMAN. . . . obviously, and where we're all now aware of it, run into an enormous, if you—we have called it an oversupply problem. If you want to choose the euphemisms of the trade, it is an underemployment problem. There is no logical way out of that in the future, in terms of changes in the job market. Consequently, we've got to begin to ask ourselves, even if we don't want to: what is the function of college in relation to this?

I think we're going to have to begin to examine what the Swedes have been calling recurrent education. But they're already terribly worried about this underemployment-oversupply problem. What they argue—and I would argue it too—is that we must move toward the concept where college does not determine your place in life. Rather, you succeed in life by your own energies and ability and that college is an educational process which aids you in that, for whatever you choose your life to be. Consequently, what has to happen, then, is we have to have the kind of relationship where one can return—go to college when one finds it appropriate, leave college when it's better to be off doing what you want to do, return to college without any great premiums, and educate yourself further as you move on in whatever it is you choose to do. And I don't mean that college should only be functional toward a career. It may very well be that you will find later that you need a sense of liberal arts for simply your sense of participation in society.

RUDD. The second Newman report will come out this fall and Mr. Newman says it will emphasize creating a more realistic relationship between college education and careers. The question is whether or not the universities and colleges will pay any attention to its recommendations. George Bonham is editor of *Change* magazine, the leading monthly journal devoted to higher education. We asked him what sort of reception he thinks the Newman report will receive.

BONHAM. I think it will be very mixed. There has not been much evidence by most campuses that they're willing to face up to this relationship of education and jobs. I just came from a faculty meeting up in New England, and I asked this question of department chairmen: are they concerned about the fact that their graduate students cannot get jobs? Well, they didn't seem to be very much concerned. One of the people said: "Well, that's not our business. Our business is education and it's up to society to provide the jobs once they get out."

RUDD. That attitude seems to be general among true-blue academics, but at Michigan State University—enrollment 44,000—the deans are at least willing to listen to a voice from the marketplace. Jack Shingleton is placement officer at Michigan State and his job is finding jobs for the graduates.

SHINGLETON. The so-called elite jobs are not available in sufficient numbers to meet the aspirations of the multitudes graduating from our colleges and universities. Now educators have never said, "Go to college and get a job," but this has been implied and now students expect it. If this is not the case, we need to tell students as emphatically as we can that they are being educated for other than career purposes. If we care what happens to these students after college, then let's get involved with what should be one of the basic purposes of education, and that is career preparation.

RICHARD E. SULLIVAN. And I'd like to submit that survival in this coming age is not going to be in the world of work so much as it's going to be in the world of deciding what's good and bad, what's humanly livable and what isn't, and so forth, and that the real challenge before the university world of the future is to adjust people to that kind of thing. I wonder if you are not just defining for us the world of work, as you see it from a placement officer's point of view.

SHINGLETON. I would agree with you that I'm probably inclined to look at it more from the hard, cold world of work. But on the other hand, when we look at what happens to our graduates today—and the graduates that you're turning out—about 75 to 80 percent of our graduates are going into that world.

RICHARD E. CHAPIN. Jack, I want to follow up some on what Dean Sullivan was saying. You refer to a couple of things that should be the goal of the university—a rich and rewarding career.

SHINGLETON. One of the purposes, yes.

CHAPIN. I wonder if maybe a rich and rewarding life might be more appropriate.

SHINGLETON. That is more important.

CHAPIN. And if we look 10 years hence, Jack, the amount of time our students spend in the real world—as you call it—or the work world is going to be much less than what they spend in the real world today. They're going to work fewer days, they're going to work fewer hours, and then what are they going to do with their life the rest of that time if we design a curriculum around a career-development program all the way?

SHINGLETON. Well, very definitely we've got to educate the people for the free time, but don't underrate the importance of jobs. To enjoy their leisure time they're going to have money to do the things that they want to do in those leisure time—in that leisure time. They're going to get that through their job.

MILTON E. MUELDER. I'd like to make a comment. I think we have in Jack Shingleton a very fine placement officer and we're grateful for all of the work that he's done. But when you get over into the problem of educational philosophy—the type of research and so forth in education—I just think that you're completely out of order on that thing and I think it's a rather fruitless, often sophomoric discussion when it comes to that level. This is not an easy problem and it's not up to you to try to solve the problem. But I just think it's out of order for us to try to discuss what the educational philosophy of Michigan State University should be in this context, and I for one think we ought to conclude the discussion.

SHINGLETON. May I just have a rebuttal to that, John? I think you've touched, Dean Muelder, on one of the most significant problems in American education today. If you'll please excuse my sophomoric approach, as you've described it, the whole problem with American education is that they have not listened to the American public, nor have they listened to the taxpayers in society at large, in terms of the major issues in American education. I think the time is now due that someone speaks up to some of the ivory-tower thoughts that have been generated over a long period of time and that have been perpetuated. I think some of those should be examined. And I do believe that all of us—and I know I can certainly stand it—can do to hear from other people outside of my area, and perhaps you would do well to consider the same. I congratulate this group on giving me the opportunity . . .

RUDD. Such discussions as this, impassioned and important though they may be, are really academic. More than 75 percent of our college students go to public colleges and universities, which exist only because of the taxpayers. That means the muscle which moves the academic body is not on campus but under the domes of the state capitols. In Michigan, State Senator Charles Oscar Zollar heads the appropriations committee, which controls the way the taxpayers' money is spent. As a businessman who's met plenty of payrolls in his time, the Senator is getting pretty impatient with those academic types who haven't.

ZOLLAR. In many areas I think we've made tremendous progress in higher education in Michigan. I'm not satisfied in many of the other areas, especially in the area of accountability—that is, establishing in the taxpayer's mind, and that's the person who's really paying the bill, that we're getting a dollar's worth for a dollar spent.

RUDD. But how can one determine in higher education whether or not you're getting your money's worth?

ZOLLAR. There are many ways that you can measure accountability. And this is the thing we're demanding. We're demanding now of higher education that they be accountable to the legislature and to the taxpayers through us that they are producing the type of education that is usable to the student.

RUDD. That means that would tend to get him gainful employment when he gets out?

ZOLLAR. That's exactly it. You put your finger right on the word.

RUDD. Some of the academic people don't seem to think that's any of the university's business.

ZOLLAR. Well, I think it is, now I disagree with them. I think if they're training people, and it is their duty to train them so that they're efficient enough to go out and become useful in a commercial way—because I think that's what we're really talking about, you know, to go out and make a living—then it's their responsibility to see that they're trained in proper fields and that they come out equipped to go into society capable of making that living.

RUDD. But as I understand it, more and more college graduates are not able to find employment nowadays.

ZOLLAR. This is one of the reasons that the accountability factor is so important. Now we knew, in our committee, that four or five years ago that there were too many teachers being trained for the incoming influx of students in the elementary grades. And yet because of the bureaucracy that was built into the educational—higher educational system, they continued to train teachers. Now you have a surplus of teachers in Michigan, and the number given to me last year was about 100,000 certified teachers that couldn't find a job. Now this is the thing that we want to avoid.

RUDD. I would imagine you're going to get an awful lot of opposition to these ideas from the more, well, traditional academic types, aren't you?

ZOLLAR. Well, I think you always have that problem. Those that are embedded in a system that has been traditional for years always oppose change. This is nothing new in government. You have to fight that as it comes along.

RUDD. Well, how do you punish them if they don't change? How do you . . .

ZOLLAR. By not giving them as much money as they want. Quite simply, that's the answer.

(Announcements).

RUDD. Emil Bonaduce graduated six months ago from Haverford College with a degree in economics. Haverford is one of the best small colleges in the United States. Emil is mar-

ried, has been looking for months for something related to economics, without success. He works now as a newspaper deliveryman in Newtown, Pennsylvania, but he likes to think that's only temporary. We asked him how much he makes from the paper route.

BONADUCE. Oh, jeez, 70, 60, 70 dollars a week, I think, right now.

RUDD. That's not much nowadays.

BONADUCE. No, doesn't go far at all. I can't even get off the ground. Been doing this for three months. I can't get off the ground.

ROGER HANSEN. Got out of school the 21st of January and since then I've been searching full-time for a job. Actually, I'm looking for social work, but, oh, for the past four or five months I've been looking in state bulletins and there's just no jobs that'll take you without experience. A lot of my friends have had similar experiences, where it's been—they've been out since June and they're still seeking jobs. So I didn't feel I was going to have much success.

RUDD. When you went to college in the first place, did you go there in order to learn how to make a living, do you think, or something else?

HANSEN. Well, when I was encouraged to go to school, you were always told you'd be received with open arms by whatever prospective employer you might go in to, and I found just the reverse.

PETER CRICHTON. Well, to my knowledge—ours was a very small graduating class, so there aren't too many people—there's only one girl that I know of who graduated who's working—for the Rochester Pure Waters Agency. Another one got an assistantship of some sort with the University of Rochester. The fellows in our class—one is working for a hospital, not in biology but more in medical technology. There's another one in a motorcycle shop repairing motorcycles. Another one, as far as I know, stayed on with the college working in their library. And another one went to work as a janitor for the college.

GREGORY KOPIA. I started actively looking for a job in September of this past year and I've been looking ever since. I've been hitting employment agencies regularly. I'm trying to be as optimistic as I can. I have this job that I'm working at now, as a painter. It's not really what I want to do, but it's paying me and it's keeping me active. I just can't get down about it. I'm sure that things are going to change and I'm hoping they'll change soon.

WILLIAM WRY: Well, I'm not giving up, but I'm not optimistic as I was in the beginning. At the beginning, I thought my chances would be a lot better, but now, looking around for about six or seven weeks, I feel that it's going to get rougher. It's just that I don't go to every interview like I did in the past. Some of the employment counselors you go to, they promise you a lot and tell you about all they've done for people in the past, but it seems like for you they're just not doing enough or they're not doing anything at all.

RUDD: Well, when you started out in college, what did you think: "Well, by going to college I'll earn more money and get a better job"?

WRY: Right. I think it was the old American Dream there that, you know, go to school, get ahead and you'll be a lot better off for it. But I think a lot of times it doesn't really happen. I know it seems that quite a few people in my age bracket right now are going through the same experience I am—of a degree but no job.

RUDD: Well, there's obviously plenty of money in the liquor business. That's not your primary concern, I guess.

WRY: No, my primary concern really isn't money. It's more or less happiness in what I'm doing and the desire to be in that position. Money isn't really my main object, because right now I'd (phone ringing) make more money in a job like this than any starting training job with a company in the United States.

Hello. Broad Liquors.

RUDD. Well, Mike, where did you go to school?

MIKE SMITH. I went to New Mexico State University for my bachelor's and my master's and I went to the University of Toledo for my doctorate—work on my doctorate.

RUDD. What was your field?

SMITH. My field was American history, specialty in the American Indians.

RUDD. Well, what are you doing driving cars in a garage for a living?

SMITH. Paying the bills. I'm looking for work in the daytime.

RUDD. You couldn't get anything in your profession?

SMITH. No, absolutely nothing. Nothing available.

RUDD. How hard did you try?

SMITH. Well, last year for example, I sent out over 300 letters to different colleges and junior colleges, got no responses—good responses.

RUDD. Well, are you tempted to go back and get a degree in something else? Change your field?

SMITH. No, that wouldn't be any good, because I'm overqualified already for most of the jobs I've applied for. I'd just be wasting my time. I'm not getting any younger.

RUDD. Mike is probably right when he says there's no point in getting another degree. We're pumping out 34,000 Ph. D.'s this year, with almost 300,000 graduate students still in the pipeline, despite the fact that most professors requiring graduate studies are oversupplied already. It's almost impossible now to get a job in the classroom: by 1980, experts predict, we may have a surplus of a million and a half neophyte teachers. At the same time, we have an enormous shortage of people for those jobs which don't require college degrees. Richard Rosensteel of the Ford Motor Company.

ROSENSTEEL. In this company currently, we need approximately 20,000 trained automotive mechanics right now. And we have only about one-fourth of the franchise dealerships within the Nation. So if you extend those figures, you would come up to a figure of something near 80,000 mechanics needed in franchise dealerships. And if you could add to that the back-alley garages and other kinds of organizations that require automotive mechanics, the number could easily go over 100,000. Yet where are those people coming from now?

RUDD. Well, one place where some of them can come from is Ferris State College in Big Rapids, Michigan. Ferris State has been in business for about 90 years, and its main business is vocational education. The school's 9,000 students get a sprinkling of liberal arts and total immersion in how to get the job done, whether it's mixing medicines, building buildings or binding books. Ferris State College offers 65 vocational programs as well as the usual four-year baccalaureate degree. We asked the school president, Robert Ewigleben, what sort of students Ferris attracts.

EWIGLEBEN. Today we're finding some kids that could get into any school in the country coming here. But for the most part, though, we do get a different cut of cloth. We get middle-class, lower-middle-class kids, kids that come from working-class families where the work ethic is still a very, very strong motivating factor. We tend to get first-generation college students, as opposed to families that have had two or three generations of higher education before them.

RUDD. Dr. Ewigleben's students are here—and Ferris State itself is here—because of a curious imbalance in human supply and demand in this country.

EWIGLEBEN. Now in this very community there isn't a licensed plumber and yet we could tomorrow hire 20 Ph.D.'s in physics. We have a waiting list of 120 applicants—of masters and Ph.D.'s—that would like to come to Ferris in that particular discipline and go to work.

RUDD. But no master plumbers.

EWIGLEBEN. But no master plumbers. Well, that's kind of where we are in this society.

RUDD. Well, Dean, how many students do you have in this program?

AARON L. ANDREWS. We have 1,004 students in our School of Health Sciences and Arts. This includes a total of 13 programs in the school at the present time.

RUDD. Well, is that an unusually large number or is that fairly standard for a school teaching this sort of thing?

ANDREWS. No, we are one of the largest schools in the United States, if not the largest, at the present time in our field.

RUDD. Well, when these dental technicians or dental hygienists get out, are they pretty much guaranteed a job, would you say?

ANDREWS. Definitely yes.

RUDD. What sort of money do they start out at?

ANDREWS. The money that they start out at will vary according to the area of study and the geography. Students starting in the programs such as we're in the area at the present time—dental laboratory technology—they're going to be starting at around $9,000 per year. The . . .

RUDD. That's after a two-year course?

ANDREWS. That's after a two-year course, yes. Students in our four-year program in environmental health, they'll generally be starting at around $10,000 per year. Basically, starting salaries are going to run in an area of $9,000 to $12,000.

RUDD. Well, what excites you about this? The fact that these kids are all getting jobs or the fact that it's really going to alter living conditions in the United States?

ANDREWS. The thing that really excites me—and I've been in, working with schools of this type for about 15 years now—is the fact that these graduates are going to make the availability and the accessibility as well as the quality of health care in the future to the people of the United States a meaningful and realistic thing.

RUDD. Well, in this part of the school, just what subjects do you teach—avionics and what else?

EUGENE BYCHINSKY. Yes. We teach radio, TV and transmitter service and avionics. This particular room is the laboratory—electrical and electronics laboratory—that you see. And the equipment you see on the benches back there are from private planes and we're repairing them—we're certified to repair them. In the automotive service we have a 30-car garage, which always has 30 cars waiting to go in from people in this community that have a problem—it could be a banged-in fender or an overhauled transmission required. We'll do that as part of the curriculum. They have nothing but real-life situations in each of our courses.

TEACHER. When you get that connection made back in there, we'll hook up . . .

RUDD. What are the students when they get out of that, after two or four years?

BYCHINSKY. They generally become lead mechanics in automotive shops. They also go into the insurance field and become adjusters and all the ancillary things that relate to the automotive field: service men, they become supply people, sales people. They are very well indoctrinated into all aspects of the automotive service field.

RUDD. Well, what about the parents? I would think an awful lot of people in this country think that a college education is a,

oh, a kind of magic password almost to higher things, and yet most of these young men are not really getting that, are they?

BYCHINSKY. Yes, that brings us to a very interesting point. Many of our parents are disappointed in their youngsters when they first announce that they want to be a radio and TV man or come into avionics. They maybe wanted them to be a doctor or lawyer or a professor or something else. We consider it a dignified skill to be able to analyze a car problem and do it accurately and expeditiously and economically, or to assist in repairing an avionics piece of equipment that's being needed by industry. These are very high-minded types of enterprises. They are needed by our society; they are essential to our society. And thank goodness that the monetary rewards now are not so much different from the so-called white-collar workers. These gentlemen that you'll meet as you go through here will tell you that, gee, they have high expectations to make a good living at what they're doing. They have removed the stigma between white and blue collars.

STUDENT. I've always had an interest in airplanes and flying, and I was glancing through the college catalogue this year and I found that they had this avionics program that they just started. So mainly that's what I was in here for, was the flying and the part of the planes, but the more I got into the electronic part of it, it was real interesting and also, I think, there's great opportunity in the avionics field.

RUDD. What about your parents? What do they think of you studying this instead of business?

STUDENT. Well, my father sort of wanted me to go on and get a four-year degree, but the more I told him about it the more he got interested in it. He also likes to fly, as I do.

RUDD. What does he do?

STUDENT. He's a senior machine designer at Fisher Body in Detroit.

STUDENT. I'm in automotive heavy-equipment technology.

RUDD. What is that going to mean? What will you be when you get out?

STUDENT. Well, I can go into the field of the auto industry, not—I won't necessarily be a mechanic. I can be a representative or some managerial job.

RUDD. What do your parents think of all this?

STUDENT. Well, my father was a doctor and he wanted me to be a doctor. And then I quite didn't want to be a doctor and I didn't know really what I wanted to be and went into the service. And after I finished the service I decided I'd have to pick up a trade, and my father asked around and he wanted me to be a plumber.

RUDD. Why? Why a plumber?

STUDENT. Well, he asked around his patients. He's—being a doctor, he's kind of money-minded, and he wanted me to go in that field because of that reason alone. And I quite didn't want to be a plumber so I chose to be a mechanic. And after I went through automotive service I decided to go two more years and get a degree.

RUDD. Well, is he reconciled to it? Does he think you can make enough money this way?

STUDENT. Oh, yes. He's really happy now.

RUDD. Professor Harold Hodgkinson of the University of California has visited or investigated more than 2,000 campuses. He sees a great economic leveling process affecting white- and blue-collar workers: in his view, they're both shading into gray.

HODGKINSON. You find that today, if you look at the income levels of all American workers, in 60 percent of the cases you can't tell whether the person who made that salary was a college graduate or a non-college person just from the salary level. So these matters have really indicated that the blue-collar worker, especially in unionized areas, has overlapped the salary levels of those who've been to college.

In my case, for example, I have a bachelor's degree, a master's degree and a doctorate from Harvard, and my average salary is about $4,000 below the mean of intercontinental truckers who drive trucks across the country. Now I'm not sure that's necessarily bad. That is, I'm not sure myself that I should be compensated for every year of graduate study that I've engaged in, because I've done it primarily for my own self-interest.

RUDD. Clark Kerr, former president of the University of California, currently chairman of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.

KERR. We may be getting into a period in the future in the United States where people get paid not just for their skill but also the disagreeableness of their work. And somebody who's doing a very disagreeable job may end up getting as much money as a person with a good deal of skill. And there'll be a certain amount of social justice in that and I really think the American people will live better with each other that way.

(Announcements).

RUDD. This is not really a commercial.

"COMPUTER". Hi, Tommy.

TOM SMOTHERS. Hi. Hey, are there really good jobs for kids without four years of college?

"COMPUTER". Yes, as technicians. Look in my visual communications center. You will see openings in engineering, chemistry . . .

RUDD. This public service message is aimed at convincing young people that they don't have to have a college degree in order to get a good job. The same message is going out on radio and in a poster campaign all over the country.

SMOTHERS. What's that address again? 'Cause my brother, he's looking for work.

"COMPUTER". Careers, Washington, D.C.

RUDD. All this originates in the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

TAPE-RECORDED VOICES. You're nothing in this country without a college degree.

If you can't afford college, you'll never get a good job.

You're both wrong. There are thousands of college graduates who can't find work, yet today there is a crying need for technicians. You don't need four years of college to become a technician. All you. . . .

RUDD. Sir, it sounds like you're discouraging people from going to college.

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION SIDNEY MARLAND. On the contrary. I've been a school man for too long to disregard the very important job of the schools to include college, certainly among the expectations of young people as one of their alternatives. But we're now hoping that young people will have greater freedom of choice in deciding about post-secondary education and not feel that it's the only road to glory. We know, for example—the Department of Labor tells us that fully 80 percent of the jobs in the next decade will be filled by people who don't require a college education.

RUDD. The Commissioner also pointed out that too many young Americans don't even bother to finish high school, much less college, and he drew some conclusions from that.

MARLAND. Well, there's something wrong with the system. We don't denounce any part of it, but we say that we can be better. And we can especially be better for those young people in the United States who are disenchanted with the system of education at all levels, particularly high school students and college students who are moving aimlessly through a network because someone says the network is good and it's supposed to be there for everybody—and indeed it is. But we're now adding what we hope will be a sense of purposefulness to that network.

RUDD. As more and more young Americans begin to realize that a four-year degree is not a guarantee of employment, we may expect an increase in enrollment in the already-booming two-year community or junior colleges, which offer both vocational training and the liberal arts. Any high school graduate can get into a community college, no matter what grades he or she made in high school, and tuition costs next to nothing.

When Miami-Dade Junior College opened with one campus in 1960, it had fourteen hundred students. Today there are two campuses and 38,000 students. Another campus is under construction and there are more on the drawing boards.

TEACHER. Chekhov and Ibsen died within a year of each other: Ibsen in 1905, Chekhov in 1904 . . .

RUDD. At community colleges, 70 percent of the students say that they want to go on to a regular four-year institution and get a degree, but the dropout rate is enormous and nobody really knows how many actually do go on and get that degree.

TEACHER. He may frisk you if he has probable cause to believe that you are armed and dangerous to him.

RUDD. Curiously enough, only 30 percent of the nation's community college students choose vocational courses. For those who do at Miami-Dade, the most popular program is police science, which trains men and women for all sorts of law enforcement work.

STUDENT. . . . stop the guy, like say he was belligerent to you and then you'd stop and frisk him, but then you thought he might have something in the car. Would you be allowed to go in the car?

TEACHER. No, a stop and frisk does not allow a car search, unless you have further probable cause to believe that the car is carrying what is, the court says, material offensive to the law.

RUDD. Some people have said that community colleges are just educational holding basins which society has created to contain those young men and women who have not yet decided what to do with their lives or who couldn't get into four-year colleges. We put that proposition to Miami-Dade's President, Peter Masiko.

MASIKO. If your conception of a college is somebody who ranks in the top ten percent of his high school class and anybody who ranks below that is not worthy of any consideration in higher education, then I can't argue with you. My philosophy is that anybody, regardless of where he stands, if he wants to move himself up, if he has higher ambitions, it's not inappropriate for us to try to work with him and develop his talent.

RUDD. We asked Clark Kerr if he thinks everyone should go to college.

KERR. To begin with, I don't think you can deny young people that opportunity if they want it. And there may be a lot of people that don't get the jobs they want to get, but still there are other things that come out of college aside from just getting a job. Generally, the studies show that people who've gone to college enjoy life more, they have more varied interests, they participate more in community activity, et cetera. So it isn't just jobs. But it just seems to me that in a democracy, almost regardless of the consequences, that every young person ought to have a chance to develop his ability and, as a matter of fact, they're going to have that chance.

HODGKINSON. The question one has to ask is: given increasing years of education, is there any increased quality of the human beings who come out of the other end of

the system? Are we really adding that much to people's competence or ability to live well as a human being? I think that's an open question.

RUDD. Well, I suppose that raises the inevitable question of what higher education is really for.

HODGKINSON. There's been a continual debate over that question and clearly there's no answer. The problem is that the elitist models that we're following—like Harvard, Yale and Princeton—have for years proclaimed that the B.A. did not certify anybody to do anything. That is, the bachelor's was never assumed to be a marketable commodity. Today more and more students are saying: "What can we do with this kind of tool? You've given us this degree. What does it now mean?" And I think some changes are going to take place along that line.

RUDD. Well, do you think that everybody should go on and get a higher education or not?

HODGKINSON. I don't think necessarily that everybody should get a baccalaureate degree from an accredited school. I think everybody who wants to should have some chance to further his educational interests, some of which may be in colleges, some of which may be not. It would seem to me that many American young people could, without ever going to a college at all, build a very satisfactory life around a good income, a good home, reasonable knowledge of cultural values, self-expression, the time to develop their own code of ethics and morality, and time to participate in community affairs. There's very little evidence that college students are necessarily any different along those lines. And the stereotypes we've held about college as being the only stepping-stone to high-status careers, I think, is going to break down.

RUDD. Meanwhile, the million members of the class of 1972 are upon us, destined—in all too many cases—to join the ranks of the unemployed members of the class of 1971.

Brockport State College in upstate New York graduated fifteen hundred young men and women this month. It was, as usual a cheerful scene.

(Voices).

But underneath the graduation-day euphoria lie some tough statistics. In the past, Brockport has been successful in finding jobs for its graduates; this year twelve hundred of the graduates registered with the placement office for employment, but only 16 actually had firm job offers at graduation.

Excuse me, miss, what was your major?

WOMAN. Elementary education and history.

RUDD. Have you got a job yet?

WOMAN. Partially. I have a promise of one from Buffalo.

RUDD. You sound sort of doubtful about it.

WOMAN. Well, they have a list that they place people from and I'm number 40.

RUDD. Forty?

WOMAN. Out of 401.

RUDD. Well, how many job openings are there?

WOMAN. They said they didn't know, yet, so that's why it's doubtful.

MAN. I figure there's a 25 percent chance I'll have a job come September.

RUDD. Did you have to borrow money to go to school, by any chance?

MAN. Yes, all four years, on the New York State Higher Education Assistance.

RUDD. How about paying it back? Are they pretty lenient about that?

MAN. I think we have 10 years—I'm not sure—to pay it back. So I should get it done, one way or another.

FATHER. It's been a pretty tough four years, but we finally got around to it. She's been here for the four years.

RUDD. Well, I just wonder if a lot of these young people are feeling pretty bitter about this. Are you? About the employment situation?

WOMAN. Well, I think there should be more jobs, but there aren't. There's nothing anybody can do.

MAN. I sent out about, I'd say, 20 letters of inquiry. You get back maybe five applications—some of them just throw the letters away, I guess. And from that maybe I'll fill out the applications, send them in from there. Have to wait until they call you. And they haven't called.

RUDD. Well, as parents, how do you feel about all that? Do you think—have you wasted four years of money, do you think?

FATHER. No . . .

MOTHER. We're very proud.

FATHER. . . . definitely not. No waste. He'll make it. He'll find something. He's very ambitious.

RUDD. What are you going to do if nothing turns up in your field?

MAN. Possibly go on and get a master's but as of yet I'm undecided.

RUDD. Are these your parents?

MAN. Yes, they are.

RUDD. What's your reaction to that, sir? When he started in school, did you expect him to be able to get a job when he got out, fairly easily?

FATHER. We hoped he would, but he hasn't been able to as yet.

RUDD. Does that seem like a terribly frustrating thing to you, I would imagine. Is it?

MAN. Yes, it is, very much. It seems that if you spend all this time and money in a college investment, that you would expect some reasonable return, but I guess I have to try harder.

RUDD. There's an old saying in this country: If you're so smart, how come you're not rich? Well, of course, a college degree never guaranteed smartness, but it did give you an edge in the job market over those who didn't have it. Actually, of course, the rewards of truly "higher" education are almost by definition intangible and Americans are not noted as a people fond of intangible rewards. We like a return on the dollar, preferably in cash, but most of today's graduates are not getting it. Of course, for the graduates of the elite Ivy League schools, the "old boy" network will probably continue to function: they won't have as much trouble finding jobs as those from Old Siwash. And the ones who are highly motivated and scholastically inclined will probably—and should probably—go on for four-year degree and graduate school. But most young Americans don't fit those categories, and that vast majority is in trouble, with no agreement at all on how to get them out.

There are those who blame the problems of most graduates on the temporary sluggishness of the economy, although many economists say that it isn't temporary for college graduates. Some blame the colleges and universities for not warning the undergraduates that it's tough out there; but the school men argue, with tradition on their side, that their function is to educate, not to run employment agencies. Also, of course, revolutionary changes in higher education would mean changes in faculties, and it's only human to try and protect one's job. Then, some blame the American Mom and Dad, who simply want their kid to go to college.

But blame implies guilt and guilt implies something wrong has been done and wrongdoing implies that something right could have been done. Well, we thought, of course, we were doing the right thing, but as we're learning more and more these days, the road to hell sometimes is paved with good intentions, and with the best intentions in the world, we've put our young college graduates in one hell of a fix.

This is Hughes Rudd for CBS REPORTS.

(Announcements).

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 15586, PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee submitted the following conference report on the bill (H.R. 15586) making appropriations for public works for water and power development, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration, and other power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Appalachian regional development programs, the Federal Power Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 92-1310)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15586) "making appropriations for public works for water and power development, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration and other power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Appalachian regional development programs, the Federal Power Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 6.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 17, 18, and 19; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,138,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$494,610,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$55,975,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,201,493,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$110,620,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$409,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$23,827,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$271,425,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$46,720,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$45,770,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$64,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$77,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$20,380,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$94,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

JOE L. EVINS,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN M. SLACK,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
GEORGE MAHON,
JOHN J. RHODES,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
HOWARD W. ROBISON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN C. STENNIS,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
ALAN BIBLE,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
MARK O. HATFIELD,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
(except amendment No. 5),
GORDON ALLOTT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15586) making appropriations for Public Works for water and power development, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration and other power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Appalachian regional development programs, the Federal Power Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

TITLE I—ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Operating expenses

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $2,138,800,000 instead of $2,129,000,000 as proposed by the House and $2,150,635,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill amount includes $4,500,000 for the weapons program; $4,000,000 for the reactor development program including $1,000,000 for thorium utilization and $3,000,000 for space propulsion systems; and $1,300,000 for changes in selected resources. The managers agree that none of the funds provided for space propulsion systems shall be available for the initiation of procurement of long lead time components for the nuclear engine.

Plant and capital equipment

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $494,610,000 instead of $486,860,000 as proposed by the House and $500,110,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill amount includes $4,750,000 for construction of a laser fusion laboratory at Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico; and $3,000,000 for land acquisition at Rocky Flats, Colorado, providing a total of $6,000,000 for this purpose. The managers agree that none of the funds provided shall be used for the acquisition of State land pending opportunity for further review by the committees.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers—Civil

General Investigations

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $55,975,000 instead of $54,200,000 as proposed by the House and $57,750,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill amount is allocated to the following studies:

Alaska: (N) Ninilchik and vicinity, small boat harbor	$30,000
Arkansas:	
(FC) Cadron Creek	[1] 20,000
(FC) Little Missouri River Basin, including Narrows Dam	[1] 15,000
(N) White River to Batesville	[1] 60,000
California:	
(FC) Calleguas Creek	[1] 15,000
(BE) San Diego County, vicinity of Oceanside	[1] 10.000
(BE) Santa Barbara County	[1] 15,000
(FC) Truckee River, California and Nevada	[1] 30,000
Delaware: (FC) Christina River Basin	50,000
Florida:	
(BE) Indian River County	[1] 20,000
(N) Intracoastal Waterway, Ft. Pierce to Miami	10,000
(FC) Lake Istokpoga, Highlands County	[1] 20,000
(BE) Shores of Northwest Florida	[1] 15,000
Georgia:	
(FC) Ogeechee River	[1] 10,000
(FC) Savannah River Basin, Ga., S.C., and N.C	[1] 20,000
Hawaii: (FC) Kihei District, Maui	[1] 15,000
Kansas:	
(FC) Grand (Neosho) River Basin, Kansas, Okla., and Mo	[1] $21,000
(FC) Tomahawk Lake and Indian Lake (restudy)	40,000
(FC) Verdigris River Basin, Kansas and Okla	[1] 10,000
Louisiana:	
(FC) Columbia Levee extension	[1] 10,000
(N) Gulf Coast Deepwater Port Facilities	[1] 90,000
(N) Louisiana Coastal area	[1] 82,000
(FC) Mermentau, Vermillion, Calcasieu Rivers and Bayou Teche	[1] 10,000
(N) Mississippi River Gulf Outlet	[1] 60,000
Maine: (FC) South Coastal Urban Areas	[1] 10,000
Maryland: (N) Back River	5,000
Massachusetts:	
(N) Lynn Harbor	20,000
(FC) Merrimack Basin wastewater study	250,000
(FC) Quincy Coastal Streams	[1] 25,000
Michigan: (N) Great Lakes Connecting Channels	[1] 58,000
New Jersey: (FC) Rahway River	[1] 140,000
New Mexico: (FC) South Canadian River and tributaries	[1] 10,000
North Carolina:	
(BE) Bogue Banks	[1] 20,000
(FC) Carolina Beach Inlet	[1] 15,000
(FC) Eastern North Carolina above Cape Lookout	[1] 5,000
(N) Hatteras Inlet	[1] 10,000
(FC) Neuse River	[1] 10,000
Oklahoma: (FC) Canadian River and tributaries, Okla., Texas, and New Mexico	[1] 20,000
Oregon:	
(FC) Luckiamute River	[1] 15,000
(N) Siuslaw River	5,000
Rhode Island: (N) Newport Harbor	[1] 15,000
South Carolina: (N) Charleston Harbor	[1] 114,000
Washington: (FC) Okanogan River and tributaries	[1] 60,000
West Virginia: (FC) Buffalo Creek	140,000
Budget Items not listed under States: Flood control studies; strip mining study	[1] 150,000

[1] Increase in House Bill figure

Amendment No. 4: Inserts language, as proposed by the Senate, providing that no part of the appropriation contained in the Act shall be used for the study of the Mississippi River channel north of Lock and Dam 25, Illinois, other than the portions of such study relating to environmental assessment and the completion of the Phase 1 feasibility study.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $1,201,493,000 instead of $1,181,098,000 as proposed by the House and $1,222,722,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The funds appropriated under this heading are to be allocated as shown in the following tabulation:

	Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1973		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	Alabama:				
(N)	Alabama River channel improvement	$1,017,000		$1,017,000	
(N)	Claiborne lock and dam	645,000		645,000	
(R)	John Hollis Bankhead lock and dam	9,000,000		9,000,000	
(MP)	Jones Bluff lock and dam	11,900,000		11,900,000	
(MP)	Millers Ferry lock and dam, William "Bill" Dannelly Reservoir	3,820,000		3,820,000	
(N)	Mobile Harbor, Theodore Channel		$50,000		$50,000
(FC)	Montgomery		100,000		100,000
(N)	Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss	12,000,000		12,000,000	
	Tombigbee River and tributaries, Mississippi and Alabama. (See Mississippi.)				
	West Point Lake, Ala. and Ga. (See Georgia.)				
	Alaska:				
(FC)	Chena River Lakes, Fairbanks	600,000		1,200,000	
(N)	Humboldt Harbor		80,000		80,000
(N)	Kake Harbor		50,000		50,000
(N)	King Cove Harbor	400,000		400,000	
(N)	Sergius and Whitestone Narrows	900,000		900,000	
(MP)	Snettisham power project	9,990,000		9,990,000	
(FC)	Talkeetna River (Restudy) (Funded under General Investigations.)				
	Arizona:				
(FC)	Indian Bend Wash		200,000		200,000
(FC)	Phoenix and vicinity, including New River (Stage 1)	1,200,000		1,200,000	
(FC)	Phoenix and vicinity, including New River (Stage 2)		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Santa Rosa Wash (Tat Momolikot Dam)	5,800,000		5,800,000	
	Arkansas:				
(FC)	Bell Foley Lake		250,000		250,000
(MP)	De Gray Lake	3,300,000		3,300,000	
(FC)	De Queen Lake	3,500,000		3,500,000	
(FC)	Dierks Lake	3,800,000		3,800,000	
(FC)	Gillham Lake	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(N)	McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System, Arkansas and Oklahoma:				
	(a) Bank stabilization and channel rectification	2,350,000		2,350,000	
	(b) Navigation locks and dams	17,000,000		17,000,000	
(N)	Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La	7,000,000		7,000,000	
(MP)	Ozark lock and dam	4,200,000		4,200,000	
(FC)	Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex	2,800,000		2,800,000	
(FC)	Village Creek, Jackson and Lawrence Counties				175,000
	California:				
(FC)	Alameda Creek, Del Valle Reservoir	2,994,000		2,994,000	
(N)	Bodega Bay				50,000
(FC)	Buchanan Lake	4,500,000		4,500,000	
(FC)	Butler Valley Dam-Blue Lake		1,280,000		1,280,000
(FC)	Chester, North Fork of Feather River		65,000		65,000
(FC)	Corte Madera Creek	850,000		850,000	
(FC)	Cucamonga Creek		550,000		550,000
(N)	Crescent City Harbor	1,150,000		1,150,000	
(FC)	Dry Creek (Warm Springs) Lake and Channel	8,400,000		10,400,000	
(FC)	Fairfield vicinity streams		60,000		60,000
(FC)	Hidden Lake	6,000,000		6,000,000	
(N)	Humboldt Harbor and Bay				50,000
(FC)	Lakeport Lake		310,000		310,000
(FC)	Los Angeles County drainage area	200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Lytle and Warm Creeks	6,400,000		6,400,000	
	Martis Creek Lake, Calif. and Nev. (See Nevada.)				
(MP)	Marysville Lake		950,000		950,000
(FC)	Merced County Streams				150,000
(FC)	Mojave River Dam	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Mormon Slough	345,000		345,000	
(MP)	New Melones Lake	26,000,000		26,000,000	
(FC)	Pajaro River (1966 act)		215,000		215,000
(N)	Port Hueneme Harbor	400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Russian River Basin Coyote Valley Dam and Russian River Channel	450,000		450,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries	100,000		100,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River bank protection	5,000,000		5,000,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River Chico Landing to Red Bluff	100,000		100,000	
(N)	San Diego Harbor	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N)	San Diego River and Mission Bay	1,200,000		1,200,000	
(FC)	San Diego River, Mission Valley		220,000		220,000
(N)	San Francisco Bay to Stockton (John F. Baldwin and Stockton ship channels)	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Santa Paula Creek channel	4,153,000		4,153,000	
(FC)	Sonoma Creek		221,000		221,000

See footnotes at end of table.

Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1973		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
California—Continued				
(BE) Surfside-Sunset and Newport Beach	$600,000		$600,000	
(FC) University Wash and Spring Brook				$100,000
(N) Ventura Marina (reimbursement)	750,000		750,000	
(FC) Walnut Creek	2,400,000		2,400,000	
Canada:				
(FC) Mica Reservoir	1,200,000		1,200,000	
Colorado:				
(FC) Bear Creek Lake	2,500,000		2,500,000	
(FC) Boulder		$80,000		80,000
(FC) Chatfield Lake	11,000,000		11,000,000	
(FC) Las Animas			200,000	
(FC) Trinidad Lake	7,400,000		7,400,000	
Connecticut:				
(FC) Danbury		114,000		114,000
(FC) Derby	1,523,000		1,523,000	
(FC) Park River		548,000		548,000
(FC) Trumbull Lake	3,000,000		3,000,000	
Delaware:				
(N) Delaware Bay—Chesapeake Bay Waterway in Del., Md., and Va		150,000		150,000
(FC) Delaware coast protection		150,000		150,000
(N) Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay (Chesapeake and Delaware Canal), pt. II, Del., and Md	7,500,000		7,500,000	
Florida:				
(BE) Brevard County	200,000		200,000	
(FC) Central and Southern Florida	8,750,000		8,750,000	
Cross-Florida Barge Canal (environmental impact study) (Funded under General Investigations.)				
(BE) Dade County				100,000
(BE) Duval County				90,000
(FC) Four Rivers basins	7,600,000		7,600,000	
(N) Hudson River (Restudy) (Funded under General Investigations)				
(N) Jacksonville Harbor (1965 act)	6,300,000		6,300,000	
(N) Miami Harbor	3,500,000		3,500,000	
(BE) Mullet Key	230,000		230,000	
(N) Panama City Harbor				50,000
(N) Tampa Harbor (main channel)				300,000
(BE) Virginia Key and Key Biscayne	800,000		800,000	
Georgia:				
(MP) Carters Lake	22,000,000		22,000,000	
(N) Savannah Harbor, 40 feet (widening and deepening)	1,200,000		1,200,000	
(N) Savannah Harbor (sediment basin)	3,230,000		3,230,000	
(MP) Spewrell Bluff Lake	3,000,000		[3] 1,900,000	
(BE) Tybee Island			200,000	
(MP) Trotter Shoals Lake, Georgia and South Carolina (land acquisition)	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(MP) West Point Lake, Ala. and Ga	24,800,000		24,800,000	
Hawaii:				
(FC) Iao Stream				165,000
(FC) Kaneohe-Kailua Area		160,000		160,000
(N) Kawaihae Small Boat Harbor		25,000		25,000
(N) Maunalua Bay Small Boat Harbor		35,000		35,000
(N) Wainae Small Boat Harbor				120,000
Idaho:				
(FC) Boise Valley (restudy) (Funded under General Investigations)				
(MP) Dworshak Dam and Reservoir	30,200,000		30,200,000	
(FC) Ririe Lake	4,400,000		4,400,000	
(FC) Stuart Gulch Dam		70,000		70,000
Illinois:				
(FC) East Moline		100,000		100,000
(FC) East St. Louis and vicinity (interior flood control)		250,000		250,000
(FC) Freeport	200,000		200,000	
(FC) Fulton		102,000		102,000
(FC) Helm Lake				75,000
(N) Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag modification, pt. I, Illinois and Indiana	2,400,000		2,400,000	
(N) Illinois Waterway Duplicate Locks		50,000		50,000
Island Levee, Ill. and Ind. (see Indiana).				
(N) Kaskaskia River navigation	18,000,000		18,000,000	
(BE) Lake Forest shore of Lake Michigan (reimbursement)	32,000		32,000	
(FC) Lake Shelbyville	3,100,000		3,100,000	
(FC) Levee District 23 (Dively), Kaskaskia River	600,000		600,000	
(FC) Lincoln Lake	2,000,000		[3] 1,500,000	
(N) Lock and dam 26, Mississippi River, Alton, Ill., and Mo		1,980,000		2,300,000
(N) Lock and Dam 53 (temporary lock), Illinois and Kentucky				650,000
(FC) Louisville Lake		250,000		250,000
(FC) McGee Creek Drainage and Levee District		100,000		100,000

See footnotes at end of table.

	Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1973		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	Illinois—Continued				
(N)	Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo.:				
	(a) Chain of Rocks	$8,100,000		$8,100,000	
	(b) Regulating works	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(N)	Mississippi River, Sny Island Levee drainage district—Rectification of damage (restudy). (Funded under General Investigations.)				
(FC)	Moline				$30,000
(FC)	Oakley Lake and channel improvement (land acquisition)	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Rend Lake	3,800,000		3,800,000	
(FC)	Rock Island	2,500,000		2,500,000	
(FC)	Rockford	200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Saline River and tributaries	2,700,000		2,700,000	
(N)	Smithland locks and dam, Illinois and Kentucky	29,300,000		29,300,000	
	Indiana:				
(FC)	Big Pine Lake (land acquisition)	450,000		450,000	
(FC)	Big Walnut Lake (resumption)				75,000
(FC)	Brookville	7,500,000		7,500,000	
	Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.)				
(N)	Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky	6,800,000		6,800,000	
(FC)	Clifty Creek Lake (land acquisition)	550,000		[3] 350,000	
(FC)	Evansville	900,000		[3] 600,000	
(FC)	Greenfield Bayou levee	500,000		500,000	
	Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag modifications, pts. I and II, Illinois and Indiana. (See Illinois.)				
(FC)	Indianapolis—Warfleigh (restudy). (Funded under General Investigations.)				
(FC)	Island levee, Indiana and Illinois	300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Lafayette Lake	[1] (183,000)		[1] (183,000)	
(FC)	Levee Unit No. 5	569,000		569,000	
(FC)	Marion				30,000
(FC)	Mason J. Niblack levee (pumping facilities)	200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Newburgh (bank revetment)		$60,000		60,000
(N)	Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky	11,000,000		11,000,000	
(FC)	Patoka Lake	2,900,000		2,900,000	
(N)	Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky	14,000,000		14,000,000	
	Iowa:				
(FC)	Ames Lake	700,000		700,000	
(FC)	Bettendorf		98,000		98,000
(FC)	Big Sioux River at Sioux City, Iowa and S. Dak		78,000		78,000
(FC)	Clinton		124,000		124,000
(FC)	Davenport		150,000		150,000
(FC)	Dubuque	1,297,000		1,297,000	
(FC)	Guttenberg	600,000		600,000	
(FC)	Marshalltown	2,300,000		2,300,000	
(FC)	Missouri River levee system, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska	1,675,000		1,675,000	
(N)	Missouri River, Sioux City to mouth, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska	10,300,000		10,300,000	
(FC)	Saylorville Lake	10,100,000		10,100,000	
(FC)	Waterloo	3,000,000		3,000,000	
	Kansas:				
	Arkansas—Red River chloride control, Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas (see Oklahoma).				
(FC)	Big Hill Lake	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Cedar Point Lake		200,000		200,000
(FC)	Clinton Lake	8,500,000		8,500,000	
(FC)	Dodge City	1,300,000		1,300,000	
(FC)	El Dorado Lake	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Great Bend		180,000		180,000
(FC)	Grove Lake		225,000		225,000
(FC)	Hays, Big Creek	200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Hillsdale Lake	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Kansas City, Kansas River, Kans. (1962 mod)	2,400,000		2,400,000	
(FC)	Lawrence	1,321,000		[3] 400,000	
(FC)	Marion		90,000		90,000
(FC)	Melvern Lake	6,900,000		6,900,000	
	Missouri River levee system, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
	Missouri River, Sioux City to mouth, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
(FC)	Onaga Lake		250,000		250,000
(FC)	Perry Lake area (road improvements)				100,000
(FC)	Winfield				40,000
(FC)	Wolf—Coffee Lake		150,000		150,000
	Kentucky:				
	Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)				
(FC)	Carr Fork Lake	4,750,000		4,750,000	

See footnotes at end of table.

	Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1973		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	Kentucky—Continued				
(FC)	Cave Run Lake	$8,800,000		$8,800,000	
(FC)	Falmouth Lake		$100,000		$100,000
(FC)	Green River Lake	250,000		250,000	
(FC)	Kehoe Lake		150,000		150,000
(MP)	Laurel River Lake	4,100,000		4,100,000	
	Lock and dam 53. (Temporary Lock.) Ill. and Ky. (See Illinois.)				
(FC)	Martin	200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Martins Fork Lake	700,000		700,000	
	Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)				
(FC)	Newport-Wilder				50,000
(FC)	Paintsville Lake	1,100,000		1,100,000	
(FC)	Pikeville	(2)		(2)	
(FC)	Red River Lake	500,000		500,000	
	Smithland lock and dam, Illinois and Kentucky. (See Illinois.)				
(FC)	Southwestern Jefferson County			500,000	
(FC)	Taylorsville Lake	2,800,000		[3] 1,500,000	
	Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)				
(FC)	Yatesville Lake			700,000	
	Louisiana:				
(N)	Atchafalaya River, Bayous Chene, Beouf and Black	3,000,000		3,000,000	
(FC)	Bayou Bodcau and tributaries	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N)	Calcasieu River at Devils Elbow		130,000		130,000
(FC)	Grand Isle and vicinity	350,000		350,000	
(FC)	Lake Pontchartrain, and vicinity	20,000,000		20,000,000	
(N)	Mermentau River (channel improvement)			300,000	
(N)	Mermentau River (Lake Arthur Bridge replacement)	1,630,000		1,630,000	
(N)	Michoud Canal	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N)	Mississippi River, gulf outlet	900,000		900,000	
(N)	Mississippi River Outlets Venice		90,000		90,000
(FC)	Monroe Floodwall	505,000		505,000	
(FC)	Morgan City and vicinity	1,200,000		1,200,000	
(FC)	New Orleans to Venice hurricane protection	5,000,000		5,000,000	
	Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La. (See Arkansas.)				
(FC)	Ouachita River Levees	300,000		300,000	
(N)	Overton-Red River Waterway (lower 31 miles only)	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N)	Red River Emergency Bank Protection	4,750,000		4,750,000	
(N)	Red River Waterway (Mississippi River to Shreveport, La.)		1,000,000	1,200,000	1,000,000
(N)	Red River Waterway, Shreveport, La., to Daingerfield, Texas (economic restudy only)				25,000
	Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)				
(N)	Vermilion lock (replacement)		100,000		100,000
	Maine:				
(N)	Frenchboro Harbor				60,000
	Maryland:				
(FC)	Bloomington Lake, Md. and W. Va.	14,000,000		14,000,000	
	Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md. (C. & D. Canal), pt. II. (See Delaware.)				
	Massachusetts:				
(FC)	Charles River Dam	3,000,000		3,000,000	
(N)	Fall River Harbor, Mass. and R.I.			[4] 1,000,000	
(FC)	Nookagee Lake		100,000		100,000
(BE)	Revere Beach		30,000		30,000
(FC)	Saxonville		111,000		111,000
(N)	Weymouth Fore and Town Rivers	5,900,000		5,900,000	
	Michigan:				
(N)	Great Lakes Connecting Channels	4,900,000		4,900,000	
(FC)	Kalamazoo	200,000		200,000	
(N)	Ludington Harbor		60,000		60,000
(FC)	River Rouge	7,200,000		7,200,000	
(FC)	Saginaw River (flood control)	2,000,000		2,000,000	
(N)	Tawas Bay Harbor				40,000
(N)	Lexington Harbor			100,000	
	Minnesota:				
(N)	Beaver Bay Harbor, including Silver Bay				50,000
(FC)	Big Stone Lake-Whetstone River, Minn. and S. Dak.	1,900,000		1,900,000	
(N)	Lutsen Harbor				50,000
(FC)	Mankato and North Mankato	1,600,000		1,600,000	
(FC)	Roseau River	100,000		100,000	
(FC)	Twin Valley Lake-Wild Rice River		80,000		50,000
(FC)	Zumbro River	1,400,000		1,400,000	
(FC)	Wild Rice River-South Branch and Felton Ditch		70,000		70,000
(FC)	Winona				60,000
	Mississippi:				
(FC)	Tallahala Creek Lake		400,000	350,000	400,000
	Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss. (See Alabama.)				
(FC)	Tombigbee River and tributaries, Mississippi and Alabama	1,500,000		1,500,000	

See footnotes at end of table,

	Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1973		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	Missouri:				
(FC)	Blue River Channel Kansas City, Mo		$50, 000		$50, 000
(FC)	Brookfield Lake		250, 000		250, 000
(MP)	Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir	$8, 000, 000		$8, 000, 000	
(MP)	Harry S. Truman Dam and Reservoir	19, 500, 000		23, 000, 000	
(FC)	Little Blue River Channel	100, 000		100, 000	
(FC)	Little Blue River Lakes (land acquisition)	2, 500, 000		4, 500, 000	
	Lock and Dam 26, Alton, Ill. and Mo. (see Illinois.)				
(FC)	Long Branch Lake	2, 000, 000		[3] 1, 500, 000	
(FC)	Meramec Park Lake	2, 500, 000		3, 000, 000	
(FC)	Mercer Lake		160, 000		160, 000
(FC)	Mississippi River Agricultural Area No. 8 (Elsberry drainage district)		120, 000		120, 000
	Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo. (See Illinois).				
	Missouri River levee system, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
	Missouri River, Sioux City to mouth, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
(FC)	Pattonsburg Lake—Highway I-35 Crossing (Land Acquisition)	100, 000		100, 000	
(FC)	Pattonsburg Lake (town relocation only)		50, 000		([3])
(FC)	Pattonsburg Lake (restudy) (Funded under General Investigations).				
(FC)	St. Louis	1, 200, 000		1, 200, 000	
(FC)	Smithville Lake	4, 000, 000		[3] 3, 500, 000	
	Montana:				
(MP)	Libby Dam-Lake Koocanusa	40, 000, 000		40, 000, 000	
(MP)	Libby Dam-Lake Koocanusa (additional units and reregulating dam)				400, 000
	Nebraska:				
(MP)	Gavins Point Dam, Lewis and Clark Lake (relocation of Niobrara, Nebr.), Nebr. and S. Dak	3, 000, 000		3, 000, 000	
	Missouri River levee system, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
	Missouri River, Sioux City to mouth, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
(FC)	Papillion Creek and Tributaries	4, 000, 000		4, 000, 000	
	Nevada:				
(FC)	Humboldt River and tributaries				100, 000
(FC)	Martis Creek Lake, Calif., and Nev	450, 000		450, 000	
	New Hampshire:				
(FC)	Beaver Brook Lake	1, 000, 000		1, 000, 000	
	New Jersey:				
(FC)	Elizabeth	3, 100, 000		3, 100, 000	
(N)	Great Egg Harbor Inlet and Peck Beach				50, 000
(N)	Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers	4, 676, 000		4, 676, 000	
(FC)	South Orange, Rahway River	780, 000		780, 000	
	Tocks Island Lake, Pa., N.J., and N.Y. (See Pennsylvania.)				
	New Mexico:				
(FC)	Cochiti Lake	14, 900, 000		14, 900, 000	
(FC)	Las Cruces	2, 000, 000		2, 000, 000	
(FC)	Los Esteros Lake	1, 500, 000		1, 500, 000	
	New York:				
(FC)	Allegheny		30, 000		30, 000
(N)	Cattaraugus Harbor		80, 000		80, 000
(FC)	East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay		150, 000		150, 000
(N)	Hamlin Beach Harbor		80, 000		80, 000
(N)	New York Harbor (anchorages)	5, 500, 000		5, 500, 000	
(N)	New York Harbor collection and removal of drift, N.Y. and N.J		[1] (80, 000)		[1] (80, 000)
(FC)	North Ellenville	2, 200, 000		2, 200, 000	
(N)	Oak Orchard Harbor	1, 073, 000		1, 073, 000	
(FC)	Scajaquada Creek				25, 000
	Tocks Island Lake, Pa., N.J., and N.Y. (See Pennsylvania.)				
(FC)	Wellsville	840 000		840, 000	
(FC)	Yonkers		145, 000		145, 000
	North Carolina:				
(N)	Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, bridges				100, 000
(FC)	Brunswick County Beaches			100, 000	
(FC)	Falls Lake	4, 300, 000		4, 300, 000	
(BE)	Fort Macon State Park (reimbursement)	108, 000		108, 000	
(FC)	Howards Mill Lake		190, 000		190, 000
(N)	Morehead City Harbor (1970 Act)		100, 000		100, 000
(FC)	New Hope Lake	15, 100, 000		15, 100, 000	
(FC)	Randleman Lake		330, 000		330, 000
(FC)	Reddies River Lake		150, 000		150, 000
(N)	Wilmington Harbor (32 feet)	390, 000		390, 000	

See footnotes at end of table.

Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1973		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
North Dakota:				
(FC) Burlington Dam		$150,000		$350,000
(MP) Garrison Dam—Lake Sakakawea	$500,000		$500,000	
(R) Garrison Dam—Lake Sakakawea (embankment repair)	200,000		200,000	
(FC) Kindred Lake (restudy) (Funded under General Investigations.)				
(FC) Minot	700,000		700,000	
(FC) Missouri River, Garrison Dam to Lake Oahe	900,000		900,000	
Oahe Dam-Lake Oahe, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See South Dakota.)				
(FC) Pipestem Lake	2,800,000		2,800,000	
Ohio:				
(FC) Alum Creek Lake	14,700,000		14,700,000	
(FC) Caesar Creek Lake	6,400,000		6,400,000	
(FC) Chillicothe		100,000		100,000
(FC) Clarence J. Brown Dam and Reservoir	4,500,000		4,500,000	
(FC) Cuyahoga River			100,000	
(FC) East Fork Lake	4,700,000		4,700,000	
(N) Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	14,500,000		14,500,000	
(N) Huron Harbor				50,000
(BE) Lakeview Park, Lorain, Ohio		60,000		60,000
(N) Lorain Harbor	3,300,000		3,300,000	
(FC) Mill Creek		225,000		350,000
(FC) Newark		110,000		110,000
(FC) North Branch of Kokosing River Lake	236,000		236,000	
(FC) Paint Creek Lake	3,988,000		3,988,000	
(N) Portsmouth State Park small boat harbor (Sec. 107)			(200,000)	
(FC) Salt Creek Lake (land acquisition)	500,000		[3] 200,000	
Shenango River Lake, Pa. and Ohio. (See Pennsylvania.)				
(FC) Utica Lake		275,000		275,000
(N) Vermillion Harbor	517,000		517,000	
(N) Willow Island locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	8,700,000		8,700,000	
(FC) Youngstown, Crab Creek	265,000		265,000	
Oklahoma:				
(FC) Arcadia Lake		200,000		200,000
Arkansas Red River chloride control, Oklahoma, Texas, and Kansas. (Resumption)				500,000
(FC) Birch Lake	1,100,000		1,100,000	
(FC) Clayton Lake			500,000	
(FC) Copan Lake	3,500,000		3,500,000	
(FC) Hugo Lake	3,600,000		3,600,000	
(FC) Kaw Lake	21,200,000		21,200,000	
(FC) Lukfata Lake	[1] (450,000)		[1] (450,000)	
McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)				
(FC) Oologah Lake (2d phase)	1,620,000		1,620,000	
(FC) Optima Lake	2,000,000		2,000,000	
(FC) Shidler Lake				130,000
(FC) Skiatook Lake	500,000		500,000	
(FC) Waurika Lake	5,600,000		5,600,000	
(MP) Webbers Falls lock and dam	6,000,000		6,000,000	
Oregon:				
(FC) Applegate Lake (land acquisition)			100,000	
(FC) Beaver Drainage District		46,000		46,000
(MP) Bonneville lock and dam (mod. for peaking), Oregon and Washington	11,000,000		11,000,000	
(FC) Catherine Creek Lake			400,000	
(N) Columbia River and lower Willamette River, 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington	3,800,000		3,800,000	
(N) Coos Bay				50,000
(FC) Elk Creek Lake	2,500,000		2,500,000	
(MP) John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	18,000,000		18,000,000	
(FC) Johnson Creek (restudy). (Funded under General Investigations.)				
(MP) Lost Creek Lake	23,000,000		23,000,000	
(FC) Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington	1,250,000		1,250,000	
(FC) Scappoose Drainage District	100,000		100,000	
The Dalles lock and dam, Washington and Oregon (additional power units). (See Washington.)				
(N) Tillamook Bay and Bar (south jetty)	3,000,000		3,000,000	
(FC) Willamette River Basin bank protection	350,000		350,000	
(FC) Willow Creek Lake		440,000		440,000
(N) Yaquina Bay and Harbor	1,947,000		1,947,000	
Pennsylvania:				
(FC) Blue Marsh Lake	1,730,000		1,730,000	
(FC) Chartiers Creek	5,800,000		5,800,000	
(FC) DuBois	700,000		700,000	
(FC) Raystown Lake	15,800,000		15,800,000	
(FC) Shenango River Lake, Pa. and Ohio	840,000		840,000	
(FC) Tioga-Hammond Lakes	10,800,000		10,800,000	
(MP) Tocks Island Lake, Pa., N.J., and N.Y.	14,800,000		14,800,000	

See footnotes at end of table.

Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1973		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Pennsylvania—Continued				
(FC) Trexler Lake		$179,000		$179,000
(FC) Tyrone	$2,100,000		$2,100,000	
(FC) Union City Lake	360,000		360,000	
(FC) Woodcock Creek Lake	5,400,000		5,400,000	
Puerto Rico:				
(FC) Portuguese and Bucana Rivers (Lago de Cerrillos; Lago de Portugues and Ponce)		400,000		400,000
Rhode Island:				
Fall River Harbor, Mass. and R.I. (See Mass.)				
South Carolina:				
(N) Cooper River-Charleston Harbor		150,000		500,000
(N) Murrells Inlet				70,000
(FC) Reedy River		60,000		60,000
Trotters Shoals Lake, Georgia and South Carolina (See Georgia.)				
South Dakota:				
(MP) Big Bend Dam-Lake Sharpe (additional community facilities for Crow Creek Indian Reservation)				70,000
Big Sioux River at Sioux City, Iowa and S. Dak. (See Iowa.)				
Big Stone Lake-Whetstone River, Minn. and S. Dak. (See Minnesota.)				
Gavins Point Dam-Lewis and Clark Lake (relocation of Niobrara, Nebraska) Nebr. and S. Dak. (See Nebraska.)				
(MP) Oahe Dam-Lake Oahe, S. Dak. and N. Dak	2,100,000		2,100,000	
Tennessee:				
(MP) Cordell Hull Dam and Reservoir	6,800,000		6,800,000	
Texas:				
(FC) Aquilla Lake		150,000		250,000
(FC) Ark-Red Chloride Control, Okla., Texas, and Kansas (resumption). (See Oklahoma.)				
(FC) Aubrey Lake		250,000		250,000
(FC) Big Pine Lake		150,000		150,000
(FC) Buffalo Bayou and tributaries	2,400,000		2,400,000	
(FC) Clear Creek		150,000		150,000
(FC) Cooper Lake and channels	2,000,000		2,000,000	
(N) Corpus Christi ship channel	4,700,000		4,700,000	
(FC) Duck Creek channel improvement	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC) Elm Fork floodway		203,000		203,000
(FC) El Paso	1,700,000		1,700,000	
(FC) Freeport and vicinity, hurricane flood protection	3,000,000		3,000,000	
(N) Freeport Harbor				100,000
(N) Galveston Channel			300,000	
(FC) Greenville			114,000	
(FC) Highland Bayou	2,700,000		[3] 1,500,000	
(FC) Lake Brownwood modification		80,000		80,000
(FC) Lake Kemp	1,389,000		1,389,000	
(FC) Lakeview Lake (restudy). (Funded under General Investigations.)				
(FC) Lavon Lake modification and East Fork channel improvement	17,000,000		17,000,000	
(FC) Millican Lake, Navasota River		300,000		600,000
(FC) Mineola Lake		100,000		100,000
(N) Mouth of Colorado River		95,000		95,000
(FC) Pecos (resumption)				140,000
(FC) Port Arthur and vicinity hurricane flood protection	10,000,000		10,000,000	
Red River levees and bank stabilization, below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)				
(FC) San Antonio Channel improvement	1,800,000		1,800,000	
(FC) San Gabriel River	7,500,000		7,500,000	
(FC) Taylors Bayou	2,300,000		2,300,000	
(FC) Texas City and vicinity hurricane flood protection	2,100,000		2,100,000	
(N) Trinity River and tributaries (advance participation on high level bridges.)	3,060,000		3,060,000	
(N) Trinity River project		3,000,000		3,000,000
(N) Wallisville Lake	6,200,000		6,200,000	
Utah:				
(FC) Little Dell Lake		280,000		280,000
(FC) Weber River and tributaries		30,000		30,000
Virginia:				
(FC) Four Mile Run, city of Alexandria, and Arlington County		690,000	900,000	690,000
(FC) Gathright Lake	9,900,000		9,900,000	
(MP) Salem Church Lake		600,000		600,000
(BE) Virginia Beach (reimbursement)	100,000		100,000	
Washington:				
Bonneville lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
(MP) Chief Joseph Dam, Rufus Woods Lake (additional units)	600,000		600,000	
Columbia River and lower Willamette River, 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				

See footnotes at end of table.

Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1973		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Washington—Continued				
(MP) Ice Harbor lock and dam, Lake Sacajawea (additional generating units).	$11,300,000		$11,300,000	
John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
(MP) Little Goose lock and dam—Lake Bryan (additional units)	4,080,000		4,080,000	
Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
(MP) Lower Granite lock and dam	77,700,000		77,700,000	
(MP) Lower Granite lock and dam (additional units)				$320,000
(MP) The Dalles lock and dam Washington and Oregon (additional power units)	5,000,000		5,000,000	
(FC) Vancouver Lake			300,000	
(FC) Wahkiakum County Consolidated Diking District No. 1	200,000		200,000	
(FC) Wenatchee Canyons 1 and 2		$100,000		100,000
(FC) Zintel Canyon Dam		180,000		180,000
West Virginia:				
(FC) Beech Fork Lake	3,400,000		3,900,000	
Bloomington Lake, Md. and W. Va. (See Maryland.)				
(FC) Burnsville Lake	3,000,000		3,000,000	
(FC) Coal River Basin		125,000		125,000
(FC) East Lynn Lake	1,985,000		1,985,000	
Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
(FC) Leading Creek Lake		125,000		125,000
(FC) Panther Creek Lake				100,000
(FC) R. D. Bailey Lake	15,400,000		15,400,000	
(FC) Rowlesburg Lake	200,000			200,000
(FC) Stonewall Jackson Lake	2,000,000		2,000,000	
(FC) West Fork Lake		125,000		125,000
Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
Wisconsin:				
(N) Green Bay Harbor (1962 act)	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC) La Farge Lake and Channel Improvement	3,000,000		3,000,000	
Wyoming:				
(FC) Sheridan	150,000		150,000	
Miscellaneous:				
(N) Small navigation projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to $1,000,000 (sec. 107)	3,500,000		3,700,000	
(BE) Small beach erosion control projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to $1,000,000 (sec. 103)	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC) Small projects for flood control and related purposes not requiring specific legislation costing up to $1,000,000 (sec. 205)	11,000,000		11,000,000	
(FC) Emergency bank protection	500,000		500,000	
(FC) Snagging and clearing	500,000		500,000	
Recreation facilities, at completed projects	10,000,000		14,000,000	
Pikeville, Kentucky Model City program	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Land acquisition fund	2,000,000		1,000,000	
Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)	840,000		840,000	
Aquatic plant control (1965 act)	1,100,000		1,100,000	
Employees compensation	1,446,000		1,446,000	
Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages	−73,246,000		−74,505,000	
General reduction based on anticipated delays			−10,000,000	
Grand total, construction, general	1,169,800,000	23,904,000	1,171,184,000	30,309,000
	(1,193,704,000)		(1,201,493,000)	

[1] Funds in reserve for release after fiscal year 1972.
[2] See line item for Pikeville Model City Program under miscellaneous of this table.
[3] Reduction reflects reduced capability of the Corps of Engineers since submission of the budget estimates due to project delays.
[4] In addition, $550,000 available in carryover funds.

Martins Fork Lake, Kentucky.—The Managers have not approved the $850,000 included in the bill by the Senate, in addition to the $700,000 provided in the House bill, because of the delay being experienced in the provision of assurances of local cooperation required by section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970.

Bonneville Lock and Dam (modification for peaking), Oregon and Washington.—The Senate Committee report directed the Corps of Engineers to utilize funds appropriated for the project for the protection, preservation, and improvement of the Indian in-lieu fishing sites of Bonneville Lake. The managers agree that funding of any corrective action should be deferred because of the pending court action and to afford an opportunity for the development of an acceptable plan, including the enactment of such legislative authorization as may be required.

Bonneville Lock and Dam (Second Powerhouse) Oregon and Washington.—The conferees have deleted without prejudice the $1 million proposed in the bill by the Senate for initiating construction of the second powerhouse at the Bonneville Lock and Dam. Although the conferees fully recognize the urgency of expediting the provision of additional generating capacity in the northwest, they do not believe it is warranted to initiate funding this year of construction of the second powerhouse, with a total estimated cost of $214 million, considering the present outstanding funding commitment of $2.2 billion involved in the construction of 66 additional generating units in 10 existing Federal hydroelectric projects in the area.

Trinity River and Tributaries, Advance Participation on High Level Bridges, Texas.—Because of the serious traffic situation involved, the managers have included $1,990,000 in the bill for advance participation with the State in the construction of State highway loop 12 bridge. However, the managers are in agreement that they will not recommend any further funding of high level bridges in connection with the project until the navigation portion has been funded for construction by the Congress.

Salem Church Lake project, Virginia.—The managers concur in the directive in the Senate committee report that the funds provided in the bill be used to plan a project at elevation 220 unless the State of Virginia recommends the project at elevation 230 in order to obtain salinity control storage for enhancing oyster production.

Williamson-Matewan project, West Virginia.—The Committee is disturbed that projects such as the Tug Fork Valley in West Virginia have not received approval of the Executive Branch. The Committee believes that meritorious projects such as Tug Valley which are located in economically distressed areas, and which have overriding non-quanti-

fiable economic, social, and ecological benefits should merit special consideration.

Amendment No. 6: Deletes language provision inserted in the bill by the Senate providing that the exception in Section 224 of the Flood Control Act of 1970, relating to certain approval, shall not apply to amounts in this appropriation.

Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $110,620,000 instead of $105,000,000 as proposed by the House and $119,115,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill amount is allocated to the following projects and activities:

1. General Investigations:	
(FC) Bayou Rapides, Boeuf, Cocodrie, and Courtableau and Outlets, La	$40,000
(N) Vicksburg Harbor, Miss.	30,000
(FC) St. Francis River Basin below Wappapello Lake, Ark. and La	10,000
(FC) Obion and Forked Deer Rivers and Tributaries, Tenn	20,000
Subtotal, General Investigations	100,000
2. Construction and Planning:	
Mississippi River levees	100,000
Channel improvement	1,700,000
Old River	475,000
St. Francis Basin	425,000
Tensas Basin: Boeuf and Tensas Rivers	120,000
Yazoo Basin:	
Tributaries, Bank Stabilization	250,000
Backwater	250,000
Lower Red River, south bank	100,000
Atchafalaya Basin	1,200,000
Subtotal, planning and construction	4,620,000
3. Maintenance	900,000
Total, increase	+5,620,000

Operation and Maintenance, General

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates $409,100,000 instead of $400,000,000 as proposed by the House and $417,479,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill amount includes $8,100,000 for pay act costs and $1,000,000, providing a total of $5,000,000, for the issuance of permits and enforcement of permit regulations for discharges or deposits in navigable waters under the Refuse Act.

The Managers direct that $250,000 be made available for required maintenance of the East Fork of the Tombigbee River.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

General Investigations

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $23,827,000 instead of $23,000,000 as proposed by the House and $24,627,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill amount includes the following:

New studies:	
Frenchman Valley, Nebraska	$50,000
Kendrick, Seminole Dam Modification, Wyoming	30,000
Rio Grande, Elephant Butte Irrigation District, New Mexico	50,000
Increase in House bill amounts:	
Dickinson Unit, M&I Water, North Dakota	55,000
Oklahoma State Water Plan	$42,000
Atmospheric Water Resources Management Program	600,000

The increase for the Atmospheric Water Resources Program is allocated as follows: Extended Southern Plains Project, $250,000; Sierra Cooperative Pilot Project, $50,000; North Dakota Pilot Project, $75,000; Winter seeding techniques, $50,000; North Platte Pilot Project, $75,000; and Environmental study, $100,000. The managers also direct that, within the funds provided, contract research work at the following universities to be continued at the 1972 funding levels: University of Nevada, South Dakota School of Mines, University of Wyoming, and Utah State University.

Construction and Rehabilitation

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $271,425,000 instead of $267,625,000 as proposed by the House and $275,014,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill amount is allocated as follows: Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado, $1,300,000; Columbia Basin project, Washington (Block 253), $100,000; Walla Walla project, Touchet Division, Washington (planning), $100,000; Washoe project, Nevada and California (drainage and minor construction), $100,000; Humboldt project, Rye Patch Reservoir, Nevada (rehabilitation and betterment), (planning), $50,000; Garrison Diversion Unit, North Dakota, $1,900,000; and Narrows Unit, Colorado (land acquisition), $250,000. The managers also approve the acceptance by the Bureau of contributed funds from local interests to accelerate land acquisition on the Narrows Unit.

Upper Colorado River Storage Project

Amendments Nos. 11 and 12: Appropriate $46,720,000 instead of $45,750,000 as proposed by the House and $47,300,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill amount includes the following: Dallas Creek project, Colorado (land acquisition), $250,000; Fruitland Mesa project, Colorado (land acquisition), $500,000; and Central Utah project, Upalco Unit, Utah (planning), $220,000.

The managers request that the Office of Management and Budget expedite the review of the economic restudy of the Savery-Pot-Hook project, Colorado, in order that the $250,000 in budgetary reserve may be made available for the initiation of work on the project.

Colorado River Basin Project

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates $64,200,000 instead of $64,000,000 as proposed by the House and $64,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill amount is for additional advance planning work on the Dixie project, Utah.

Operation and Maintenance

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $77,500,000 instead of $77,000,000 as proposed by the House and $78,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Loan Program

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $20,380,000 instead of $22,380,000 as proposed by the House and $19,680,000 as proposed by the Senate. The reduction of $2,000,000 from the House bill amount is based on the revised requirement in loan funds for the Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, California.

Bonneville Power Administration

Construction

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $94,500,000 instead of $90,000,000 as proposed by the House and $99,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill amount includes $2,500,000 to initiate construction on a double circuit for a portion of the Grand Coulee-Raver transmission line and $2,000,000 for other high priority requirements of the Administration.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Appalachian regional development programs

Funds Appropriated to the President

In reference to the increase of $25,000,000 provided for the Development Highway Program, the Managers request that the Commission render all possible assistance to enable those jurisdictions who are not presently in the program to participate.

Tennessee Valley Authority

Payment to Tennessee Valley Authority Fund

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $64,550,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $60,800,000 as proposed by the House. The increase provided over the House bill amount is for the Tellico Dam and Reservoir project, Tennessee, providing a total in the bill of $11,250,000 for continuing project construction during fiscal year 1973.

Water Resources Council

Water Resources Planning

Amendment Nos. 18 and 19: Appropriate $7,086,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $6,886,000 as proposed by the House. The increase provided over the House bill amount is for initiation of the Hawaii Framework Study.

Conference total—with comparisons

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1973 recommended by the committee of conference, with comparisons to fiscal year 1972 amount, to the 1973 budget estimate and to the House and Senate bills for 1973 follows:

	Amounts
New Budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1972	$4,794,137,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority (as amended) fiscal year 1973	5,489,058,000
House bill, fiscal year 1973	5,437,727,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1973	5,571,696,000
Conference agreement, fiscal year 1973	5,504,914,000
Conference agreement compared with—	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1972	+710,777,000
Budget estimate of new (obligational) authority (as amended), fiscal year 1973	+15,856,000
House bill, fiscal year 1973	+67,187,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1973	−66,782,000

JOE L. EVINS,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN M. SLACK,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
GEORGE MAHON,
JOHN J. RHODES,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
HOWARD W. ROBISON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN C. STENNIS,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
ALAN BIBLE,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
MARK O. HATFIELD,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
(except amendment No. 5)
GORDON ALLOTT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 15097, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. McFALL submitted the following conference report on the bill (H.R. 15097) making appropriations to the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 92-1312)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15097)" making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 21, 23, 24, 25, 27, 30, 32, 35, 37, 42, 43, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, and 55.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 26, and 41, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its agreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$38,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$17,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$19,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$44,185,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$29,490,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,835,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$52,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,542,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$96,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$93,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,785,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 303. None of the funds provided under this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of $40,000,000 for 'Highway Beautification' in fiscal year 1973."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 304. None of the funds provided under this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of $85,000,000 in fiscal year 1973 for 'State and Community Highway Safety' and 'Highway Related Safety Grants'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3.

JOHN J. MCFALL,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
TOM STEED,
GEORGE MAHON,
SILVIO O. CONTE,
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
JACK EDWARDS,
FRANK T. BOW,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
JOHN STENNIS,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
ALAN BIBLE,
WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
GORDON ALLOTT (Res. 34 and 39),
NORRIS COTTON,
TED STEVENS,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15097) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $23,970,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of $24,120,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $38,500,000 for transportation planning, research, and development instead of $37,000,000 as proposed by the House and $45,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes $1,000,000 for university research and $500,000 for noise abatement research in addition to the amounts provided by the House.

Amendment No. 3: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment to appropriate $875,000 for grants-in-aid for natural gas pipeline safety instead of $750,000 as proposed by the House and $1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Deletes language proposed by the Senate making funds appropriated for grants-in-aid for natural gas pipeline safety contingent upon enactment of authorizing legislation.

Coast Guard

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $548,900,000 for operating expenses as proposed by the House instead of $551,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Deletes language proposed by the Senate making $318,596,000 of the appropriation for operation expenses contingent upon enactment of legislation authorizing active duty personnel strength for the Coast Guard.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $131,550,000 for acquisition, construction and improvements as proposed by the House instead of $134,680,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees direct that the funds provided for public family quarters be allocated to the highest priority locations, not excluding those at Homer and Cordova, Alaska.

Amendment No. 8: Deletes language proposed by the Senate making funds appropriated for acquisition, construction and improvements contingent upon enactment of authorizing legislation for active duty personnel strength and for vessels, aircraft, and construction.

Amendment No. 9: Deletes language proposed by the Senate making funds appropriated for alteration of bridges contingent upon enactment of authorizing legislation.

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $31,735,000 for reserve training as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $17,500,000 for research, development, test, and evaluation instead of $16,500,000 as proposed by the House and $18,256,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees direct that the Coast Guard

use available funds for increased research and development in the area of pollution monitoring.

Amendment No. 12: Deletes language proposed by the Senate making $1,424,000 of funds appropriated for research, development, test, and evaluation contingent upon enactment of authorizing legislation for Coast Guard active duty personnel strength.

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates $4,500,000 for state boating safety assistance instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House and $7,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Aviation Administration

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $1,150,538,000 for operations as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,152,038,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $19,200,000 for acquisition and modernization of facilities and equipment and service testing (operations) instead of $19,100,000 as proposed by the House and $21,218,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The amount recommended includes an additional $100,000 to accelerate the development and technical feasibility of devices which would provide pilots with timely and adequate information on terrain obstacles, particularly during approach to landing under poor visibility conditions.

Amendment No. 16: Deletes the words "active metal detection" (devices) as proposed by the House and inserts in lieu thereof "screening" (devices) as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17: Provides $3,500,000 for acquisition of screening devices as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

This appropriation would also permit the Federal Aviation Administrator to extend the benefits of the funding action to those airlines which responded promptly to the new aviation security regulations by reimbursing such airlines for (or acquiring from such airlines) screening devices heretofore acquired by the airlines.

The conferees expect that FAA and the airlines will agree on uniform procedures which will supplement the screening devices and decrease the time involved in providing comprehensive coverage of airport boarding gates in order to assure safety of citizens in air transportation.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $302,650,000 for facilities and equipment (Airport and Airway Trust Fund) as proposed by the Senate instead of $251,939,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees are concerned over the delay in the implementation of this program. Accordingly, the conferees direct FAA to submit, by October 1, 1972, its plan for obligating all appropriated funds and its schedule for commissioning all instrument landing systems, control towers, and airport surveillance radars for which funds have been provided.

Morristown Airport in New Jersey is one of the airports for which funds are provided to install an instrument landing system. The conferees understand that residents of the area in and near Morristown Airport have expressed concern that the installation of such a system might be used to create pressure for the expansion of that airport against the wishes of the communities most affected. It is the intention of the conferees that the installation of an instrument landing system at Morristown Airport is not intended and shall not be used as an argument for the expansion of that airport against the wishes of the communities concerned.

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates $48,728,000 for Federal payment to the airport and airway trust fund as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $12,265,000 for operation and maintenance, National Capital Airports, as proposed by the Senate instead of $12,200,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $2,600,000 for construction, National Capital Airports, as proposed by the House instead of $3,608,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees are in agreement that the repaving of a runway and two taxiways at Washington National Airport is not to be deferred. If this work can not be accomplished with existing unobligated funds, the conferees suggest that FAA defer work on low priority projects.

Federal Highway Administration

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $13,325,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $13,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 23: Provides transfer of $98,400,000 from the appropriation for "Federal-aid highways (trust fund)" as proposed by the House instead of $99,535,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement does not provide any funds for dual-mode research under this heading. It is intended that the funds included will provide for 30 new positions to be employed in the manner justified to the Committees.

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates $2,000,000 for rail crossings-demonstration projects as proposed by the House instead of $10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

In view of the seriousness of the rail-highway crossing problem, the conferees urge the Department of Transportation to seek a modification of the original legislative authorization to expedite the implementation of this program.

Amendment No. 25: Provides that $600,000 of the amount appropriated for rail crossings-demonstration projects is to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund as proposed by the House instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates $15,000,000 for the Darien Gap Highway as proposed by the Senate instead of $25,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates $4,891,990,000 for Federal-aid-highways (trust fund) as proposed by the House instead of $4,893,125,000 as proposed by the Senate.

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates $44,185,000 for traffic and highway safety, instead of $43,000,000 as proposed by the House and $45,673,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes $1,000,000 for the alcohol safety action program and $185,000 for school bus safety in addition to the amounts provided by the House. It is intended that the funds included for school bus safety will provide for 10 new positions.

Amendment No. 29: Provides that $29,490,000 of the amount appropriated for traffic and highway safety is to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund instead of $28,700,000 as proposed by the House and $30,363,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30: Deletes language proposed by the Senate making $188,000 of the appropriation for traffic and highway safety contingent upon enactment of authorizing legislation.

Federal Railroad Administration

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates $2,835,000 for Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses, instead of $2,750,000 as proposed by the House and $2,921,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates $10,350,000 for railroad research as proposed by the House instead of $10,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The amount agreed upon by the conferees includes $150,000 for funding the grade crossing elimination and railroad track relocation studies for Wheeling, West Virginia; Lincoln, Nebraska; and Lafayette, Indiana.

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates $7,000,000 for the Bureau of Railroad Safety instead of $6,900,000 as proposed by the House and $7,110,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates $52,500,000 for high-speed ground transportation research and development instead of $45,000,000 as proposed by the House and $60,879,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35: Deletes language proposed by the Senate making the appropriation for high-speed ground transportation research and developed contingent upon enactment of authorizing legislation.

Urban Mass Transportation Administration

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates $6,542,000 for administrative expenses instead of $6,400,000 as proposed by the House and $6,684,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Deletes language proposed by the Senate making the appropriation for administrative expenses available until expended.

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates $96,250,000 for research, development, and demonstrations and university research and training instead of $74,000,000 as proposed by the House and $118,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The additional funds provided over the House bill are to be allocated as follows:

Urban demonstration of Dulles PRT systems	$11,500,000
Dual-mode transit system development	4,000,000
Urban tracked air cushion vehicle	4,500,000
Service development	1,750,000
Rail-bus demonstration	500,000

Amendment No. 39: Earmarks $93,250,000 of the amount appropriated for research, development, and demonstrations and university research and training for research, development, and demonstrations instead of $71,000,000 as proposed by the House and $115,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

National Transportation Safety Board

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates $7,785,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $7,700,000 as proposed by the House and $8,285,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Civil Aeronautics Board

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates $14,173,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $14,123,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates $54,000,000 for payments to air carriers as proposed by the House instead of $65,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

It is the understanding of the conferees that the CAB can borrow forward to pay the additional amounts due in fiscal year 1972 resulting from the promulgation of Class Rate VI. It is, of course, the intention of the conferees to recognize the obligations of the Government with respect to payments to air carriers under the applicable law.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 43: Restores House provision limiting commitments for grants-in-aid for airport development to $280,000,000.

Amendment No. 44: Restores House provision and limits obligations for highway beautification to $40,000,000 instead of $30,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 45: Restores House provision and limits obligations for State and community highway safety and Highway-related safety grants to $85,000,000 instead of $80,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 46: Restores House provision limiting obligations for territorial highways to $4,000,000.

Amendment No. 47: Restores House provision limiting obligations for forest highways to $20,000,000.

Amendment No. 48: Restores House provision limiting obligations for public lands highways to $12,000,000.

Amendment Nos. 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, and 55: Conform section numbers.

Conference totals—with comparisons

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1973 recommended by the committee of conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 1972 amount, the 1973 budget estimate, and the House and Senate bills follows:

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year, 1972	[1] $3,194,614,997
Budget estimates of new (obligational authority, fiscal year 1973 (as amended)	[2] 3,040,362,095
House bill, fiscal year 1973	[2] 2,922,795,095
Senate bill, fiscal year 1973	[2] 3,038,175,095
Conference agreement	[2] 2,999,118,095
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1972	−195,496,902
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973 (as amended)	=41,244,000
House bill, fiscal year 1973	+76,323,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1973	−39,057,000

[1] Includes $174,321,000 advance fiscal year 1973 appropriation for Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.

[2] Includes $131,181,000 advance fiscal year 1974 appropriation for Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.

JOHN J. MCFALL,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
TOM STEED,
GEORGE MAHON,
SILVIO O. CONTE,
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
JACK EDWARDS,
FRANK T. BOW,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
JOHN STENNIS,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
ALAN BIBLE,
WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
GORDON ALLOTT (Res. 34 and 39),
NORRIS COTTON,
TED STEVENS,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. LENNON (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today through Friday, August 18, on account of official business (congressional adviser to the U.N. Committee on Peaceful Users of Seabed and Ocean floor at Geneva).

Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. VEYSEY), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOSMER, today, for 15 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, today, for 3 minutes.

Mr. MCKEVITT, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARLSON, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. BELL, today, for 5 minutes.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DANIELSON), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ASPIN, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODINO, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. WOLFF, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOGGS, on August 16, for 60 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. CELLER and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $637.50.

Mr. LONG of Maryland, prior to the passage of S. 2499 on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. STOKES to revise and extend his remarks notwithstanding an estimated cost of $468 by the Public Printer.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon to revise and extend her remarks and include an article, CBS documentary, "Higher Education—Who Needs It?" notwithstanding the cost as estimated by the Public Printer to be $765.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. VEYSEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BRAY in three instances.
Mr. HOSMER in three instances.
Mr. HALPERN in five instances.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. SMITH of New York.
Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.
Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.
Mr. FRENZEL.
Mr. ARCHER.
Mr. BELL in two instances.
Mr. SHOUP in two instances.
Mr. SCHWENGEL.
Mr. COLLINS of Texas in three instances.
Mr. HORTON.
Mr. SPRINGER in two instances.
Mr. VANDER JAGT.
Mr. RIEGLE.
Mr. MILLER of Ohio in six instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DANIELSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LONG of Maryland in two instances.
Mr. DIGGS in two instances.
Mr. BOLAND in three instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. MAHON.
Mr. GRIFFIN in three instances.
Mr. HELSTOSKI in 10 instances.
Mr. CAREY of New York.
Mr. FRASER in five instances.
Mr. FOUNTAIN.
Mr. PUCINSKI in five instances.
Mr. MOORHEAD in five instances.
Mr. NICHOLS.
Mr. JARMAN.
Mr. ROGERS in five instances.
Mr. HARRINGTON in three instances.
Mr. EDWARDS of California.
Mr. ROSENTHAL in five instances.
Mr. STOKES.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3876. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide for the regulation of clearing agencies and transfer agents, to create a National Commission on Uniform Securities Laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 254. Joint resolution to authorize the printing and binding of a revised edition of Senate Procedure and providing the same shall be subject to copyright by the author.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on August 4, 1972, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 489. An act to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Modoc Point unit of the Klamath Indian irrigation project, Oregon;

H.R. 9936. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for a current listing of each drug manufactured, prepared, propagated, compounded, or processed by a registrant under that act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15093. An act making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development; for space, science, veterans, and certain other independent executive agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15418. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 8, 1972, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

July 13, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee:		
Christine S. Gallagher	Chief clerk	$16,004.82
Lacey C. Sharp	General counsel	16,004.82
Hyde H. Murray	Associate counsel	17,985.72
Louis T. Easley	Staff consultant	12,982.74
Betty M. Prezioso	Secretary to general counsel.	8,558.16
Lydia Vacin	Staff assistant	8,558.16
Martha S. Hannah	Subcommittee clerk	8,558.16
Majorie B. Johnson	Secretary to assoicate counsel.	8,558.16
Peggy L. Pecore	Calendar clerk	8,558.16
George L. Misslbeck	Printing editor (January, February, March, May, June).	9,547.50
Fowler C. West	Staff consultant (March, April, May).	8,333.31
Love M. Pattie	Staff assistant	3,096.40
Investigative staff:		
Mildred Baxley	Staff assistant	8,558.16
Mary Perry Shaw	do	6,360.36
Doris Lucile Farmarco	do	6,360.36
Bertha W. Maginniss	do	5,897.70
Doris R. Swischer	do	6,360.36
Bert Allan Watson	Staff assistant (January).	876.03
Patricia D. Stewart	Staff assistant (April–May).	1,149.99
Nancy Gail Glass	Staff assistant (June)	433.33

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$250,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	91,163.57
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972	35,966.65
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1971, to June 30, 1972	127,130.22
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	122,869.78

W. R. POAGE, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

July 12, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Paul M. Wilson	Clerk and staff director.	$18,000.00
Jay B. Howe	Staff assistant	18,000.00
Robert M. Moyer	do	18,000.00
G. Homer Skarin	do	18,000.00
Eugene B. Wilhelm	do	18,000.00
Samuel R. Preston	do	18,000.00
Hunter L. Spillan	do	17,882.28
Henry A. Neil, Jr	do	17,882.28
Aubrey A. Gunnels	do	17,407.50
Keith F. Mainland	Staff assistant to chairman.	16,879.98
George E. Evans	Staff assistant	16,879.98
Earl C. Silsby	do	16,879.98
Peter J. Murphy, Jr	do	16,352.52
William G. Boling	do	13,609.50
John M. Garrity	do	13,345.74
Robert B. Foster	do	13,345.74
Milton B. Meredith	do	12,660.00
Thomas J. Kingfield	do	11,077.50
Donald E. Richbourg	do	11,077.50
Robert C. Nicholas III	do	10,919.28
George A. Urian	do	10,497.24
Dempsey B. Mizelle	do	10,497.24
Charles W. Snodgrass	do	10,128.00
Thayer A. Wood	do	8,545.50
John G. Plashal	do	7,912.50
Byron S. Nielson	do	7,384.98
Paul E. Thomson	do	$8,176.26
J. David Willson	do	10,972.02
Americo S. Miconi	do	10,999.98
Derek J. Vander Schaaf	do	9,934.17
Robert L. Knisely	do	3,337.50
Lawrence C. Miller	Editor	13,609.50
Paul V. Farmer	Assistant editor	9,389.52
Francis W. Sady	Administrative assistant.	7,807.02
Austin G. Smith	Clerical assistant	7,807.02
Gerard J. Chouinard	do	7,543.26
Dale M. Shulaw	do	6,593.76
Daniel V. Gun Shows	do	6,405.40
Gemma M. Hickey	do	4,272.78
Virginia M. Keyser	do	5,538.78
Randolph Thomas	Messenger	5,908.02
Marilyn R. Quinney	Clerical assistant	5,441.96
Harold H. Griffin	Minority clerk	14,242.50
Enid Morrison	Staff assistant to Minority.	10,448.52
Mary H. Smallwood	Clerical assistant	7,384.98
Samuel A. Mabry	do	7,384.98
Leta M. Buhrman	do	7,000.02
Catherine M. Voytko	do	7,087.74
John F. Walsh	do	7,0.7.74
T. Robert Garretson	do	7,087.74
Forrest O. Tate, Jr	do	4,725.16
Vincent Rizzutto	do	2,362.58
Naomi A. Rich	do	6,719.40
Laura C. Lineberry	do	6,710.16
Robert M. Walker	do	6,275.00
Susan L. Shaw	do	4,725.16
George Allen	do	4,307.91
Karen Lee Sahlin	do	7,384.98
Peggy C. Ehringhaus	do	7,087.74
Katherine D. Coupe	do	7,087.74
Linda Steele	do	6,902.97
David H. Kehl	do	6,963.00
Carolyn J. Johnston	do	6,330.00
Thomas H. Hardy	do	7,384.98
James W. Dyer	do	6,375.70
Mary Ann Bond	do	5,749.74
Barbara C. Wallace	do	5,275.02
Patience S. Vaccaro	do	6,450.00
Russell Hardin, Jr	do	7,384.98
Anna L. Lamendola	do	6,277.26

Amount of expenditures previously reported	$622,435.38
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1972 to June 30, 1972	683,105.89
Total amount expended from July 1, 1971 to June 30, 1972	1,305,541.27

GEORGE H. MAHON, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

July 12, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Cornelius R. Anderson	Director, surveys and investigations staff.	$16,774.50
Leory R. Kirkpatrick	1st assistant director, surveys and investigation staff.	15,613.98
Willie C. Law	2d assistant director, surveys and investigation staff.	14,295.24
Mary Alice Sauer	Administrative assistant.	7,754.28
Janet Lou Dameron	Clerk-stenographer	5,096.76
Frances May	do	6,710.16
Beatrice T. Dew	do	5,538.78
Agriculture, Department of:		
Crabtree, Paul O., Jr	Clerical assistant	1,396.63
Robison, John S	Investigator	2,135.84
Agency of International Development: Peterson, G. D.	do	13,004.60
Bureau of Standards:		
Shupe, Philip D., Jr	do	11,599.00
Tipson, R Stuart	do	18,733.00
Office of Secretary of Defense: Buckles, Jimmie.	do	11,706.59
Defense Contract Audit Agency: Herron, M. A.	do	13,335.82
General Services Administration:		
Jones H. H	do	$5,102.71
Kelly, C. A	do	14,673.98
Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of: Haaser, T. C.	do	16,395.82
Housing and Urban Development, Department of: Knisely, Robert L	Clerical assistant	3,215.58
National Aeronautics and Space Administration:		
Driver, C	Investigator	9,062.32
Stepka, Francis	do	6,762.39
Treasury, Department of: Miconi, A. S.	Clerical assistant	5,226.46
Naval Audit Service. Wyte, D.	Investigator	9,150.80
U.S. Army Audit Lyons, F. T.	do	5,187.60
Federal Bureau of Investigation: Baber, John R.	do	11,286.00
Bennett, Carl L	do	13,669.20
Bosko, Andrew P	do	11,800.80
Brummitt, Donald A	do	12,735.20
Carroll, Gerard C	do	13,113.60
Carson, Dana W	do	13,669.20
Cauffman, R. E	do	6,967.81
Creedon, Dennis F., Jr	do	5,396.40
Fenstermacher, H. E., Jr.	do	13,669.20
Franklin, Robert M	do	13,046.40
Funkhouser, Paul K	do	11,222.80
Goedtel, John G	do	13,046.40
Groover, L. Clyde, Jr	do	6,176.00
Haynes, William P., Jr	do	430.80
Ivy, Coy M	do	11,538.00
Jenkins, D. L	do	7,252.80
Leffler, Raymond P	do	12,804.80
Magee, E. Huyett	do	8,928.00
Maher, Martin F	do	13,358.00
Malyniak, Joseph, Jr	do	12,423.60
Mansfield, James P	do	13,136.00
McCreight, A. H	do	10,223.20
McGahey, H. B	do	13,358.00
Michalski, Joseph E	do	13,046.40
Morris, E. J	do	12,723.60
O'Connor, John J	do	2,296.72
Schaum, E. V	do	12,867.20
Schmidt, D. A	do	14,665.60
Shannon, Andrew J	do	13,714.00
Szoka, Charles E	do	12,735.20
Theisen, L. J	do	12,423.60
Welch, W. H., Jr	do	13,669.20
Wetzel, Roy G	do	10,040.40
Wood, H. B	do	13,669.20
Oesch, Cinda Jean	Clerical assistant	2,696.40
Health benefits		3,358.16
Life insurance fund		1,360.72
Retirement fund		23,593.48
Travel expenses		144,839.78
Miscellaneous expenses		2,441.04
FICA		140.17

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$1,444,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	622,425.72
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1972, to June 30, 1972	778,005.92
Total amount expended from July 1, 1971, to June 30, 1972	1,400,431.64
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	43,568.36

GEORGE MAHON, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

July 12, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John R. Blandford	Chief counsel	$18,000.00
Frank M. Slatinshek	Assistant chief counsel	18,000.00
Earl J. Morgan	Professional staff member.	17,950.00

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
William H. Cook	Counsel	17,950.00
John J. Ford	Professional staff member.	16,879.98
Ralph Marshall	do	15,297.48
George Norris	Counsel	14,690.88
James F. Shumate, Jr	do	14,690.88
William H. Hogan, Jr	do	12,132.48
H. Hollister Cantus	Professional staff member (from Feb. 1)	9,758.76
Oneta L. Stockstill	Executive secretary	13,187.52
Berniece Kalinowski	Secretary	9,626.88
L. Louise Ellis	do	9,626.88
Edna E. Johnson	do	9,626.88
Dorothy R. Britton	do	9,626.88
Innis E. McDonald	do	7,226.76
Brenda J. Gore	do	6,013.50
Ann R. Willett	do	6,013.50
Emma M. Brown	do	6,013.50
Nancy S. Jones	do	5,011.26
Sally A. Moore	Secretary (from Feb. 1)	4,176.05
William B. Short	Clerical staff assistant (from Feb. 1).	6,593.75
James A. Deakins	Clerical staff assistant	7,279.56
Issiah Hardy	Messenger	5,222.28
Staff, Armed Services Investigating Subcommittee (pursuant to H. Res. 201, H. Res. 202, and H. Res. 912, 92d Cong.):		
John T. M. Reddan	Counsel	17,950.00
John F. Lally	Assistant counsel	15,297.48
Richard A. Ransom	Professional staff assistant.	14,031.48
Sanford T. Saunders	Security officer	7,279.50
Rose C. Beck	Secretary	7,226.76
Adeline Tolerton	Clerk	6,330.00
Joyce C. Bova	Secretary	5,037.60
Diane W. Bowman	do	5,011.26
John B. Vinson	Clerical staff assistant (from June 1).	685.42
William B. Short, Jr	Clerical staff assistant (to Feb. 1).	1,318.75
H. Hollister Cantus	Professional staff member (to Feb. 1).	1,626.46
Sally A. Moore	Secretary (to Feb. 1)	835.21

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, H. Res. 202 and H. Res. 912	$450,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	199,755.04
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972	98,523.28
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1971 to June 30, 1972	298,278.32
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	151,721.68

F. EDWARD HÉBERT, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

July 1, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee:		
Paul Nelson	Clerk and staff director.	$18,000.00
Orman S. Fink	Professional staff member, minority.	18,000.00
Curtis A. Prins	Chief investigator	17,292.60
Charles B. Holstein	Professional staff member.	18,000.00
Benet D. Gellman	Counsel	18,000.00
Joseph C. Lewis	Professional staff member.	18,000.00
Graham T. Northup	Professional staff member, minority.	18,000.00
Mary W. Layton	Secretary to minority	11,346.12
Donald G. Vaughn	Administrative assistant.	9,809.22
Total		146,447.94
Investigative staff (H. Res. 226):		
Rose Marie Allen	Assistant clerk	6,857.52
Richard C. Barnes	Professional staff member.	10,549.98
David O Couch	Counsel	$8,967.48
Jane N. D'Arista	Professional staff member.	5,478.54
Dolores K. Dougherty	Research associate	9,237.78
Michael P. Flaherty	Assistant counsel	1,666.67
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY		
Lucia Gonzales	Secretary	3,649.98
Stuart D. Halpert	Counsel	15,825.00
Helen Hitz	Administrative assistant,	9,966.77
Linda Leah Hoff	Secretary	5,823.82
Joseph J. Jasinski	Professional staff member,	16,246.98
Mary-Helen Kesecker	Secretary	4,744.08
Mary E. Kirk	Assistant Clerk	5,490.48
Kelsay Ray Meek	Professional staff member,	14,506.26
Mildred S. Mitchell	Assistant clerk	9,727.44
Richard H. Neiman	do	2,571.85
Clifford E. Payne, Jr	do	4,560.90
Gayle L. Peabody	Secretary	5,033.46
Margaret L. Rayhawk	Research associate	8,855.24
Yan Michael Ross	Counsel, minority	11,812.17
Alicia F. Shoemaker	Secretary, minority	7,541.44
Jeane Carolyn Smith	Secretary	5,908.02
Elizabeth Stabler	Professional staff member,	2,197.92
Robert E. Weintraub	Staff economist	1,600.00
Jane L. Williams	Secretary	3,698.61
Donald F. Winn	Professional staff member,	7,648.74
C. Robert Zelnick	do	10,833.35
Total		201,000.48

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 226—Full committee)	$942,500.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	398,835.55
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972	220,168.92
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1971 to June 30, 1972	619,004.47
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	323,495.53

WRIGHT PATMAN, Chairman.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

July 1, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Subcommittee investigative staff (H. Res. 226, 92d Cong.):		
Brent Barriere	Assistant clerk	$325.69
M. Wendell Belew	do	650.00
Terrence Boyle	Minority counsel	12,411.48
Marie L. Chaillet	Minority secretary	6,250.31
Wanda Jean Clarkson	Secretary	6,127.50
Patricia A. Eley	Assistant clerk	5,344.50
Jane Carey Enger	Secretary	1,621.24
David Glick	Counsel	18,000.00
George Gross	do	18,000.00
Emily M. Hightower	Secretary	7,912.50
Casey Ireland	Minority staff member	18,000.00
Margaret J. Leary	Secretary	8,106.20
Benjamin B. McKeever	Assistant counsel	13,958.34
Gerald R. McMurray	Staff director	17,407.64
Catherine M. Smith	Minority secretary	5,079.29
Doris M. Young	Assistant clerk	8,991.30
Total		148,785.99

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 226—Housing)	$717,300.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	315,751.35
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972	166,406.19
Total amount expended from Jan 3, 1971 to June 30, 1972	482,157.54
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	235,142.46

WRIGHT PATMAN, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

June 15, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuaut to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Whitney L. Turley	Investigator	$9,563.94
Margaret Hoffman	Legislative assistant	6,330.00
Rebecca D. Moore	do	6,330.00
Irene V. Howard	do	5,275.02
Browardine R. Broyhill	Clerk-assistant	5,802.48
Wanda M. Worsham	Secretary	5,646.75
David D. Salmon, Jr	Clerk-typist	3,750.00
David A. Danmyer	Assistant clerk-typist, off payroll July 2, 1972.	1,800.01
Mary E. Finklea	Clerk-typist	500.00
Carol D. Tedards	do	500.00
Elizabeth B. Mellette	do	500.00
Marsha Miller Harper	Clerk-typist (resigned June 10, 1972).	1,361.10
Hayden S. Garber	Counsel	14,115.34
Leonard Hilder	Legislative clerk	11,473.38
James T. Clark	Clerk	14,977.38
Othello Steinkuller	Secretary	9,237.78
Betty C. Alexander	do	8,540.64
John E. Hogan	Minority clerk	13,534.34
Patrick E. Kelly	Assistant counsel	7,500.00
Terry D. Hill	Clerk—public relations.	5,802.48
Paul Y. Little	Special consultant	10,549.98
Clayton Gasque	Staff director (retired Jan. 31, 1972).	2,138.33

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$250,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	103,806.25
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to July 1, 1972	50,305.12
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, to July 1, 1972	154,111.37
Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1972	95,888.63

JOHN L. McMILLAN, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR—STANDING COMMITTEE

July 15, 1972,

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Donald M. Baker	Chief clerk and associate counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972),	$18,000.00
Donald F. Berens	Administrative assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	12,976.50
Louise Maxienne Dargans.	Research director (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	18,000.00
William F. Gaul	Associate general counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	18,000.00
Hartwell D. Reed, Jr	General counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	18,000.00
Benjamin F. Reeves	Assistant to chairman	18,000.00
	and assistant clerk (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	18,000.00
Austin P. Sullivan, Jr	Legislative specialist (from Jan. 1 to Apr. 30, 1972) and legislative director (from May 1 to June 30, 1972).	17,605.00
Louise M. Wright	Administrative assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	13,401.52
		13,401.52

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Marian R. Wyman	Special assistant to chairman (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	$16,812.48
Minority staff:		
Robert C. Andringa	Minority staff director (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	16,352.52
Michael J. Bernstein	Minority counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	18,000.00
Charles W. Radcliffe	Minority counsel for education (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	18,000.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	Contingent
Amount of expenditures previously reported	$395,344.72
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972	203,148.02
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1971 to June 30, 1972	598,492.74
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	Contingent

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR—FULL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING STAFF

July 15, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Louise A. Amidon	Assistant clerk (from June 15 to June 30, 1972).	$240.00
Carole J. Ansheles	Assistant clerk (from Jan. 1 to Jan. 14, 1972), and (from May 17 to June 30, 1972)	955.00
Goldie A. Baldwin	Legislative assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	8,869.03
Portia A. Battle	Assistant clerk (from June 19 to June 30, 1972).	180.00
William H. Cable	Counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	10,128.00
Elizabeth A. Cornett	Administrative assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	9,237.60
Lelia T. Cornwell	do	8,229.00
Carol Ann Edwards	Assistant clerk (from June 26 to June 30, 1972).	83.33
Eydie Gaskins	Administrative assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972.)	8,229.00
Katherine Clark Gibbons	Research assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	8,144.00
Marilyn L. Hargett	Research assistant (from June 19 to June 30 1972).	200.00
Ernest B. Hillenmeyer, III.	Assistant clerk (from May 12 to June 30, 1972)	816.67
Richard Lim	Staff assistant to associate general counsel (from Mar. 1 to June 30 1972).	2,516.66
Mattie L. Maynard	Research assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30 1972).	633.00
Shirley R. Mills	Secretary (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	8,229.00
Lewis D. Morris, Jr.	Assistant clerk (from June 6 to June 30, 1972).	416.67
David S. Putnam	Staff assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	5,124.12
Timothy T. Reese	Assistant clerk (from June 1 to June 30, 1972).	$500.00
Peter Schott	Assistant clerk (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	4,177.80
May L. Shuler	Secretary (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	6,884.94
Carlton Stewart	Assistant clerk (from June 1 to June 30, 1972).	500.00
Brian E. Sullam	Assistant clerk (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	2,532.00
Jeanne E. Thomson	Legislative assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	10,072.62
Robert H. Van Meter III	Assistant clerk (from June 15 to June 30, 1972).	240.00
John E. Warren	Research assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	5,127.30
Minority:		
Cynthia Deane Banzer.	Minority legislative assistant (from Mar. 1 to June 30, 30, 1972).	5,000.00
Mildred S. Blumel	Receptionist (from June 8 to June 30, 1972).	472.78
Louise W. Finke	Assistant to minority staff director (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	8,029.54
Anita M. Gerhardt	Minority research assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 24, 1972).	6,237.32
Cheryl Dianne Heny	Secretary (from Mar. 20 to June 30 1972).	2,496.96
Sophia Jo Jolivette	Secretary (from Jan. 1 to Mar. 31, 1972).	2,055.00
Martin L. LaVor	Minority legislative associate (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	14,426.10
John C. Miller	Minority associate counsel for labor (from Jan. 1 to June 30 1972).	15,297.48
Jo Anne Pierson	Minority receptionist (from Feb. 7 to June 7, 1972) and secretary (from June 8 to June 30, 1972).	3,200.02
Silvia J. Rodriguez	Secretary (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	5,380.50
Yvonne Franklin Smith.	Minority legislative associate (from May 1 to June 30, 1972).	3,200.00
Dorothy L. Strunk	Secretary (from Jan. 1, to May 31, 1972).	5,377.00
Dennis J. Taylor	Minority associate counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	10,761.00
Jack D. Thorsen	Minority staff member (from Jan. 1 to Mar. 31, 1972).	2,670.48

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures 1971-72	$1,188,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	372,418.77
Amount expended from January 1 to June 30, 1972	215,123.01
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1971, to June 30, 1972	587,541.78
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	600,458.22

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, NO. 1

(Representative Edith Green, Chairman)

July 15, 1972

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Bland Joseph Ballard	Research director (from June 1 to June 30, 1972).	$1,375.00
Suzanne L. Black	Research assistant (from Mar. 1 to June 30, 1972).	4,666.68
Malcolm Henry Cross	Director of Research (from Mar. 1 to May 31, 1972).	4,125.00
Nancy Davis	Secretary (from Jan. 1 to June 15, 1972).	4,835.44
Harry Hogan	Legal counsel (from June 1 to June 30, 1972).	2,083.33
Sally K. Kirkgasler	Research assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	7,249.98
Kenneth L. Otto	Assistant clerk (from June 24 to June 30, 1972).	97.22
Ronald Schwartz	Research assistant (from Jan. 1 to Mar. 31, 1972).	3,000.00
James Sullivan	Special assistant (from June 1 to June 30, 1972).	2,083.33

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures 1971-72	$170,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	70,593.56
Amount expended from January 1, to June 30, 1972	30,275.80
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1971, to June 30, 1972	100,869.36
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	69,130.64

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, NO 2

July 15, 1972.

(Representative Frank Thompson, Jr., Chairman)

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Jeunesse M. Beaumont	Clerk (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	$8,495.40
High G. Duffy	Counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	13,533.90
George A. Franklin	Research assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	2,395.63
Thomas C. Keeney	Research assistant (from June 19 to June 30, 1972).	346.67
Christopher J. Kennan	Research assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	3,900.00
Thorn P. Lord	Research assistant (from Jan. 1 to Mar. 14, 1972).	1,603.33
Daniel H. Pollitt	Special counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	4,666.98
Anne W. Risdon	Assistant clerk (from Jan. 1 to Feb. 29, 1972).	633.00
Kathleen M. Sullivan	Assistant clerk (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	3,892.52
Thomas R. Wolanin	Research specialist (from Apr. 1 to June 30, 1972).	2,400.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$170,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	71,682.03
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1972 to June 30, 1972	45,828.36
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1971 to June 30, 1972	117,510.39
Balance unexpeded as of June 30, 1972	52,489.61

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, NO. 3

(Representative John H. Dent, Chairman)

July 15, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Adrienne Fields	Clerk (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	$8,315.52
Cheryl Jeanne Peck	Secretary (from May 1 June 30, 1972).	1,083.34
Robert E. Vagley	Director (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	16,347.24

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, 1971-72	$170,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	67,695.56
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972	31,331.16
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1971 to June 30, 1972	99,026.72
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	70,973.28

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, No. 4

July 15, 1972.

(Representative Roman C. Pucinski, Chairman)

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Thomas J. Gerber	Assistant Clerk (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	$8,481.51
John F. Jennings	Counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	13,053.54
Alexandra J. Kisla	Clerk (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	8,306.04
Toni E. Painter	Secretary (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	2,532.00
Patricia Ann Rugg	Secretary (from May 15 to June 30, 1972).	830.56

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, 1971-72	$170,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	62,095.26
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30 1972	43,919.32
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1971 to, June 30, 1972	106,014.58
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	63,985.42

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR—TASK FORCE ON WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS

(Representative John H. Dent, Chairman)

July 15, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Vance J. Anderson	Counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	$10,000.02
Barbara A. Dinuson	Secretary (from Jan. 20 to June 30, 1972).	2,983.33
Eric Honick	Staff assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	4,500.00
Julie Domenick McAteer	do	3,933.35
Shirley Marsdon	Research assistant (from Feb. 1 to June 30, 1972).	1,500.00
W. Kenneth Miller	Assistant clerk (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	1,800.00
Alan Rabin	Research assistant (from June 1 to June 30, 1972).	900.00
John M. Smokevitch	Minority counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	12,166.67

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$100,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	7,987.43
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972	44,044.86
Total amount expended from July 1 to June 30, 1972	52,032.29
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	47,967.71

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, NO. 5

(Representative Dominick V. Daniels, Chairman)

July 15, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Loretta A. Bowen	Clerk (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	$7,681.44
Daniel H. Krivit	Counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	14,045.22
Catherine Ladnier	Research assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	4,219.98
Catherine R. Romano	Secretary (from Jan. 1 to Jan. 31, 1972) and research and staff assistant (from Feb. 1 to June 30, 1972).	5,042.22
John Douglas Wagner	Assistant clerk (from June 12 to June 30, 1972).	316.67
Charles R. Zappala	Assistant clerk (from June 19 to June 30, 1972).	260.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, 1971-72	$170,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	60,788.44
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1972, to June 30, 1972	33,323.59
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1971, to June 30, 1972	94,112.03
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	75,887.97

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

July 15, 1972.

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, NO. 6

(Representative John Brademas, Chairman)

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Margaret Sue Brown	Special assistant (from Jan. 1 to Apr. 30, 1972).	$4,666.68
Connie de Launey	Secretary (from Mar. 20 to June 2, 1972).	1,723.60
Marjorie C. Carver	Assistant clerk (from Feb. 1 to 29, 1972).	294.00
Jack G. Duncan	Counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	13,250.02
Marianne Frederick	Secretary (from Apr. 24 to June 30, 1972).	1,395.83
James Harvey	Deputy assistant (from Apr. 10 to June 30, 1972).	3,375.00
Christine M. Orth	Staff assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	4,333.34
Ann Nichloson Owens	Clerk (from Jan. 1 to Apr. 7, 1972).	2,341.66
Gladys Marie Walker	Secretary (from Jan. 1 to May 31, 1972).	3,999.99

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, 1971-72	$170,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	65,299.93
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972	39,081.65
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 1971, to June 30, 1972	104,381.58
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	65,618.42

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL LABOR, NO. 7

July 15, 1972.

(Representative James G. O'Hara, Chairman)

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Rosanne Aceto	Assistant clerk (from May 1 to June 30, 1972).	$1,166.67
Arthur R. Baltrym	Legislative assistant (from Jan. 1 to Feb. 12, 1972).	840.00
Barbara A. Bernstein	Assistant clerk (from June 1 to June 30, 1972).	541.67
Alfred Carl Franklin	Counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	10,000.02
James B. Harrison	Staff director (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	13,150.02
Joan Marie King	Assistant clerk (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	1,800.00
Marilyn Myers	Research assistant (from Mar. 1 to Mar. 15, 1972).	390.00
Martha D. Risdon	Assistant clerk (from Jan. 1 to Jan. 14, 1972).	252.78
Elnora H. Teets	Clerk (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).	6,000.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures 1971-72	$170,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	54,470.88
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1972	36,819.62

Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1971 to June 30, 1972	$91,290.50
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	78,709.50

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

July 1, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Roy J. Bullock	Staff administrator	$18,000.00
Albert C. F. Westphal	Staff consultant	18,000.00
Franklin J. Schupp	do	18,000.00
Harry C. Cromer	do	18,000.00
Marian A. Czarnecki	do	18,000.00
Melvin O. Benson	do	15,694.38
Everett E. Bierman	do	14,935.98
John J. Brady	do	13,714.98
John H. Sullivan	do	13,714.98
Robert K. Boyer	do	10,549.98
John Chapman Chester	do	13,714.98
Peter Anthony Abbruzzese.	do	12,660.00
George R. Berdes	Subcommittee staff consultant.	13,187.52
Robert B. Boettcher	do	11,868.78
Goler Teal Butcher	do	13,187.52
Robert Michael Finley	do	10,919.28
Clifford P Hackett	do	13,187.52
Roland S. Homet, Jr	do	6,249.99
Charles S. Levy	do	3,333.34
Henry M. Lloyd	do	13,187.52
Michael H. Van Dusen	do	10,549.98
Helen C. Mattas	Senior staff assistant	12,348.60
Mary Louise O'Brien	Staff assistant	11,019.78
Dora B. McCracken	do	9,103.98
Jean S. Brown	do	7,198.32
Paula L. Peak	do	9,103.98
Ray Sparks	do	9,509.40
Thelma H. Shirkey	do	5,538.78
Arlene M. Atwater	do	5,538.78
Shirley A. Furnier	do	6,857.52
Bernadette M. Kuwik	do	5,538.78
Audray Lee Clement	do	5,538.78
Donna Gail Wynn	do	4,483.74
Charles W. Snyder	do	5,064.00
Stephen E. Markovich	Special assistant	837.77

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$936,662.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	310,324.17
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1972 to June 30, 1972	213,423.38
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1971 to June 30, 1972	523,747.55
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	412,914.65

THOMAS E. MORGAN, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

July 15, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Expenses—Jan. 1 through June 30, 1972:		
Full committee		$4,051.93
Special investigative staff.		26,566.63
Legislation and Military Operations Subcommittee.		80,041.85
Government Activities Subcommittee.		$50,156.00
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee.		55,686.58
Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee.		56,212.62
Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee.		47,495.25
Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee.		62,553.68
Special Studies Subcommittee.		54,167.29
Total		436,931.83
Salaries: Full committee, Jan. 1 through June 30, 1972:		
Herbert Roback	Staff director	18,000.00
Christine Ray Davis	Staff administrator	18,000.00
James A. Lanigan	General counsel	18,000.00
Miles Q. Romney	Associate general counsel.	16,903.20
Dolores L. Fel'Dotto	Staff member	9,237.78
Ann E. McLachlan	do	8,953.74
Catherine S. Cash	do	7,337.70
Marilyn F. Jarvis	do	7,941.72
Annie M. Abbott	do	7,300.50
John Philip Carlson	Minority counsel	18,000.00
William H. Copenhaver.	Minority professional staff member.	15,147.78
Clara Katherine Armstrong.	Minority research assistant.	8,240.22
Expenses, Jan. 1 through June 30, 1972: Full committee, Hon. Chet Holifield, Chairman: Expenses		4,051.93
Total		4,051.93
Special investigative staff, Hon. Chet Holifield, Chairman:		
Warren B. Buhler	Minority staff member	9,495.00
Thomas H. Saunders	do	9,085.20
Susanna Dixon	Minority staff secretary (from Feb. 2, 1972).	3,736.45
Ralph T. Doty	Clerical staff	4,249.98
Total		26,566.63
Legislation and Military Operations Subcommittee, Hon. Chet Holifield, Chairman:		
Elmer W. Henderson	Counsel	17,111.46
Douglas G. Dahlin	Staff attorney	12,322.80
John Paul Ridgely	Investigator	10,986.30
Joseph C. Luman	Defense analyst	11,868.78
Catherine L. Koeberlein.	Research assistant	8,456.16
Veronica B. Johnson	Clerk	8,240.22
Mary Etta Haga	Clerk-stenographer	5,275.02
Gloria Ann Rubin	do	4,590.42
Expenses		1,190.69
Total		80,041.85
Government Activities Subcommittee, Hon. Jack Brooks, Chairman:		
Ernest C. Baynard	Subcommittee staff director.	16,382.76
C. Don Stephens	Research analyst	10,969.56
Paul A. Mutino	Counsel	9,758.76
Lynne Higginbotham	Clerk-stenographer	7,337.70
Mary G. Jones	Secretary	4,483.74
Expenses		1,223.48
Total		50,156.00
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Hon. L. H. Fountain, Chairman:		
James R. Naughton	Counsel	16,382.76
Delphis C. Goldberg	Professional staff member.	16,382.76
Gilbert S. Goldhammer	Consultant	10,679.40
Pamela R. Horsmon	Clerk-stenographer	5,275.02
Margaret M. Goldhammer.	Secretary	4,427.64
Expenses		2,539.00
Total		55,686.58
Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee, Hon. Henry S. Reuss, Chairman:		
Phineas Indritz	Counsel	16,382.76
David B. Finnegan	Assistant counsel	13,426.80
David H. Baris	Legal assistant (from Apr. 17, 1972).	3,286.96
Josephine Scheiber	Resaerch analyst	8,347.38
Ruth M. Wallick	Stenographer	6,198.54
Frances B. Lee	Stenographer (from Jan. 17,1972).	3,782.48
C. Robert Zelnick	Professional staff member (from Jan. 3 to Jan. 31, 1972).	1,711.q6
Expenses		$2,896.54
Total		56,212.62
Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Hon. John S. Monagan, Chairman:		
Richard L. Still	Subcommittee staff director.	14,506.26
Charles A. Intriago	Assistant counsel	10,910.94
Jeremiah S. Buckley	do	7,046.88
Frances M. Turk	Clerk	5,275.02
Helena A. Grady	Secretary (from Jan. 17, 1972).	3,644.46
Jane G. Cameron	Secretary (to Jan. 17, 1972).	155.56
Expenses		5,956.13
Total		47,495.25
Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, Hon. William S. Moorhead, Chairman:		
William G. Phillips	Subcommittee staff director.	16,382.76
Norman G. Cornish	Deputy subcommittee staff director.	16,382.76
Harold F. Whittington	Professional staff member.	12,580.68
Martha M. Doty	Clerk	4,747.50
Mary Elizabeth Blanton.	Secretary (to June 16, 1972).	3,648.57
Almeda J. Harley	Secretary (from June 28, 1972).	65.94
Expenses		8,745.47
Total		62,553.68
Special Studies Subcommittee, Hon. Wm. J. Randall, Chairman:		
Erskine Stewart	Subcommittee staff director.	12,156.53
Jacob N. Wasserman	Counsel	15,068.40
James L. Gyory	Investigator	7,648.74
Wileen O. Moore	Clerk	4,483.74
Elynor H. Humber	Secretary	4,483.74
Expenses		10,326.14
Total		54,167.29

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures H. Res. 303 and H. Res. 911, 92d Cong.	$1,832,600.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported Jan. 3, to Dec. 31, 1971	835,792.74
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1972	436,931.83
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1971 to June 30, 1972	1,272,724.57
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	559,875.43

CHET HOLLIFIELD, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

June 11, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972 inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John T. Walker	Staff director	$18,000.00
Frank B. Ryan	Director, information systems.	18,000.00
Louis I. Freed	Assistant clerk	17,143.75
Robert D. Gray	Chief auditor	16,776.38
David S. Wolman	Personnel analyst	16,604.30
Melvin M. Miller	Minority clerk	16,604.30
John G. Blair	Assistant to the staff director.	13,715.00
Ralph W. Murphy	Assistant clerk (minority).	10,550.00
Louis Silverman	Assistant clerk	10,145.31
Mary Stolle	do	6,793.04
Evelyn Hange Wilson	Office manager	6,725.62
Judith Leonard Vargas	Assistant clerk (minority).	4,306.35
Thomas S. Foster, Sr.	Election's clerk	9,502.50
Thomas A. Tangretti	Electrical and mechanical's clerk.	9,231.24

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
William E. Sudow	Printing's clerk	$4,050.00
Rose E. Polito	Assistant legal clerk	1,500.00
John L Boos	Library and Memorial's clerk.	8,749.98
Thomas W. Latham	Account's clerk	8,550.00
Jospeh T. Ventura	Nonessential employees' clerk.	3,616.67
Gurney S. Jaynes	Assistant clerk	6,593.76
Judith K. Holes	Accounts' assistant clerk.	6,450.00
Norman J. Jacknis	Assistant clerk	3,165.00
Barbara D. Lewis	do	5,802.48
Velma T. Youngblood	do	5,802.48
Marie V. McGee	Printing's assistant clerk.	3,666.68
Johanna Lucas	Assistant clerk	5,275.02
John Paul Tolson	do	3,776.66
Vickie Sue Moser	do	2,499.99
Lynne E. Pattridge	do	4,747.50
Barbara Lee Giaimo	E. & M.'s assistant clerk.	3,291.67
Judith Lyris Rigby	Assistant clerk	958.33
Pamela M. Bussen	do	3,692.52
Colette K. Bohatch	do	3,692.52
Elizabeth M. Johns	Election's assistant clerk.	600.00
Deborah K. Liggett	Assistant clerk	253.33
Carol S. Eliel	Printing's assistant clerk.	190.00
Robert A. Burck	Assistant clerk	1,055.00
Bolling B. Flood	do	516.67
Louis Gerber	do	1,055.00
Thomas J. Hart	E. & M.'s assistant clerk.	461.93
Charles T. Moffitt	Assistant clerk	3,000.00
Vincent J. Paka	Printing's clerk	3,000.00
Gerald Wygoda	Assistant clerk	1,055.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$615,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	214,237.83
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1972	122,966.43
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1971 to June 30, 1972	337,204.26
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	277,795.74

WAYNE L. HAYS, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

(House Information Systems—H. Res. 601)

June 11, 1972,

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles E. Graham	Deputy Director	$5,000.00
Phillip B. Ladd	Management assistant	10,310.52
E. Jean Walker	Management analyst	7,800.00
Betty Lamb	Office manager	6,593.76
Mary C. Frye	Executive secretary	688.67
Diane Louise Sisson	Secretary	1,148.33
Dwight H. Pfaehler	Management assistant	305.56
Stuart M. Robinson	Senior information systems specialist.	11,341.26
Earl Devere Watterson	Information systems specialist,	10,022.52
Charles N. Arrowsmith	do	10,022.52
Betty J. Sharp	Secretary	4,219.98
Edmond S. Mesko	Information systems	4,633.33
Nancy Maxwell	Secretary	2,340.00
Daniel J. Lasser	Manager	12,132.48
Edward R. Mills	Senior systems analyst,	5,716.67
Jasper T. Wagliardo	do	4,274.99
William R. Hill	Systems analyst	8,197.38
Michael Tomanio	Programer analyst	7,596.00
David L. Brazeal	do	7,238.88
Kathryn A. Smith	Assistant information systems specialist.	6,533.46
Vernon J. Walters	Programer	6,593.76
Benjamin R. Candler	do	6,362.70
Melvin R. Mallonee	do	5,620.76
Curtis L. Merrick	Manager (acting)	9,231.24
Harold W. Harding, Jr	Senior systems programmer.	3,210.42
Noah M. St. Clair	Systems programer	6,616.80
James L. Guthrie	Junior programer	3,313.33
Timothy E. Gunter	Production control supervisor.	5,487.42
Lynn Alcock	Data entry specialist	1,825.00
Robert Mumma	Computer operator	4,431.00
Irene S. Morris	Data control coordinater.	4,158.26
Betty U. Gill	Data entry specialist	4,248.48
Antionette Gauthier	Data control specialist	3,798.00
Cherie C. Barnes	Data entry specialist	448.61
William R. Lindsay	Manager	5,007.21
Joseph L. Burns	Facility manager	11,648.95
Kent Huff	Member, technical staff	1,524.77

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$1,500,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	55,134.53
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1972	435,039.17
Total amount expended from Nov. 1971 to June 30, 1972	490,173.70
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	1,009,826.30

WAYNE L. HAYS, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

June 11, 1972.

(Remodeling of Longworth Cafeteria facilities, H. Res. 862)

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from March to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
None	None	None.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$146,200.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	None.
Amount expended from March 1972 to June 30, 1972	39,163.61
Total amount expended from March 1972 to June 30, 1972	39,163.61
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	107,036.39

WAYNE L. HAYS, Chairman

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

July 15, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employe	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Sidney L. McFarland	Staff director and chief clerk.	$18,000.00
Lewis A. Sigler	Counsel and consultant on Indian affairs.	18,000.00
William L. Shafer	Consultant on mines and mining and public lands.	18,000.00
Charles Leppert, Jr	Minority counsel	$16,879.98
Lee McElvain	Assistant counsel and consultant on National Parks and Recreation.	15,297.48
Jim T. Casey	Consultant on irrigation and reclamation.	16,352.52
Robert M. Gants	Assistant minority counsel.	11,077.50
Dixie S. Barton	Clerk (resigned as of Jan. 15, 1972).	879.17
Patricia A. Murray	Clerk	10,549.98
Patricia B. Freeman	do	9,495.00
Susan W. Gardner	Clerk (resigned as of June 10, 1972).	5,408.33
Kathleen V. Sandy	Clerk (resigned as of June 30, 1972).	7,912.50
Charles Conklin	Special counsel on public lands and environmental matters.	16,879.98
William G. Thomas	Consultant on territorial and insular affairs.	15,297.48
Miriam Waddell	Clerk	7,384.98
Inez H. Jarvis	do	7,912.50
Nancy Lou Larson	do	7,121.28
Marsha L. Lane	do	7,121.28
Marston L. Becker	Printing clerk	8,967.48
Edward P. Gaddis	Messenger	5,275.02
Bertha D. Drotos	Clerk (minority)	5,879.17
Edward L. Weidenfeld	Counsel on energy matters.	15,297.48
Frances J. Paris	Secretary—Energy study staff (from Jan. 10, 1972).	5,462.48
Carleton Craig Smith	Staff assistant—Energy study staff (from Jan. 1, 1972).	9,899.98
Robert H. Anthony	Staff assistant—Energy study staff (from Jan. 26, 1972).	[1] 4,834.99
Mary Lee Gennari	Clerk (from Mar. 27, 1972).	2,741.67
Heather M. Petroni	Secretary—Energy study staff (from May 1, 1972).	1,333.34
Therese M. Mariner	Clerk (from May 18, 1972).	1,134.73

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$704,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	188,514.22
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972	[2] 174,283.61
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1971 to June 30, 1972	362,797.83
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	341,202.17

[1] Includes $835 salary paid under contract approved Feb. 9, 1972, appointed to investigating staff as of Apr. 1, 1972.

[2] Includes payment of $835 to Robert H Anthony, staff assistant—Energy study staff-pursuant to contract approved Feb. 9, 1972.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY

July 12, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee (majority):		
Donald G. Sanders (P)	Chief counsel	$18,000.00
Richard L. Schultz (P)	Associate chief counsel.	14,415.36
William H. Hecht (P)	Executive staff assistant.	15,561.24
Alfred M. Nittle (P)	Legislative counsel	15,658.62
Robert M. Horner (C)	Chief investigator	12,336.00
William G. Shaw (C)	Research director	13,032.00
V. Bernice King (C)	Financial secretary	8,917.92
Mary M. Valente (C)	Administrative secretary.	9,636.60

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Anniel Cunningham (C).	Chief, files and reference.	$9,038.28
Standing committee (minority):		
DeWitt White (P)	Legal counsel	15,658.62
Herbert Romerstein (C).	Chief investigator	15,297.48
James L. Gallagher (C).	Research analyst (to standing May 1, 1972).	4,166.66
Ruth I. Matthews (C)	Clerical (terminated Apr. 31, 1972).	8,440.00
Investigative committee (majority):		
Victoria Appell	Clerk-typist (summer help, appointment May 22, 1972).	585.00
Barbara B. Bagwell	Information classifier (resigned June 12, 1972).	3,085.88
Patricia A. Belback	Stenographer (terminated Apr. 24, 1972).	2,839.70
Margis D. Biggerstaff	Secretary	5,324.34
Charles Bonneville	Investigator	8,390.46
Daniel Butler	Assistant documents clerk.	5,271.48
S. Janice Coil	Secretary	6,047.16
Ruth Ann Crocitto	Information analyst	4,023.48
Susan K. Daniels	do	4,653.66
Florence P. Doyle	Secretary	5,051.52
Elizabeth Edinger	Editor	8,174.46
Daniel Ferry	Assistant counsel	9,791.04
Andrea Foy	Information classifier	3,428.76
Helen M. Gittings	Research analyst	9,405.72
Sheila Harrison	Clerk-typist	3,428.76
Isobel Hurwitz	Information classifier (resigned Mar. 13, 1972).	1,524.77
L. William Ivory, Jr	Assistant documents clerk.	3,263.16
Doris Jaeck	Information analyst	5,335.38
Mildred James	Clerk-typist	3,741.78
Joan Keller	Secretary (resigned Apr. 20, 1972).	3,317.75
John F. Lewis	Coordinating editor	14,538.90
Norma H. Lewis	Secretary (appointed May 29, 1972).	965.16
Virginia Masino	Receptionist	4,481.88
Anito Maggio	Clerk	3,428.76
David E. Muffley, Jr	Documents clerk	5,151.00
Maureen P. Ontrich	Information analyst	4,689.84
Alma T. Pfaff	Research analyst	5,917.62
Peggy Pixley	Editorial clerk	5,335.38
Robert Poos	Research analyst	9,791.04
Stuart Pott	Investigator	6,811.44
Audrey Rollins	Secretary	4,762.20
Karen Sue Russell	Information classifier	3,759.72
Richard A. Shaw	Investigator	9,256.80
Albert H. Solomon, Jr	do	10,594.98
Jeanne L. Spencer	Clerk-stenographer	4,483.74
John N. Stratton	Investigator	8,390.46
Barbara C. Sweeny	Clerk-stenographer	4,167.54
Joseph Thach, Jr	Research analyst	8,440.02
Francis M. Watson, Jr	Research specialist (terminated May 14, 1972).	7,682.67
Investigative committee (minority):		
George C. Armstrong	Investigator	7,648.74
James L. Gallagher	Research analyst (terminated May 1, 1972).	5,781.40
Richard Norusis	Investigator	8,176.26
William T. Poole	Research analyst	7,261.74
Linda Spirt	Secretary	5,794.20

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$1,095,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	541,929.05
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1972	278,795.32
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1972 to June 30, 1972	820,724.37
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	274,275.63

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

July 17, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Clerical staff:		
W. E. Williamson	Clerk	$18,000.00
Kenneth J. Painter	First assistant clerk	15,864.18
Marcella F. Johnson	Assistant clerk	9,890.94
Frank W. Mahon	Printing editor	10,439.28
Eleanor A. Dinkins	Clerical assistant	7,830.24
Hazel J. Collie	Staff assistant	9,845.52
Mary Ryan	Clerical assistant	7,830.18
Edwin E. Thomas	Staff assistant	7,365.60
Marion M. Burson (minority).	do	15,864.18
Lewis E. Berry, Jr. (minority)	Minority counsel	18,000.00
Professional staff:		
James M. Menger	Professional staff member.	18,000.00
William J. Dixon	do	18,000.00
Robert F. Guthrie	do	18,000.00
Kurt Borchardt	do	18,000.00
Charles B. Curtis	do	18,000.00
Additional temporary employees under H. Res 170, 290, and 908:		
A. Bennett Schram	Staff assistant (minority).	10,549.98
Henry Thomas Greene	do	10,549.98
Helen M. Dubino	do	15,401.76
Barbara L. Bullard	Clerical assistant (minority).	6,583.62
Darlene G. McMullen	do	4,255.86
Linda K. Lantz	do	4,654.68
Dennis C. Shumaker	Clerical assistant (through Feb. 15)	980.24
Judith Wood	Clerical assistant (through Apr. 7)	2,700.51
Diane G. K. Cox	Clerical assistant	6,066.24
Joanne E. Bell	Clerical Assistant (from May 1).	1,666.66
Violet M. McCarthy	Clerical assistant	6,812.88
Anne P. Lebbon	do	4,694.76
Joseph T. Kelley	Messenger (from May 30).	620.00
William Charles Barnich.	Clerical assistant (from Mar. 1).	3,333.32
Walter J. Graham, Jr	Staff assistant	13,580.52
Stephan E. Lawton	do	13,580.52
Michael R. Lemov	do	13,580.52
Richard Krolik	Staff assistant (from Feb. 14)	10,336.28
JoAnn Robinson	Staff assistant (from June 6).	694.44
Margaret C. Mazzone	do	500.00
Troy Webb	Staff assistant (from June 1).	600.00
Special Subcommittee on Investigations:		
Daniel J. Manelli	Acting chief counsel	16,879.98
William T. Druhan	Staff assistant	14,865.42
James F. Broder	do	14,242.50
James R. Connor	Special assistant	13,783.92
Benjamin J. Smethurst.	do	14,865.42
Mark J. Raabe	Staff attorney	13,714.98
Michael F. Barrett	do	13,714.98
Michael Parker	do	11,605.02
Albert J. McGrath	Special assistant	7,490.52
Elizabeth G. Paola	Clerical assistant	7,830.18
Elizabeth A. Eastman	do	6,995.64
Judith B. Fisher	do	5,802.48
Russell D. Mosher	Staff assistant	5,526.96
Special securities study group:		
William Hall Painter	Special counsel	18,000.00
Robert L. Stern	Special consultant	14,506.26
Harvey A. Rowen	Staff attorney	10,068.78
Barbara C. Flues	Clerical assistant	5,802.48
Judith Ann Quinn	do	4,747.50
Annette Bouchard	do	4,747.50
Roy A. Schotland	Special consultant (from May 15).	2,300.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$1,474,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	651,002.02
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1972	382,131.60
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1971 to June 30, 1972	1,033,133.62
Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1972	440,866.38

HARLEY O. STAGGERS, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

July 15, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972 inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Bess E. Dick	Staff director	$18,000.00
Benjamin L. Zelenko	General counsel	18,000.00
Herbert Fuchs	Counsel	18,000.00
Garner J. Cline	do	16,382.76
William F. Shattuck	do	16,382.76
Donald G. Benn	Associate counsel	15,825.00
R. Frederick Jett	Counsel	14,935.98
Jerome M. Zeifman	do	15,825.00
Frances Christy	Clerical staff	10,633.56
Jane C. Caldwell	do	9,600.24
Gertrude Clara Burak	do	8,540.64
Carrie Lou Allen	do	8,081.10
Lorraine W. Beland	do	8,081.10
Roberta E. Eisenberg	do	8,081.10
Joanne E. Bell	Clerical staff (through Apr. 30, 1972).	2,551.16
Pearl L. Chellman	Clerical staff	5,275.02
Daniel L. Cohen	Assistant counsel	7,701.65
George A. Dalley	do	9,800.43
Howard C. Eglit	do	10,198.31
Arthur P. Endres, Jr	do	7,526.65
James B. Farr	Messenger-clerk	3,710.49
Mary Shea Gaffney	Clerical staff	5,108.82
Samuel A. Garrison III	Associate counsel	10,022.52
Alma B. Haardt	Clerical staff	6,719.40
Herbert E. Hoffman	Special counsel for Federal Criminal Law Reform.	18,000.00
Alice M. Jackson	Clerical staff	4,483.74
Florence C. Johnson	do	5,151.98
Alfred S. Joseph III	Assistant counsel (through May 31, 1972).	8,132.30
Judith Kahn	Clerical staff	3,976.02
Michael Kelemonick	do	7,087.74
Florence T. McGrady	do	7,087.74
Thomas E. Mooney	Associate counsel	11,077.50
Franklin G. Polk	do	15,825.00
Ruth T. Pratt	Clerical staff	5,802.48
Ann P. Sartori	Clerical staff (from June 5, 1972).	765.55
Mary G. Sourwine	Clerical staff	6,963.00
Annelie Tischbein	do	5,115.84
Louis S. Vance	Messenger-clerk	4,979.22

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$800,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	299,993.18
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972	198,296.91
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1971, to June 30, 1972	498,290.09
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	301,709.91

Funds for preparation of United States Code, District of Columbia Code, and Revision of the Laws

A. Preparation of New Edition of United States Code (no year):	
Unexpended balance Dec. 31, 1971	$132,951.56
Expended Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972	20,159.07
Balance June 30, 1972	112,792.49
B. Preparation of New Edition of District of Columbia Code:	
Unexpended balance Dec. 31, 1971	77,974.52
Expended Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972	14,972.55
Balance June 30, 1972	63,001.97
C. Revision of the Laws, 1972:	
Unexpended balance Dec. 31, 1971	22,560.50
Expended Jan. 1–June 30, 1972	18,000.00
Balance June 30, 1972	4,560.50

EMANUEL CELLER, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

June 30, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Ralph E. Casey	Chief counsel	$18,000.00
Ned P. Everett	Counse	15,917.88
Ernest J. Corrado	do	14,242.50
Leonard L. Sutter	do	13,282.50
Robert J. McElroy	Chief clerk	17,983.14
William B. Winfield	Clerk	11,867.77
Frances P. Still	do	9,672.96
Vera A. Barker	Secretary	9,502.28
Albert J Dennis	Investigator	11,092.47
Richard N. Sharood	Minority counsel	13,731.66
William C. Rountree	do	9,495.00
Virginia L. Noah	Secretary (Minority)	9,255.32
Investigative staff:		
Francis D. Hewyard	Counsel	13,714.98
Alfred Ronald Santo	do	8,813.34
Frank M. Potter, Jr	do	9,000.00
Donald A. Watt	Editor	10,108.98
Lucye L. Summers	Secretary	6,498.36
Jane C. Wojcik	do	7,792.98
Pauline M. Dickerson	do	8,202.66
Eleanor P. Mohler	do	5,894.41
Betty Ann Nevitt	do	5,925.02
Norman M. Barnes	Investigator	5,344.50
Ronald W. C. Watt	Assistant clerk	3,031.23
Ruth I. Hoffman	do	5,758.34
Elizabeth D. Heater	Staff Assistant	1,142.92
James L. Larocca	Clerk, Subcommittee on Panama Canal.	9,000.00
Gwendolyn H. Lockhart	Assistant minority clerk.	1,083.33
Carlton J. Hicks	Assistant clerk	410.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$519,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	194,366.60
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972	$111,940.39
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972	306,306.99
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	212,693.01

EDWARD S. GARMATZ, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

July 17, 1972

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing Committee staff:		
Martiny, John H	Chief Counsel	$18,000.00
Gaughan, Vincent M	Staff director and special counsel	17,500.02
Bray, Bun Benton	Associate staff director	17,749.98
Smiroldo, Victor C	Counsel	71,749.98
Irvine, William A	Assistant staff director	17,749.98
Kazy, Theodore J	Senior staff assistant	17,749.98
Fortune, Francix C	Coordinator	14,716.68
Lockhart, Robert E	Assistant counsel	14,316.67
Thornton, Elsie E	Chief clerk	12,666.79
Wells, Barbara M	Executive secretary	9,149.98
Simons, Blanche M	Secretary	8,679.18
Investigative staff, pursuant to H. Res. 217, 279, and 826 of the 92d Congress:		
Araneta, Louis A	Intern (from June 1)	300.00
Barry, Margaret R	Secretary (minority)	5,500.02
Barton, Richard A	Staff assistant	11,608.75
Bates, Kathryn E	Secretary (minority)	6,542.50
Bethea, Barbara Faye	Secretary	3,337.50
Borger, Deanne L	Secretary (to Jan. 2)	65.28
Bracy, Raymond	Intern (from June 19)	120.00
Brown, Lorraine L	Secretary	5,180.47
Ciaravella, Jo Ann	do	5,234.42
Cleven, Cathy L	Intern (from June 1)	300.00
Coultrap, Ray H	Staff assistant (minority).	7,454.18
Devlin, Ralph J	Staff assistant	14,516.65
Diamond, Elaine L	Secretary	3,977.00
Findley, Thomas W	Staff assistant (to Feb. 29).	1,712.50
Fussell, Glenda J	Secretary	4,066.32
Gabusi, John B	Staff assistant	13,083.40
Gould, George B	do	13,086.02
Gustafson, Tanya	Intern (from June 12)	$190.00
Harding, Delois	Secretary	5,176.90
Hatcherson, Jane W	Secretary (from June 12).	506.67
Hedglon, Peter F	Intern (from June 5)	260.00
Herzog, Andrew F	Intern (Feb. 1 to Feb. 29).	500.00
Howard, Alton M	Printing editor	10,016.65
Hugler, Edward T	Investigator	14,250.00
Kennedy, Thomas R	Staff assistant	12,780.07
Mulholland, James S	Staff Assistant (from Mar. 1).	2,525.00
Meyer, Robert James	Intern (from June 12)	190.00
Moore, Robert M	Intern (from June 26)	68.06
Myers, Lois G	Secretary	6,693.32
Napier, Margaret G	Assistant document clerk.	5,645.85
Neuman, Robert A	Staff assistant	9,379.18
Pendleton, Maria R	Document clerk	8,629.15
Peters, Dorothy L	Secretary	7,424.98
Pierce, Crystal D	Intern (from June 5)	260.00
Raymond, Anthony J	Staff assistant (minority).	12,291.68
Snipes, Justine P	Secretary	7,458.21
Spetka, David R	Intern (from June 5)	260.00
Stoner, Gordon S	Intern (from June 1)	300.00
Thayer, Ted J	Research assistant	7,414.18
Ward, Sara L	Secretary	8,341.67

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$1,056,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	415,759.93
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972	256,178.25
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1972	671,938.18
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	384,061.82

THADDEUS J. DULSKI, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

June 30, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee staff:		
Richard J. Sullivan	Chief counsel	$18,000.00
Lester Edelman	Counsel	16,879.98
Clifton W. Enfield	Minority counsel	18,000.00
Lloyd A. Rivard	Engineer consultant	16,879.98
Carl H. Schwartz, Jr	Consultant—Projects and programs.	7,374.00
James L. Oberstar	Administrator	16,886.34
Dorothy A. Beam	Executive staff assistant.	11,630.34
Meriam R. Buckley	Staff assistant	9,700.20
Sterlyn B. Carroll	do	8,107.68
Erla S. Youmans	Minority executive staff assistant.	9,758.76
Gordon E. Wood	Minority professional staff (June 1, 1972 transferred to investigating staff).	10,034.98
Ruth Costello	Staff assistant (effective Jan. 1, 1972).	7,965.07
Richard C. Peet	Assistant minority counsel (effective June 1, 1972).	2,808.33
Investigating staff:		
Richard C. Peet	Assistant minority counsel (June 1, 1972 transferred to Standing Comm. staff).	13,862.05
Robert F. Spence	Subcommittee clerk	9,103.98
Joseph A. Italiano, Jr	Editorial assistant	9,985.03
Linda L. Williams	Minority staff assistant (terminated May 15, 1972.)	4,431.01
Nancy B. Vitali	Subcommittee clerk	$6,066.24
Peggy Lynn Clements	Staff assistant	6,066.24
Cynthia J. Van Sant	do	4,483.74
Rosemari E. Gaughan	Staff assistant (terminated May 19, 1972).	1,222.04
Toby Stein	Staff assistant	3,951.00
Patricia A. Hill	Minority staff assistant	5,275.02
Richard C. Barnett	do	6,507.66
Brenda C. Jones	do	4,747.50
Robert F. Loftus	Technical staff assistant.	15,297.48
William M. Corcoran	Staff assistant	3,850.00
Marie M. Lynch	Subcommittee clerk	6,435.48
Thomas R. Dougherty	do	9,495.00
Steven H. Bourke	Staff assistant	9,231.24
Elizabeth H. Kiley	do	3,384.79
Machele J. Miller	do	4,219.98
Margaret F. McCarthy	do	4,219.98
Ruth Constandy	Technical consultant	11,605.02
Henry G. Edler	Project coordinator	17,407.50
Pauline L. DeCourcy	Minority staff assistant (effective Apr, 17, 1972).	2,055.55
Catherine A. Evans	Staff assistant (effective May 15, 1972).	1,150.00
Gordon E. Wood	Minority professional staff assistant (effective June 1, 1972).	2,125.00
Paul Sanders Francis	Staff assistant (effective June 1, 1972).	750.00
Alissa Deitz	Staff assistant (effective June 12, 1972).	316.67
Joseph R. Brennan	Consultant	8,400.00
Peter Jutro	do	2,520.00
Max K. Taher	do	3,200.00
F. Robert Edman	do	4,600.00
Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight:		
Walter R. May	Chief counsel	18,000.00
Salvatore J. D'Amico	Associate counsel	15,825.00
John P. O'Hara	do	15,825.00
Carl J. Lorenz, Jr	do	15,825.00
Robert G. Lawrence	do	16,359.81
George M. Kopecky	Chief investigator	17,629.56
Sherman S. Willse	Professional staff member.	15,825.00
Paul R. S. Yates	Professional minority staff member.	15,730.66
Kathryn M. Keeney	Chief clerk	9,336.78
Martha E. Downie	Minority staff assistant	7,121.28
Betty Hay	Administrative assistant.	7,912.50
Shirley R. Knighten	Staff assistant	6,593.76
Carol Dahlstedt	do	6,593.76
William O. Nolen	Investigator	10,549.98
George P. Karseboom	Professional staff member.	14,242.50
Agnes M. Ganun	Staff assistant	6,829.86
Charles A. Krouse	Professional staff member (effective Jan. 10, 1972).	12,825.00
Sheldon Gilbert	Minority counsel (effective Mar. 6, 1972).	9,583.33

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures:	
H. Res. 351	$1,072,670.00
H. Res. 1000	798,890.00
Total	1,871,560.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	705,302.22
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1972, to June 30, 1972	443,293.55
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1971, to June 30, 1972	1,148,595.77
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	722,964.23

JOHN A. BLATNIK, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

July 3, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Laurie C. Battle	Staff director and counsel (P).	$18,000.00
Mary Spencer Forrest	Assistant counsel and research analyst (P).	11,329.98
Winifred L. Watts	Administrative assistant (P).	9,075.00
Jonna Lynne Cullen	Staff assistant (C)	8,500.02
Margaret Anne Budick	Secretary (C)	6,000.00
William D. Crosby, Jr	Minority counsel (P)	9,499.98
Total		62,404.98

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$5,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	724.83
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972	305.61
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972	1,030.44
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	3,969.56

WILLIAM M. COLMER, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

June 30, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
C. F. Ducander	Executive director and chief counsel.	$18,000.00
John A. Carstarphen, Jr.	Chief clerk and counsel	18,000.00
Philip B. Yeager	Counsel	18,000.00
Frank R. Hammill, Jr.	do	18,000.00
James E. Wilson, Jr.	Technical consultant	17,319.72
Carl Swartz	Minority staff	11,868.78
Joseph Del Riego	do	11,605.02
Mary Ann Robert	Secretary	7,575.32
Emily Dodson	do	7,263.36
Carol F. Rogers	do	7,087.74
June C. Stafford	do	7,087.74
Kieran U. Cashman	do	5,864.64
Theresa M. Gallo	do	5,011.26
Investigative staff (H. Res. 247 and 824):		
Richard P. Hines	Staff consultant	17,319.72
Harold A. Gould	Technical consultant	17,319.72
Philip P. Dickinson	do	15,015.42
W. H. Boone	do	18,000.00
William G. Wells, Jr	do	14,581.97
J. Thomas Ratchford	Science consultant	15,712.26
John D. Holmfeld	Science policy consultant.	12,660.00
Frank J. Giroux	Printing clerk	9,237.78
Elizabeth S. Kernan	Scientific research assistant.	8,521.92
Martha N. Rees	Secretary	6,783.84
Denis C. Quigley	Publications clerk	7,495.68
Patricia J. Schwartz	Secretary	5,225.88
Barbara Jackson	Secretary (to Jan. 31, 1972).	838.91
A. Patrick Nucciarone	Assistant publications clerk.	2,532.00

Funds authoriaed or appropriated for committee expenditures	790,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	329,585.48
Amount expended from Dec. 31, 1971, to June 30, 1972	182,330.96
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1971, to June 30, 1972	511,916.44
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	278,083.56

GEORGE P. MILLER, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

July 1, 1972

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John M. Swanner	Staff Director	$18,000.00
Bennett Wolfe	Assistant staff director	15,855.30
Robert G. Ailett	Senior staff member	17,937.30
Mariann R. Mackenzie	Secretary	10,549.98
Tempie W. Whittington	Assistant clerk	5,157.80
John A. Lauder	Clerk Feb. 14 through June 30, 1972.	3,283.33

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 236; Mar. 23, 1971)	$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	564.65
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972	781.35
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1972	1,346.00
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	23,654.00

MELVIN PRICE, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

July 14, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee:		
Oliver E. Meadows	Staff director	$18,000.00
John R. Holden	Professional staff (minority).	16,347.00
Donald C. Knapp	Counsel	18,000.00
Billy E. Kirby	Professional aide	16,347.00
George W. Fisher	Clerk	18,000.00
Helen A. Biondi	Assistant clerk	11,439.42
Alice V. Matthews	Clerk-stenographer	7,895.22
Morvie Ann Colby	do	7,672.20
Marjorie J. Kidd	do	7,337.70
Arthur M. Gottschalk	Professional aide (minority).	11,077.50
Patricia J. Wilton	Clerk-stenographer (minority).	5,782.50
Investigative staff:		
Philip E. Howard	Investigator	16,239.72
Audrey A. Powelson	Clerk-stenographer	5,782.50
Candis L. Graves	do	4,735.08
Vance L. Gilliam	Records clerk	4,572.30
Ralph M. Waugh	Clerk-messenger (from June 12, 1972).	369.44
Rita W. Schwall	Clerk-stenographer	3,210.38
Jomes A. Hight	Clerk-messenger (from June 19, 1972).	233.33

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$260,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	109,094.57
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1972	53,958.11
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1971 to June 30, 1972	163,052.68
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	96,947.32

OLIN E. TEAGUE, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

June 30, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John M. Martin, Jr	Chief counsel (P)	$18,000.00
Richard C. Wilbur	Minority counsel (P)	18,000.00
John Patrick Baker	Assistant chief counsel (P).	17,749.98
Robert B. Hill	Professional staff (P)	12,454.26
William Kane	do	16,604.28
James W. Kelley	do	17,394.30
Harold T. Lamar	do	17,394.30
A. L. Singleton, Jr	do	15,371.04
Florence Burkett	Staff assistant (C)	7,801.74
Virginia Butler	do	9,273.48
William C. Byrd	Staff assistant (C) to Feb. 14.	1,537.67
Marie Crane	Staff assistant (C)	7,384.98
Mary Clare Fitzgerald	do	5,532.66
William Fullerton	do	17,394.30
Charles Hawkins	do	17,749.98
Grace Kagan	do	9,273.48
June Kendall	do	10,805.82
Eunice Leigh	Staff assistant (C) from Jan. 20.	4,472.20
Elizabeth Lieblich	Staff assistant (C)	4,114.50
Doris J. Parker	Staff assistant (C) from June 15.	391.04
Jean Ratliff	Staff assistant (C)	5,409.54
Gloria Shaver	do	8,983.88
Eileen Sonnett	Staff assistant (C) to June 15.	7,151.43
Danna Thomas	Staff assistant (C)	4,879.38
Judith VanDerSchaaf	do	5,412.18
Carole Vazis	do	6,434.58
Kaye Anne Weinstein	do	5,891.10
Hughlon Greene	Document clerk (C)	7,801.74
Walter B. Little	do	7,801.74

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$75,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	10,508.74
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1972	7,204.91
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1971, to June 30, 1972	17,713.65
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	57,286.35

W. D. MILLS, Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME

July 31, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Mildred Irene Appleby	Secretary	$4,472.15
Avanell K. Bass	Office manager (from June 1, 1972).	1,250.00
Livio A. Beccaccio	Investigator	10,549.98
Leroy C. Bedell, Jr	do	9,139.57
Barry Stuart Berger	Assistant counsel (from June 1, 1972).	1,833.33
Michael William Blommer.	Associate chief counsel	14,083.47
Jack Ross Blumenfeld	Special counsel (from May 15, 1972).	2,300.00
Mary R. Boysen	Secretary to associate counsel.	6,171.78
Marian Canty	Secretary to the chairman.	6,752.92
Frederick B. Collison	Investigator	7,593.37
Martha A. Cook	Secretary	4,747.50
James P. Donovan	Investigator	10,549.98
Elsworth D. Dory	do	9,139.57
Miriam E. Douglass	Secretary	5,275.02
Mary Faye Downey	do	4,483.74
Lina Mabel Duran	do	6,593.76
Hazel K. Edwards	Secretary to associate chief counsel (to Feb. 6, 1972).	1,200.00
Patti Lu Englander	Research assistant (from June 15, 1972).	213.33
Mary M. Goulart	Finance officer	7,912.50
Evelyn Savage Grey	Researcher	6,066.24
Raphael J. Madden	Research assistant	3,920.94
Robert E. McKenna	Investigator	10,549.98
Helen Joyce Morse	Secretary (to Jan. 19, 1972).	395.83
H. Christopher Nolde	Associate counsel	13,565.47

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
N. Ross Otters	Investigator	$10,549.98
Michael Don Petit	Press officer	10,549.98
Joseph A. Phillips	Chief counsel	18,000.00
Andrew Radding	Assistant counsel	8,484.30
Pauline B. Reeping	Secretary to chief counsel.	6,749.37
Theresa A. Sbarra	Secretary	4,206.27
Wade Carter Scaggs	Research assistant (from May 1 to May 31, 1972).	325.00
Margaret M. Schauer	Research assistant	6,066.24
Betty B. Seal	Secretary to associate chief counsel (from Feb. 23, 1972).	3,555.54
Thomas K. Sullivan	Investigator	10,549.98

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$1,145,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	448,475.73
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972	296,900.24
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1971 to June 30, 1972	745,375.97
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	399,624.03

SELECT COMMITTEE ON HOUSE RESTAURANT

July 14, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Thomas J. Campbell	Staff director	$10,072.61
Patricia S. Putnins	Secretary	3,965.75

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$44,141.98
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30	14,211.49
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30	14,211.49
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	29,930.49

JOHN C, KLUCZYNSKI. Chairman.

PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

July 14, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Emilia E. Parrish	Secretary	$6,349.98
Brenda H. Napier	do	2,997.24
William A. Keel, Jr.	Research analyst	18,000.00
Myrtle Ruth Foutch	Clerk	10,002.00
Donna M. Watson	Secretary	4,725.00
Henry A. Robinson	Counsel	16,750.02
Don M. Parkinson	Staff assistant	300.00
Leslie R. Pennington	Printing editor	9,900.00
Thomas G. Powers	Counsel	7,375.02
Ralph W. Emerson	Investigator	12,000.00
Justinus Gould	Counsel	16,500.00
Donald B. Roe	do	9,900.00
Mary Eileen Owens	Secretary	3,499.98
Howard Greenberg	Staff director	18,000.00
Linda W. Kinkead	Secretary	6,349.98
Valerie Ayres	Secretary	$2,600.00
Millard V. Oakley	General counsel	18,000.00
John K. Rayburn	Counsel	11,500.02
Charles E. O'Connor	do	4,937.49
Christine Stewart	Secretary	4,125.00
Dorothy M. Jordan	do	616.67
Linda Louise Spakes	do	4,999.98
Mary Biddle Dick	Secretary, minority	3,862.50
Willa C. Rawls	do	4,750.02
Bernadette O. Romanesk	do	5,550.00
James R. Phalen	Assistant minority counsel.	11,050.02
John M. Finn	Minority counsel	12,100.02

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$928,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	417,719.39
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1972	241,183.99
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1971 to June 30, 1972	658,903.38
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	269,096.62

JOE L. EVINS, M.C., Chairman.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS

July 7, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Eugene F. Peters	Executive director	$18,000.00
Raymond L. Gooch	Counsel	14,500.02
Cynthia K. Watkins	Administrative clerk	5,616.65
Donald G. Tacheron	Director of research	16,875.00
George Meader	Counsel	11,172.00
Ann Holoka	Research assistant	5,625.00
Nancy Carole Pennington	Clerk	3,083.33
Judith A. Gandy	do	2,569.43
Thomas R. White, III	do	2,000.00
Xavier Louis Suarez	do	1,500.00
David Hugh Green	do	1,000.00
Robert J. Kelley	Administrative officer	8,481.68
James F. McAllister	do	14,043.75
Gerard C. Snow	Clerk	3,875.01
Lynn Gayle Zeltner	do	3,583.33
James S. Machowski	do	3,624.99
Molly McKnight Hughes	do	3,173.60
Dianne Spiegel	do	3,381.94
Dennis Frank Burkhart	do	2,644.43
Denise Ann West	do	583.33
Terrell Martin Tannen	do	175.00
John Winston Heron	do	175.00
Elena Tabet	do	20.83
Mary E. Bernard	do	291.67

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$425,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	90,070.13
Amount expended from January 1972 to June 1972	138,389.13
Total amount expended July 1971 to June 1972	228,459.26
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	196,540.74

JACK BROOKS, Chairman.

JULY 11, 1972.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Harold J. Warren	Staff director and counsel.	$16,382.76
Charles S. Brewton	General counsel	16,096.62
Cary H. Copeland	Assistant staff director	12,268.98
George T. Ault	Professional staff member.	11,153.70
Mattie I. Echols	Secretary	5,773.38
John R. Hall	Staff assistant	527.50
Helen O. McDaniel	Clerk assistant	616.67
Stephen J. Caudle	Staff assistant	1,500.00
Billy Henry Thompson	Professional staff member.	1,500.00
Adrienne Hampton	Clerk	750.00
Olivia S. Mitchell	do	750.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$136,580.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	61,631.53
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972	67,809.52
Total amount expended from July 1 to June 30, 1972	129,441.05
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	7,138.95

WRIGHT PATMAN, Chairman.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

July 15, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employer	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Laurence N. Woodworth	Chief of staff	$19,999.98
Lincoln Arnold	Deputy chief of staff	18,000.00
Dennis P. Bedell	Assistant chief of staff (through Jan. 31, 1972).	2,982.17
Arthur Fefferman	Chief economist	18,000.00
Nicholas A. Tomasulo	Legislation counsel	17,745.48
Herbert L. Chabot	Assistant legislation counsel.	15,749.98
Robert R. Smyers	Refund counsel (through Feb. 29, 1972).	5,912.16
James H. Symons	Statistical analyst	17,250.00
John Germanis	do	14,100.00
Meade Emory	Legislation attorney	15,499.98
Albert Buckberg	Economist	14,933.35
Michael D. Bird	do	14,975.02
Harrison B. McCawley	Refund counsel	13,750.02
Bernard M. Shapiro	Legislation attorney	13,708.33
Joseph P. Spellman	do	10,827.00
Harold Dubroff	do	11,749.98
Donald C. Evans, Jr	do	11,189.58
Anastasia Connaughton	Statistical clerk	11,020.02
Joseph E. Fink	do	11,020.02
James E. Wheeler	Accountant	10,022.48
Leon W. Klud	Economist	10,083.35
Carl E. Bates	Refund attorney	10,508.24
Mark L. McConaghy	Legislation attorney (as of Feb. 1, 1972).	8,515.01
Howard J. Silverstone	Legislation attorney (as of Apr. 3, 1972).	6,055.58
Robert A. Warden	Legislation attorney (as of Apr. 17, 1972).	5,638.53
Joanne McDermott	Secretary	8,535.83
Linda Savage	do	6,726.65
Blanche Nagro	Secretary (refund)	6,561.27
Mary W. Gattie	Secretary (through Jan. 31, 1972).	1,099.00
Jamie L. Daley	Secretary	6,040.42
June Matthews	do	5,557.52
Amelia Del Carmen	do	5,452.90
Marcia B. Rowzie	do	5,527.90
Sharon Malcom	Secretary (refund)	4,344.18
Jacqueline S. Pfeiffer	Secretary	5,712.08
Ellen I. Woodriff	Secretary (as of Feb. 1, 1972).	3,791.67
Helen Strosnider	Secretary (through Mar. 31, 1972).	3,165.00

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Elaine Stairs	Secretary (as of Apr. 6, 1972).	$3,219.4
Jill Holmes	Secretary (Mar. 1, to May 15, 1972).	1,875.00
Ann Stewart	Secretary (as of June 12, 1972).	570.00
Katherine Keller	do	274.44
Richard Eigenbrode	Clerk (as of May 22, 1972).	520.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$779,700.70
Amount of expenditures previously reported (July 1, 1971 to Jan. 1, 1972)	360,316.91
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to July 1, 1972	385,574.79
Total amount expended from July 1, 1971 to July 1, 1972	745,891.70
Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1972	33,878.30

RUSSELL B. LONG, Chairman.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES, 1972

July 15, 1972.

(Pursuant to H. Res. 907, 92d Congress)

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from February 28, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John Warren McGarry	Chief counsel	$12,000.00
Patricia A. Potope	Secretary	1,336.00
Carmen Galvan Loomis	Stenographer	340.00
Daniel G. Meckley, IV	do	1,540.00
Joyce A. Gustavson	Staff assistant	906.67

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$185,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	00.00
Amount expended from Feb. 28, to June 30, 1972	29,221.03
Total amount expended from Feb. 28 to June 30, 1972	29,221.03
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	155,778.96

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr. Chairman.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2219. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting a report of transfers of amounts appropriated to the Department of Defense under the authority granted to the Secretary of Defense by section 736 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1972; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2220. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a report on the number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army and detailed to the Army General Staff on June 30, 1972, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 3031(c); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2221. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the promotion of officers of the Navy and Marine Corps who are in a missing status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2222. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report of Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July 1971 to May 1972, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2223. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting volume II of the SBA's Annual Report for 1971, containing statistical information required by law; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2224. A letter from the Chairman, National Commission on State Workmen's Compensation Laws; transmitting the report of the Commission, pursuant to the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2225. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to ratify certain payments made by the United States under the Federal Airport Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2226. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the Annual Report of the Department of Justice for fiscal year 1971; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2227. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 215, title 18, United States Code, Receipt of Commissions or Gifts for Procuring Loans, to expand the institutions covered; to encompass indirect payments to bank officials; to make violation of the section a felony; and to specifically include offerors and givers of the proscribed payments; and for other related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2228. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens found admissible to the United States, pursuant to section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2229. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of certain aliens, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 212(d)(6) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2230. A letter from the Director, National Development and Finance, Boys' Clubs of America, transmitting the annual report and audit of Boys' Clubs of America, pursuant to section 17 of Public Law 988 (84th Congress); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2231. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on problems associated with reimbursements to hospitals for services furnished under the medicare program; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2232. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the sizable amounts due to the Government by institutions that terminated their participation in the medicare program; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2233. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the importance of testing and evaluation in the acquisition process for major weapon systems; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 16071. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965; with amendment (Rept. No. 92–1311). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 7211. A bill to establish public land use policy, to establish guidelines for its administration, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 92–1306). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRASER: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 1268. Joint Resolution calling for an immediate and appropriate moratorium on the killing of polar bears (Rept. No. 92–1307). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRASER: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Senate Joint Resolution 182. Joint Resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign nations to participate in Farmfest—U.S.A. and the World Ploughing Contest in September 1972 (Rept. No. 92–1308). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRASER: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 1257. Joint resolution to authorize an appropriation for the annual contributions by the United States for the support of the International Agency for Research on Cancer (Rept. No. 92–1309). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 15586. (Rept. No. 92–1310). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. McFALL: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 15097. (Rept. No. 92–1312). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. ABZUG:

H.R. 16210. A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to extend the act to State and local governments; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 16211. A bill to provide for civil and criminal actions to prevent or restrain physical or economic intimidation of individuals engaged in voting or activities related to voting; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16212. A bill to amend title XVII of

the Social Security Act to provide financial assistance to individuals suffering from chronic kidney disease who are unable to pay the costs of necessary treatment, and to authorize project grants to increase the availability and effectiveness of such treatment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. FULTON, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. NIX, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 16213. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to enable units of general local government to increase the numbers of police; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 16214. A bill to provide for the suspension of air transportation between the United States and foreign countries in cases of international aircraft hijacking; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAREY of New York (for himself, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. COTTER, Mr. MINISH, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. FISH, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. NIX, and Mr. KOCH):

H.R. 16215. A bill to provide payments to States for public elementary and secondary education and to allow a credit against the individual income tax for tuition paid for the elementary or secondary education of depedents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H.R. 16216. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to restore the system of recomputation of retired pay for certain members and former members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 16217. A bill to authorize grants to the Deganawidah-Quetzalcoatl University; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California (for himself, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BELL, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DOW, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. MIKVA):

H.R. 16218. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to enable the Federal criminal justice system to deal more effectively with the problem of narcotic addiction, to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to enable the State and municipalities to deal more effectively with that problem, and for other related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California (for himself, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REES, and Mr. SARBANES):

H.R. 16219. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to enable the Federal criminal justice system to deal more effectively with the problem of narcotic addiction, to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to enable the States and municipalities to deal more effectively with that problem, and for other related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 16220. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code (respecting firearms) to penalize the use of firearms in the commission of any felony and to increase the penalties in certain related existing provisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD (for himself and Mr. KUYKENDALL):

H.R. 16221. A bill to provide for the sale of the Washington National and Dulles International Airports; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 16222. A bill to provide additional readjustment assistance to veterans by providing improved job counseling, training, and placement service for veterans; by providing an employment preference for disabled veterans and veterans of the Vietnam era under contracts entered into by departments and agencies of the Federal Government for the procurement of goods and services; by providing for an action program within the departments and agencies of the Federal Government for the employment of disabled veterans and veterans of the Vietnam era; by providing a minimum amount that may be paid to ex-servicemen under the unemployment compensation law; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 16223. A bill to encourage and support the dissemination of news, opinion, scientific, cultural, and educational matter through the mails; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. KEITH, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. PIKE, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. VAN DEERLIN):

H.R. 16224. A bill to provide compensation to U.S. commercial fishing vessel owners for damages incurred by them as a result of an action of a vessel operated by a foreign government or citizen of a foreign government; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 16225. A bill to protect the constitutional rights of citizens of the United States and to prevent unwarranted invasions of privacy by prescribing procedures and standards governing the disclosure of information to Government agencies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 16226. A bill to permit the U.S. flag to be displayed for 24 hours of each day at the grave of Francis Bellamy and at the site of Fort Stanwix; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 16227. A bill to insure orderly congressional review of tax preferences and other items which narrow the income tax base; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI (for himself and Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 16228. A bill to provide reimbursement to State accounts in the Unemployment Trust Fund for extraordinary unemployment compensation outlays resulting from the effects of hurricane and tropical storm Agnes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 16229. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a temporary 20-percent increase in annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H.J. Res. 1274. Joint resolution designating October 8–14, 1972 as Newspaper Week and October 14 as Newspaper Carrier Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECKHARDT:

H.J. Res. 1275. Joint resolution to provide for the continued operation of the transportation properties owned or operated by Penn Central Transportation Co., to protect the security interest of the United States in such properties and to provide for the payment of just and reasonable compensation therefor; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.J. Res. 1276. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution changing certain requirements for membership in the Houses of Congress and service as President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H. Con. Res. 676. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to an international conference on air piracy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEE:

H. Con. Res. 677. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the withdrawal of all American Forces from Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEMP:

H. Con. Res. 678. Concurrent resolution designating October 6 of each year as German-American Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN (for himself and Mr. FUQUA):

H. Con. Res. 679. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of additional copies of the report of the Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. NIX:

H. Res. 1083. Resolution to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

413. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to parental responsibility in the Federal food stamp program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. PIRNIE introduced a bill (H.R. 16230) relating to the date on which the Glove Manufacturers Pension Trust is deemed to have qualified for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.