

Wednesday to file its report on S. 2483, the Metric Conversion Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, may we have order in the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENTSEN). The Senate will be in order. The Senator from West Virginia may proceed.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

PROGRAM

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

The Senate will convene at 10 a.m. tomorrow. After the two leaders have been recognized under the standing order, the distinguished Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss) will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes; after which the distinguished junior Senator from California (Mr. TUNNEY) will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes; after which there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 15 minutes with statements therein limited to 3 minutes; at the conclusion of which the Chair will lay before the Senate the unfinished business, Senate Joint Resolution 241, a joint resolution authorizing the President to approve an interim agreement between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

No agreements have been reached with

respect to time thereon or with respect to time on any amendment thereto.

At no later than 2 p.m. under the prior order, the distinguished majority leader or his designee will call up H.R. 14896, the National School Lunch Act, on which there is a time agreement allowing 1½ hours on the bill, the time to be equally divided; 40 minutes on amendments in the first degree, the time to be equally divided; and 30 minutes on amendments in the second degree, the time to be equally divided.

Yea-and-nay votes will occur. We understand that at least five proposed amendments to the bill will be called up, each of which will very likely require a yea-and-nay vote.

Following the disposition of H.R. 14896, the National School Lunch Act on tomorrow, the Senate will resume the consideration of the unfinished business (S.J. Res. 241), the interim agreement, or will go to other business. In either case, yea-and-nay votes may occur.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 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 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 5:14 p.m. the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 16, 1972, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 15, 1972:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Frank T. Bow, of Ohio, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Panama.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Caldwell, John.

The following-named temporary disability retired officer for reappointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Gebser, Clarence U., XXXX USMC.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, August 15, 1972:

INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

James R. Schlesinger, of Virginia, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the Sixteenth Session of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The following-named persons to be Alternate Representatives of the United States of America to the Sixteenth Session of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency:

William O. Doub, of Maryland.

T. Keith Glennan, of Virginia.

Robert H. McBride, of New Hampshire.

Dwight J. Porter, of Nebraska.

James T. Ramey, of Illinois.

Herman Pollack, of Maryland.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, August 15, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Wallace Chappell, McKendree United Methodist Church, Nashville, Tenn., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, we are in Thy presence, conscious of the divisions that separate us: color, background, creed, party; yet we want to be made more conscious of those dedications that unite us: commitment to God, service to country, peace for humanity.

We want to be so aware of these lasting likenesses that the dedications will surpass the divisions, thus allowing us to contribute significantly to the brotherhood of our Nation and the freedom of our world. And this we pray in the name of Him who gave Himself for us all. 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.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were com-

municated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on August 10, 1972, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 489. An act to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior cancelling irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Modoc Point unit of the Klamath Indian irrigation project, Oregon.

H.R. 1682. An act to provide for deferment of construction charges payable by Westlands Water District attributable to lands of the Naval Air Station, Lemoore, Calif., included in said district, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5721. An act pertaining to the inheritance of enrolled members of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Spring Reservation of Oregon;

H.R. 6745. An act to amend section 122 of title 28 of the United States Code to transfer certain counties of the central division of the judicial district of South Dakota;

H.R. 11350. An act to increase the limit on dues for U.S. membership in the International Criminal Police Organization;

H.R. 12979. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to authorize the recall of retired commissioners of the U.S. Court of Claims for temporary assignments;

H.R. 13435. An act to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Upper Colorado River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior;

H.R. 14108. An act to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15418. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and re-

lated agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 3524. An act to extend the provisions of the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1964, as amended.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 92-352, appointed the following to the Commission on the Organization of the Government for the Conduct of Foreign Policy: Mr. SPONG and Mr. PEARSON, as members on the part of the Senate; and Mrs. Charles Engelhard and Mr. Frank C. P. McGinn, as members from private life.

TRIBUTE TO REV. WALLACE CHAPPELL

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

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and honor that the House today opened its business session with a prayer by one of Nashville's most distinguished clergymen, Rev. Wallace Chap-

pell. Rev. Wallace Chappell is a pastor and noted author who is serving at McKendree Methodist Church in Nashville. He has been serving the needs of our community for approximately 13 years. During all of this time it has been my pleasure to have Reverend Chappell as my friend.

Reverend Chappell's family has been involved in bringing the gospel to the people for much longer than this period of time. His uncle, Rev. Clovis Chappell, served at Washington's Mount Vernon Methodist Church in the 1920's while also devoting time to the authoring of 36 books. Following this training, Rev. Wallace Chappell has written six books of his own, the best known of which is "Who Jesus Says You Are."

INTRODUCING A RESOLUTION ON STAFF APPOINTMENTS

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

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about an internal problem in the House which may be the cause of some inconvenience today.

On the House Foreign Affairs Committee I serve as chairman of one of the subcommittees. An excellent staff member on my recommendation was hired by the committee to work with the subcommittee.

Toward the end of July our colleague from Ohio, Mr. HAYS, as chairman of the House Administration Committee, deleted the name of this staff member when certifying the payroll for the House of Representatives for payment for the month of July.

Chairman Hays was apparently bothered by some of the work of the staff member. Specifically, the staff member had contacted another Member of the House to see if he wished to testify or submit a statement on behalf of a bill of which I was a sponsor and which was before a subcommittee which Mr. HAYS chairs and on which I serve. Mr. HAYS apparently regarded this action as an unwarranted interference with his subcommittee.

Neither the House Administration Committee nor the Foreign Affairs Committee authorized Chairman HAYS to strike the name.

Two and one-half weeks have gone by without remedial action. Since the House will recess on Friday I am compelled to seek relief.

I am filing today a resolution for consideration by the Committee on Rules. A copy will appear at the end of my statement. You will note that the resolution deals also with the matter of appointments by the Speaker. I have not consulted with the Speaker on the provision, but include it because an equally serious problem—as I am informed—exists in the case of certain appointments he has submitted.

I apologize for the inconvenience which will occur in order to press for action on this matter. However, I am sure you would wish to protect your own employ-

ees from arbitrary action just as I seek to do.

Mr. Speaker, I will include a copy of the resolution in the Extensions of Remarks section for the information of the Members.

THE TERMS OF SURRENDER TO BARBARIC AGGRESSION

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, we have had reports in the past few days about envoys to Hanoi coming back and pronouncing they have found a solution to the war in Vietnam. Judging from the source of these reports and the nature of the terms offered, what they are really telling the American people is that we can surrender today on the same terms we could have surrendered 4 years ago.

Frankly, I do not expect us to surrender today, and I do not expect to surrender anytime in the future.

If these people want to do the United States a favor, they can advise their comrades in North Vietnam to withdraw their troops from South Vietnam and stop their barbaric aggression.

PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE GEORGE MCGOVERN HAS ANSWERING TO DO TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, presidential candidate GEORGE MCGOVERN has some answering to do to the American people concerning North Vietnam, Ramsey Clark, and Jane Fonda's attempts to use American POW's to influence the election of the President. Specifically, he needs to personally state whether he or any of his campaign staff gave instructions to actress Jane Fonda prior to or after her trip to North Vietnam in which she engaged in propaganda broadcasts directed at American service personnel. Also, he needs to state whether or not his staff had contact with or gave instructions to Ramsey Clark prior to or after his visit to North Vietnam as part of an international Communist propaganda committee termed, "International Committee To Investigate U.S. War Crimes in Indochina."

The sequence of events is more than accidental. First, Jane Fonda in Paris said that if President Nixon were re-elected, the POW's feared they would never be released. Then Ramsey Clark stated that should GEORGE MCGOVERN be elected the POW's would be released on Inauguration Day.

I am astounded that neither of these so-called Americans would denounce the North Vietnamese for their refusal to comply with the provisions of the Geneva Convention or even approach the subject with them. Instead, they spouted a propaganda line soothing to the North Vietnamese and designed to promote the

candidacy of GEORGE MCGOVERN for President.

The people of America have a right to have GEORGE MCGOVERN speak out as to whether his Senate or campaign staff counseled or advised either Fonda or Clark in this connection in an effort to help him in his political campaign.

REMARKS BY FORMER ATTORNEY GENERAL RAMSEY CLARK

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, Ramsey Clark, the former Attorney General of the United States of America, has returned from Hanoi, and he is again projecting the Communist line. It seems so strange to me that Mr. Clark is unable to address himself to the predicament of the people of South Vietnam and the atrocities that are being reported that have been committed by the North Vietnamese army, the invaders of South Vietnam.

He makes great issue about some holes in a dike, but makes no reference to the fact that the dikes are the main platforms of support for the North Vietnam artillery that has been shelling Hue and other cities of South Vietnam, causing considerable casualties among refugees and the civilian population there.

After hearing what Mr. Clark had to say last night, there is no wonder in my mind as to why the Justice Department under Ramsey Clark had such a dismal record. Hanoi should bestow the title of "propagandist minister without portfolio" upon Clark.

INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION ON THE ENVIRONMENT—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 Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with Public Law 91-269, I wish to inform the Congress today of current plans for the six-month International Exposition on the Environment to be held in Spokane, Washington in 1974.

This exposition will be a particularly welcomed event in America. The Spokane exposition and the 1976 Winter Olympics are now the only internationally recognized events scheduled for this country during our Bicentennial Era. In addition to stimulating trade and cultural exchanges, the exposition through its theme—"How Man Can Live, Work, and Play in Harmony with His Environment"—will also focus fresh attention on one of the most pressing concerns of our time.

In November 1970, Expo '74, the non-profit corporation which is sponsoring the exposition and is responsible for its planning and operation, applied for Fed-

eral recognition of the exposition under the provisions of Public Law 91-269. After reviewing the plans of the sponsor, the Secretary of Commerce submitted to me the detailed report required under Section 2(a)(1) of Public Law 91-269 and recommended Federal recognition. A copy of the Secretary's report is transmitted herewith. In this report the Secretary indicated that the sponsor had fulfilled all of the requirements of that law and the regulations issued thereunder (15 CFR § 667).

The Secretary concluded that the environmental theme of the exposition was relevant to current national concerns and was appropriate to the exposition site. He also determined that the sponsors had obtained from the State of Washington, the local governments involved, business, and civic leaders of the region and others the financial and other support necessary to assure the successful development of the exposition.

The Secretary of State also reported under Section 2(a)(2) of Public Law 91-269 that the event qualified for registration by the Bureau of International Expositions as a Special Category event.

Based on these favorable reports, I advised the Secretaries of State and Commerce on October 15, 1971, that the exposition warranted Federal recognition as provided by statute. I also indicated that it was my intention to extend this Administration's fullest possible support to foster a successful event.

On November 24, 1971, upon request of the United States, the Bureau of International Expositions in Paris officially recognized the event as a Special Category exposition and approved its General Rules and Regulations by unanimous vote. At its meeting on May 16, 1972, the Bureau also established procedures for sanctioning the special rules and regulations for the exposition.

On January 31, 1972, I issued a proclamation directing the Secretary of State to invite such foreign countries as he may consider appropriate to participate in this event. The Secretary issued those invitations through diplomatic channels on February 15, 1972. Thus far, Canada, the USSR, and Iran have accepted—and many other countries are now expected to accept. In that proclamation, I also indicated that I planned to appoint a United States Commissioner General to exercise the responsibility of the United States Government for fulfillment of the Convention Relating to International Expositions of November 22, 1928, as modified. Pending this appointment, I am designating the Secretary of Commerce to serve in that capacity on an acting basis. In addition, the Secretary is currently preparing a plan for Federal participation under Section 3 of Public Law 91-269, which I will transmit to the Congress at some later date.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 15, 1972.

CXVIII—1780—Part 22

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. 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. 322]

Abourezk	Hagan	Powell
Abzug	Hastings	Railsback
Ashley	Hébert	Rarick
Baker	Heckler, Mass.	Rhodes
Barrett	Hosmer	Rooney, N.Y.
Betts	Hull	Ruppe
Brasco	Keith	Ryan
Carter	Kemp	St Germain
Chamberlain	Landrum	Scheuer
Clancy	Leggett	Schmitz
Clark	Lennon	Scott
Clay	Lent	Staggers
Conte	Long, La.	Stephens
Davis, Wis.	McCloskey	Sullivan
Dowdy	McDade	Talcott
Dwyer	McDonald,	Teague, Calif.
Edmondson	Mich.	Teague, Tex.
Edwards, Ala.	McEwen	Thompson, N.J.
Ford,	McKevitt	Ullman
William D.	McMillan	Veysey
Frelinghuysen	Michel	Waldie
Gallagher	Passman	Whalen
Gray	Pelly	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 366 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Without objection, further proceedings under the call will be dispensed with.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I do object to dispensing with further proceedings under the rollcall.

The SPEAKER. The question is on dispensing with further proceedings under the call.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes had it.

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair will remind the gentleman that the House has just established a quorum and there has been no intervening business. There is a quorum present. Under the call of the House a quorum is present.

The Clerk will read a message from the President.

FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-342)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to Public Law 89-794, I have the honor to transmit herewith the Fifth Annual Report of the National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 15, 1972.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

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

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. YATES. 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. 323]

Abzug	Frelinghuysen	Moorhead
Addabbo	Gallagher	Murphy, N.Y.
Anderson, Ill.	Hagan	Passman
Archer	Hanna	Pelly
Ashley	Hansen, Wash.	Rarick
Baker	Hastings	Rees
Betts	Hébert	Rhodes
Blackburn	Heckler, Mass.	Rooney, N.Y.
Blanton	Hull	Ruth
Brasco	Jacobs	Ryan
Carter	Karsh	St Germain
Chamberlain	Keith	Scheuer
Clancy	Kemp	Schmitz
Clark	Landrum	Smith, Calif.
Clay	Leggett	Stanton,
Conte	Lennon	J. William
Davis, Wis.	Lent	Stuckey
Delaney	Long, La.	Symington
Dingell	McCloskey	Teague, Tex.
Dowdy	McDonald,	Ullman
Dwyer	Mich.	Veysey
Edmondson	McMillan	Waldie
Edwards, Ala.	Mailliard	Wilson,
Ford,	Michel	Charles H.
William D.	Montgomery	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 362 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BOLAND

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 15580, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE AND FIREMEN'S SALARY ACT

Mr. CABELL, on behalf of Mr. McMILLAN, filed the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 15580) (to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to increase salaries, and for other purposes):

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 92-1340)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the

amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15580) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to increase salaries, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SALARY SCHEDULE

"Salary class and title	Service step—								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Class 1: Fire private, police private.....	\$10,000	\$10,300	\$10,800	\$11,300	\$12,100	\$12,900	\$13,400	\$13,900	\$14,400
Class 2: Fire inspector.....	11,400	12,100	12,800	13,500	14,200	14,900	15,600		
Class 3: Detective, assistant pilot, assistant marine engineer.....	12,500	13,125	13,750	14,375	15,000	15,625	16,250		
Class 4: Fire sergeant, police sergeant, detective sergeant.....	13,580	14,260	14,940	15,620	16,300	16,980			
Class 5: Fire lieutenant, police lieutenant.....	15,700	16,485	17,270	18,055	18,840				
Class 6: Marine engineer, pilot.....	17,150	18,005	18,860	19,715					
Class 7: Fire captain, police captain.....	18,600	19,530	20,460	21,390					
Class 8: Battalion fire chief, police inspector.....	21,560	22,640	23,720	24,800					
Class 9: Deputy fire chief, deputy chief of police.....	25,300	27,015	28,730	30,445					
Class 10: Assistant chief of police, assistant fire chief, commanding officer of the Executive Protective Service, commanding officer of the U.S. Park Police.....	30,000	32,000	34,000						
Class 11: Fire chief, chief of police.....	34,700	36,800							

SEC. 102. Section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-823) is amended (1) by striking out "The" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), the, and (2) by inserting after the salary schedule in that section the following:

"(b) Compensation may not be paid, by reason of any provision of this Act, at a rate in excess of the rate of basic pay for level V of the Executive Schedule contained in subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code."

SEC. 103. Section 201 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-824) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 201. The rates of basic compensation of officers and members in active service on the effective date of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1972 shall be adjusted as follows:

"(1) Each officer or member receiving basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date at one of the scheduled service step rates of subclass (a) or (b) of salary class 1 in the salary schedule in effect on the day next preceding such effective date shall be placed in and receive basic compensation in salary class 1 in the salary schedule in effect on and after such date, and each such officer or member shall be placed at the respective service step in which he was serving immediately prior to such date. Each officer or member receiving basic compensation immediately prior to such date at one of the scheduled longevity step rates of subclass (a) or (b) of salary class 1 in the salary schedule in effect on the day next preceding such effective date shall be placed in and receive basic compensation in salary class 1 in the salary schedule in effect on and after such date, and each such officer or member shall be placed in a service step as follows:

"From—	To—
Class 1, subclass (a) or (b):	Class 1:
Longevity step A.....	Service step 7.
Longevity step B.....	Service step 8.
Longevity step C.....	Service step 9.

"(2) Each officer or member receiving basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date at one of the scheduled service step rates of subclass (a) or (b) of salary class 2 in the salary schedule in effect on the day next preceding such effective date shall be placed in and receive basic compensation in salary class 2 in the salary schedule in effect on and after such date, and each shall

be placed at the respective service step in which he was serving immediately prior to such date. Each officer or member receiving basic compensation immediately prior to such date at one of the scheduled longevity step rates of subclass (a) or (b) of salary class 2 in the salary schedule in effect on the day next preceding such effective date shall be placed in and receive basic compensation in salary class 2 in the salary schedule in effect on and after such date, and each such officer or member shall be placed in a service step as follows:

"From—	To—
Class, subclass (a) or (b):	Class 2:
Longevity step A.....	Service step 5.
Longevity step B.....	Service step 6.
Longevity step C.....	Service step 7.

"(3) Each officer or member receiving basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date at one of the scheduled service step rates of salary class 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, or 9 in the salary schedule in effect on the day next preceding such effective date shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding scheduled service step and salary class in the salary schedule in effect on and after such date. Each officer or member receiving basic compensation immediately prior to such date at one of the scheduled longevity step rates of salary class, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, or 9 in the salary schedule in effect on the day next preceding such effective date shall receive basic compensation at the corresponding salary class in the salary schedule in effect on and after such date, and each shall be placed in a service step as follows:

"From—	To—
Class 3:	Class 3:
Longevity step A.....	Service step 5.
Longevity step B.....	Service step 6.
Longevity step C.....	Service step 7.

"From—	To—
Class 5:	Class 5:
Longevity steps A and B.....	Service step 5.
"From—	To—
Class 6, 7, 8, and 9:	Class 6, 7, 8, or 9:
Longevity steps A and B.....	Service step 4.

"(4) Each officer or member receiving basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date at one of the scheduled service step rates of subclass (a), (b), or (c) of salary class 4 in the salary schedule in effect on the day next preceding such effective date shall be placed in and receive basic compensation in salary class 4 in the salary schedule in effect on or after such date, and each shall be placed at the respective service step in which he was serving immediately prior to such date. Each officer or member receiving

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE AND FIREMEN'S SALARY ACTS

SEC. 101. The salary schedule contained in section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-823) is amended to read as follows:

basic compensation immediately prior to such date at one of the scheduled longevity step rates of subclass (a), (b), or (c) of salary class 4 in the salary schedule in effect on the day next preceding such effective date shall be placed in and receive basic compensation in salary class 4 in the salary schedule in effect on and after such date, and each shall be placed in a service step as follows:

"From—	To—
Class 4, subclass (a), (b), or (c):	Class 4:
	Longevity step A..... Service step 5.
	Longevity steps B and C..... Service step 6.

"(5) Each officer or member receiving basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date at one of the scheduled service step rates of salary class 10 or 11 in the salary schedule in effect on the day next preceding such effective date shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding scheduled service step and salary class in the salary schedule in effect on and after such date, except that any such officer or member who immediately prior to such date was serving in service step 4 of salary class 10 or in service step 3 of salary class 11 shall be placed in and receive basic compensation in a service step as follows:

"From—	To—
Class 10:	Class 10:
Service step 4.....	Service step 3.
"From—	To—
Class 11:	Class 11:
Service step 3.....	Service step 2."

SEC. 104. Section 202 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-825) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 202. Each officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force, Executive Protective Service, and United States Park Police force assigned on or after the effective date of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1972—

"(1) to perform the duty of a helicopter pilot, or

"(2) to render explosive devices ineffective or to otherwise dispose of such devices, shall receive, in addition to his scheduled rate of basic compensation, \$2,100 per annum so long as he remains in such assignment. The additional compensation authorized by this section shall be paid to an officer or member in the same manner as he is paid the basic compensation to which he is entitled. No officer or member who receives the additional compensation authorized by this section may receive additional compensation under section 302."

SEC. 105. (a) Section 203 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-826) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 203. The aide to the Fire Marshal shall be included as a Fire Inspector in salary class 2."

(b) Section 204 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-826a) is repealed.

SEC. 106. Section 302 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-828) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 302. (a) The Commissioner of the District of Columbia, in the case of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the Secretary of the Treasury, in the case of the Executive Protective Service, and the Secretary of the Interior, in the case of the United States Park Police force, are authorized to establish and determine, from time to time, the positions in salary classes 1, 2, and 4 to be included as technicians' positions.

"(b) Each officer or member—

"(1) who immediately prior to the effective date of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1972—

"(A) was in a position assigned to subclass (b) of salary class 1 or 2 or subclass (c) of salary class 4, or

"(B) was in salary class 4 and was performing the duty of a dog handler, or

"(2) whose position is determined under subsection (a) to be included in salary class 1, 2, or 4 on or after such date as a technician's position,

shall on or after such date receive, in addition to his scheduled rate of basic compensation, \$680 per annum. An officer or member described in paragraph (1) (A) or (2) shall receive the additional compensation authorized by this subsection until his position is determined under subsection (a) not to be included in salary class 1, 2, or 4 as a technician's position or until he no longer occupies such position, whichever occurs first. An officer or member described in paragraph (1) (B) shall receive such compensation so long as he performs the duty of a dog handler. If the position of dog handler is included under subsection (a) as a technician's position, an officer or member performing the duty of a dog handler may not receive both the additional compensation authorized for an officer or member occupying a technician's position and the additional compensation authorized for officers and members performing the duty of a dog handler.

"(c) Each officer or member who immediately prior to the effective date of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1972 was assigned as a detective sergeant in subclass (b) of salary class 4 shall on or after such date, receive, in addition to his scheduled rate of basic compensation, \$500 per annum so long as he remains in such assignment. Each officer or member who is promoted after such date to the rank of detective sergeant shall receive, in addition to his scheduled rate of basic compensation, \$500 per annum so long as he remains in such assignment.

"(d) The additional compensation authorized by subsections (b) and (c) shall be paid to an officer or member in the same manner as he is paid the basic compensation to which he is entitled."

SEC. 107. Section 303 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-829) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 303. (a) Each officer and member, if he has a current performance rating of 'satisfactory' or better, shall have his service step adjusted in the following manner:

"(1) Each officer and member in service step 1, 2, or 3 of salary class 1 shall be advanced in compensation successively to the next higher service step at the beginning of

the first pay period immediately subsequent to the completion of fifty-two calendar weeks of active service in his service step.

"(2) Each officer and member in service step 4 or 5 of salary class 1 shall be advanced in compensation successively to the next higher service step at the beginning of the first pay period immediately subsequent to the completion of one hundred and four calendar weeks of active service in his service step.

"(3) Each officer and member in service step 6, 7, or 8 of salary class 1 shall be advanced in compensation successively to the next higher service step at the beginning of the first pay period immediately subsequent to the completion of one hundred and fifty-six calendar weeks of active service in his service step.

"(4) Each officer and member in salary classes 2 through 11 who has not attained the maximum service step, rate of compensation for the rank or title in which he is placed shall be advanced in compensation successively to the next higher service step rate for such rank or title at the beginning of the first pay period immediately subsequent to the completion of one hundred and four calendar weeks of active service in his service step, except that in the case of an officer or member in service step 4, 5, or 6 of salary class 2 or 3, service step 4 or 5 of salary class 4, and service step 4 of salary class 5, such officer or member shall be advanced successively to the next higher service step at the beginning of the first pay period immediately subsequent to the completion of one hundred and fifty-six calendar weeks of active service in his service step.

"(b) As used in this title, the term 'calendar week of active service' includes all periods of leave with pay, and periods of non-pay status which do not cumulatively equal one basic workweek."

SEC. 108. Section 304 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act

"If an officer or member has completed at least:

15 years of continuous service-----

20 years of continuous service-----

25 years of continuous service-----

30 years of continuous service-----

"(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), continuous service as an officer or member includes any period of his service in the Armed Forces of the United States other than any period of such service (A) determined not to have been satisfactory service, (B) rendered before appointment as an officer or member, or (C) rendered after resignation as an officer or member.

"(3) Each officer and member shall receive additional compensation in accordance with paragraph (1) only as long as he remains in the active service. Such compensation shall be paid in the same manner as the basic compensation to which such officer or member is entitled, except that it shall not be subject to deduction and withholding for retirement and insurance, and shall not be considered as salary for the purpose of computing annuities pursuant to the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act and for the purpose of computing insurance coverage under the provisions of chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code.

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other law, individuals retired from active service prior to the effective date of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1972, and who are entitled to receive a pension relief allowance or retirement compensation under the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement

of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-830) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 304. (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section, any officer or member who is promoted or transferred to a higher salary class shall receive basic compensation at the lowest scheduled rate of such higher salary class which exceeds his existing scheduled rate of basic compensation by not less than one step increase of the next higher step of the salary class from which he is promoted or transferred.

"(b) Any officer or member receiving additional compensation as provided in section 302 of this Act who is promoted or transferred to a higher salary class shall receive basic compensation at the lowest scheduled rate of such higher class which exceeds his existing scheduled rate of basic compensation by at least the sum of one step increase of the next higher step of the salary class from which he is promoted or transferred and the amount of such additional compensation."

SEC. 109. Section 305 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-831) is amended by (1) striking out "Commissioners" and inserting in lieu thereof "Commissioner", and (2) striking out "or Subclass" immediately after "Class".

SEC. 110. Section 401 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-832) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 401. (a) (1) In recognition of long and faithful service, each officer and member in the active service on or after the effective date of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1972 shall receive per annum, in addition to the rate of basic compensation prescribed in the salary schedule contained in section 101 of this Act, an amount computed in accordance with the following table:

He shall receive per annum an amount, fixed to the nearest dollar, equal to:	
5 per centum of the rate of basic compensation prescribed for service step 1 of the salary class of such salary schedule which he occupies.	10 per centum of such compensation.
	15 per centum of such compensation.
	20 per centum of such compensation.

ment and Disability Act, shall not be entitled to receive an increase in their pension relief allowance or retirement compensation by reason of the enactment of this section.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other law, each deputy chief of the Metropolitan Police force and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall, upon completion of thirty years of continuous service on the police force or fire department, as the case may be, be placed in, and receive basic compensation at, the highest service step in the salary class to which his position is assigned in the salary schedule contained in section 101. For purposes of this subsection, in computing a deputy chief's continuous service on the police force or fire department, there shall be included any period of his service in the Armed Forces of the United States other than any period of such service—

"(1) determined not to have been satisfactory service,

"(2) rendered before appointment as an officer or member, or

"(3) rendered after resignation as an officer or member."

SEC. 111. Section 501 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-833), is amended by (1) adding "and the Executive Protective Service" immediately after "United States

Park Police", and (2) striking out "or Sub-Classes" at the end of such section.

Sec. 112. The Act approved May 25, 1926 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-131), is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "That", and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) The Chief of Police of the Metropolitan Police force, the Commanding Officer of the Executive Protective Service, and the Commanding Officer of the United States Park Police force, are each authorized to provide a clothing allowance, not to exceed \$300 in any one year, to an officer or member assigned to perform duties in 'plainclothes'. Such clothing allowance is not to be treated as part of the officer's or member's basic compensation and shall not be used for the purpose of computing his overtime, promotions, or retirement benefits. Such allowance for any officer or member may be discontinued at any time upon written notification by the authorizing official."

Sec. 113. Subsection (h) of the first section of the Act approved August 15, 1950 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-904(b)), is amended by striking out "class 10" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "the salary class applicable to the Fire Chief and Chief of Police".

Sec. 114. Section 301 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-518) is amended—

(1) by striking out "Such" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as otherwise provided in this section, such";

(2) by striking out the third sentence;

(3) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 301." and by adding the following at the end thereof:

"(b) The increase prescribed by subsection (a) of this section in the pension relief allowance or retirement compensation received by an individual retired from active service before the effective date of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1972 under the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act as a result of the increase in salary provided by the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1972 shall not be less than 17 per centum of such allowance or compensation."

"(c) Each individual retired from active service and entitled to receive a pension relief allowance or retirement compensation under the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act shall be entitled to receive, without making application therefor, with respect to each increase in salary, granted by any law which takes effect after the effective date of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1972, to which he would be entitled if he were in active service, an increase in his pension relief allowance or retirement compensation computed as follows: His pension relief allowance or retirement compensation shall be increased by an amount equal to the product of such allowance or compensation and the per centum increase made by such law in the scheduled rate of compensation to which he would be entitled if he were in active service on the effective date of such increase in salary."

"(d) Each increase in pension relief allowance or retirement compensation made under this section because of an increase in salary shall take effect as of the first day of the first month following the effective date of such increase in salary."

Sec. 115. (a) Section 2 of the Act of September 8, 1960 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-823b) is repealed.

(b) Section 2 of the Act of October 24, 1962 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-823c) is repealed.

(c) Section 102 of the Act of September 2, 1964 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-823d) is repealed.

(d) Section 102 of the District of Columbia

Policemen and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1966 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-823d-1) is repealed.

(e) Section 2 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1968 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-823d-2) is repealed.

(f) Section 103 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1970 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-823-3) is repealed.

Sec. 116. (a) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of the amendments made by this title only in the case of an individual in the service of the District of Columbia government or of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to an officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, or the Executive Protective Service, who retired during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after May 1, 1972, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act for services rendered during such period, and (2) in accordance with the provisions of subchapter 8 of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code (relating to settlement of accounts of deceased employees), for services rendered during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after May 1, 1972, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act, by an officer or member who dies during such period.

(b) For the purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

(c) For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an officer or member is eligible under the provisions of chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code (relating to government employees group life insurance), all changes in rates of compensation or salary which result from the enactment of this title shall be held and considered to be effective as of the date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 117. (a) If an officer or member of the Metropolitan Police Force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the Executive Protective Service, or the United States Park Police force engages in educational course work in police or fire science or administration and if he is eligible for payments or reimbursements under section 4109(a)(2)(C) of title 5 of the United States Code for tuition expenses for such course work, the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Interior shall, in accordance with such section 4109(a)(2)(C), pay or reimburse each such officer and member under their jurisdiction for all his tuition expenses for such course work.

Sec. 118. Except as provided in section 117 (b), the effective date of this title and the amendments made by this title shall be the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after May 1, 1972.

(b) Subsection (a) of this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 119. This title may be cited as the "District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1972".

TITLE II—POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN'S RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY ACT AMENDMENTS

Sec. 201. (a) The Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act (section 12 of

the Act of September 1, 1916, D.C. Code, sec. 4-521 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) Subparagraph (5)(B) of subsection (a) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 4-521) is amended by striking out "or" immediately after "residence".

(2) Paragraph (5) of subsection (c) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 4-523) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "No deposit shall be required for days of unused sick leave credited under subsection (h) of this section."

(3) Subsection (h) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 4-528) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) In computing an annuity under this subsection, the police or fire service of a member who has not retired prior to the effective date of this paragraph shall include, without regard to the limitation imposed by paragraph (3) of this subsection, the days of unused sick leave credited to him. Days of unused sick leave shall not be counted in determining a member's eligibility for an annuity under this subsection."

(4) The first paragraph of subsection (k) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 4-531) is amended to read as follows:

"(k) (1) If any member—

"(A) dies in the performance of duty and the Commissioner determines that (i) the member's death was the sole and direct result of a personal injury sustained while performing such duty, (ii) his death was not caused by his willful misconduct or by his intention to bring about his own death, and (iii) intoxication of the member was not the proximate cause of his death; and

"(B) is survived by a survivor, parent, or sibling,

a lump sum payment of \$50,000 shall be made to his survivor if the survivor received more than one-half of his support from such member or if such member is not survived by any survivor (including a survivor who did not receive more than one-half of his support from such member), to his parent or sibling if the parent or sibling received more than one-half of his support from such member. If such member is survived by more than one survivor entitled to receive such payment, each such survivor shall be entitled to receive an equal share of such payment; or if such member leaves no survivor and more than one parent or sibling who is entitled to receive such payment, each such parent or sibling shall be entitled to receive an equal share of such payment."

(b) The amendments made by paragraphs (1) and (4) of subsection (a) of this section shall be effective on and after November 1, 1970. The amendments made by paragraphs (2) and (3) of such subsection shall be effective on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after the date of enactment of this title.

Sec. 202. (a) Section 3 of the Act of July 11, 1947 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-183a), is amended by striking out "on the effective date of this section".

(b) Section 4 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 4-183b) is amended by striking out "on September 22, 1959".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Sec. 203. (a) Subsection (m) of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act (D.C. Code, sec. 4-533) is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(m)" and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) If a member is retired under subsection (f) or (g) of this section and is employed on or after the effective date of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1972, such member shall, in accordance with such regulations as the Commissioner shall prescribe, notify the Commissioner of the employment; and the Commissioner shall, as soon as prac-

licable after the receipt of such notice, require each such member to undergo a medical examination (satisfactory to the Commissioner) of the disability upon which the member's retirement under such subsection is based."

(b) The Commissioner of the District of Columbia shall (1) promulgate the regulations required by paragraph (2) of subsection (m) of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act not later than ninety days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and (2) give timely written notice to each member retired under subsection (f) or (g) of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act of the promulgation of such regulations.

(c) This section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE III—REVENUE FOR SALARY INCREASES

Sec. 301. (a) (1) Section 125 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2602) is amended by striking out "4 per centum" in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "5 per centum".

(2) Paragraphs (2) and (3) of such section 125 are each amended by striking out "5 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "6 per centum".

(3) (A) Paragraph (a) of section 127 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2604(a)) is amended by striking out "and other than sales or charges for rooms, lodgings, or accommodations furnished to transients."

(B) Paragraph (c) of such section is repealed.

(C) Paragraphs (a) and (b) of such section are redesignated as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively.

(b) (1) Section 212 of the District of Columbia Use Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2702) is amended by striking out "4 per centum" in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "5 per centum".

(2) Paragraphs (2) and (3) of such section 212 are each amended by striking out "5 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "6 per centum".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins on or after the thirtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act.

And the Senate agree to the same.

JOHN L. McMILLAN,
EARLE CABELL,
W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY, Jr.,
ANCHER NELSEN,
JOEL T. BROYHILL,
Managers on the Part of the House.
THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
DANIEL K. INOUE,
CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15580) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to increase salaries, and for other purposes, 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:

RETROACTIVITY

Section 118 of the Senate amendment provided that salary increases will be effective beginning with the first pay period beginning on or after March 1, 1972. Section 117 of the House bill provided that salary increases will be effective beginning with the first pay pe-

riod beginning on or after July 1, 1972. The conference substitute provides that salary increases will be effective beginning with the first pay period beginning on or after May 1, 1972.

LONGEVITY COMPENSATION IN COMPUTATION OF RETIREMENT ANNUITIES

Section 110 of the Senate amendment provided that total service longevity compensation would be included in the computation of the amount of the retirement annuity of an officer or member. Section 110 of the House bill provided that such compensation would not be included in computing the retirement annuity of an officer or member. The conference substitute adopts the House provision.

DEPUTY CHIEFS

Section 110 of the House bill retained the provision of existing law which provides that deputy chiefs with 30 years of continuous service shall be placed in, and receive basic compensation at, the highest step in the salary class to which the position of deputy chief is assigned. Section 110 of the Senate amendment repealed this provision of law. The conference substitute adopts the House provision.

EDUCATIONAL SUBSIDIES

Section 113 of the Senate amendment authorized the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, in the case of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the Secretary of the Treasury, in the case of the Executive Protective Service, and the Secretary of the Interior, in the case of the United States Park Police force, to pay additional compensation for successful completion by an officer or member of educational course work leading to a degree in police or fire science or administration. The additional annual compensation would be \$200 for each 15 credit hours completed except that such compensation could not exceed \$1,800. The House bill contained no such provision. The conference substitute provides that if an officer or member is eligible to receive payment or reimbursement under section 4109 of title 5, United States Code, for his tuition expenses for educational course work in police or fire science or administration, such payment or reimbursement shall be increased to cover all such officer's or member's tuition expenses. Currently, 90 per centum of such tuition expenses are covered under section 4109.

SALARY USED IN COMPUTATION OF RETIREMENT ANNUITY

Section 201 of the House bill provided that the retirement annuity of officers and members who first came on active duty after July 9, 1972, would be based on the highest annual rate resulting from averaging his basic salary for any three years of continuous service. The retirement annuity of officers and members on active duty on July 9, 1972, would be based on the higher of (1) a three-year average of his salary, or (2) his pre-July 9, 1972, salary increased by 17 per cent. The Senate amendment contained no such provision thus retaining existing law which provides that the retirement annuity of an officer or member is to be based on the basic salary of the officer or member in effect on the date of his retirement. The conference substitute adopts the Senate position, retaining existing law.

The conferees further agreed that the Commissioner of the District of Columbia should conduct a full and complete study of the feasibility and cost of, and the effect on morale of the officers and members as a result of, adopting a system of computing retirement annuities using a three-year average salary rate (as provided in the House bill). The conferees agreed that the results of the study should include the views and opinions of the Secretary of the Interior and

the Secretary of the Treasury, and should be transmitted to the Congress within six months after the date of the enactment of the bill.

MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS FOR OFFICERS AND MEMBERS RETIRED FOR DISABILITY

Section 202 of the House bill provided that an officer or member who is retired for a disability and who on or after July 9, 1972, is employed shall notify the Commissioner of his employment and shall undergo such medical examination of his disability as the Commissioner may prescribe. The Senate amendment contained no such provision. The conference substitute adopts the House provision.

TREATMENT OF UNUSED SICK LEAVE

Sections 201(a) (2) and (3) of the Senate amendment authorized unused sick leave to be used in determining the amount of an optional retirement annuity of an officer or member. It was also provided that the days of unused sick leave shall not be counted in determining eligibility for an optional retirement annuity. The House bill contained no such provisions. The conference substitute adopts the Senate provisions.

SURVIVORS LUMP SUM BENEFIT

Section 201(a) (4) of the Senate amendment expanded eligibility for the \$50,000 lump sum benefit payable upon the death of a member in the performance of duty to include a deceased member's parents and siblings who receive more than one-half of their support from the deceased member. A parent or sibling would be eligible only if the deceased member is not survived by a spouse or child. The House bill contained no such provision. Existing law provides that only the spouse and the children who received more than one-half of their support from the deceased member are entitled to such benefit. The conference substitute adopts the Senate provision which is to take effect as of November 1, 1970.

RETIREMENT ANNUITY OF POLICE BAND DIRECTOR

Section 202 of the Senate amendment permitted the current police band director and his successors to retire under provisions of District of Columbia law which previously were limited to the band director in office in September of 1959. The House bill contained no such provision. The conference substitute adopts the Senate provision.

SALES TAX INCREASE

Section 302 of the Senate amendment increased the rate of the sales and use tax on laundry and dry cleaning services, sales of nonprescription drugs, and charges for textiles rentals from 2 percent to 5 percent. The House bill contained no such provisions. The conference substitute contains no such provisions.

INCREASE IN CIGARETTE TAX

Section 311 of the Senate amendment increased the tax on cigarettes from 4¢ per package to 6¢ per package. The House bill contained no such provision. The conference substitute contains no such provision.

JOHN L. McMILLAN,
EARLE CABELL,
W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY, Jr.,
ANCHER NELSEN,
JOEL BROYHILL,
Managers on the Part of the House.
THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
DANIEL K. INOUE,
CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FRASER. 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:

Abzug	Foley	McDonald,
Anderson, Ill.	Ford,	Mich.
Ashley	William D.	McMillan
Baker	Fraser	Mailliard
Betts	Frelinghuysen	Mayne
Blanton	Gallagher	Michel
Boggs	Gibbons	Passman
Brademas	Gray	Pelly
Brasco	Hagan	Pickle
Carter	Harsha	Rarick
Clancy	Hathaway	Rees
Clark	Hébert	Rhodes
Clay	Heckler, Mass.	Riegle
Colmer	Horton	Rooney, N.Y.
Conte	Hull	Rosenthal
Coughlin	Jacobs	Ryan
Davis, Wis.	Keith	Scheuer
Dingell	Kemp	Schmitz
Dowdy	Landrum	Smith, Calif.
Dwyer	Leggett	Stuckey
Edmondson	Lennon	Veysey
Edwards, Ala.	Lent	Waldie
Erlenborn	Long, La.	Wilson,
Evins, Tenn.	McCloskey	Charles H.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 362 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

MRS. ROSE THOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2067) for the relief of Mrs. Rose Thomas.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MARIA LUGIA DI GIORGIO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2070) for the relief of Maria Luigia Di Giorgio.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. ANNA MARIA BALDINI DELA ROSA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3713) for the relief of Mrs. Anna Maria Baldini Dela Rosa.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CHARLES COLBATH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4310) for the relief of Charles Colbath.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. CARMEN PRADO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6108) for the relief of Mrs. Carmen Prado.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

RENE PAULO ROHDEN-SOBRINHO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5181) for the relief of Rene Paulo Rohden-Sobrinho.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CATHERINE E. SPELL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7312) for the relief of Catherine E. Spell.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

DONALD L. BULMER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1994) for the relief of Donald L. Bulmer.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. MARINA MUNOZ DE WYSS (NEE LOPEZ)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5579) for the relief of Mrs. Marina Munoz de Wyss (nee Lopez).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CARMEN MARIA PENA-GARCANO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6342) for the relief of Carmen Maria Pena-Garcano.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

WILLIAM H. NICKERSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4064) for the relief of William H. Nickerson.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ALBINA LUCIO Z. MANLUCU

The Clerk called the bill (S. 559) for the relief of Albina Lucio Z. Manlucu.

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

S. 559

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Albina Lucio Z. Manlucu shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to reduce by one number, during the current fiscal year or the fiscal year next following, the total number of immigrant visas and conditional entries which are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under paragraph (1) through (8) of section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

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.

MARGARIDA ALDORA CORREIA DOS REIS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6504) for the relief of Margarida Aldora Correia dos Reis.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

EMILIA RUFFOLO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10142) for the relief of Emilia Ruffolo.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

DONALD P. LARIVIERE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8952) for the relief of Donald P. Lariviere.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MR. AND MRS. JOHN F. FUENTES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11045) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John F. Fuentes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ARLINE LOADER AND MAURICE LOADER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 341) for the relief of Arline Loader and Maurice Loader.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

FREDI ROBERT DREILICH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2725) for the relief of Fredi Robert Dreilich.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

DENNIS YIANTOS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 65) for the relief of Dennis Yiantos.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

SGT. GARY L. RIVERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12638) for the relief of Sgt. Gary L. Rivers, U.S. Marine Corps, retired.

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

H.R. 12638

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Sergeant Gary L. Rivers, United States Marine Corps, retired, is relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of \$1,147.41 representing the amount of overpayment of compensation from (1) overcrediting a variable reenlistment bonus of \$675.60; (2) failure to liquidate a previous overpayment of \$239.31; and (3) payment of \$232.50 of allotments without corresponding deductions. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of

any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Sergeant Gary L. Rivers, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

(b) No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike "\$1,147.41" and insert "\$1,153.86".

Page 1, line 9, strike "and".

Page 1, line 10, after "deductions", insert "; and (4) failure to recoup a pro rata portion of reenlistment bonus and variable reenlistment bonus for a period of time lost, in the amount of \$6.45".

Page 2, line 10, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

SEAVIEW ELECTRIC CO.

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 943) to refer the bill (H.R. 3462) entitled "A bill for the relief of Seaview Electric Company" to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims.

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

H. RES. 943

Resolved, That H.R. 3462, entitled "A bill for the relief of Seaview Electric Company", together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, for further proceedings in accordance with applicable law.

The resolution was agreed to.

ELMER ERICKSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 889) to restore the postal service seniority of Elmer Erickson.

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

S. 889

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the laws, rules, and regulations pertaining to the seniority rights of employees of the Post Office Department, Elmer O. Erickson, of Minneapolis, Minnesota, an employee of the postal service assigned to the Saint Paul and Aberdeen railway post office, Minnesota, shall be entitled to receive credit for service performed by him in the postal service during the period from August 12, 1940, through January 13, 1961, in like manner as if the provisions of sections 748.1 through 748.17 of the Postal Transportation Service seniority rules, Post Office Department Publication 31, dated August 18, 1958, under which certain employees who transfer from and later reenter an oc-

cupational group subject to such rules will have service seniority based upon the seniority they had attained before transferring from such group, had been applicable with respect to the said Elmer O. Erickson during the period from January 14, 1961, the date he transferred from the clerical group, which is the occupational group into which he and all other former employees of the Postal Transportation Service were placed when such Service was merged into the post offices, to April 29, 1961, the date he transferred to such group.

SEC. 2. In making any adjustment in salary level or step authorized by section 1 of this Act, no payment shall be made by the United States Postal Service for any period prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

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.

WILLIAM JOHN WEST

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2575) for the relief of William John West.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

RITA ROSELLA VALLERIANI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2704) for the relief of Rita Rosella Valleriani.

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

S. 2704

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 203(a)(1) and 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rita Rosella Valleriani shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Vincenzo Valleriani, citizens of the United States: Provided, That the parents, brothers, or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

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.

WALTER EDUARD KOENIG

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 14173) for the relief of Walter Eduard Koenig.

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

H.R. 14173

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Walter Eduard Koenig, shall be held and considered to have complied with the provisions of section 316 of that Act as they relate to residence and physical presence.

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

MRS. GAVINA A. PALACAY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4646) for the relief of Mrs. Gavina A. Palacay.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. PURITA PANINGBATAN BOHANNON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10711) for the relief of Mrs. Purita Paningbatan Bohannon.

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

H.R. 10711

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Purita Paningbatan Bohannon, the widow of a United States citizen, shall be determined to be an immediate relative within the meaning of section 201(b) of that Act and the provisions of section 204 shall be inapplicable in her case.

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.

FLORA DATILES TABAYO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10712) for the relief of Flora Datiles Tabayo.

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

H.R. 10712

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Flora Datiles Tabayo may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Jack Lee, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 7, strike out the language "citizens of the United States," and substitute in lieu thereof the following: a citizen of the United States and a lawfully resident alien, respectively.

On page 1, line 8, strike out the word "Act," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Act: *Provided*, That the natural parents or brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

JAY ALEXIS CALIGDONG SIAOTONG

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12204) for the relief of Jay Alexis Caligdong Siaotong.

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

H.R. 12204

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jay Alexis Caligdong Siaotong may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Bautista and Coronacion Siaotong, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act: *Provided*, That the natural parents or brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.*

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.

ANKA KOSANOVIC

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1777) for the relief of Anka Kosanovic.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MARIA CAMILLA GIULIANI NIRO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3899) for the relief of Maria Camilla Giuliani Niro.

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

H.R. 3899

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the provisions of section 316(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act as they relate to residence and physical presence requirements for naturalization, shall be inapplicable in the case of Maria Camilla Giuliani Niro.

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.

ROSITA E. HODAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5324) for the relief of Rosita E. Hodas.

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

H.R. 5324

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rosita E. Hodas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to deduct the required number from the total number of immigrant visas and conditional entries which are made available to natives of the country of each alien's birth under paragraphs (1) through (8) of section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

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

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rosita E. Hodas, the widow of a citizen of the United States, shall be held and considered to be within the purview of section 201(b) of that Act and the provisions of section 204 of such Act shall not be applicable in this case."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS. NGUYEN THI LE FINTLAND AND SUSAN FINTLAND

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5923) for the relief of Mrs. Nguyen Thi Le Fintland and Susan Fintland.

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

H.R. 5923

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nguyen Thi Le Fintland and Susan Fintland shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to deduct two numbers from the total number of immigrant visas and conditional entries which are made available to natives of the aliens' birth under paragraphs (1) through (8) of section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

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

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Nguyen Thi Le Fintland and Susan Fintland, the widow and stepdaughter, respectively, of a citizen of the United States, shall be held and considered to be within the purview of section 201(b) of that Act and the provisions of section 204 of such Act shall not be applicable in their cases."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT BRIEFING ON VIETNAM

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to invite the Members, all Members of the House, to attend a

briefing tomorrow morning at 10:30 in the committee room of the House Committee on Armed Services. At that time the Defense Department will brief the Members on the current situation in Vietnam.

CONTROVERSY OVER STAFF MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by some strange coincidence, I did not get a copy of the letter which the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) circulated this morning telling his side of the little controversy about the staff member on the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The truth of the matter is that the staff member was one of those created by the Hansen committee, of which I am a member. Apparently, some of these staff people think that they owe allegiance to nobody, and especially not the chairman of the full committee.

What this man was doing, as it was reported to me by the staff of the full committee, was arranging and scheduling hearings for my subcommittee, of which I am the chairman, without either consulting me or the chairman of the full committee.

But, be that as it may, I have agreed on my own initiative to sign his payroll for July. I am not going to do anything about August until the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN) has a chance to talk with him, and to tell him—as I am told he is going to tell him—that he is to work for one subcommittee, and that subcommittee only, unless he clears it with the chairman of the full committee to work for another.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on this subject, let me say to the Members that the Committee on House Administration unanimously ordered me last week to write a letter, which is in the process of being prepared, to all chairmen, advising them that these extra staff people for subcommittee chairmen who were funded by the Committee on House Administration, and that they are under the ultimate responsibility of the chairman of the full committee.

I do not know whether it is true or not, but I have heard report and, in fact, I had one chairman, and I will not mention his name because he told me in confidence—he told me that two of the people he had signed on for last January, he had never seen or heard of since. He does not know whether they are in Washington and whether they are working or not.

Now the truth is—this House Administration Committee has to fund these extra jobs and we are going to be a little bit reluctant unless we know more about it.

Finally, I have no fear of going to the Rules Committee. But there are 1,700,-

000 flood victims waiting for this bill which was first on the calendar today and I am not willing for this matter to stand in the way of getting that bill passed even if Mr. FRASER is willing to hold it up by quorum calls.

But, if you folks in the House of Representatives want a rubber-stamp to be put on every payroll—you pass a law to that effect. Do not say that the chairman, as long as it is me, shall sign it because I do not rubberstamp anything. That is why the cafeterias were losing a half million dollars a year, because the payrolls were rubber-stamped every 2 weeks.

THE POWERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER).

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to argue here the question of whether my staff employee, who is a hard-working employee, and who has done a good job, may have done something to which Mr. HAYS could properly take offense or not.

My problem was, that regardless of what was involved, the first announcement I got from Mr. HAYS was that my man had been fired by Mr. HAYS acting in his capacity as chairman of the House Administration Committee.

Neither the rules of the House or the resolution on the contingent funds or any other statute provides the chairman with such power. The power to approve vouchers to pay committee employees resides in the full committee.

I am delighted that we have passed beyond the issue of getting the staff member paid. I apologize to the House for the inconvenience which occurred today, but the issue remains as to whether the chairman of the House Administration Committee should have the power to withhold approval of payment of the employees of committees, or payment of your telephone account, and disbursements from your other special allowances that come from the contingent fund, or refuse to approve the appointment by the Speaker or by other officers of the House to fill already authorized positions.

I believe that this question must be addressed by the House in the future and I hope the House will have an opportunity to do so.

INVESTIGATION OF NONESSENTIAL EMPLOYEES

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like the Members of the House to know, as a member of the House Administration Committee, that I was appointed

by the chairman of that committee as chairman of a special committee to investigate nonessential employment in the four divisions that cover the House of Representatives.

In that capacity, the full chairman of the committee has given me complete authority to act.

I have frozen all jobs. We have not tried to fill any job and I want the Members to know that the people of the U.S. Civil Service Commission are making a study on every employee of this House as to their duties, their salaries, and their functions.

I want to commend the chairman of the House Administration Committee for taking this long needed step in this House. You and I know we have too many people who are around, they are faceless people and when this study is completed by the U.S. Civil Service Commission, I want the Members of the House to know that the appropriate action will be taken by me in making my recommendations to the chairman and to the committee, and we intend to save money wherever money is needed to be saved, as our distinguished chairman has done in the cafeteria and restaurants.

INVESTIGATION OF NONESSENTIAL EMPLOYEES

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to keep this going. There are two things I want to say.

First, as you know, Mr. FRASER had a minute earlier.

I think the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) inadvertently said "Members" of the House. What he meant to say is "staff officials" of the House and of the House itself.

The second thing is, I have not refused to sign any properly documented appointment by the Speaker or anybody else. I resent Mr. FRASER's dragging that in. It was not true. The facts of the matter are, when these documents came to my desk I was out of town and I simply do not allow the staff, as was the custom in the past, to use a rubber stamp and put my name on it. When I came back there were a couple of jobs that were supposed to be frozen. The Doorkeeper had tried to run around the House Administration Committee. He sent them upstairs first; they did not get signed; he took them to the Speaker and the Speaker and I sat down and ironed that matter out.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. I thank the gentleman for making that correction, but I thought I said four divisions of the House, meaning the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Postmaster, the

Sergeant at Arms, and the Doorkeeper, the divisions under the House. We have nothing to do with the staffs of Members of the House. That is strictly their business.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman.

LESTER L. STITELER

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 10676) for the relief of Lester L. Stiteler, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "comprise," and insert "compromise."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISASTER RELIEF SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 16254) making certain disaster relief supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1973, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes, namely:

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," \$1,800,000.

CHAPTER II

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For an additional amount for "Construction, general," \$3,500,000, to remain available until expended.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

For an additional amount for "Flood control and coastal emergencies," \$26,000,000, to remain available until expended.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

For an additional amount for "Appalachian regional development programs," \$16,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CHAPTER III

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

DEVELOPMENT FACILITIES

For an additional amount for "Development facilities," \$30,000,000: *Provided*, That

such additional amount shall not be subject to the restrictions of the last sentence of Section 105 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended.

PLANNING, TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, AND RESEARCH

For an additional amount for "Planning, technical assistance, and research," \$9,100,000.

OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

For an additional amount for "Operations and administration," \$900,000.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," \$20,000,000, to be transferred from the "Disaster loan fund."

DISASTER LOAN RELIEF

For additional capital for the "Disaster loan fund," authorized by the Small Business Act, as amended, \$1,300,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CHAPTER IV

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

DISASTER RELIEF

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

CHAPTER V

GENERAL PROVISION

No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

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

(Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include certain tables and documentary material.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the supplemental disaster relief appropriations required at this time are greater than at any time in the history of the Republic. Tropical storm Agnes caused unparalleled destruction in many areas of the Eastern United States.

The bill before us provides \$1,587,300,000 for further assistance to disaster victims and to States and communities affected. The bill is made up of several chapters. The report is available to Members.

In addition to the \$1.5 billion-plus in the pending bill, there was recently made available \$200 million to the highway program, which makes a total of about \$1.7 billion-plus. If you couple that to appropriations made otherwise for disaster relief, the total appropriation or other availability for this session is in excess of \$2 billion.

Insofar as I know, there is no controversy in regard to the measure before us, and unless there are Members who are interested in particular questions, we can, I think, move along rather rapidly.

Of course, everyone has the opportunity to speak or to offer amendments. I would point out, as does the report, that we are providing the amounts requested by the President, plus \$17.5 million additional. It seems to me to be the best that we can do under the circumstances. It may very well develop that as the progress of reconstruction progresses, that additional funds will be found necessary.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

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

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House concurred in the conference report on the disaster bill. Will these appropriations that are contained in this bill be used in furtherance of that law we passed yesterday?

Mr. MAHON. The funds are available under several laws for disaster relief and assistance in connection with the Agnes disaster. The broadening and liberalization of the programs represented by the additional legislation referred to, as I understand, may or may not have been fully anticipated in this appropriation. I doubt that anyone can say for certain at this time.

Mr. KAZEN. That precisely is my question, Mr. Speaker. In other words, Mr. Speaker, what I am interested in knowing is whether the moneys in this appropriation bill will cover the subject of the bill we passed last night.

Mr. MAHON. I would hope so, but if it does not the additional funds can be requested and provided.

Mr. KAZEN. Because, as the chairman knows, the bill we approved yesterday provides not only for the Agnes disaster but also for disasters going back to January 1, of 1972.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. KAZEN. The moneys in this bill are going toward solving the problems from January 1, 1972, to the present.

Mr. MAHON. This appropriation is a supplemental appropriation to cover all the disasters insofar as the funds will go, and if the funds are adequate it would cover all requirements that were anticipated or authorized by law.

Mr. KAZEN. I thank the chairman.

Mr. MAHON. That, I believe, is a fair interpretation.

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

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, this is emergency legislation. We all realize the importance of it. Those of us who represent areas which were hard hit by this hurricane have had people coming to us wondering when they are going to get help and get relief. All over this country these questions are being asked. I would hope we could obtain a statement by the chairman of the sense of the Congress that, in view of the fact this supplemental appropriation is being passed, we expect relief to be provided expeditiously and efficiently.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct in that we need to provide the assistance as quickly as reasonably possible. The gentleman from Maryland has been insisting on a more expeditious and efficient handling of the program. He raised this matter some weeks ago when we had another bill providing supplemental funds for the program. I would say I shall do everything I can, and I want the record to show that the Congress expects these funds to be expended expeditiously in the interest of the flood sufferers. Of course, we want it done without waste or mismanagement.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. We should all thank the chairman for the expeditious way in which he has handled this legislation.

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

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

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, in further reply to the question the chairman answered a moment ago, relative to the moneys in this bill and as far as the changes in the disaster relief program, broadly the bill we accepted the conference report on yesterday directs itself to homeowners and businessmen. I would point out to the chairman and my colleagues that this bill does approve \$1.3 billion appropriations for the Small Business Administration, and a part of that will go to meet the costs of this program. How much that will be, I do not think anybody at the present time knows, but this would be the best estimate we have at the present time.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

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

Mr. CORMAN. Does the Appropriations Committee have any estimate as to the public property damage; that is, the property owned by the public which, as I understand it, is to be paid for in full by the Federal Government? Are there any estimates as to how much that obligation will be? That is exclusive of our obligation for losses to private individuals.

What is the public loss for which we will assume total responsibility?

Mr. MAHON. Some facts were developed on the matter in the hearings. I do not have the exact figures at my fingertips but of course there were vast losses in the public domain.

As Members know, \$200 million has been made available not through this legislation but otherwise for the highway program.

The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. STEED) the chairman of the subcommittee handling the disaster relief part of the appropriation, might be able to supply some information.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, in the hearings this whole subject was gone into, and there was a preliminary report by the Office of Emergency Preparedness, which is shown on page 90 of the hearings. It gives by State the amounts that are estimated to be needed. It gives the totals. It lists the loss of life by States. It is rather detailed. It is all there, and I recommend that the gentleman refer to pages 90 through 96 of the hearings which have all the statistical information.

By way of elaboration, I would add a summary compiled from figures supplied by the Office of Emergency Preparedness:

Estimated losses caused by tropical storm Agnes

Estimated property loss (in 206 counties and 27 cities):	
(a) Public facilities (Federal, State, and local) ..	\$700,000,000
(b) Business and industry ..	1,600,000,000
(c) Private (personal)	1,100,000,000
Total	3,400,000,000

Homes: damaged, 100,000, destroyed, 3,500.
Bridges: Damaged or destroyed, 515; estimated loss, \$366,000,000.

Schools: Damaged or destroyed, 1,104; estimated loss, \$62,700,000.

Persons unemployed as a result of Agnes, 88,520.

Lives lost, 118.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. ABOUREZK. I noticed the conference report spoke only of Hurricane Agnes and the results of that disaster. Does this money which is to be appropriated in this bill include any other disaster aside from Hurricane Agnes?

Mr. MAHON. Yes. It is an addition to funds available in the regular disaster appropriations. Each year we have disaster appropriations. We cannot anticipate in advance what disasters will occur. This adds to the funds. The funds will go principally for Hurricane Agnes, but if there are other disasters they will be available for disaster-type assistance.

Mr. ABOUREZK. In other words, this is not restricted and would be available for use in the South Dakota disaster?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

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

Mr. Speaker, I come from the city of Wilkes-Barre, Pa. Need I say more?

Believe it or not, as Members know, my name is FLOOD. So this is a question of one Flood against another.

As Members will recall, just a few weeks ago the President sent to the Congress a request for an emergency disaster relief fund for Hurricane Agnes, of \$100 million. In the Appropriations Committee I immediately amended that to make it \$200 million, and that committee acted unanimously in favor, and so did this House and the Congress. That was just a few weeks ago, \$200 million. Do you remember?

Then in a few weeks the President sent this request to the Congress for \$1.7 billion. It will amount to \$1.8 billion, as the chairman told us. That was acted on unanimously by the Appropriations Committee, as I am sure it will be by the House and the Congress today.

Mr. Speaker, in that part of my district alone damaged by this disaster, the greatest civil disaster, as I told you a month ago, in the history of the republic—do you hear that? The greatest civil disaster in the history of this republic. Let me boggle your minds. In my district alone damage undoubtedly will be \$1 billion. Do you hear that? In my district alone. In the Agnes hurricane, I am speaking not at all of the other five States

which were badly damaged and the District of Columbia.

Looking you in the eye now I tell you you are talking about damage of \$5 billion. Do you hear? Just so you know. What you are doing we are grateful for and the speed at which you are doing it we are grateful for. More is going into my district now, this day, and has been going in the last 20 great disasters of all kinds in our history. All right now.

But this is a drop in the bucket as to what will be needed, I tell you. You are going to have to do this. The existing laws will not do. The scope of the laws will have to meet the scope of this disaster. Do you hear? The scope of the laws will have to meet the scope of this disaster. There will have to be something in the nature of a permanent disaster fund. How big? We do not know. How administered? We do not know. From what source the fund will come? We yet do not know. But this will have to be done. I am telling you. Do you hear? From now on. Not only to meet this emergency now but in the years ahead so that the administrative heads of the Government agencies and the Congress are prepared as they were not prepared to meet this one. We were not prepared.

The shock to the people and the individual businesses has been indescribable. I think you know now. I think you know now in the last couple of weeks. I think you know what I am talking about.

This will have to be done. A new concept, a new way, a new operation, to handle the flood plains by the Engineers and the responsible Federal agencies. Dams, dikes, dredging. All of these things. The experiences of the Chinese; yes—of the North Vietnamese, and of the north and south. You have heard about dikes; yes. The Dutch. Yes; we must borrow the knowledge of all these people who for a thousand years have done this. We will be 200 years in 4 years. We are just babes in the woods on preparing for and handling these natural disasters; babes in the woods. We cannot be any longer. We cannot be. We cannot be.

Just loans? What a great thing it is; yes. From 5½ percent and now down to 1 percent. Marvelous. Five-thousand-dollar forgiveness, marvelous.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FLOOD was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. FLOOD. Great things the loans, but you must examine from now on the total loss of equities. The loans are great, but the equities are gone. With businesses, small businesses, and private homeowners and their possessions, their equities are wiped out. There is no equity. With additional mortgages and additional loans, you have to examine from now on the impact of grants and loans or a combination of both. It is a new thing. I know. You know.

I know, you know—I am talking to you in the Congress at Washington—that some new things will have to be done, and you will have to do them, right away.

All right, you ask me "what new things, Flood?" Well let me tell you—and let us begin right here, and I repeat for the purpose of emphasis, let us begin in the Wyoming Valley, in the heart of the greatest civic disaster in the history of the Republic. It is by far the most massive—we all know that.

What is needed is an integrated, coordinated, trained, on-the-alert, organization to sweep into an area in the wake of a disaster. This group must be held constantly on "yellow alert"—standing by like a wing of SAC bombers—ready to go on "red alert" at a moment's notice. And crack troops at that. Coordination must be established at all governmental levels—local, State, and Federal, and all of it integrated into the private organizations—the Red Cross, the Salvation Army, and the scores of other groups which make it their duty to end human suffering wherever they find it.

This Congress has done a great deal—1 percent interest rate, \$5,000 forgiveness, massive appropriations—but it would be a grievous mistake to assume that this kind of emergency effort will lead to a happy ending for Wilkes-Barre and the other towns ravaged by the Susquehanna River. We must now move into a more subtle and newer phase of planning for the long haul. Now these are trick questions I am raising. Build up the dikes and dams? Can they be depended upon? Should the entire Wyoming Valley be rebuilt? A little perhaps—how much, we just do not know.

Now that the SBA loan provisions are almost law, the words on everyone's lips will be—"should we rebuild?" They are torn between rebuilding where they are now, or relocating. They have many questions, I have many questions, this body has many questions—the trouble is we all have precious little to guide us in answering them. This is unprecedented. The sad truth is that at the local, State, or Federal level, there is no satisfactory mechanism for planning and steering the complete recovery of such a huge and thoroughly devastated area as the Wyoming Valley. There ought to be one. Should it be public? Private? Public and private—that seems to be the answer. What must be made available to stricken communities is nothing less than the best technical talent and managerial expertise, coupled with all that the Federal agencies can provide. Instead of reacting with shock, surprise, disbelief, and depression—and this is what happens in a disaster—such a select "disaster action group" could swing into action with calm, with reason, with action.

What has happened in the Wyoming Valley must never happen again. Never again. Let us make this area a laboratory, a model in the end, for recovery planning for disasters of such huge magnitude. There is nothing to stop such a thing happening anywhere else—a new program can mean the difference.

At this point, I would like to read to you letters which I have sent recently which will give you a further idea of what I am talking about here—this is massive, beyond one government or one agency's capacity. On August 1, 1972, I sent the

following letter to Lieutenant General Clarke, commanding general, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
August 1, 1972.

Lt. Gen. F. J. CLARKE,
Chief of Engineers,
Department of the Army,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL CLARKE: I have been advised that there is now established in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, a District office of the United States Army Engineers.

I am not clear as to whether this is a brand new U.S. Army Engineers District office and, if so, its jurisdiction. In view of the fact that the disaster area on the Susquehanna in my District has been under the jurisdiction of the Baltimore District down through the years, and because of this history the Baltimore District office is closely identified with the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, I would like to know what will be the jurisdiction of the Harrisburg and Baltimore offices in this matter.

At the same time, as I am sure you well know better than I, the most thorough survey ever made by the Army Engineers in its history must now be made in the Susquehanna disaster area. I would like to know what plans the Army Engineers have in mind, beginning immediately to examine the whole spectrum of flood control, including the original and later abandoned dam proposals for upper New York State and Pennsylvania, the status of all existing dam constructions, the problem of the dredging of the river, especially through the Wyoming Valley area through the so-called Shickshinny Gorge—and if that phrase is not in your records, you can be sure it will be from now on—on the theory that the dredging of this Gorge below Wilkes-Barre in Shickshinny would prevent the back-up of the flood waters into the Wyoming Valley.

Now, with reference to the dikes, I want to know what the Engineers are thinking and talking about with reference to the dike system, particularly in the Wyoming Valley. Do you propose to continue the existing dike system? Are special inspections now being made of the existing system? Are repairs that are made merely temporary? What is the value of the existing system with temporary repairs in case of another unexpected high water level—not another cataclysm like Agnes, but any river rise approaching flood stage? What is the plan insofar as additional height for the dikes and extensive spreads at the base are concerned if the repairs are merely temporary now? What are the plans for immediate and full repair at once pending planned development extension or increasing the dikes system? What is your thinking with reference to recurring flooding in the surrounding countryside from rainfall and flash floods from tributaries which occur in many places and requires a constant elevation of the retaining walls? What about a secondary dike system—say half the height, more or less, and running parallel to the main dike, designed to localize and minimize damages of the primary dikes when breached? And what about a tertiary system of smaller dikes to control the levels of small streams and tributaries in the flood plan? In controlling the Susquehanna River floods before they happen with the high waters coming from upper New York State, can the Susquehanna River be diverted from a point near Towanda to connect with the west branch of the Susquehanna and join the southern branch in the vicinity of Muncy and Montoursville?

The flood waters everywhere deposited huge amounts of silt which must be dredged. In the dredging proposals, do you consider the removal of all islands in the river regardless of size?

Apart from the immediate losses, it is clear the floods produced a long-range physical damage. The enormous force of the water unleashed through the breaches in the primary dikes caused widespread erosion far beyond the obvious scouring and whirling effects near the breaks. What about the many breaches and what about the many washed-out pumping stations?

The prolonged inundation during and after the floods could have caused serious undermining of the primary dike system that may not show until late this summer or early fall. There is a possibility that the dike system has therefore been weakened, and there is the potential danger of immediate or future flooding, regardless of the height to which the water rises, although not necessarily, I repeat, another Agnes.

What about the practice of permitting municipalities along the river to drive their sewers through the dikes?

To what extent have you consulted with countries like Holland, China, and other nations historically renowned for their effective dike systems? What are your proposals with reference to the possibility of streets, roadways, or highways on the tops of new dike systems as is found in many places of the world, even in the Greater Washington Area?

What about the question of maintenance of the dikes—should this be left to local municipal authorities with the Engineers merely making periodic inspections? There should be grave doubts about this procedure, and the responsibility of inspection and maintenance should be that of the Federal Government.

What about the question of trees, shrubbery, and other such impediments on the face of the dike facing the river? What about riprapping the face of the dikes with stone or other materials?

As you know, the Army Engineers discovered that in 1946, the year of a very serious flood in Elmira, there was a flow of 130,000 cubic feet of water per second passing the city in the Chemung River which empties into the Susquehanna. According to the Army Engineers, that flood tide was felt to be so rare that when they later erected dikes they considered that amount of water flow to be a "1 in 1,000 years" situation. But in the great flood of 1972, preliminary estimates are that between 200,000 and 300,000 cubic feet of water per second passed through Elmira on the Chemung. I would like to be assured that the Army Engineers are now going to plan a flood control system in the disaster area which will take care of the amount of water flow for at least a thousand years.

I would like the details on the 2 dams which the Army Engineers ordered to be built on 2 tributaries of the Chemung. These 2 projects were to be built inside the Pennsylvania border. I would like a detailed report as to what protests were raised by Pennsylvania officials which held up the building of the dams and if they brought up the objection, "Why should we lose our tax base to benefit New Yorkers?" I would like the names of protesters, their titles, and verbatim statements as to the protests. I would like, as well, the history, with the dates, names of persons involved, and their addresses, of farmers and rural residents who were alleged to have stated they would not give up their lands for dams and dikes; and the statements of any County Commissioners or other officeholders in the area supporting such arguments.

While all of the above matters are of vital importance, and while this does not directly concern the Army Engineers—although I am sure it will interest them acutely, have you considered a more novel approach to this problem—that which involves man's ability to control the weather? The concept of "seeding" storm systems with silver iodine to remove some of their power while they are still at sea is, as you know, still under experimen-

tation. So are several other potential means of fighting killer storms. The recent disaster provides plenty of evidence that this Federal project, known as "Stormfury," should be expedited on the same priority basis as assigned to finding the cure for certain diseases. A nation that can land a man on the moon ought to come up with a solution to this problem.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

On August 2, 1972, I sent the following letter to Mr. Elbert F. Osborn, Director, U.S. Bureau of Mines:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
August 2, 1972.

MR. ELBERT F. OSBORN,
Director, Bureau of Mines,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. OSBORN: As I am sure you know, during the early days of the flood disaster in the Wyoming Valley in my District, I was in touch with Joe Corgan, Chief of Division of Environment in your office, and John Shuttack, District Manager of the Bureau of Mines in Wilkes-Barre, and they reported to me regularly with reference to surface and underground conditions as related to the flood situation.

Under the circumstances, it is imperative that a very special full and complete survey be made of the entire disaster area having to do with all underground conditions, water, surface support, erosion, and any and all problems which might directly or indirectly be affected by this catastrophic flood.

This report, of course, must also include a complete analysis of surface conditions, surface subsidence dangers, and all and any other matters which may affect directly or indirectly the surface of the disaster area.

In view of the magnitude of this disaster and the water levels which resulted in the disaster area of this part of the hard coal fields, I would like to be assured that your office can act fully and completely and immediately without legislation. If, however, you feel that the scope of the survey is such that legislation or special authority from the Congressional Committees concerned is necessary, be sure and let me know so that I can cooperate with you in seeing that your requests to these Committees are complied with without delay.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

On August 15, 1972, I sent the following letter to the Honorable Earl Butz, the Secretary of Agriculture:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
August 15, 1972.

HON. EARL L. BUTZ,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am sure you know of the devastation caused by Hurricane Agnes in Wilkes-Barre in the center of the disaster area in my District. It was unexpected and unforeseen—but it happened.

We are desperately trying to recoup our losses. At the same time, we are looking for reasons why it happened and solutions to prevent a recurrence.

There are various forms of flood control, but what I am interested in having your comments on is reforestation as a flood control. It is a known fact that hillsides without trees allow more water to run off faster.

I would like to know what regulations, if any, the Department of Agriculture has on stripping hillsides and denuding forests, especially in a watershed area—what enforcement powers do you have to uphold such regulations—what means are employed to

educate the farmers about controlling floods on their farm lands—what is the Soil and Water Conservation Corps—what is its purpose and how is that purpose achieved. I would also like to know if the Department has a reforestation program and what it is all about.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

The above letters illustrate, if nothing else, what each and every one of you will face in time of a disaster.

Concern for these problems is not confined to the Wyoming Valley. They know what is happening in Wilkes-Barre in the entire Nation. On August 9, 1972, Mr. Frank Blewitt, managing editor of the Scranton Times, Scranton, Pa., in co-operation with my office, took a leading group of national news media—TV, radio, magazines, newspapers—throughout the disaster area. Their response—shock, dismay, "something must be done." I could not be there, but sent my legislative assistant, Richard Altman, a Wilkes-Barre native who lost his home in the flooding. On a walking tour of the area arranged by the Honorable Max Rosenn, U.S. circuit court judge, I am told the media's response to what was happening—mind you 7 weeks after the flood—was complete disbelief. Something must be done. Something new, untried. This public-private disaster action group.

An editorial in the Washington Sunday Star, written by Jim Welch, one of those who made the tour, appeared on August 13, 1972, and was entitled "Lessons on Agnes and the Wyoming Valley." It is much the same as I am pointing out to you today—something, and what it is should be determined by this body, must be done.

You may ask where this leaves the victims of the flooding. Much has been done to help these people. They have faith that much more will be done. We cannot disappoint that faith. They have faith that their homes and businesses will recover. We cannot disappoint that faith. They have faith that their lives and their children's lives will not be washed away in a freak quirk of nature's fury. And we cannot disappoint that faith. Above all they have an abiding faith in their Government and their God. This brings to mind several thoughts scribbled on parchment long ago:

And God remembered Noah, and every living thing, and all that were with him in the ark: And God made a wind to pass over the earth, and the waters assuaged. . . . While the earth remains, seedtime and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease.

We cannot disappoint that faith.

MR. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

MR. SPEAKER, I heartily support this supplemental appropriation. We have great feelings for the people who are in the disaster areas, and we feel we have the responsibility to pass this bill as soon as possible. I endorse it, the minority endorses it, and I join with those who support it, and I hope that it will be used promptly, that there not be any red tape or any political efforts to make somebody look good or look bad, but that

the funds will be used for the purpose for which they are appropriated, and that is for prompt relief for these unfortunate people in these disaster areas.

I hope that the bill will be passed unanimously.

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

MR. SPEAKER, I want to comment on the disaster legislation we passed yesterday. I hope that after we have some experience with this one that we will learn more than we learned from the earthquake in California. We did learn that the law was inadequate in some respects, and the law was much too loosely administered in other respects. There was a tremendous waste of the taxpayers' money without helping those who were most seriously injured.

Instead of correcting those errors we legislated to double waste and inequity in the disaster program. That is why I voted against the bill yesterday. I will vote for this appropriations bill today because, among other things, I presume it includes the money to repair the public damages to the sewer systems, water systems, and the streets. Those systems must be put back in order, and quickly, for the health and safety of the people in the ravaged areas. The people who have lost their homes must be given a chance to get back into their homes, and that as quickly as possible.

But the bill we passed yesterday is an invitation to fraud, and that is how it will be used. The little old lady who loses her home by having it float down the river will find no help in this bill. She will be told she cannot borrow the money to rebuild her home because she cannot pay it back. But the person whose rug is stained and who finds he lost \$5,000 will be given that by the Treasury. And we will all hear, as Congressman Bow just said, "No red tape, get the money out fast." And that is precisely what will happen.

As soon as the first person on the block gets his \$5,000 Christmas present the rest of the people will be down to get theirs. And you will find a year from now that the people who are in the worst economic conditions and who suffered the greatest loss will be looking you in the eye and saying, "What happened to those \$3 or \$4 or \$5 billion?" I am already getting some of that.

I hope that some day we can carefully and thoughtfully revise the disaster program; some time when we are not faced with a disaster, and we will treat everybody with equity and see that the Federal largess is given according to the amount of damage suffered rather than on a kind of one-man, one-vote plan.

MR. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. CORMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

MR. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman for the courage of his expression. I think that the gentleman is absolutely right in that the authorizing legislation is not good legislation. I think we can all share the problems and sorrows and so on of those who have suffered damage and property loss from the disaster such as

the one the gentleman has mentioned. But I think it is somewhat less than fully responsible for us to be legislating as we did in the authorizing legislation, because I fear, as the gentleman fears, that what happened in California will happen elsewhere unless there is much better administration, and even better legislation than presently exists.

Mr. CORMAN. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. CORMAN. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California.

Much of the 1971 earthquake damage occurred in his district. He and the other gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER) had a great number of these type cases of which Mr. CORMAN has spoken. People who sustained heavy damages by the earthquake did not always receive adequate remuneration for the kind of losses that were caused by the 1971 disaster, whereas there were whole neighborhoods of people who came in and took unfair advantage of the so-called forgiveness clause.

Then various groups and the news media pressured their Representatives and the Small Business Administration to give faster and faster service. Now in this current situation rather than really looking carefully at this legislation, as I think we should have done in our Committee on Banking and Currency. The whole House has rushed through authorizing legislation to help the people damaged by Hurricane Agnes.

We have again, in my opinion, not adequately considered some of the objections that the gentleman from California has properly raised. I think it is too bad that we tend to wait until a disaster occurs and then hurry up and rush ill-conceived legislative bills through because nobody in this body wants to be against people in distress. The Committee on Appropriations feels the pressure on them to try to do their part in appropriating the actual funds.

I think the gentleman is to be complimented for raising these issues once again and hopefully we will legislate more responsibly very soon. We must take a hard look at the so-called forgiveness clause which encourages, as I think the gentleman said, "outright fraud."

I compliment him for his remark.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Texas one question?

We have talked a great deal about the \$250 billion expenditure ceiling. The administration has urged that we adopt that and indicated any expenditures that go over the budget would have to be cut someplace else.

May I ask whether the administration had this money in the budget or whether this would exceed the \$250 billion expenditure ceiling?

Mr. MAHON. These funds were not in the January budget. These funds, I believe, were in the recalculated budget that had to do with the President's statement on the \$250 billion expenditure ceiling.

I think the gentleman from California agrees with me that the way to control expenditures in this country is to proceed carefully with authorizations and to proceed carefully with the appropriations.

But after we have made the money available, then it is up to the administration to manage the expenditure of the funds for the purposes for which they are appropriated. Very often the administration finds it possible to delay or extend the time.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 16254, which provides additional relief to the victims of hurricane and tropical storm Agnes, and to the victims of the South Dakota flood disaster.

The widespread devastation caused by Agnes affected the lives of thousands of our fellow Americans and caused millions of dollars of property damage. Many communities are still engaged in the tedious job of digging out.

Only through a fortuitous change of course by the storm was my own State of Connecticut spared the massive destruction which several of our sister States suffered, although our coastal municipalities received the full force of the storm with 7 inches of rain falling in a short period of time. This legislation will help these cities along the road to recovery. The people of Connecticut are fully aware of the damage which can suddenly be caused by normally docile, meandering streams and rivers breaking over their banks and spreading havoc throughout the surrounding area. We saw this in August and October of 1955 during the floods in which many lives were lost and millions of dollars of damage caused.

In the aftermath of those fateful months, people from other areas of the country came to the aid of Connecticut. Funds for emergency assistance were made available and since that time funds have been appropriated for dams, retaining walls, levees, and similar flood control structures which now protect our State from a recurrence of that devastation of 1955.

On Thursday of this week the culmination of the Naugatuck Valley flood control project is taking place with the dedication of the Ansonia-Derby link of this vital investment in the protection of the property and lives of the people of Connecticut. I have been assured by the Army Engineers that "the Naugatuck Valley now enjoys the highest degree of protection of any watershed of its size in the country" against storms such as Agnes and that if tropical storm Agnes had hit Connecticut with its full fury little, if any, flood damage would have occurred in the Naugatuck Valley.

The people of Connecticut fully appreciate what has been done for them and I take this opportunity to lend my support to the legislation which is before us today.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the

engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. 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 392, nays 0, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 325]

YEAS—392

Abbott	Clark	Garmatz
Abernethy	Clausen,	Gaydos
Abourezk	Don H.	Gettys
Adams	Clawson, Del	Gialmo
Addabbo	Clay	Gibbons
Alexander	Cleveland	Goldwater
Anderson,	Collier	Gonzalez
Calif.	Collins, Ill.	Goodling
Anderson, Ill.	Collins, Tex.	Grasso
Anderson,	Colmer	Gray
Tenn.	Conable	Green, Oreg.
Andrews, Ala.	Conover	Green, Pa.
Andrews,	Conyers	Griffin
N. Dak.	Corman	Griffith
Annunzio	Cotter	Gross
Archer	Coughlin	Grover
Arends	Crane	Gubser
Ashbrook	Culver	Gude
Ashley	Curlin	Haley
Aspin	Daniel, Va.	Hall
Aspinall	Daniels, N.J.	Halpern
Badillo	Danielson	Hamilton
Baring	Davis, Ga.	Hammer-
Barrett	Davis, S.C.	schmidt
Begich	de la Garza	Hanley
Belcher	Delaney	Hanna
Bell	Dellenback	Hansen, Idaho
Bennett	Dellums	Hansen, Wash.
Bergland	Denholm	Harrington
Bevill	Dennis	Harsha
Biaggi	Dent	Harvey
Bieber	Derwinski	Hastings
Bingham	Devine	Hathaway
Blackburn	Dickinson	Hawkins
Blatnik	Diggs	Hays
Boggs	Dingell	Hechler, W. Va.
Boland	Donohue	Heinz
Bolling	Dorn	Helstoski
Bow	Dow	Henderson
Brademas	Downing	Hicks, Mass.
Bray	Drinan	Hicks, Wash.
Brinkley	Dulski	Hillis
Brooks	Duncan	Hogan
Broomfield	du Pont	Hollifield
Brotzman	Eckhardt	Horton
Brown, Mich.	Edwards, Calif.	Hosmer
Brown, Ohio	Ellberg	Howard
Broyhill, N.C.	Erlenborn	Hungate
Broyhill, Va.	Esch	Hunt
Buchanan	Eshleman	Hutchinson
Burke, Fla.	Evans, Colo.	Ichord
Burke, Mass.	Evins, Tenn.	Jacobs
Burleson, Tex.	Fascell	Jarman
Burlison, Mo.	Findley	Johnson, Calif.
Burton	Fish	Johnson, Pa.
Byrne, Pa.	Fisher	Jonas
Byrnes, Wis.	Flood	Jones, Ala.
Byron	Flowers	Jones, N.C.
Cabell	Flynt	Jones, Tenn.
Caffery	Foley	Karsh
Camp	Ford, Gerald R.	Kastenmeier
Carey, N.Y.	Ford,	Kazen
Carlson	William D.	Keating
Carney	Forsythe	Kee
Casey, Tex.	Fountain	Kemp
Cederberg	Fraser	King
Celler	Frey	Kluczynski
Chamberlain	Fulton	Koch
Chappell	Fuqua	Kuykendall
Chisholm	Galifianakis	Kyl

Kyros	Patman	Smith, Calif.
Landgrebe	Patten	Smith, Iowa
Latta	Pepper	Smith, N.Y.
Link	Perkins	Snyder
Lloyd	Pettis	Spence
Long, Md.	Peyster	Springer
McClary	Pickle	Staggers
McClure	Pike	Stanton
McCollister	Pirnie	J. William
McCormack	Poage	Steed
McCulloch	Podell	Steele
McDade	Poff	Steiger, Ariz.
McDonald,	Powell	Steiger, Wis.
Mich.	Preyer, N.C.	Stephens
McEwen	Price, Ill.	Stokes
McFall	Price, Tex.	Stratton
McKay	Pryor, Ark.	Stubblefield
McKevitt	Pucinski	Stuckey
McKinney	Purcell	Sullivan
Macdonald,	Quile	Symington
Mass.	Quillen	Talcott
Madden	Railsback	Taylor
Mahon	Randall	Teague, Calif.
Mailliard	Rangel	Teague, Tex.
Mallory	Rees	Terry
Mann	Reid	Thompson, Ga.
Martin	Reuss	Thompson, N.J.
Mathias, Calif.	Riegler	Thomson, Wis.
Mathis, Ga.	Roberts	Thone
Matsunaga	Robinson, Va.	Tiernan
Mayne	Robison, N.Y.	Udall
Mazzoli	Rodino	Ullman
Meeds	Roe	Van Deerlin
Melcher	Rogers	Vander Jagt
Metcalfe	Roncalio	Vanik
Mikva	Rooney, Pa.	Vigorito
Miller, Calif.	Rosenthal	Waggonner
Miller, Ohio	Rostenkowski	Wampler
Mills, Ark.	Roush	Ware
Mills, Md.	Rousselot	Whalen
Minish	Roy	Whalley
Mink	Roybal	White
Minshall	Runnels	Whitehurst
Mitchell	Ruppe	Whitten
Mizell	Ruth	Widnall
Molloyhan	St Germain	Wiggins
Monagan	Sandman	Williams
Montgomery	Sarbanes	Wilson, Bob
Moorhead	Satterfield	Wilson,
Morgan	Saylor	Charles H.
Mosher	Scherle	Winn
Moss	Scheuer	Wolf
Murphy, Ill.	Schneebell	Wright
Murphy, N.Y.	Schwengel	Wyatt
Myers	Scott	Wylder
Natcher	Sebelius	Wylie
Nedzi	Seiberling	Wyman
Nelsen	Shipley	Yates
Nichols	Shoup	Yatron
Nix	Shriver	Young, Fla.
Obey	Sikes	Young, Tex.
O'Hara	Slak	Zablocki
O'Konski	Skubitz	Zion
O'Neill	Slack	Zwack

NAYS—0
NOT VOTING—40

Abzug	Frenzel	McMillan
Baker	Gallagher	Michel
Betts	Hagan	Passman
Blanton	Hébert	Pelly
Brasco	Heckler, Mass.	Rarick
Carter	Huck	Rhodes
Clancy	Keith	Rooney, N.Y.
Conte	Landrum	Ryan
Davis, Wis.	Leggett	Schmitz
Dowdy	Lennon	Stanton
Dwyer	Lent	James V.
Edmondson	Long, La.	Veysey
Edwards, Ala.	Lujan	Waldie
Frelinghuysen	McCloskey	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Rhodes.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Waldie with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.
Mr. Ryan with Mr. Lent.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mrs. Abzug with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. James V. Stanton with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Frenzel.
Mr. Leggett with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Carter.

Mr. Hagan with Mr. Keith.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. Rarick with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Betts.
Mr. Pelly with Mr. Schmitz.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 3726,
EQUAL EXPORT OPPORTUNITY
ACT AND INTERNATIONAL ECO-
NOMIC POLICY ACT OF 1972

Mr. PATMAN submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 3726) 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: CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 92-1342)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3726) 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, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE EXPORT
ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1969

Sec. 101. This title may be cited as the "Equal Export Opportunity Act".

Sec. 102. Section 2(3) of the Export Administration Act of 1969 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "particularly when export restrictions applied by the United States are more extensive than export restrictions imposed by countries with which the United States has defense treaty commitments".

Sec. 103. Section 3 of the Export Administration Act of 1969 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(6) It is the policy of the United States that the desirability of subjecting, or continuing to subject, particular articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data or other information, to United States export controls should be subjected to review by and consultation with representatives of appropriate United States Government agencies and qualified experts from private industry."

Sec. 104. (a) Section 4(b) of the Export Administration Act of 1969 is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "(b)"; and
(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(2) The Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with appropriate United States Government departments and agencies and the appropriate technical advisory committees established under section 5(c), shall undertake an investigation to determine which articles, materials, and supplies, including technical data and other information, should no longer be subject to export controls because of their significance to the national security of the United States. Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1), the President shall remove unilateral export controls on the export from the United

States of articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data or other information, which he determines are available without restriction from sources outside the United States in significant quantities and comparable in quality to those produced in the United States, except that any such control may remain in effect if the President determines that adequate evidence has been presented to him demonstrating that the absence of such a control would prove detrimental to the national security of the United States. The nature of such evidence shall be included in the special report required by paragraph (4).

"(3) In conducting the investigation referred to in paragraph (2) and in taking the action required under such paragraph, the Secretary of Commerce shall give priority to those controls which apply to articles, materials, and supplies, including technical data and other information, for which there are significant potential export markets.

"(4) Not later than nine months after the date of enactment of the Equal Export Opportunity Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall submit to the President and to the Congress a special report of actions taken under paragraphs (2) and (3). Such report shall contain—

"(A) a list of any articles, materials and supplies, including technical data and other information, which are subject under this Act to export controls greater than those imposed by nations with which the United States has defense treaty commitments and the reasons for such greater controls; and

"(B) a list of any procedures applicable to export licensing in the United States which may be or are claimed to be more burdensome than similar procedures utilized in nations with which the United States has defense treaty commitments, and the reasons for retaining such procedures in their present form."

(b) (1) Section 4(e) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The authority conferred by this section shall not be exercised with respect to any agricultural commodity, including fats and oils or animal hides or skins, without the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture shall not approve the exercise of such authority with respect to any such commodity during any period for which the supply of such commodity is determined by him to be in excess of the requirements of the domestic economy, except to the extent the President determines that such exercise of authority is required to effectuate the policies set forth in clause (B) or (C) of paragraph (2) of section 3 of this Act."

(2) Any rule, regulation, proclamation, or order issued after July 1, 1972, under section 4 of the Export Administration Act of 1969, exercising any authority conferred by such section with respect to any agricultural commodity, including fats and oils or animal hides or skins, shall cease to be effective upon the date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 105. Section 5 of the Export Administration Act of 1969 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(c) (1) Upon written request by representatives of a substantial segment of any industry which produces articles, materials and supplies, including technical data and other information, which are subject to export controls or are being considered for such controls because of their significance to the national security of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce shall appoint a technical advisory committee for any grouping of such articles, materials, and supplies, including technical data and other information, which he determines is difficult to evaluate because of questions concerning technical matters, worldwide availability and actual utilization of production and tech-

nology, or licensing procedures. Each such committee shall consist of representatives of United States industry and government. No person serving on any such committee who is representative of industry shall serve on such committee for more than two consecutive years.

"(2) It shall be the duty and function of the technical advisory committees established under paragraph (1) to advise and assist the Secretary of Commerce and any other department, agency, or official of the Government of the United States to which the President has delegated power, authority, and discretion under section 4(d) with respect to actions designed to carry out the policy set forth in section 3 of this Act. Such committees shall be consulted with respect to questions involving technical matters, worldwide availability and actual utilization of production and technology, and licensing procedures which may affect the level of export controls applicable to any articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data or other information, and including those whose export is subject to multilateral controls undertaken with nations with which the United States has defense treaty commitments, for which the committees have expertise. Such committees shall also be consulted and kept fully informed of progress with respect to the investigation required by section 4(b) (2) of this Act. Nothing in this subsection shall prevent the Secretary from consulting, at any time, with any person representing industry or the general public regardless of whether such person is a member of a technical advisory committee. Members of the public shall be given a reasonable opportunity, pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, to present evidence to such committees.

"(3) Upon request of any member of any such committee, the Secretary may, if he determines it appropriate, reimburse such member for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in connection with his duties as a member.

"(4) Each such committee shall elect a chairman, and shall meet at least every three months at the call of the Chairman, unless the Chairman determines, in consultation with the other members of the committee, that such a meeting is not necessary to achieve the purposes of this Act. Each such committee shall be terminated after a period of two years, unless extended by the Secretary for additional periods of two years. The Secretary shall consult each such committee with regard to such termination or extension of that committee."

Sec. 106. Section 14 of the Export Administration Act of 1969 is amended by striking out "August 1, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1974".

Sec. 107. Nothing in this title shall be construed to require the release or publication of information which is classified pursuant to Executive order or to affect the confidentiality safeguards provided in section 7(c) of the Export Administration Act of 1969.

Sec. 108. The provisions of this title take effect as of the close of July 31, 1972.

TITLE II—COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY

SHORT TITLE

Sec. 201. This title may be cited as the "International Policy Act of 1972".

STATEMENT OF PURPOSES

Sec. 202. It is the purpose of this title to provide for closer Federal interagency coordination in the development of a more rational and orderly international economic policy for the United States.

FINDINGS AND POLICY

Sec. 203. The Congress finds that there are many activities undertaken by various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government which, in the aggregate, constitute the domestic and international economic policy of the United States. The Congress further finds that the objectives of the United States with respect to a sound and purposeful international economic policy can be better accomplished through the closer coordination of (1) domestic and foreign economic activity, and (2) in particular, that economic behavior which, taken together, constitutes United States international economic policy. Therefore this Act establishes a Council on International Economic Policy which will provide for—

(A) a clear top level focus for the full range of international economic issues; deal with international economic policies including trade, investment, balance of payments, and finance as a coherent whole;

(B) consistency between domestic and foreign economic policy; and

(C) close coordination with basic foreign policy objectives.

The Congress intends that the Council shall be provided with the opportunity to (i) investigate problems with respect to the coordination, implementation, and long-range development of international economic policy, and (ii) make appropriate findings and recommendations for the purpose of assisting in the development of a rational and orderly international economic policy for the United States.

CREATION OF COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY

Sec. 204. There is created in the Executive Office of the President a Council on International Economic Policy (hereinafter referred to in this title as the "Council").

MEMBERSHIP

Sec. 205. The Council shall be composed of the following members and such additional members as the President may designate:

- (1) The President.
- (2) The Secretary of State.
- (3) The Secretary of the Treasury.
- (4) The Secretary of Defense.
- (5) The Secretary of Agriculture.
- (6) The Secretary of Commerce.
- (7) The Secretary of Labor.
- (8) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(9) The Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.

(10) The Special Representative for Trade Negotiations.

The President shall be the Chairman of the Council and shall preside over the meetings of the Council; in his absence he may designate a member of the Council to preside in his place.

DUTIES OF THE COUNCIL

Sec. 206. Subject to the direction of the President, and in addition to performing such other functions as he may direct, the Council shall—

(1) Assist and advise the President in the preparation of the International Economic Report required under section 207.

(2) Review the activities and the policies of the United States Government which indirectly or directly relate to international economics and, for the purpose of making recommendations to the President in connection therewith, consider with some degree of specificity the substance and scope of the international economic policy of the United States, which consideration shall include examination of the economic activities of (A) the various agencies, departments, and instrumentalities of the Federal Govern-

ment, (B) the several States, and (C) private industry.

(3) Collect, analyze, and evaluate authoritative information, current and prospective, concerning international economic matters. Such evaluations shall include but not be limited to the impact of international trade on the level, stability, and financial rewards for domestic labor and the impact of the transnational corporation on international trade flows.

(4) Consider policies and programs for coordinating the activities of all the departments and agencies of the United States with one another for the purpose of accomplishing a more consistent international economic policy, and make recommendations to the President in connection therewith.

(5) Continually assess the progress and effectiveness of Federal efforts to carry out a consistent international economic policy; and

(6) Make recommendations to the President for domestic and foreign programs which will promote a more consistent international economic policy on the part of the United States and private industry. Recommendations under this paragraph shall include, but shall not be limited to, policy proposals relating to monetary mechanisms, foreign investment, trade, the balance of payments, foreign aid, taxes, international tourism and aviation, and international treaties and agreements relating to all such matters. In addition to other appropriate objectives, such policy proposals should be developed with a view toward—

(A) strengthening the United States competitive position in world trade;

(B) achieving equilibrium in international payment accounts of the United States;

(C) increasing exports of goods and services;

(D) protecting and improving the earnings of foreign investments consonant with the concepts of tax equity and the need for domestic investment;

(E) achieving freedom of movement of people, goods, capital, information, and technology on a reciprocal and worldwide basis;

(F) increasing the real employment and income of workers and consumers on the basis of international economic activity; and

(G) preserving the diversified industrial base of the United States.

REPORT

Sec. 207. (a) The President shall transmit to the Congress an annual report on the international economic position of the United States. Such report (hereinafter referred to as the "International Economic Report") shall be submitted not later than sixty days after the beginning of each regular session of the Congress, and shall include—

(1) information and statistics describing characteristics of international economic activity and identifying significant current and foreseeable trends and developments;

(2) a review of the international economic program of the Federal Government and a review of domestic and foreign economic conditions and other significant matters affecting the balance of international payments of the United States and of their effect on the international trade, investment, financial, and monetary position of the United States;

(3) a review of the impact of international voluntary standards, the foreign investments of United States based transnational firms, and the level of foreign wage rates on the level, stability, and financial reward for domestic employment; and

(4) a program for carrying out the policy objectives of this title, together with such

recommendations for legislation as he may deem necessary or desirable.

(b) The President may transmit from time to time to the Congress reports supplementary to the International Economic Report, each of which may include such supplementary or revised recommendations as he may deem necessary or desirable to achieve the purposes and policy objectives set forth in this title.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND STAFF OF THE COUNCIL

SEC. 208. (a) The staff of the Council shall be headed by an Executive Director who shall be appointed by the President, and he shall be compensated at the rate now or hereafter provided for level II of the Executive Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5313). He shall keep the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Finance of the Senate, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and the Joint Economic Committee fully and currently informed regarding the activities of the Council.

(b) (1) With the approval of the Council, the Executive Director may appoint and fix the compensation of such staff personnel as he deems necessary. Except as provided in paragraph (2), the staff of the Council shall be appointed subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(2) With the approval of the Council, the Executive Director may appoint and fix the compensation of one officer at a rate of basic compensation not to exceed the rate provided for level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule, and appoint and fix the compensation of two officers at rates of basic compensation not to exceed the rate provided for level V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule.

(c) With the approval of the Council, the Executive Director may procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at rates not to exceed the daily equivalent of the rate provided for GS-18.

(d) Upon request of the Executive Director, the head of any Federal agency is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of its personnel to the Council to assist it in carrying out its duties under this title.

SEC. 209. The provisions of this title shall expire on June 30, 1973, unless extended by legislation enacted by the Congress.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 210. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, there are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$1,400,000 for fiscal year 1973.

And the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its amendment to the title of the bill.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
WM. A. BARRETT,
LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
HENRY S. REUSS,
THOMAS L. ASHLEY,
FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN,
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
ALBERT W. JOHNSON,
GARRY BROWN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CXVIII—1781—Part 22

JOHN SPARKMAN,
H. WILLIAMS,
W. F. MONDALE,
WALLACE F. BENNETT,
BILL BROCK,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3726) 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, 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:

AMENDMENTS TO THE EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1969

Findings and policy

The Senate bill contained a provision which amended a finding that the unwarranted restriction of exports has a serious adverse effect on our balance of payments by adding language indicating that this is particularly the case when United States restrictions are more extensive than those imposed by countries with which the United States has defense treaty commitments.

The Senate bill also contained a provision stating that it is the policy of the United States that the review of United States export controls should involve consultation with representatives of appropriate United States government agencies and qualified experts from private industry.

The House amendments contained no similar provisions. The conferees adopted the Senate provisions.

Investigation by the Secretary of Commerce of items subject to export control

The Senate bill contained a provision which required the Secretary of Commerce to undertake an investigation to determine which items should no longer be subject to export controls because they are not significant to the national security of the United States. The provision also required the President to remove unilateral export controls on items he determines are available outside the United States in significant quantity and quality comparable to those produced in the United States, except when he determines that the absence of controls would prove detrimental to the national security of the United States.

The House amendments contained no similar provision. The conferees adopted the Senate provision.

Report by the Secretary of Commerce

The Senate bill required that the Secretary of Commerce report to the President and to the Congress not later than nine months after the date of enactment of the Act concerning steps which he has taken to reduce certain unilateral United States export controls. If he decides to continue unilateral controls on specific items, he must state the reasons for doing so.

The Senate bill further provided that the Secretary of Commerce shall report items and information subject to control procedures which are more burdensome than comparable procedures of other countries.

The House amendments contained no similar provision. The conferees adopted the Senate provision.

Technical advisory committees

The Senate bill contained a provision which required the Secretary of Commerce to establish technical advisory committees to

assist in reducing both unilateral and multilateral export controls on peaceful, non-strategic trade.

The House amendments contained no similar provision. The House receded to the Senate provision with an amendment which eliminated the requirement that the members of any such committee be compensated and substituted a provision which authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to reimburse any such member for travel and subsistence upon request of the member.

Confidentiality of business information

The Senate bill had a provision which stated that nothing in this Title should be construed to require the release or publication of information which is classified pursuant to executive order or already protected by other safeguards in the Export Administration Act of 1969.

The House amendments contained no similar provision. The conferees adopted the Senate provision.

Effective date

The Senate bill provided that the title was to take effect on July 31, 1972.

The House amendments provided for the effective date to be on the date of enactment of the Act.

The conferees adopted the Senate provision.

COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY

The Senate bill contained a Title II which provided for the establishment of a Council on International Economic Policy. The purpose of this Council is to provide for closer interagency coordination in the development of United States international economic policy. This better coordination is found to be necessary because there are many departments and agencies of the Federal government operating in the international economic policy area, and because better coordination is needed between domestic and foreign economic policy.

The Council created in the Senate bill would be in the Executive Office of the President. Its membership includes the President and nine cabinet officers and executive office officials. The duties of the Council include advising and assisting the President in the preparation of an International Economic Report, reviewing the policies of the many agencies operating in the international economic policy area and making recommendations to the President for improving and making more consistent our international economic policy.

The Senate bill provided that the President, with the assistance of the Council, shall submit an annual International Economic Report to the Congress.

The Senate bill further provided for a Council staff to be headed by an Executive Director. The Executive Director would be required to keep the appropriate committees of both the House and the Senate fully and currently informed regarding the activities of the Council.

The Senate bill authorized \$1,400,000 for the Council for fiscal year 1973 and provided that the legislation creating the Council shall expire on June 30, 1973 unless specifically extended by legislation enacted by the Congress.

The House amendments contained no similar provision. The House receded to the Senate provision with the following amendments:

1. In connection with the duty of the Council to review the activities and the policies of the United States government, there was stricken explicit reference to a specific international agreement and to specific trading partners. The conferees agreed that the re-

maining language was broad enough to allow the Council to review any such trade relationships.

2. In connection with the duty of the Council to make recommendations to the President, the conferees agreed to strike the word "existing" from the requirement that policy proposals be developed with a view toward "preserving the existing diversified industrial base of the United States."

3. In connection with the appointment of an Executive Director for the Council, it was agreed to delete the requirement that he be an Assistant to the President. The conferees agreed that the Executive Director shall be appointed by the President and shall be compensated at the rate provided for Level II of the Executive Schedule.

The conferees unanimously agreed that the work of the Council and the Report of the President shall include as their objectives—

1. strengthening the United States competitive position in world trade;
2. achieving equilibrium in international payment accounts of the United States;
3. increasing exports of goods and services;
4. protecting and improving the earnings of foreign investments consonant with the concepts of tax equity and the need for domestic investment;
5. achieving freedom of movement of people, goods, capital, information, and technology on a reciprocal and worldwide basis;
6. increasing the real employment and income of workers and consumers on the basis of international economic activity; and
7. preserving the diversified industrial base of the United States.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
WM. A. BARRETT,
LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
HENRY S. REUSS,
THOMAS L. ASHLEY,
FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN,
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
ALBERT W. JOHNSON,
GARRY BROWN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN SPARKMAN,
H. WILLIAMS,
W. F. MONDALE,
WALLACE F. BENNETT,
BILL BROCK,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday last, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1278) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1973, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That clause (c) of section 102 of the joint resolution of July 1, 1972 (Public Law 92-334), is hereby amended by striking out "August 18, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1972 or

the sine die adjournment of the second session of the Ninety-second Congress".

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

Mr. Speaker, this continuing resolution would extend to September 30 or the sine die adjournment of this session, whichever comes first.

Of course, agencies and activities which are provided for in appropriation bills that are enacted and signed into law are no longer under the continuing resolution.

The report covers the details. There is nothing unusual about the pending resolution.

I believe the Congress has done a reasonably satisfactory job in expediting handling of appropriation bills at this session of the Congress.

Earlier this session, with respect to the fiscal year 1972, we passed four appropriation measures. Congress reduced the budget requests for new spending authority in those measures by \$418 million.

There are 13 regular annual appropriation bills for the current fiscal year 1973. Nine of those 13 bills have cleared the Congress and gone to the President; four remain.

There will also be a closing supplemental bill.

Among the bills remaining is the State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary appropriation bill which has passed the House and the Senate but has not yet cleared conference.

Another remaining bill for which we have not had the annual authorization is the military construction appropriation bill. We hope to handle that during the first part of September.

Another is the defense appropriation bill. The related annual defense authorization bill has not cleared the Congress and thus we do not have authorization, but it is expected that early in September the House Committee on Appropriations, by the use of a special rule if a rule is granted, will bring before the House the appropriation bill for the Department of Defense.

As you know, the House and the Senate have passed the authorization bills but settlement of the differences between the House and the Senate has not yet taken place.

Then, we have the foreign assistance appropriation bill which we hope to present to the House by about mid-September. That, too, has been delayed for lack of authorization.

Then, of course, there will be a closing supplemental bill.

So it would now seem, from the standpoint of the appropriation bills, unless there are unforeseen difficulties, the business can be fully cleared by September 30, the expiration date of the pending continuing resolution.

Now, of course, this will not be easy to accomplish but it can, it seems to me, be accomplished.

It is not certain just what bills may be vetoed. It has been widely asserted that the Labor-HEW appropriation bill,

which is far above the President's budget requests, will be vetoed. If that takes place, of course some delay would be brought about as it will be necessary to bring a new bill before the House, consider it, pass it, and have it considered by the other body and then it will have to go to conference. There will be some delay there. I would add that if it is vetoed, the activities involved would be continued under existing continuing resolution ground rules.

We do not, of course, know what bills may be vetoed, and of course there will be some delay in the event any of the bills are vetoed.

THE APPROPRIATION BILLS OF THE SESSION

Now, questions may arise as to how well or how poorly Congress has done in handling the appropriation bills at this session. On the four supplemental measures for fiscal 1972, we were below the budget requests, as I mentioned, by about \$418 million.

When the work is all done this fall and we complete all the appropriation bills for fiscal 1973, I would not be at all surprised if the House has not provided, in total, something materially below the total of the budget requests, considered in those appropriation bills. I say that in spite of the fact that the Labor-HEW bill is very considerably above the budget requested. I am speaking of the annual appropriation bills only. And I refer only to the House. But even in respect to final action by Congress on the annual appropriation bills for 1973, when we consider all the measures which will be before us, it would seem to me that we might very well be about even—seven, in total, with the budget requests—perhaps a few hundred million below the total.

Much has been said about an overall expenditure limitation for the current fiscal year. The administration has available for expenditure many billions of dollars in addition to the new appropriations being made for this year. Unexpended Federal funds across the Government, for all purposes, at the beginning of this fiscal year totaled roughly \$140 billion, in addition to perhaps \$110 billion of balances in various trust funds. Of course, billions and billions of those funds could not be expended during the current fiscal year for various reasons, one being that many, many billions would not even be committed or obligated.

Controlling spending comes down to this: The way to reduce and control expenditures is to reduce and control the appropriations and to also slow down passage of legislation which mandates expenditures through nonappropriation bills. The budget has been seriously breached by three or four nonappropriation bills this year.

I may have more to say about this question at a later date.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I am including a table on the appropriation bills as they stand at this time with respect to fiscal 1973:

NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY IN THE APPROPRIATION BILLS FOR 1973—REVISED TO AUG. 15, 1972

[Note.—As to fiscal year 1973 amounts only]

Bill	Budget request considered	Approved	Change, (+) or (-)	Bill	Budget request considered	Approved	Change, (+) or (-)
In the House:				6. Treasury-Postal Service-General Government			
1. Legislative	\$433,627,004	\$427,604,764	-\$6,022,240	7. Labor-HEW	\$5,066,603,000	\$5,057,186,000	-\$9,417,000
2. State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary	4,687,988,600	4,587,104,350	-100,884,250	8. Interior	28,776,633,500	31,354,930,500	+2,578,297,000
3. HUD-Space-Science-Veterans	20,173,185,000	19,718,490,000	-454,695,000	9. Public Works-AEC	2,527,154,000	2,550,922,800	+23,768,800
4. Transportation	2,909,181,095	2,791,614,095	-117,567,000	10. Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection	5,489,058,000	5,571,696,000	+82,638,000
Advance 1974 appropriation	(131,181,000)	(131,181,000)		11. Disaster Relief Supplemental, 1973	12,952,190,400	13,561,055,800	+608,865,400
5. District of Columbia (Federal funds)	343,306,000	332,306,000	-11,000,000	12. Military Construction			
6. Labor-HEW	27,327,323,500	28,603,179,500	+1,275,856,000	13. Defense			
7. Interior	2,520,340,000	2,529,558,200	+9,218,200	14. Foreign Assistance			
8. Treasury-Postal Service-General Government	5,066,603,000	5,057,145,000	-9,458,000	15. Supplemental, 1973			
9. Public Works-AEC	5,489,058,000	5,437,727,000	-51,331,000	Total, bills cleared Senate	83,545,983,494	87,235,301,844	+3,689,318,350
10. Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection	12,952,177,400	12,897,010,900	-55,166,500	Cleared to the President:			
11. Disaster Relief Supplemental, 1973	1,569,800,000	1,587,300,000	+17,500,000	1. Legislative	519,347,899	513,787,980	-5,559,919
12. Military Construction	(2,661,384,000)			2. Treasury-Postal Service-General Government	5,066,603,000	5,057,827,000	-8,776,000
13. Defense	(79,594,184,000)			3. District of Columbia (Federal funds)	343,306,000	316,393,000	-26,913,000
14. Foreign Assistance	(5,163,024,000)			4. Interior	2,527,154,000	2,548,935,000	+21,781,000
15. Supplemental, 1973				5. HUD-Space-Science-Veterans	20,258,183,000	20,125,951,000	-132,232,000
Total, House bills	83,472,589,599	83,969,039,809	+496,450,210	6. Labor-HEW	28,776,633,500	30,538,919,500	+1,762,286,000
In the Senate:				7. Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection	12,952,190,400	13,434,032,700	+481,842,300
1. Legislative	519,347,899	514,722,880	-4,625,019	8. Public Works-AEC	5,489,058,000	5,504,914,000	+15,856,000
2. HUD-Space-Science-Veterans	20,258,183,000	20,583,370,000	+325,187,000	9. Transportation	2,909,181,095	2,867,937,095	-41,244,000
3. District of Columbia (Federal funds)	343,306,000	313,706,000	-29,600,000	Advance 1974 appropriation	(131,181,000)	(131,181,000)	
4. State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary	4,704,326,600	4,820,717,769	+116,391,169	Total, bills cleared to the President	78,841,656,894	80,908,697,575	+2,067,040,681
5. Transportation	2,909,181,095	2,906,994,095	-2,187,000				
Advance 1974 appropriation	(131,181,000)	(131,181,000)					

COMPREHENSIVE BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. Speaker, I again add that the foregoing table relates only to the annual appropriation bills. Those bills do not encompass all actions—or inactions—that have an impact on the budget recommendations. In that connection, I would again call attention to the periodic budget "scorekeeping" reports issued by the staff of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures. These reports are designed to keep tabs, currently, on what is happening in the legislative process to the budget recommendations of the President, both appropriationwise and expenditurewise, and on the revenue recommendations, and not only from actions in the revenue and appropriation bills but also in legislative bills that affect budget authority and expenditures—backdoor bills, bills that mandate expenditures, and so on.

Several such reports have been issued this year—the latest one as of August 4. Others will be forthcoming. Copies are sent to the office of each Member.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I was intrigued by the gentleman's statement that there are only four or five appropriation bills remaining to be considered. On one hand he says that we can reasonably expect to get through by September 30, as provided in the continuing resolution.

Then the distinguished chairman seems to think he has some doubt about that. Would the gentleman care to clarify and make a prediction as to whether we can reasonably expect to have to join the campaigning absentees of the other body or be stuck here well into October?

Mr. MAHON. I, of course, do not know, but unless there is some extended controversy or delaying tactic of some kind relating to an end-the-war resolution or

some other unanticipated and very controversial matter, it would seem to me that in the normal course of things the appropriation bills could be disposed of between September 5 and September 30. This would require considerable activity, I must say, but most of the hearings have been held and some of the bills tentatively marked up. If we can find a parliamentary way to proceed with foreign aid, the two defense bills, and the final supplemental bill, we should be able to make the deadline. We should have no difficulty in settling the State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary bills.

Mr. GROSS. Then the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, having had a great many years of experience in this body and having watched its workings, would see no reason why, with the appropriation bills cleared by September 30, there should be any sessions thereafter?

Mr. MAHON. From the standpoint of the Committee on Appropriations I am compelled to agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman. I would certainly hope we can finish our business in order that we can all return to our districts and visit with our people. I would hope, as I know the gentleman and most other Members of the House do, that we would not have a lameduck session after the November election. Generally, I think the Congress is proceeding with reasonable deliberation in most of these matters. We have taken time but we ought to take the time necessary.

Mr. GROSS. I could not agree with the gentleman more, that the last thing we need is a lameduck session of Congress on top of what we have already had. Moreover, the gentleman from Iowa would like to do a little fishing in the interim between November 7 and the convening of the next Congress, being

fortunate enough to be reelected of course, but that is in the lap of the gods, too. I would like to go fishing even though I might have to fish through the ice.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman knows that the apostle Peter was also a fisherman but he was to be a fisher of men.

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute. Let us keep our comparisons in perspective.

Mr. MAHON. I think most of us would like to visit with our constituents as frequently as possible and certainly between now and the November election.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the distinguished gentleman from Texas with his powers of persuasion will be able to carry on some effective missionary work with the Speaker, while the Republicans are conventioning, leading to an early end in September of this session of Congress.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I believe this continuing resolution is necessary.

I am afraid the gentleman from Iowa, if he is interested at all in my observation, will find my distinguished chairman is a bit optimistic. I thought that this resolution might go until sine die instead of trying to get it as of September 30, but it is not always a pleasant thing to come in and ask for the continuing resolution.

I would be willing of course to bet, but we are not allowed to bet on the floor of the House, but I would wager a buck-eye at least that we will be here for another continuing resolution after September 30.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Iowa

is not much of a better and he would have little or no use for a buckeye. I hope the gentleman is wrong and I hope if he does make that kind of wager that he loses, because I can see no reason in the world why we should be in session during the month of October.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman knows it would not be the first time I have been wrong. This is one time I should like to be wrong, on this, but I just do not like to see people get their hopes up to be out of here by September 30, when we look at what is ahead of us and also realize there may be some delaying tactics in another body. I would suggest we do not get packed on September 30.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I am in favor of this continuing resolution. I hope it will pass unanimously.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. DELLENBACK. 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 381, nays 8, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 326]

YEAS—381

Abbitt	Brinkley	Conover
Abourezk	Brooks	Conyers
Adams	Broomfield	Corman
Addabbo	Brotzman	Cotter
Alexander	Brown, Mich.	Coughlin
Anderson	Brown, Ohio	Culver
Calif.	Broyhill, N.C.	Curlin
Anderson, Ill.	Broyhill, Va.	Daniel, Va.
Anderson, Tenn.	Buchanan	Daniels, N.J.
Andrews, Ala.	Burke, Fla.	Danielson
Andrews, N. Dak.	Burleson, Tex.	Davis, Ga.
Annunzio	Burlison, Mo.	Davis, S.C.
Archer	Burton	de la Garza
Arends	Byrne, Pa.	Delaney
Ashley	Byrnes, Wis.	Dellenback
Aspin	Cabell	Dellums
Aspinall	Caffery	Denholm
Badillo	Camp	Dennis
Baring	Carey, N.Y.	Dent
Barrett	Carlson	Devine
Begich	Carney	Dickinson
Belcher	Casey, Tex.	Diggs
Bell	Cederberg	Dingell
Bennett	Celler	Donohue
Bergland	Chamberlain	Dorn
Bevill	Chappell	Dow
Blaggi	Chisholm	Downing
Blester	Clark	Drinan
Bingham	Clausen	Dulski
Blackburn	Don H.	Duncan
Blatnik	Clawson, Del.	du Pont
Boggs	Clay	Eckhardt
Boland	Cleveland	Edwards, Calif.
Bolling	Collier	Eilberg
Bow	Collins, Ill.	Eisenborn
Brademas	Colmer	Esch
Bray	Conable	Eshleman
		Evans, Colo.
		Evins, Tenn.

Fascell	McClure	Rosenthal
Findley	McCollister	Rostenkowski
Fisher	McCormack	Roush
Flood	McCulloch	Rousselot
Flowers	McDade	Roy
Flynt	McDonald, Mich.	Runnels
Foley	McEwen	Ruppe
Ford, Gerald R.	McFall	Ruth
Ford, William D.	McKay	St Germain
Forsythe	McKevitt	Sandman
Fountain	McKinney	Sarbanes
Fraser	Macdonald, Mass.	Satterfield
Frenzel	Madden	Saylor
Frey	Mahon	Scherle
Fulton	Mailliard	Scheuer
Fuqua	Mallory	Schwengel
Galifianakis	Mann	Scott
Garmatz	Martin	Sebelius
Gaydos	Mathias, Calif.	Shipley
Gettys	Mathis, Ga.	Shoup
Gialimo	Matsunaga	Shriver
Gibbons	Mayne	Sikes
Goldwater	Mazzoli	Sisk
Gonzalez	Meeds	Skubitz
Goodling	Melcher	Slack
Grasso	Metcalfe	Smith, Calif.
Gray	Mikva	Smith, Iowa
Green, Oreg.	Miller, Calif.	Smith, N.Y.
Green, Pa.	Miller, Ohio	Snyder
Griffin	Mills, Md.	Spence
Griffiths	Minish	Springer
Grover	Mink	Staggers
Gubser	Minshall	Stanton, J. William
Gude	Mitchell	Stanton, James V.
Haley	Mizell	Steed
Halpern	Mollohan	Steele
Hamilton	Monagan	Steiger, Ariz.
Hammer	Montgomery	Steiger, Wis.
schmidt	Moorhead	Stephens
Hanley	Morgan	Stokes
Hanna	Mosher	Stratton
Hansen, Idaho	Moss	Stubblefield
Hansen, Wash.	Murphy, Ill.	Stuckey
Harrington	Murphy, N.Y.	Sullivan
Harsha	Myers	Symington
Harvey	Natcher	Talcott
Hastings	Nedzi	Taylor
Hathaway	Nelsen	Teague, Calif.
Hawkins	Nichols	Teague, Tex.
Hays	Nix	Terry
Hechler, W. Va.	Obey	Thompson, Ga.
Heinz	O'Hara	Thompson, N.J.
Helstoski	O'Konski	Thompson, Wis.
Henderson	O'Neill	Thone
Hicks, Mass.	Patman	Tiernan
Hicks, Wash.	Patten	Udall
Hillis	Pepper	Ullman
Hogan	Perkins	Van Deulin
Hollifield	Pettis	Vander Jagt
Horton	Peyser	Vank
Hosmer	Pickle	Vigorito
Howard	Pike	Waggonner
Hungate	Pirnie	Wampler
Hunt	Poage	Ware
Hutchinson	Podell	Whalen
Ichord	Poff	Whalley
Jacobs	Powell	White
Jarman	Preyer, N.C.	Whitehurst
Johnson, Calif.	Price, Ill.	Whitten
Johnson, Pa.	Price, Tex.	Widnall
Jonas	Pryor, Ark.	Wiggins
Jones, Ala.	Pucinski	Williams
Jones, N.C.	Purcell	Wilson, Bob
Jones, Tenn.	Quile	Wilson, Charles H.
Karth	Quillen	Winn
Kastenmeier	Rallsback	Wolf
Kazen	Randall	Wright
Keating	Rangel	Wyatt
Kee	Rees	Wydler
Kemp	Reid	Wyllie
King	Reuss	Wyman
Kluczynski	Riegle	Yates
Koch	Roberts	Yatron
Kuykendall	Robinson, Va.	Young, Fla.
Kyl	Robinson, N.Y.	Young, Tex.
Kyros	Rodino	Zablocki
Latta	Roe	Zion
Link	Rogers	Zwack
Lloyd	Roncalio	
Long, Md.	Rooney, Pa.	
McClory		

NAYS—8

Ashbrook	Derwinski	Landgrebe
Collins, Tex.	Gross	Selberling
Crane	Hall	

NOT VOTING—43

Abernethy	Brasco	Dowdy
Abzug	Carter	Dwyer
Baker	Clancy	Edmondson
Betts	Conte	Edwards, Ala.
Blanton	Davis, Wis.	Fish

Frelinghuysen	Lent	Rhodes
Gallagher	Long, La.	Rooney, N.Y.
Hagan	Lujan	Roybal
Hébert	McCloskey	Ryan
Heckler, Mass.	McMillan	Schmitz
Hull	Michel	Schneebeli
Keith	Mills, Ark.	Veysey
Landrum	Passman	Waldie
Leggett	Pelly	
Lennon	Rarick	

So the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Rhodes.
 Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Betts.
 Mr. Blanton with Mr. Baker.
 Mr. Waldie with Mrs. Abzug.
 Mr. Ryan with Mr. Carter.
 Mr. Brasco with Mr. Lujan.
 Mr. Hull with Mr. Lent.
 Mr. Landrum with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Passman with Mr. Clancy.
 Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Conte.
 Mr. Leggett with Mr. McCloskey.
 Mr. Lennon with Mr. Keith.
 Mr. Hagan with Mrs. Dwyer.
 Mr. McMillan with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Rarick with Mr. Schmitz.
 Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Pelly.
 Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
 Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Schneebeli.
 Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Michel.
 Mr. Roybal with Mr. Fish.
 Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the appropriation bill for disaster relief (H.R. 16254) passed this afternoon and on the continuing joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1278) just passed.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 9092, PAY OF GOVERNMENT PREVAILING RATE EMPLOYEES

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9092) to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of August 1, 1972.)

Mr. HENDERSON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 9092, passed the House by a voice vote on July 28, 1971. On June 15, 1972, the Senate by voice vote passed H.R. 9092 with three substantive amendments.

The conference agreement contains only two substantive changes to the House-passed bill. These changes are as follows:

FEDERAL PREVAILING RATE ADVISORY
COMMITTEE

The House bill established a Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee, composed of 11 members, to study the prevailing rate system.

The Advisory Committee would be composed of five representatives of management and five representatives of Federal employee organizations, plus an independent Chairman to be appointed by the President for a 4-year term.

Nine of the 10 Advisory Committee members would be designated by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission.

The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the House bill regarding the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee, except that the Chairman of the Advisory Committee will be appointed by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission rather than by the President.

As was provided in the House bill, the Chairman of the Advisory Committee will be appointed for a 4-year term and may not hold any other office or position in the Federal Government or in the District of Columbia government.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF NEW FOURTH AND
FIFTH PAY STEPS

One of the major changes in the prevailing rate system which is made by H.R. 9092 is to provide that each grade of a regular wage schedule for nonsupervisory prevailing rate employees shall have five steps instead of the present three steps.

Under the effective date section of the House bill, the provisions relating to the new fourth and fifth pay steps would have become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the 90th day after the date of enactment.

The conference agreement provides that the provisions of the bill relating to the new fourth and fifth pay steps shall not become effective until the first day of the first pay period commencing after: First, the date on which the President ceases to exercise his authority under the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 to stabilize wages and salaries, or second, April 30, 1973, whichever date occurs first.

This change, of course, is in recognition of the administration's existing program of economic restraint.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the bill H.R. 9092 represents very reasonable and equitable legislation. I urge adoption of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield now to my distinguished colleague from Virginia.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I take this

time simply to congratulate the gentleman who has just presented this report, the chairman of the subcommittee, and the members of his subcommittee and the House conferees. They have done an outstanding job for people who have been long overworked, and I commend the gentleman and his subcommittee for a splendid job well done.

Mr. HENDERSON. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I recognize his longtime interest in the development of this legislation and in the system.

I hope we can move to adopt the conference report very shortly.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN).

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, again, I find myself in the uncomfortable position of supporting legislation—the conference report on H.R. 9092—which is opposed by the President. I am hopeful that circumstances this time will allow him to sign this bill into law.

As I stated when this bill passed the House in 1970 and again in July 1971 enactment will go a long way toward assuring that Wage Board employees, so-called blue-collar workers, of the Federal Government, are in a pay position comparable with their counterparts in private industry.

It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that this upgrading and revision of the prevailing rate system is long overdue, and necessary if the Federal Government is going to compete with private industry for top-flight laborers and tradesmen.

This compromise bill is realistic, equitable, and just, and will provide necessary guidelines for Wage Board rates for many years to come.

I strongly urge passage of this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the conference report on this bill and urge that it be rejected. The differences between the Senate- and House-passed bills were relatively minor, and there was no way for the conferees to report an acceptable piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I did not sign the conference report, and neither did any of the House Members who were conferees on this piece of legislation.

First, I think one point should be made very clear. There seems to be some attempt, whether intentional or not, to disguise this bill as a general pay raise for Federal blue-collar workers in order to treat these employees on an equitable basis with so-called white-collar employees. Such is not the case.

Under the existing system for fixing the pay of Wage Board employees, pay raises are continually being granted these workers in all wage areas throughout the United States. Before the wage-price guidelines, pay raises averaging over 8 percent were the rule. Pay raises equaling the 5.5-percent guidelines are now being given in most wage areas. In fact, the present Wage Board system is not only operating effectively, but it is maintaining the pay of these employees on a comparable basis with pay in the private sector.

What this bill actually does is destroy forever the prevailing rate concept—the existing system—which has operated successfully for more than 100 years to assure Wage Board employees full comparability with private industry employees. The bill replaces the existing three-step pay system with a five-step pay system, with the fifth step paying 12 percent more than local prevailing wages. Since most Wage Board employees would eventually go into the fifth step, the new system perpetually guarantees that most Wage Board employees around the country will be paid 12 percent higher pay rates than are paid by local private employers. The legislation would adopt the policy that the Federal Government will be the highest paying employer in any given wage area in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the consequences of such a policy could be devastating. Certainly, there would ensue an inflationary wage spiral throughout the country that would be impossible to control. The Federal Government, by setting Federal wages 12 percent higher than local wages, would be inviting inflated pay demands nationwide from every trade, craft, and union. Employees in the private economy would be automatically forced into a continuing demand to catch up and to receive wages comparable to those received by Federal employees.

I would also point out that this bill will add an additional \$180 million per year to the existing \$4 billion Wage Board pay roll. It is a cost that is not budgeted. It will contribute to the existing budget deficit. It will definitely feed the fires of inflation.

There are additional reasons why this conference report should be rejected. The inclusion of so-called nonappropriated fund employees, the enactment of nationwide pay differentials for evening and night work, the one-half billion dollar additional increase in the unfunded liability of the civil service retirement system—these are but a few.

Mr. Speaker, by every objective standard, this is bad legislation. It is a much worse bill than was enacted in the last Congress—and which was vetoed by the President. It is a bill that definitely violates the President's message to the Congress on July 26 on fiscal discipline, in which he stated he would veto any bill coming to his desk which called for excessive spending threatening the Federal budget.

I sincerely urge that this conference report be rejected; otherwise, I would think the President will have no other course of action but to veto it.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the gentleman from Iowa inadvertently made a misstatement in his remarks; I believe the gentleman said that none of the Members who were House conferees signed the conference report. I am sure the gentleman from Iowa did not mean that.

Mr. GROSS. None of the minority members of the committee signed the conference report.

Mr. HENDERSON. All of the majority members signed the conference report.

Mr. GROSS. If I made that statement it will be corrected, and I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for correcting me.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the question on this conference report on H.R. 9092 is not whether we are in support of Federal blue collar workers because, we are, but rather do we favor a pay system that will allow, not a prevailing wage rate, but an actual wage rate of 12 percent above the prevailing rate for local private industry.

To vote "aye" means you approve of Federal employees receiving 12 percent above the rates of pay the craftsmen and tradesmen receive in your district. To vote "no" means you disapprove of this concept, and the corresponding inflationary effects.

Mr. Speaker, our present system of compensating Federal blue collar workers by paying them the local prevailing rates of pay of their counterparts in private industry has worked well, and we should not tamper with it.

I urge disapproval of the conference report on H.R. 9092.

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on H.R. 9092 is a fair compromise of the bills which passed the House and the Senate, and I support it.

While I still do have reservations concerning the inclusion of nonappropriated fund employees in the prevailing rate system, nevertheless, they, too, must be treated fairly. And, this bill will enact into law the principle of equal pay for equal work, and assure the Federal Government of being able to recruit and retain the best qualified tradesmen and craftsmen.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to properly recognize our Federal blue collar workers and insure that they receive the same compensation as their counterpart in the private sector.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference agreement on H.R. 9092. This legislation will establish a long-needed statutory system for fixing and adjusting rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Federal Government. There are approximately 600,000 Federal employees covered by this legislation.

I want to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERSON) and the other conferees, for their cooperation in working out the conference agreement. There really is only one significant difference between the conference agreement and the House-passed bill.

This difference is the effective date for the new fourth and fifth pay steps. The effective date under the House bill for the fourth step would have been the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the 90th day after the date of enactment. The employees eligible for advancement on that date would go into the fourth step, and after serving the prescribed time for in-step service, would advance to the fifth step.

The conference agreement provides

that these new steps shall not become effective until the first day of the first pay period commencing after the date on which the President ceases to exercise his authority under the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, to stabilize wages and salaries, or April 30, 1973, whichever date occurs first.

This is not a significant delay as it extends only from 90 days after date of enactment to April 30, 1973, a matter of not more than 6 months. The major benefits that will accrue under this Act far offset this 6-month delay.

Approval of the conference report by the House, which I am convinced will be followed by approval of the legislation by the President, will result in enactment into law the long established principles and policies for setting the pay of prevailing rate employees.

In addition, it will make the following changes in the currently operating system and procedures.

It will establish a Federal Prevailing Wage Advisory Committee consisting of 11 members, one of whom will be a full-time chairman appointed by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission.

It will provide new wage schedules for five pay steps instead of the present three steps, with the fifth step rising to 112 percent of the prevailing wage.

It provides automatic step advancements after 26 weeks in step 1, 78 weeks in step 2, and 104 weeks in each of step 3 and step 4.

It provides a 7½-percent pay differential for nonovertime work during the second shift, 3 p.m. until midnight, and 10 percent for the third shift, 11 p.m. until 8 a.m.

It provides saved pay for 2 years for prevailing rate employees who are reduced in grade.

And the final major feature of this legislation will bring employees of nonappropriated fund activities of the Armed Forces, and employees of the Veterans' Canteen Service, under the prevailing rate system.

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

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report on the bill H.R. 9092.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 5065, AMENDING NATURAL GAS PIPELINE SAFETY ACT OF 1968

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 5065) to amend the Natural Gas

Pipeline Safety Act of 1968, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS)?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House on August 9, 1972.)

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) is recognized.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, there were very few differences between the Senate and the House bills, and it took the conferees only a few minutes to iron out these differences. The House was able to accept most of the Senate amendments, and the Senate was willing to compromise on one of the principal provisions.

The House bill had provided that the Secretary of Transportation must pay to the States the grants-in-aid provided for in this legislation. The Senate bill left to the discretion of the Secretary whether such grants-in-aid payments should be made. The compromise language provides that the Secretary shall pay the grants-in-aid unless he determines that a particular State has failed to carry out the State safety program in a satisfactory manner.

The other Senate amendments agreed to by the conferees relate to the deadline which the States must meet to qualify under the legislation and to reports which the Secretary will be required to submit to the Congress.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY ACT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1084 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1084

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15375) to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1973. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to

final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1084 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 15375 to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Act.

The purpose of H.R. 15375 is to authorize \$37,461,000 for fiscal year 1973 to carry out the responsibilities and functions of the Department of Transportation under the act.

The legislation as introduced would have authorized \$37 million, which was the Department's budget request. After hearings, however, the authorization was increased to \$37,461,000, because of pay adjustments mandated by the Pay Act.

The funds are expected to be used as follows: \$3.4 million for motor vehicle and equipment standards, \$5.8 million for compliance and defects analysis, \$22.7 million for research and analysis, \$5.4 million for personnel and support cost.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of time I concur and associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Hawaii in explanation of the rule. I simply add, Mr. Speaker, that there are letters in the committee report from the Office of Management and Budget and Department of Transportation arguing for a different bill, H.R. 15111.

This would have amended the act and also provided an open-ended authorization, but the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee preferred not to give an open-ended authorization and therefore decided not to consider H.R. 15111 at that time. Instead, they recommended H.R. 15375. There are no minority reports in the committee report. The committee reported it by voice vote.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1084.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15375) to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1973.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the con-

sideration of the bill H.R. 15375, with Mr. BINGHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BROYHILL) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS).

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15375—a bill to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1973.

This legislation proposes to authorize \$37,461,000 for fiscal year 1973 to carry out functions and responsibilities under the Motor Vehicle Safety Act. This amount is equal to the Department of Transportation's budget request for fiscal year 1973, and represents a 20-percent increase over 1972 expenditures for the auto safety program.

In the last few years we are seeing real evidence that the legislative efforts of the Congress in motor vehicle and highway safety and the work of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration are beginning to bear fruit. It is clear that safety standards have saved lives and that the overall rate of death and serious injury is declining. Preliminary statistics of 1972, however, indicate that the number of motor vehicle fatalities is on the rise. If statistical projections can be trusted, we will set an annual record in 1972 for highway deaths. Quite obviously we must increase our efforts to reverse this trend.

Let me say a brief word to explain why the committee recommends only a 1-year authorization in this legislation. In March of this year the Department of Transportation submitted proposed legislation which included an amendment to the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act to allow an open-ended authorization for "such amounts as are necessary" to carry out the purposes of the act. It has been the consistent position of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that our legislative oversight responsibilities preclude the giving of blanket authorizations. Accordingly, we asked the Department to submit cost estimates for the next 3 fiscal years. On June 5, 1972, the Department informed the committee that its requirements for fiscal years 1974 and 1975 have not yet been determined and only fiscal year 1973 data were available. Recognizing that the existing authorizing authority under the act would terminate on June 30, I introduced the bill, H.R. 15375, to extend the authorization for 1 additional year.

Hearings on the proposed 1-year extension were held and—after a minor amendment to take into account a pay act adjustment—the bill was reported unanimously by both the subcommittee and the full committee.

I am well aware that the administra-

tion and many Members have proposed important substantive amendments to the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act. The committee has every intention to conduct thorough hearings on these proposals at the earliest possible date. At that time we are hopeful that the Department will be able to provide estimates of their budget requirements for fiscal years 1974 and 1975 so that we may extend the authorization to cover those years.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding. I would like to make some comments regarding the bill before us today authorizing appropriations for fiscal 1973 to carry out functions and responsibilities under the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act.

I intend to support this bill.

But I have also this day introduced a bill that would amend the bill before us to open the national driver register for certain special purposes. I am not offering this proposal as an amendment to the bill before us today because I realize that hearings have not been held on this proposal as yet. But the chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Affairs Committee has introduced this same proposal and it has the endorsement of the Department of Transportation. Let me now explain the objective sought.

The national driver registration compilation maintained by the Department of Transportation contains the names of individuals whose driver's licenses have been terminated, or temporarily withdrawn. The names are supplied to the registry from the States. This is a list, then, of drivers guilty of serious violations of the law.

Under present law the release of register information is permitted only to a State, one of its political subdivisions or a Federal agency and only for the purpose of issuing a motor vehicle operator's license or permit. The bill I have introduced today would change the law in two respects.

First it would allow the State to enter the Register on request of an employer, like a moving company, which was considering hiring a driver. In this instance it is important to know if the prospective employee has a history of license suspensions or revocations based on a record of hazardous, unsafe, drunken driving and any convictions for these. Presently such information is not available from the National Registry. The employer could ask each State in which the job applicant is registered as a driver for such information, but that is time consuming and inadequate. There is no way the employer can know which States the applicant was registered in, unless that information is given by the prospective employee.

Second, in section 2(a)(3) of the bill I introduced today, information would become available from the Register to judges prior to their imposition of sentences on individuals convicted of of-

fenses arising out of the unsafe operation of motor vehicles. Certainly judges should be allowed access to information available in the Register in order to be able to justly and properly sentence a violator. As a former county prosecuting attorney I found that previous license revocations, suspensions or driving conditions imposed on Indiana drivers when brought into court acted as a definite influence on judges in succeeding driving offenses. If the driver happened to be from Indiana his record was available, but if from another State, or if his or her license from another State had been revoked we had no ready access to this information. Again, as with employers, we could ask the States in question, if we knew about them.

I believe opening the National Driver Register in these two ways extremely important. This bill also recognizes the importance of privacy and thus requires the State to furnish at no cost to the individual involved, copies of any information furnished any potential employer.

My interest in this legislative proposal is that the goal of highway safety be better served in view of the fact that last year approximately 55,000 Americans lost their lives on our Nation's streets and highways as a result of motor vehicle accidents.

My special interest in this legislative proposal is that I believe it is one way to help drive the drunken driver from the streets. Research findings indicate that half of those 55,000 dead are the victims not of the automobile, but of alcohol. This means that 2,250 persons a month, 75 a day, one person every 20 minutes dies in motor accidents influenced by alcohol. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration considers reducing this problem of the highest priority. So do I.

We have begun an important campaign in this country to make the automobiles we drive safer, less vulnerable on impact. We will finally reach a limit, technologically, in what we can do to make cars safe. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration is also trying to educate the public on safety standards for drivers for this is equally important.

I also believe that we must make some legislative adjustments and that is why I have introduced this bill today. In the House Report accompanying H.R. 15375, which authorizes appropriations under the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act, the committee noted that several important bills have been introduced which propose substantive amendments to the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act and that the committee intends to conduct thorough hearings on these proposals "at the earliest possible date." I hope that the proposal I have discussed today will be among these.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I might say to the gentleman this could be taken under consideration next year. It is not in this bill in any way. We have to have another authorization next year, and at that time we will consider the amendments.

Mr. ROUSH. If the gentleman will yield further, I understand it will not

pertain to this bill and I can understand the reasons why. I merely ask the question in order to express an opinion, I guess, to the effect that I think these are substantive matters and should be brought to the attention of the committee. More than 55,000 people died on the U.S. highways last year. In approximately half of those instances drinking drivers were involved.

Mr. STAGGERS. I realize that.

Mr. ROUSH. I hope some way or other this Congress might direct its attention to this highway safety problem which confronts us.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I have read the report thoroughly. As one who does his homework and I hope is erroneously accused of being quick to criticize oftentimes, I want to compliment the committee thoroughly on the report, to say nothing of its decisions and actions. This is an unusually good report which demonstrates the concern for reducing the numbers of injuries and the numbers of accidents.

One has to drive only halfway across the Nation to understand why that is happening; namely, car production and probably unlicensed and incapable drivers who are driving longer cars faster than we can build the roads to accommodate them.

I am not sure we can legislate that out of existence, but I am very appreciative of the action and the function of the committee, and I certainly want to compliment the committee for continuing their effort, all of which has been funded for the amount appropriated and authorized in recent years with the exception of a very few tens of thousands of dollars, in the research and development necessary. Still they have not gone for the open-ended funding and runaway inflation characteristic of so many of the ideologists and "bleeding hearts." This is the epitome of responsible oversight and surveillance on the part of a standing committee of the legislative branch of our Government.

I believe the committee has quite properly taken a firm stance, and again I compliment the committee on its action. I intend to vote for this bill.

Mr. STAGGERS. I appreciate the words of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the full committee has given a very good explanation as to what this bill will do. It is a simple extension of this much needed program.

Also, as the gentleman explained, the bill as introduced was open-ended. DOT wanted an open-ended authorization, but the committee provided a 1-year extension with specific figures.

I might add that the budget requests are exactly the same as the amounts authorized in this legislation.

In partial answer to the question of the gentleman from Indiana, we had a

very short discussion in the committee of all the amendments which were pending before the subcommittee at the time. There were a number of amendments pending. I should be delighted to go over these with the gentleman, if he would like to have me do so.

The amendment the gentleman was interested in was one of them. Of course, I do not know whether either of us will be back in the Congress next year, but if I am a member of this committee I can assure the gentleman from Indiana we will give very serious attention to the amendment he has proposed as well as to the amendments that have been proposed by the Secretary of Transportation.

It was felt by the subcommittee that in order to get this legislation through and to get some appropriations which are needed we should give a simple extension and not go into all these amendments at this particular time.

I might add that the appropriations for this program have not been considered yet and will possibly come up in an appropriation bill at a later date.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15375, which, if enacted, will amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1973 in the amount of \$37,461,000.

When the Congress in 1966 passed the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act, it committed all of us in the United States to a program of reducing the annual toll of motor vehicle deaths and injuries on our highways, and although some progress has been made, yet the increasing number of automobiles and automobile users, makes it imperative for us to intensify our efforts to implement the work of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

Although the rate of deaths and serious injury is declining, yet the absolute number of motor vehicle fatalities is rising. Motor vehicle fatalities present to us some gruesome figures. Through March 1972 they totaled 11,800 compared to 11,130 for the same period in 1971. Based on the past experience, the Department of Transportation projects a 1972 fatality total of 57,500 compared to 55,000 in 1971, an increase of 4.5 percent.

If these projected figures prove accurate, more Americans, young and old, will be killed in 1972 on the U.S. highways than have been killed in Vietnam during the entire war. To look at it in another way, Hollywood, Fla., the second largest city in my congressional district, has approximately 110,000 people. The projected number of traffic deaths on U.S. highways then will be more than one-half the population of the city of Hollywood, Fla. This slaughter is everyone's problem and this slaughter must be stopped.

Mr. Chairman, the authorization provided by this legislation represents an increase of approximately 20 percent over the 1972 expenditures for the auto safety program. Even though I advocate that Government expenditures be held at a minimum, if we are to fight inflation, yet to me our highway fatalities are a national disgrace.

One hears a lot of talk about reordering priorities and here is a perfect case

in point. Last week Congress finished work on the Labor-HEW appropriation for fiscal year 1973 providing billions of dollars in Federal money on health programs. If we are, however, interested in saving lives through Federal programs, then this is the program because the yield from improved highway safety would go further dollar for dollar than that spent in the various health programs. Do not misunderstand me, because most health programs are good and necessary, but what I am trying to say is that more lives can be spared with improved automobile and highway safety programs than through any individual health program that has been proposed. If we had 57,500 people dying from a single disease in any one year the demand of the public to find a cure would be enormous. Yet people in our country accept highway deaths more complacently than death from any disease although death rides in the front seat with all of us when we take the wheel of our cars or when we sit as a passenger therein.

For this reason I support the passage of H.R. 15357 and ask my colleagues to vote in its favor.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 121 of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 (15 U.S.C. 1409) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 121. There are authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this Act, not to exceed \$37,000,000 for the fiscal year 1973."

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 1, line 8, strike out "\$37,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$37,461,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BINGHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 15375) to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1973, pursuant to House Resolution 1084, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 3824, PUBLIC BROADCASTING CORPORATION AUTHORIZATION

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1086 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1086

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3824) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1973 for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and for making grants for construction of noncommercial educational television or radio broadcasting facilities. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1086 provides for consideration of the bill, S. 3824, which would authorize fiscal year 1973 appropriations for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and for making grants for construction of noncommercial educational television or radio broadcasting facilities. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

After general debate, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute

recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, now printed in S. 3824, as an original bill.

At the conclusion of consideration of S. 3824 under the 5-minute rule, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. Speaker, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, a private, independent, nonprofit enterprise established under the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, has effectively carried out its congressional mandate. Under the stewardship of a bipartisan board of 15 members, the Corporation has: First, helped to develop high quality programs for presentation over public television and radio stations, second, helped to establish and develop interconnection for such stations, third, helped to establish and develop systems of public broadcasting stations, and fourth, helped to assure the maximum freedom of noncommercial educational broadcasting systems and stations from interference with or control of program content or other activities.

S. 3824, as reported, would authorize the appropriation of \$40 million for the Corporation's operational expenses for fiscal year 1973.

In addition, the bill authorizes an appropriation for payment to the corporation a further sum, not to exceed \$5 million, to match dollar for dollar, contributions from non-Federal sources to the Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, S. 3824 would also authorize \$25 million for the educational broadcasting facilities grant program. However, because prior legislation has already authorized \$15 million for that program for fiscal year 1973, this particular provision of the pending bill would actually increase the grant program amount by only \$10 million.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1086 in order that S. 3824 may be considered.

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

Mr. Speaker, first I agree with the remarks made by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) and associate myself with them in explanation of House Resolution 1086.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a rather unique situation and a rather interesting situation because to some extent I believe we are legislating after the fact. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, we had the original bill here some time ago to extend for 2 years the Public Broadcasting Corporation, and I believe it had some \$65 million in it rather than the \$45 million.

The administration objected to the 2 years, and to the amount.

We had quite a bit of discussion about Sander Vanocur, and about some other individual, and it was quite an interesting operation. In any event, the President vetoed that bill on June 30, 1972.

I do not believe there was any effort to

override the veto, and the Senate prepared this bill clearly in accordance with the request of the President of \$45 million and for the 1-year extension.

I voted against the original bill, although I support the Public Broadcasting System. Then last week, Mr. Speaker, we had an appropriation conference report that had the \$45 million in it. So we have already appropriated the \$45 million.

So what we are going to do today is to make legal what we did last week in appropriating the money. I voted against the conference report on the appropriation because I thought it was against the rules. I did it technically, but on the bill here today, to make everything legal, I am going to vote for it, Mr. Speaker. I urge the adoption of the resolution and the bill so we can get the train back on the track legally and in accordance with the rules.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

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

There was no objection.

PUBLIC BROADCASTING CORPORATION AUTHORIZATION

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3824) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1973 for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and for making grants for construction of noncommercial educational television or radio broadcasting facilities.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GAIAMO) to preside over the Committee of the Whole and asks the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) to take the Chair temporarily.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration on the bill (S. 3824), with Mr. BINGHAM (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FREY) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS).

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House does two things. It authorizes the appropriation of \$45 million for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for fiscal year 1973 and increases the authorization for grants for noncommercial educational broadcasting facilities for fiscal year 1973 from \$15 million to \$25 million. Although the committee has amended the Senate bill, the amendment is entirely technical in nature and the substance of the House committee amendment is the same as the bill passed by the Senate.

As Members of the House will recall, Mr. Chairman, on April 11 of this year the House by a vote of 256 to 69 passed H.R. 13918 which among other things—

Authorized the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to promote the utilization and development of telecommunications facilities for the production and distribution of educational radio and television programs.

Required that at least 30 percent of the funds appropriated to CPB in each fiscal year be distributed to noncommercial educational broadcasting stations for use—in their discretion—in activities related to their local broadcast operation.

Authorized an appropriation to CPB of not to exceed \$65 million for fiscal year 1973 and not to exceed \$90 million for fiscal year 1974.

Provided for inclusion of the 15 member board of directors of CPB of five members who are chief executive staff officers of noncommercial educational broadcasting stations. All members of the board of directors are, and would continue to have been, appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Increased from \$15 million to \$25 million the authorization for fiscal year 1973 for grants for acquisition and installation of noncommercial educational broadcasting facilities.

The Senate passed the House bill without amendment by a vote of 82 to 1 on June 22. On the last day before the Fourth of July recess began the President vetoed H.R. 13918.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I was shocked and terribly disappointed by the President's veto. There is no better investment in the future of this great Nation than education and H.R. 13918 would have provided education, information, and enlightenment not only for the young people in our schools but for everyone who has access to a television set which today, Mr. Chairman, includes just about every man, woman, and child in the United States.

Since H.R. 13918 was last acted upon in the House—June 1—several other events of great consequence to public broadcasting have taken place, Mr. Chairman.

Five members have been appointed to the board of directors of CPB. When they are joined by our former colleague

here in the House, Thomas Curtis, as I think they soon will be, there will be a Republican majority on the CPB's board of directors for the first time since the corporation was organized.

The chairman of the board of CPB, Frank Pace, its president, John Macy, and Ralph Nicholson, the corporation's vice president, have all announced their resignations. Without digressing too far, Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to commend these gentlemen for the job they have done. It has been superb. My hope is that their successors will do as well.

Last week the House in acting on the Labor-HEW appropriation bill (H.R. 15417) provided for the appropriation of \$45 million for the CPB and \$15 million for grants for noncommercial educational broadcasting facilities for fiscal year 1973.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House was introduced in the other body and passed by it on the fifth day after our return from the Fourth of July recess—July 21. As I have already said, it does nothing more than authorize \$45 million for the CPB, and \$25 million for grants for noncommercial educational broadcasting facilities, for fiscal year 1973. I have every confidence that the bill will be signed by the President.

Mr. Chairman, several amendments relating to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting were offered and two were adopted while H.R. 13918 was under consideration here in the House. It is my hope that S. 3824 will be passed by the House without amendment.

The Corporation will soon be operating under new leadership. I think its new leaders should be given at least a year to show what they can do without imposing restrictive amendments on the corporation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members of the House to pass S. 3824, as reported by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Would the defeat of this authorizing legislation invalidate the appropriation, as approved by the House only a few days ago?

Mr. STAGGERS. I believe since the House has passed the appropriation, defeat of this bill would not invalidate the appropriation.

Mr. GROSS. Someone said here this afternoon that this legislation is merely to validate what the Appropriations Committee approved a few days ago but the gentleman does not think that defeat of this bill would invalidate the appropriation already made?

Mr. STAGGERS. We had this bill on the suspension calendar before the appropriation came up. The Appropriations Committee had the figures that we have in this bill for the CPB.

Then when we found we could not get to it under suspension, we had to get a rule and it was scheduled for today. As the gentleman from Iowa observes the appropriation bill was passed last week.

But, as I say, that is a debatable question.

I do urge the adoption of the bill, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MACDONALD), chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this substitute bill rather reluctantly. But knowing that public broadcasting is needed in the country, I, of course, was in favor of the bill which came out of our committee. But, in the absence of any desire to override the President on this particular thing, which now is in the hands of the President and the Board which he has appointed, I ask all Members to support the bill as I intend to do.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 3824, a bill to fund the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for fiscal year 1973 at a level of \$45 million and to authorize up to \$25 million for badly needed technical broadcasting facilities at the local TV and radio stations which broadcast noncommercial, educational programs.

For those of my colleagues who may not have followed the tortuous legislative history of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1972, it will suffice to refer them back to the President's veto of our original bipartisan bill which provided for a substantially higher level of funding, over a 2-year period instead of 1.

That veto did more than kill the bill. It triggered the resignation of John Macy, the president of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. John Macy is a distinguished public servant who gave without reservation his skill, his talent, his patience, and his health to the proposition that it would be truly in the public interest of all the citizens of the United States if that incredible communications medium, television, offered a choice of program fare for our 50 million television homes. Mr. Macy did an outstanding job, and he will be missed.

Aside from paying tribute to the achievements of John Macy in building the structure that enabled public broadcasting to go in 3 short years for 165 educational TV stations, each going its own way on 165 shoestrings, to more than 200 interconnected stations with a number of first rate, professionally produced, national programs to lure viewers to their sometimes-hard-to-get channels, the business before the House is to maintain at least this minimal support for public broadcasting now, this year, this week.

I am certainly not happy with the options open to us, but those are the options—either pass this bill, or stop public broadcasting dead in its tracks.

I earnestly urge the House to pass S. 3824 without further delay, and without amendments that would nitpick and quibble and serve only to make the public broadcasting people more insecure and frightened of vague and formless threats to their existence.

Those threats have come, quite candidly, from the Office of Telecommunications Policy in the White House. That office has grown like Topsy, and as it has grown, so has its interpretation of its

mandate. The policy that they have been setting is much more than policy dealing with the efficient use of the spectrum allocated to Government agencies, much more than dealing with foreign governments, much more than formulating proposals for the orderly development of such futuristic communications techniques as cable TV and satellites.

The policy that OTP has arrogated unto itself is a partisan policy. OTP decided, in all its cloistered wisdom, that public broadcasting might turn out to be something they tried to scare us by calling a "fourth network." Well, what is wrong with a fourth network, or a fifth, or a sixth? Networks are, after all, only a collection of stations who have learned the hard way that they should be interconnected so that important events can be covered on a real-time, simultaneous basis, or that programs distributed from a central source to all affiliated stations at the same time present clear advantages to their viewers and to themselves. Should not the noncommercial broadcasters have access to the same truth? Does it take a genius to perceive that more people will be educated—and absorbed—by watching "Sesame Street" or "Wives of Henry the Eighth" than by watching locally produced finger painting? Should not the hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee be made available in prime time to all public broadcasting stations at once as was done by PBC when the commercial networks could not?

What can be wrong with offering the American people an alternative? The only thing that I can think of would be if that alternative should be Government-controlled, Government-approved, Government-dominated. But turn the coin over—if Government can scare public television away from presenting the important issues that concern the thinking citizen, at a time when he is able to watch that presentation on his TV set the Government's meddling will be directly responsible.

We must put a stop to this Government meddling. The Congress established the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. The administration has tightened the rein on them, but at least public broadcasting can still have some room to run if we pass this bill today. Next year they will be back with their track record, and I hope just as fervently as you that it is a good record.

One more thing: The track record for fiscal 1973 will be the administration's track record. There have been 11 appointments to the CPB board made by President Nixon; the new chairman will be from his party; the new chairman's first job will be to pick a new president to replace John Macy, and his first job will be to pick a new vice president to replace the man who resigned just a month ago. That is a lot of tough assignments, and having completed them, the administration's choices will be called upon to perform. The Congress will be watching that performance with great interest, I am sure. From this side of the aisle, we may even feel constrained to question the judgment of some CPB decision, just as our distinguished col-

leagues on the other side of the aisle have charged that crimes may have been committed by the choice of commentators or the presentation of programs by this theoretically independent corporation.

The point of the argument here is that Corporation for Public Broadcasting should be independent. It should be insulated from political pressure. It should be free to experiment and make occasional mistakes and bring television into a real golden age, an age where pandering to the lowest common denominator need not rule, where selling deodorants need not be the only criterion for putting on TV programs, where the Congress can look back on its wisdom in creating public broadcasting and say, "That was a good thing."

Mr. FREY. Mr. Chairman, when this bill came before the House a few weeks ago, there was considerable disagreement about the main provisions of the bill, especially the question of the 1- or 2-year authorization. Amendments were offered in various ways to limit the authorization and were defeated by very narrow margins. Many of the misgivings and dissatisfactions voiced here were also noted by the administration and its suggestion for a 1-year authorization allowing an increase of \$10 million over 1972 levels, many people felt that this was a 30-percent increase, a very generous increase.

Of course feeling on the opposite side was evidenced by the vote.

Based upon the actions taken here during consideration of the original bill, it became obvious that there were considerably less than two-thirds needed to override a veto for the 2-year funding. Therefore, it is not surprising that when the President did veto it that there has been no attempt to override it.

I think it is important that we understand at this point also that the situation is a little bit different than it was before. I think at this point we had the resignations of the chairman of the board, the president and vice president of the corporation, and we will have new appointments to this. I believe also there are appointments to the number of 15 made to the board of directors. It also will have a different caste to it. I think it is only fair that we allow these people to look at the job they have to do and then to see what they accomplish.

I think to go ahead and change right now would not be fair to them, and certainly it would not be fair to public broadcasting. I also believe that in some way, as the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) said, we are beating a dead horse. The Committee on Appropriations has always acted on this. If we are to act today, if we are going to act today on the Senate bill which is basically like this, except for a few technical amendments, we are going to draw this business out until way after the recess, and I think for the good of public broadcasting, even if some in public broadcasting do not like this, they at least ought to know where they stand and what they are going to get.

I personally was hoping the 30 percent pass through provision that we had

would be legislation, but the Public Broadcasting Corporation indicated this would be a policy.

I am glad to see that more money is going into facilities because we need them.

To summarize, it seems to me any act right now other than what is proposed would be to go back to the President and with the overwhelming vote in the Senate and the compromise in the House, I am in support of what we are doing. The only thing to do is to vote "yes" on this bill and take a hard look at it in our further deliberations next year.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER).

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, several weeks ago when we considered this proposal which the President later vetoed, the controversy which surrounded that bill had to do with the actions of the people in public broadcasting. A number of us, myself included, felt that some of the salaries being paid were excessive. We offered an amendment which had the effect of controlling the salary, of course, of only one individual. We made an effort to limit the salaries of some of the people whose participation in the program production which is done for PBS under this. That particular amendment failed.

Another amendment was offered which had to do with prohibiting the participants in public broadcasting from doing and publishing political polls. I think by now that some of these people have begun to get the word that the Congress is not going to sit idly by or stand idly by and let public broadcasters be fully competitive with the private broadcasters, the networks. This is what I intended then, and this is what I intend now.

The chairman of the committee (Mr. STAGGERS) tells me that he has made it perfectly clear to these people that their days of political polling are over; that they had better put their house in order. This would be my recommendation with the understanding that we have—the original bill having been vetoed, that we pass this authorization for 1 year, that we get on with it. We have got next year, a new Congress, the 93d Congress, to write a new bill.

It could be a multiyear program, and if their performance is not such and the direction they take in the interim is wrong, then we are going to have to finish the job we started on the bill which was vetoed. I think we ought to pass this bill today.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAGGONNER. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the bill as it came from the committee. I think this is a good solution to a controversial and complicated matter. It is a 1-year extension. On the assurances that the gentleman from Louisiana has had, it seems to me that in the interval of 1

year we can adequately monitor the performance of the organization and its personnel. If they disappoint us, then the House as well as the other body will have an opportunity to work their will in the next Congress.

It seems to me this is a good compromise. I hope we do not change the bill. I hope that it is acceptable to the White House, and I understand it is. I think under the circumstances the best course of action is to pass this bill in its present form.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan, the distinguished minority leader, and I urge that we pass the bill.

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

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

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman with reference to this bill. I subscribe to his thinking completely. I have never opposed the principle of public broadcasting. I think there is a place for it in the educational system, but I have been very critical of some of the programing that has been done. I have been critical of some of the boards of directors of the individual stations for abrogating their authority to the Washington setup, or wherever the headquarters might be, and for their negligence in not screening some of the activities of the respective stations.

I certainly hope that the fine remarks of the gentleman in the well will be heeded as well as the feeling of the House as I get it, and that in the coming year some of those difficulties can be eliminated.

Again I commend the gentleman in the well for his remarks.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. FREY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Louisiana 1 additional minute.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAGGONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FREY. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's statements about public broadcasting getting the message is extremely good. From the time of the last debate to the present the General Accounting Office has started an audit, as was discussed the last time. This is a significant step. It goes along with the remarks of the gentleman that we must be sure to get our money's worth. I think from the discussions in the committee as well as the debate today we can be assured this will be looked into in the future.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California, a member of the committee, such time as he may consume.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I think some of the things that have been said illustrate the necessity of getting public broadcasting out from under the thumbs of politicians.

This must become a truly independent arm of broadcasting to which the Government contributes, or it is nothing.

We have heard talk about "the message getting through" to public broadcasting licensees, and how we in Congress will be "keeping an eye" on the way those broadcasters behave between now and the time of our next authorizing legislation.

I find such talk both sinister and chilling. I do hope the administration, as it has been promising for 3 years, will come up with plans for the kind of ongoing funding that will assure the independence necessary for a truly useful educational and public broadcasting arm.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know who wrote the President's veto message, and I am inclined to wonder if Mr. Nixon even read it. I cannot believe he read both his veto message and the bill it purports to criticize.

Because in all the rhetoric over public broadcasting, Mr. Chairman, the administration has fuzzed over the issue of "localism." Thus far, they seem to be getting away with it.

Listening to young Dr. Whitehead and his allies, one would think that Congress and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting are bent on building an all-powerful "network" at the expense, financial and programatic, of local stations.

The facts are otherwise. In view of the misleading statements, I think the record should be very precise on this point.

H.R. 13918, the bill vetoed by the President, was actually far more generous to public broadcasting stations than either the administration's first proposals, or S. 3824, the stripped-down version we are passing this afternoon.

The legislation which Mr. Nixon vetoed would have authorized a total of \$65 million the first year and \$90 million the second. Of critical importance was the stipulation that at least 30 percent of the funds which went to CPB had to be passed along to public radio and TV stations for their own local purposes. This would have meant a minimum of \$19.5 million the first year, \$27 million in the following year, for use as local managers saw fit. And CPB gave assurances, in writing, that actual total outlays to stations would be higher than the minimums required by the proposed law.

By comparison, the administration seems tight-fisted, indeed, when we consider who is doing what for—or to—the local public broadcasting outlets. In its budget for the current fiscal year, the administration sought \$45 million for CPB, of which \$15 million would have been earmarked for local stations. At best, then, the administration would have provided at least \$4.5 million less in operating funds for the local stations on which it lavishes such extravagant expressions of concern.

In the bricks-and-mortar department, the performance of this administration is just as sorry. Although \$15 million had been initially authorized for the construction of public broadcast facilities, the administration this year asked only \$13 million. Congress again tried to come

to the rescue of financially strapped stations, by providing \$25 million in H.R. 13918 for facilities. The bill before us today also would authorize \$25 million for this purpose—further evidence of the concern of Congress.

H.R. 13918 originally proposed 5 years of funding for the stations and CPB. It was put forward because the administration had promised long range financing for public broadcasting year after year after year. But none came. So H.R. 13918 was offered and considered in open hearings by the Communications and Power Subcommittee. Then—and only then—did the administration come forward with a finance plan for public broadcasting and it consisted of a 1-year authorization for CPB at \$45 million, with a rigid grant formula to stations which would have provided less funding to the stations than H.R. 13918 but would have been much more difficult to administer. The administration bill made no provision at all for vitally needed local broadcast facilities.

Would the administration come forward with even that bill had hearings not been scheduled for H.R. 13918? Probably not. If the administration had had its way, the program would have been allowed to go ahead in fiscal 1973 without a penny of increase. But the House subcommittee set the pace—and thus made possible a significant increase in CPB funds.

S. 3824 contains no new provisos for public broadcasting. It continues the enterprise basically as before. H.R. 13918 would have made some changes. As it came from the subcommittee, the bill would have given more control of public broadcasting to the local licensees. As I mentioned earlier, at least 30 percent of the funds would have been required to go to them, and five station managers would be on the CPB board. The law has always permitted these matters. But, as a result of the House subcommittee hearings and debate, and even before any bill had passed, the board of directors of the Corporation accepted the principle of more influence by the stations, and has already begun to consult with station managers on budgets and planning.

S. 3824 does include \$25 million for station facilities grants. In the hearings called by the subcommittee to consider H.R. 13918, the stations made a persuasive case, and our subcommittee increased that \$15 million to the \$25 million in H.R. 13918. So S. 3824 fully follows the subcommittee recommendation in that regard, and even the administration is restrained in its opposition to this addition for local public broadcast station support.

I can only conclude, Mr. Chairman, that had the subcommittee not initiated action in its own bill, the situation for public broadcasting would have been far worse. S. 3824 represents some progress—not as much as many of us would like—but at least some progress.

The real question now lies ahead. The administration has promised to develop a long-range finance plan for presentation to the Congress. Inasmuch as they

presented only a 1-year bill, Congress must assume that the administration's long-range plan is going to be presented for action by the next Congress in time to take effect for funding the stations and CPB in fiscal 1974—less than a year away. The next Congress certainly will want to consider these plans at length, as soon after the first of next year as possible. This would imply that such plans are even now under development. Will the administration share them with the subcommittee?

Funds for CPB for 1974 must also be in somebody's budget in the administration. What is planned? Should not the House subcommittee have some understanding of this at this time?

One thing is certain. There is nothing so far in the Record to indicate this administration is doing anything at all to enable public broadcasting to improve its stepchild status. Our per capita expenditures are \$13.96 for commercial TV but still only 74 cents for public TV. Putting it another way, we spend 19 times as much for the commercial stuff. For the sake of comparison, the per capita outlay for noncommercial TV is \$3.29 in Britain and \$2.90 in Japan—despite the generally higher costs prevailing in the United States.

The Federal contribution to CPB for its first 4 years has totaled \$78 million—well under the \$100 million which the Carnegie Commission on Public Broadcasting had estimated was needed annually if CPB were to be fully viable.

All across the Nation the community and State public groups and agencies which are the licensees for the more than 700 public radio and TV stations have watched the Washington battle over Federal assistance for them. They learned the names of the agencies and Congressmen and where they stood on support for public broadcasting. Their voices were heard. Then when the President vetoed the Congress bill to help these local licensees and their national support agencies—and CPB—they and their local newspapers wanted to know why—and why their President had so little faith in them. They still do not know. And they must now go through the coming year far less well equipped to do the job than need be. But now they have learned who their friends are—and are not—and they will be looking forward to next year. So will the Congress.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain in connection with what the gentleman from Florida said, that on June 5 I wrote to the Comptroller General to ask him to audit the financial transactions of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for fiscal year 1972. It has been started. We will have the results before the Congress before the next bill comes up. The letter to the Comptroller General reads as follows:

JUNE 5, 1972.

HON. ELMER B. STAATS,
Comptroller General of the United States,
General Accounting Office, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. STAATS: On Thursday of last week (June 1) the House of Representatives con-

sidered and passed H.R. 13918, a bill which, among other things, authorizes the appropriation of funds for fiscal years 1973 and 1974 for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

The Corporation is a private, non-profit corporation established pursuant to the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 (Public Law 90-129). During its existence the Corporation has been principally funded with monies appropriated by the Federal Government. Section 396(1) of the Act (47 U.S.C. 396(1)) provides that the accounts of the Corporation must be audited annually by independent accountants having certain prescribed qualifications. That section also authorizes an audit of the financial transactions of the Corporation by the General Accounting Office for any fiscal year during which Federal funds are available to finance any portion of the Corporation's activities.

During House consideration of H.R. 13918, I was informed that no audit of the Corporation has even been conducted by the General Accounting Office. In view of the substantial amounts of Federal funds being appropriated to the Corporation, I believe that an audit of the Corporation's financial transactions by the General Accounting Office is desirable. Accordingly, I request that the General Accounting Office conduct an audit of the financial transactions of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for fiscal year 1972.

Sincerely yours,

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Member of Congress,
Chairman.

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

Mr. FREY. Mr. Chairman, when the public broadcasting bill was here before the House a few weeks ago there was considerable disagreement about the wisdom of providing more than 1 year of authorization under all of the circumstances surrounding the operation of the corporation and its offshoots. Amendments offered in various ways to so limit the authorizations were defeated by very narrow margins. Many of the misgivings and dissatisfactions voiced here had also been noted by the administration and its suggestion was a 1-year authorization allowing an increase of \$10 million over the 1972 levels. All things considered, this seemed not only adequate but generous.

Based upon the actions taken here during consideration of the original bill it is obvious that considerably less than two-thirds of the Members felt that 2-year funding was justified. It is therefore not surprising that the President saw fit to veto that measure and ask again that Congress come forth with a 1-year bill. The other body promptly took up and passed a very simple measure to extend the Public Broadcasting Corporation authorization for 1 year only and in the amounts suggested. Meanwhile the Appropriations Committees indicated that these same figures would be honored.

In going along with the action by the other body we do eliminate some changes in the operation of the corporation which the committee felt were desirable. The most important one had to do with the funneling of money through to the local stations for their use. The bill required that 30 percent of appropriated funds be passed through to the stations. Meanwhile the board of directors of the corpo-

ration has decided as a matter of policy to do so and has definitely announced its intention to follow through. For the time being at least there seems to be no great need for a legislative mandate on this subject. By next year a look at the experience of the stations with the new corporation policy may lead the committee to recommend a different requirement. With a 1-year authorization you will be certain to have a crack at it here also.

There are differences between the bill now before you and that passed by the Senate but they are technical and our bill reflects exactly what the other body intended to do. We are assured that they will be accepted and the bill can become law very soon, thereby providing authorizations for actions already decided upon by the Appropriations Committees.

I recommend that the House suspend the rules and pass this bill.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, as Congress moves to consider appropriations for public broadcasting I think it is worth a look at the origin of our broadcasting system.

Public broadcasting began in the 1920's with high aspirations. The then Secretary of Commerce Herbert Hoover told Congress in 1924:

Great as the development of radio distribution has been, we are probably only on the threshold of the development of one of the most important of human discoveries bearing on education, amusement, culture and business communication.

The need for broadcasters to serve the public was repeatedly emphasized. The Federal Radio Commission, established in 1929, made clear that the public interest required diversity of programs. It stated:

The tastes, needs and desires of all substantial groups among the listening public should be met in some fair proportion, by a well-rounded program, in which entertainment, consisting of music of both classical and lighter grades, religion, education and instruction, important public events, discussions of public questions, weather, market reports, and news, and matters of interest to all members of the family find a place.

The promise of those days has not been fulfilled. While commercial television has made some excellent contributions, television today is far from what it could be. Increasingly, the networks have been victimized by the "numbers game" where the ratings become more important than the quality of the programming.

The extent of this victimization of the networks and the public is shown by the excessive amount of violence on the air. This phenomenon was criticized by the President's Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence. It was also the subject of a study by the Surgeon General's Advisory Committee on Television and Social Behavior. That committee, after sponsoring numerous research studies on the subject, presented its findings to the public in a six-volume report.

The Surgeon General stated to Congress:

While the committee report is carefully phrased and qualified in language acceptable

to social scientists, it is clear to me that the casual relationship between televised violence and antisocial behavior is sufficient to warrant appropriate and immediate remedial action. . . . (T)here comes a time when the data are sufficient to justify action. That time has come.

Another area of commercial broadcasting where a sense of responsibility has eroded is advertising. I am thinking in particular of the constant barrage of food advertisements which nutritionists say are contributing to the bad eating habits of our children. Over 60 percent of the advertising on children's television is food advertising and as a result the typical child is exposed to 8,000 food commercials a year. This is not advertising of solid nutritional food such as meat, potatoes, and vegetables. Rather the advertising is primarily of candy, sugary drinks, and other sweet foods of limited nutritional value.

Studies have shown the impact of such advertising on children and the persuasive power of children on family shopping habits. Nutritionists have called to the attention of Congress and the public the imbalance in the kinds of foods that are advertised on children's shows, saying that it "makes it impossible for a child not to go wrong." Yet this practice continues.

By the time the average child reaches 18, he will have spent more time watching television than attending school. If this amount of television is being watched by our children, let us at least see to it that some of the programs are worthwhile.

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting deserves a reasonable level of funding. On a very limited budget, it has produced such excellent shows for children as "Sesame Street" and "Misterogers Neighborhood." It can do much more.

Decent programming for our children is just one reason to support the Public Broadcasting Corporation. There are many others, including the need for more informational and cultural programs. But I think the need for better television for our children is compelling.

Unfortunately, President Nixon vetoed the bill Congress passed on June 22, providing a 2-year authorization of \$165 million for the Public Broadcasting Corporation. I supported that bill. I believe the present bill before us, S. 3824, is by no means adequate. But in light of the President's veto, we must move to provide at least minimal financing for the Corporation. Congress must pass this bill with the commitment to give the Public Broadcasting Corporation in the future the funding it needs to help provide this country the kind of television it deserves.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 396(k) (1) of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended to read as follows:

"(k) (1) There is authorized to be appropriated for expenses of the Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, the sum of \$40,000,000."

(b) Section 396(k) (2) of such Act is amended by striking out "1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "1973".

Sec. 2. Section 391 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended to read as follows:

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 391. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, such sums, not to exceed \$25,000,000, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of section 390. Sums appropriated under this section shall remain available for payment of grants for projects for which applications, approved under section 392, have been submitted under such section prior to July 1, 1974."

Mr. STAGGERS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to be proposed to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute? If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BINGHAM, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 3824) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1973 for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and for making grants for construction of noncommercial educational television or radio broadcasting facilities, pursuant to House Resolution 1086, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. PETTIS. 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 377, nays 8, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 327]

YEAS—377

Abbutt
Adams
Addabbo
Alexander
Anderson,
Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews,
N. Dak.
Annunzio
Archer
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Aspin
Aspinall
Badillo
Baring
Barrett
Begich
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Bergland
Bevill
Biaggi
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burlison, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Byron
Cabell
Caffery
Carey, N.Y.
Carlson
Casey, Tex.
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chappell
Chisholm
Clark
Clausen,
Don H.
Clawson, Del.
Clay
Cleveland
Collier
Collins, Ill.
Collins, Tex.
Colmer
Conable
Conover
Conyers
Corman
Cotter
Coughlin
Culver
Curlin
Daniel, Va.
Daniels, N.J.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, S.C.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Dellums
Denholm
Dennis
Dent
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Downing
Drinan

Dulski
Duncan
du Pont
Eckhardt
Edwards, Calif.
Ellberg
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Flood
Flowers
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford,
William D.
Forsythe
Fountain
Fraser
Frenzel
Frey
Fulton
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Garmatz
Gaydos
Gettys
Glaimo
Gibbons
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Grassco
Grasso
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammer-
schmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harrington
Harsha
Harvey
Hastings
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heinz
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks, Mass.
Hicks, Wash.
Hillis
Hogan
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jacobs
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Keating
Kee
Kemp
King
Kluczynski
Koch
Kuykendall
Kyros
Landgrebe
Latta
Link

Lloyd
Long, Md.
Lujan
McClary
McClure
McCollister
McCormack
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
McFall
McKay
McKevitt
McKinney
Macdonald,
Mass.
Madden
Mahon
Mallard
Mallory
Mann
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathis, Ga.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Mazzoli
Meeds
Melcher
Metcalfe
Mikva
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills, Ark.
Mills, Md.
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mitchell
Mizell
Molohan
Monagan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morgan
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
O'Konski
O'Neill
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Peyser
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Podell
Poff
Powell
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Rallsback
Randall
Rangel
Rees
Reid
Reuss
Riegle
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Robison, N.Y.
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Roncallo
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roussellot
Roy
Roybal

Runnels
Ruppe
Ruth
St Germain
Sandman
Sarbanes
Saylor
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Sebelius
Seiberling
Shipley
Shoup
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Spence
Springer
Staggers

Stanton,
J. William
Stanton,
James V.
Steed
Steele
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stokes
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Symington
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Thone
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito

Waggonner
Wampler
Ware
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
Charles H.
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wyllie
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Young, Fla.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—8

Camp
Crane
Derwinski

Flynt
Gross
Terry

Tiernan
Wiggins

NOT VOTING—47

Abernethy
Abouzeck
Abzug
Anderson,
Tenn.
Baker
Betts
Blanton
Byrnes, Wis.
Carney
Carter
Clancy
Conte
Danielson
Davis, Wis.
Dingell
Dowdy

Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Hagan
Hébert
Heckler, Mass.
Hull
Keith
Kyl
Landrum
Leggett
Lennon
Lent
Long, La.

McCloskey
McDonald,
Mich.
McMillan
Michel
Passman
Pelly
Rarick
Rhodes
Rooney, N.Y.
Ryan
Satterfield
Schmitz
Teague, Tex.
Veysey
Waldie

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Rhodes.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Lent.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Ryan with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
Mrs. Abzug with Mr. Abouzeck.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Keith.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Edmondson with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Betts.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. Rarick with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Carney with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Danielson with Mr. Schmitz.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Dow.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Satterfield.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to

extend their remarks on the two bills just passed, H.R. 15375 and S. 3824.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 15, 1972.The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: On this date, I have been served, as Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, with a subpoena duces tecum that was issued by the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania. This subpoena appears to be in connection with the case of the United States of America v. Grand Jury Investigation.

This subpoena commands the Clerk of the House to appear in said United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania at 10 A.M. on August 22, 1972, and requests certain House records that are outlined in the subpoena itself, which is attached hereto.

The rules and practices of the House of Representatives indicate that no official of the House may, either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpoena duces tecum, produce such papers without the consent of the House first being obtained. It is further indicated that he may not supply copies of certain of the documents and papers requested without such consent.

The subpoena in question is herewith attached, and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

With kind regards, I am
Sincerely,W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpoena.

[In the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania]

SUBPENA TO PRODUCE DOCUMENT OR OBJECT
(United States of America v. Grand Jury Investigation)

To W. Pat Jennings, Clerk of the House, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

You are hereby commanded to appear in the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania at 708 U.S. Post Office & Cthse. at 7th Ave. and Grant Street in the city of Pittsburgh on the 22nd day of August 1972 at 10:00 o'clock A.M. to testify in the case of United States Grand Jury Investigation.

This subpoena is issued upon application of the United States of America.

August 9, 1972. Blair A. Griffith, First Assistant U.S. Attorney.

BERNARD SHAFFT, Clerk.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 1091) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1091

Whereas in the Grand Jury Investigation pending in the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania, a subpoena duces tecum was issued by the said court and addressed to W. Pat Jennings, Clerk of the House of Representatives, di-

recting him to appear as a witness before the grand jury of the said court at 10 o'clock antemeridian on the 22nd day of August, 1972, and to bring with him certain papers and documents in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives; Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such action thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That W. Pat Jennings, Clerk of the House, or any officer or employee in his office whom he may designate, be authorized to appear at the place and before the grand jury in the subpoena duces tecum beforehand, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in possession of the House of Representatives; be it further

Resolved, That when the said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpoena duces tecum, then the said court, through any of its officers or agents, be authorized to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House, and take copies of those requested papers and documents which are in possession or control of the said Clerk; and the Clerk is authorized to supply certified copies of such documents or papers in his possession or control that the court has found to be material and relevant and which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said documents and papers by the said Clerk shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under the said Clerk; and be it further

Resolved, That as a respectful answer to the subpoena duces tecum a copy of these resolutions be submitted to the said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE—GRAND JURY INVESTIGATION, U.S. DISTRICT COURT, WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the question of privilege of the House.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in my capacity as chairman of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, I have been subpoenaed to appear before the grand jury of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania, on August 22, 1972, and to bring with me certain records of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. Under the rules and precedents of the House, I am

unable to comply with the subpoena duces tecum without the permission of the House being involved.

I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

[U.S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania]

SUBPENA TO PRODUCE DOCUMENT OR OBJECT (United States of America, Grand Jury Investigation)

To Melvin Price, Chairman, Committee on Standards of Official Conduct (House Ethics Committee), House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

You are hereby commanded to appear in the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania, at 708 U.S. Post Office and Courthouse, 7th Avenue and Grant Streets, in the city of Pittsburgh, on the 22d day of August 1972, at 10 o'clock A.M., to testify in the case of United States Grand Jury Investigation and bring with you all affidavits submitted by current or past employees of Congressman J. Irving Whalley, referring to the existence or absence of salary kickbacks.

This subpoena is issued upon application of the United States of America.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 1092) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 1092

Whereas in the Grand Jury Investigation pending in the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania, a subpoena duces tecum was issued by the said court and addressed to Honorable Melvin Price, Chairman of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct of the U.S. House of Representatives, directing him to appear as a witness before the grand jury of the said court at 10 o'clock antemeridian on the 22nd day of August, 1972, and to bring with him certain documents in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives; Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such action thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That Honorable Melvin Price, Chairman of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, or any employee of that committee whom he may designate, be authorized to appear at the place and before the grand jury in the subpoena duces tecum beforehand, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in that committee or under his control or in possession of the House of Representatives; be it further

Resolved, That when the said court determines upon the materiality and relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpoena duces tecum, then the said court, through any of its officers or agents, be au-

thorized to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House, and take copies of those requested papers and documents which are in possession or control of the said committee; and the Clerk of the House is authorized to supply certified copies of such documents or papers in the possession or control of the said committee that the court has found to be material and relevant and which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said documents and papers by the said committee shall not be disturbed or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under the said committee; and be it further

Resolved, That as a respectful answer to the subpoena duces tecum a copy of these resolutions be submitted to the said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce a change in the program for tomorrow.

The consumer product safety bill which was originally scheduled will not be considered and in place thereof we will consider the bill, H.R. 14847, to amend the Airport and Air Development Act of 1970, more commonly known as the head tax bill.

In addition to that, we hope to obtain unanimous consent to vote on the SALT interim agreement on Thursday.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on final passage of House Joint Resolution 1227, the SALT interim agreement be taken on Thursday instead of tomorrow.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have been contacted concerning the desirability of this unanimous-consent request in view of the fact that there is considerable colloquy in the RECORD involving the leadership as to not deferring the business of the House for primary elections and other valid excuses, but still trying to accommodate the Members where possible; in view of the fact that the sole reason for deferring such an important vote as the House's part in concurring in the SALT interim agreement; and in view of the fact that the gentleman from Missouri has also been invited to his State fair by his Governor and other officials and rejected it because in my view it is our elected and bounden duty to be on the floor of the Congress when we are officially in session, I am constrained to object, and I do object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BOGGS. Proceeding under my 1-minute unanimous consent grant, I would like to announce that the program tomorrow otherwise will be as scheduled:

H.R. 16071, Public Works and Economic Development Act, will be considered first under an open rule with 2 hours of debate, and because of the objection of the gentleman from Missouri, the

SALT Agreement—House Joint Resolution 1227—will be considered and voted on tomorrow.

Finally, H.R. 14847, the airport head tax bill will be the last order of business.

RE ACTIVITIES OF JANE FONDA IN NORTH VIETNAM

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

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, late last week the Committee on Internal Security discussed, at some length, the question of whether or not to issue a subpoena to the actress, Jane Fonda, with respect to broadcast statements she made over the Communist Radio Hanoi to our troops in Vietnam.

It was agreed by the committee that it would be best, at this time, to give the Justice Department time to complete its announced inquiry into the Fonda affair before considering any further course by the committee.

At the request of my colleagues on the committee, I addressed a letter which was hand-delivered Friday afternoon to Attorney General Kleindienst setting forth the committee's concern with this matter and our desire to have a report from the Justice Department by September 14 or an explanation from a representative of the Department on that date regarding what can and should be done with respect to Miss Fonda's activities in the capital of our enemy.

For the benefit of my colleagues in the House, Mr. Speaker, I include the contents of my letter to the Attorney General in the RECORD at this point:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COM-
MITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY,
Washington, D.C., August 10, 1972.

Hon. RICHARD G. KLEINDIENST,
Attorney General of the United States, De-
partment of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: The Committee on Internal Security met this morning in executive session to consider a request that a subpoena be issued to require Jane Fonda to appear before the Committee in regard to her travel to North Vietnam and radio broadcasts to U.S. military forces during July 1972. During the meeting a number of reasons were expressed as a basis for opposition to the issuance of a subpoena. Important factors in the ultimate determination of the Committee were that the facts seemed to be already rather well-known, that the matter was under study by the Department of Justice and Fonda would be entitled to the full protection of the Fifth Amendment, that any such hearing might work to the prejudice of the Government in the event prosecution is undertaken and that the Committee's overriding interest is not in what additional information might be secured from Fonda, but rather in any insufficiency in the terms of the law or in its enforcement.

I am sure that you recognize the pernicious nature of Miss Fonda's statements to our servicemen, and the seriousness with which nearly all Members of Congress view her conduct. Although it might be fairly said that public support for American involvement in the Vietnam conflict is steadily declining, such aid and comfort to a nation with which we are engaged in hostilities

is nevertheless condemned by the public. But whatever political or public reaction might obtain under the circumstances, I am sure you agree that the Department of Justice has a most solemn obligation to engage the full weight of the law against conduct which the Congress has made criminally punishable.

The Committee has reviewed the treason, sedition and other relevant statutes. It has also been informed of Fonda's travel itinerary, and has studied the transcripts of her broadcasts while recently in Hanoi. It is not difficult to perceive why a cry of treason has been raised. But if the burden of proof is too great for treason, would not a prima facie case exist under Section 2387 of Title 18, United States Code or even Section 2388, notwithstanding the jurisdictional limitation?

In discharging its responsibility to the Congress to insure that statutes within its oversight jurisdiction are being duly enforced by the Executive Branch, the Committee resolved that the staff investigation of Fonda's activities will continue, and in the event the Justice Department determines that the broadcasts of Jane Fonda from Hanoi during July 1972 do not constitute treason or sedition, or that her conduct cannot be reached by existing statute for any other reason, then the Department is requested to furnish a report to the Committee with recommendations for legislation which would be effective to impose criminal sanctions under similar circumstances in the future. Desiring to resolve the questions at an early date, but hoping to avoid an unreasonable burden upon the Department, the Committee voted to request that the report be submitted by September 14, or in the alternative, that a representative of the Department appear before the Committee on that date.

Your cooperation and assistance in providing an analysis of the federal criminal law vis-a-vis the recent conduct of Jane Fonda will indeed be appreciated. Would you please advise me as soon as possible whether the Department will furnish a report on or before the above date or will provide for the appearance of a representative so that arrangements can be made for a meeting of the Committee.

Sincerely,

RICHARD H. ICHORD,
Chairman.

LEGISLATION TO ASSURE THAT NO VETERAN LOSES ANY OF HIS PENSION DUE TO RECENT SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASE

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

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I am happy to reintroduce, along with 58 cosponsors, legislation to assure that no veteran loses any of his pension due to the recent social security increase.

Most of us were happy to see social security benefits rise by 20 percent recently, because we all have thousands of senior citizens in our districts who badly need this assistance.

But provisions in current law will prevent retired veterans in our districts from benefiting much from that social security increase, since veterans pensions are based on income limits which include social security. When social security benefits are increased, veterans' pensions automatically drop.

This means that our Nation's veterans

will benefit only partially from the recent 20-percent increase in social security—their income will rise slightly, while the income of other senior citizens will rise 20 percent.

More than 20,000 veterans at the upper-income limit will lose all their veterans pension unless remedial action is taken.

This means that a veteran and his wife, whose income is pushed above the \$3,800 income limit by the recent social security increase, could lose all of their \$33 monthly pension, bringing their income below \$3,800. Most couples in this situation would be better off had no social security increase been passed. No wonder many of these veterans feel badly cheated.

In addition, there are 1.3 million veterans and widows who will see their pension reduced by an average of \$8.71 monthly unless remedial action is taken. 211,827 single veterans will lose an average of \$12.14 per month, while 466,948 veterans with dependents will lose an average of \$9.46 per month. Some 525,000 veteran's widows will lose approximately \$6.35 monthly.

A \$12 or even \$6 monthly loss of pension may not sound too critical, but when an elderly couple is living on a shoestring budget, as many of our veterans are, this small amount can make a big difference.

I personally do not believe social security should be counted in computing veterans pensions. They are both retirement incomes which the recipient has earned for two different reasons—it is like qualifying for two pension plans from two separate companies.

I plan to continue working in the Veterans' Affairs Committee toward changing this policy. However, for the immediate future, we need some kind of remedial legislation to assure that no veteran loses part of his pension when the social security increase takes effect September 1.

The bill I have sponsored, along with my 58 colleagues, will raise by \$600 the limit on income which a veteran can earn without losing his pension. It will also increase the benefit formula for computing veterans' pensions. The pension base for a veteran with no dependents will be increased from \$130 to \$148 monthly; for a veteran with a dependent, from \$140 to \$158 monthly; for a widow with no child from \$87 to \$93 monthly; and for a widow with a child from \$104 to \$110 monthly.

I am certain you will agree that our veterans deserve to benefit at least as much as other senior citizens from the recent social security increase. Today I join 58 other Members from all segments of the political and geographical spectrum in asking all of our colleagues to give their full support to this bill and help expedite its enactment at the earliest possible date.

The full list of cosponsors is as follows:

Mr. Forsythe, Mr. Winn, Mr. Del Clawson, Mr. Ellberg, Mr. McDade, Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin, Mr. Gude, Mr. Sarbanes, Mr. Aspin, Mr. Quie, Mr. Hungate, Mrs. Abzug, Mr. Sisk, Mrs. Chisholm, Mr. Clark, Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Tiernan, Mr. Young of Florida, Mr. Derwinski, Mr. Walde,

Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Fascell, Mr. Melcher, Mr. King, Mr. Myers, Mr. Sebelius, Mrs. Hansen, of Washington, Mr. Hastings, Mr. Veysey, Mr. Brinkley, Mr. Rangel, Mr. Bell, Mr. Hansen of Idaho, Mr. Jones of North Carolina, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Danielson, Mr. Thone, Mr. Matsunaga, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Collier, Mr. Kemp, Mr. Hanna, Mr. Obey, Mr. Anderson of Tennessee, Mr. Scherle, Mr. Bray, Mr. O'Konski, Mr. Leggett, Mr. Charles H. Wilson, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania, Mr. Molohan, Mr. Latta, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Cederberg, Mr. Duncan and Mr. Blanton.

UNFOUNDED CHARGES LEVELED AGAINST REPRESENTATIVE WAYNE ASPINALL

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in this biannual season of political rhetoric I am sincerely hopeful that these few words offered by me will not be obscured by the sheer volume of similar efforts by those who think differently than I, or my totally genuine concern not be mitigated by any cynical attitude presuming personal or political considerations.

I have served on the House Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs for 6 years. As an inevitable result of this service I am very comfortable in expressing outrage at the totally unfair and ridiculous charges that have been repeatedly leveled at the chairman of the full committee, WAYNE ASPINALL.

He has been designated capriciously, unconsciously, and in absolute error as a "foe of conservationists," "a tool of public land permittees" and a whole lot more. He has been labeled a member of the "Dirty Dozen," those Members of Congress who allegedly would destroy our environment. Recognizing all the inequities in the political process, I can simply not remain silent in the face of this blatant, ludicrous, and vicious lie. As a member of the opposition party to WAYNE ASPINALL, I have found myself in disagreement with him on occasion. But to overlook Mr. ASPINALL's achievements in the fields of conservation—genuine—environmental protection and ecological concern is so damnable it simply must be stopped.

Under his leadership the Congress has passed the Wilderness Act, the wild rivers bill, national trails, and literally hundreds more. To allow the spleen of a few professional activists to be vented unchallenged is to do truth more harm than it deserves.

History will show that WAYNE ASPINALL was the lynch-pin that turned the Nation's concern for the environment from verbiage to solid, national action.

He is entitled to the respect and gratitude of those who are similarly concerned, not their meaningless, blind attacks.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

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

minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, as you know, John Macy resigned last week as president of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. All of us who have watched CPB grow from infancy into adolescence are grateful to this courageous and thoughtful public servant for his guidance of this most important addition to American broadcasting.

In resigning, Mr. Macy said:

Contrary to views expressed in some quarters, it is my conviction that we have adhered to the intent of Congress in a faithful but creative fashion and that the groundwork which has been laid will form the foundation from which the evolutionary progress of this industry can be achieved.

In my view, it is John Macy's leadership that has brought about such a good beginning for CPB.

I would take issue with Mr. Macy on only one point. He indicates that "current trends in the development of the industry point toward the desirability of a change in leadership of the Corporation." It is not the leadership which must change, but rather the trends which currently make outstanding leadership—such as that of a John Macy—impossible.

The major step required to achieve this goal is the removal of the present administration and its stultifying veto on the progress of public broadcasting.

TWENTY-EIGHT NEW COSPONSORS FOR BILL TO ESTABLISH COUNCIL ON ENERGY POLICY

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our colleague (Mr. KEITH) and myself, I am pleased today to reintroduce H.R. 15752, for establishing a Council on Energy Policy in the Executive Office of the President.

This afternoon we are joined by 27 Members as cosponsors, making a total of 71 who have signed this legislation since it was first offered last June 28.

The proposal, intended to provide an urgently needed focal point for setting governmental policies in the energy field, enjoys the broadest kind of bipartisan backing—as evidenced by the fact that the signers include 36 Democrats and 35 Republicans.

I understand there is the possibility of early action on a very similar bill in the other body. And it comes none too soon—responsibility for energy matters is now divided among 65 Executive agencies and 12 committees of Congress, while each day's news dispatches give evidence of a mounting energy crisis.

Let us act now to provide a new degree of guidance for conserving and expanding on the most precious of commodities—our energy fuels.

HEALTH CARE: A NATIONAL PRIORITY

(Mr. MURPHY of New York asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, comprehensive health care is the inherent right of every American, for good health is a prerequisite to the full realization of the opportunities for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Society, thus, must guarantee each citizen quality health and medical attention. Traditionally, this responsibility has fallen to the individual practitioners and institutional providers, as well as to the organizations which furnish public protection from the high cost of unexpected illness.

The legislation I am introducing today, the Health Security Act of 1972, shifts the weight of the responsibility for assuring each American necessary health care to the Federal Government, and provides the means by which it can be satisfied.

The critical circumstances of the national health crisis dictate the necessity for realizing this shift. The fact is that many Americans are deprived of adequate health care. A glance at comparative statistics reveals a situation which is truly appalling, and it is incongruous that the richest and most technically sophisticated country in the world trails 12 nations in infant mortality rates, six in maternal mortality rates, 17 in life expectancy for males, and 10 in life expectancy for females. While the figures shock, they are a painfully accurate indicator of the unnecessary condition of health care in this Nation.

We are all subject today to a health care system which manifests prohibitively high costs. Skyrocketing hospital costs and soaring doctors' fees produce real anxiety in each of us, when we are faced with the necessities of routine examinations and minor medical needs. But the anxiety is minimal compared to the well-founded fear instilled in Americans in every income bracket that, should a catastrophic illness strike, financial disaster would almost certainly follow. Many self-supporting victims of disabling accidents and chronic illnesses, facing open ended liabilities for \$100-a-day hospital rooms, thousands of dollars of laboratory costs, and precious surgeons' fees, meagerly protected by insurance policies with very limited commitments, have had their worst fears realized. And, each American lives in a perpetual state of insecurity, knowing that "There but for the grace of God go I."

While the problems of the delivery of health care, the manpower shortage and the resulting problems of distribution and accessibility, affect us all, they are particularly troublesome for certain groups of Americans and result in the relegation of some to second class citizenship. Those who live in obscure rural outposts, the ghetto poor, the disabled, and the aged are truly in this category.

If each American has the right to adequate health care, how can we justify the fact that in 130 primarily rural counties no medical care of any kind is available? Or that in East Harlem in New York, a barren plain in the midst

of plenty, there is only one doctor for every 1,600 prospective patients? How can we permit circumstances to exist in which a crippled widow cannot get protection against catastrophic illness because she is disabled, a bad risk? Or a medicaid recipient is denied treatment because the doctor is afraid the patient cannot pay her share of the cost of his fee?

The answer is: We no longer can.

Nor can we afford to leave the problem of quality control unsolved. Although most institutions and practitioners strive to afford their patients proper care, there are no truly enforceable standards concerning "overdoctorization," unnecessary hospitalization, or irrelevant treatment. And, the consumer is particularly vulnerable to abuses such as these, for in his helpless ignorance he has no way of judging the quality of the care he receives.

Any objective review of the circumstances of the present national health care system makes one point very clear: Neither the providers nor the insurance companies have been able to afford every American comprehensive quality health care at a price he can pay. The crux of the problem, as I see it, is that the present health system has generated neither incentives, nor created the mechanisms for self-control, that would serve to influence either group to check rising medical costs, institute needed changes in the delivery of health care, or control the quality of medical attention.

Practitioners, plagued by an understandable conflict—forced to respond to rising income necessities in an inflating economy, and at the same time striving to maintain their professional commitment—have done little to meet the urgent need for reform. Unaffected by the natural incentives arising from the competition within most industries, due largely to the critical manpower shortage within the medical profession, physicians "arrange" their prices largely among themselves, locate in the more affluent and professionally attractive areas, and fail to provide measures for true quality control.

Institutions, such as hospitals and nursing homes, often suffer from similar problems. Leading administrators have not assumed the responsibility for instigating needed change. Like the medical professionals, they do not compete with their fellow institutions. Thus, they often operate inefficiently and uneconomically, and locate where they wish, rather than where they are most needed.

Insurance carriers are in the best position of all to effect the necessary changes in the system. But, they have not only failed to take advantage of their position, but shine as one of the true sources of the health care crisis. Reaping real benefits from the \$75 billion a year health care market, they suffer from the same malady as the other sectors: A lack of true competition. While each carrier does compete with 1,800 other carriers, the result of this competition is that each strives to attract the most select, low-risk clientele, offer the least possible benefits cloaked in the most attractive and un-

intelligible vagueries, and pay the fewest possible claims. Preoccupied with meeting their high operating costs, salesmen's commissions and advertising expenses, and ladden with complicated administrative considerations, they have failed to represent the consumer's interests in the market. They offer truly inadequate protection against the high costs of medical care, and have failed to use the \$15 billion they pay to providers each year to influence the control of costs, or improve the delivery and quality of health care in this country.

It is thus apparent that none of the private sectors, operating within the present health care system, are going to rise to challenge the viability of that system. Yet, it is crucial that this challenge be made. The Federal Government is best qualified to make and meet this challenge. Unaffected by conflicting interests, and ultimately accountable to the people, the Government can truly dedicate itself to assuring every American comprehensive quality health care.

The Health Security Act, which I am introducing today, creates the mechanism and provides the means whereby this can be accomplished. This bill substantially follows the Kennedy bill, and it establishes the blueprint for a federally administered program of national health care which will offer every American, regardless of his ability to pay, comprehensive services, including physician's services, inpatient and outpatient care, and essential supporting services such as podiatry and optometry. Replacing the private insurers, the Government would be responsible for financing essentially the entire health care system. The funds derived from a combination of payroll and general revenue taxes will be used to reimburse practitioners, pay for the services of hospital administrators and related personnel, costs of equipment, supplies, and so forth. The funds will also serve to support a system of controls and incentives designed to effect the changes necessary to alleviate the circumstances of the health care crisis.

Of all the bills offering answers to the national health problem, only the Health Security Act places positive and firm controls on costs. It does this by prospectively budgeting the amount of money available to cover health care of the entire population. Broken down by regions and areas of the country, the budget would be allocated among hospitals and other institutions as well as prepaid groups, such as health maintenance organizations, foundations, and providers who wish to be paid on a capitation or salaried basis. A pool would be left for physicians who choose to practice on a fee-for-service basis.

The budgets would be essentially absolute, thus providing a strong incentive for efficient and economical operation. Practitioners, reimbursed primarily for their services on a per capita basis, would be influenced to continue the trend toward the development of more efficacious and desirable group arrangements. Hospitals and other institutions, strictly budgeted, would be forced to work toward avoiding waste.

A most important aspect of the Health

Security Act is that it provides the means for ultimately eliminating the problems of inaccessibility and poor distribution of resources. It would authorize allocations to be used to increase professional manpower and related health personnel, provide for stipends to be paid to practitioners to locate in remote and deprived areas, and provide financial support for institutions manifesting this same goal.

These measures would begin to effect an improved health delivery system which could respond to the new demands for competent national comprehensive health care.

The legislation also offers major assurances in the area of the quality control of health care. It would establish licensing requirements for participating practitioners, and require continuing education for health professionals. It would work toward the control of drug abuse. And, it would remove the financial incentive that has fostered unnecessary, irrelevant, and expensive treatment.

Critics of the Health Security Act attack the bill on the basis that while it strives to secure the consumer's right to comprehensive, quality health care, it unnecessarily restricts the freedom of the providers. This is patently untrue. The bill not only allows for unlimited pluralism in the manner of payment to physicians, patterns of practice, and methods of organization, but furnishes support and financial backing for experimentation and innovation. Far from infringing on the right of practitioners to practice, it releases them from cumbersome administrative and financial matters, freeing them to concentrate on the art of creative healing. In this sense, it creates a truly workable partnership of the public and private sectors.

The realization of a system which provides comprehensive health care for all is far too important a goal to allow it to be thwarted by the whims of the marketplace, the conflicting interests of private industry, or the special interests of a single profession. The Health Security Act strives to remove these obstacles and provide the means by which the ultimate end can be achieved.

THE TRANSPORTATION CRISIS

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday's Washington Post contained a timely editorial which pointed up the controversy being wrestled with in Congress. This is whether we need better transportation or just more highways.

The thrust of this significant editorial is that we seriously need to improve our transit systems for moving people in urban areas and not just build more and more express highways to do it. This thesis has my firm support, as I have often announced on the House floor and elsewhere. I agree that the Highway Trust Fund should be opened up to finance other means of moving people and goods. We certainly should not overlook the obvious necessity for providing the

means of moving our goods as well as ourselves.

The Senate Public Works Committee proposal places some emphasis on the use of buses. The experiment now in progress to utilize a special bus lane for commuter purposes on the Shirley Highway has been evaluated a success, pointing the way for expanded future use in other areas. If this system is effective in reducing automobile use, it should be continued and planned for in future systems. But adequate planning should lean strongly to balanced systems—rail and subway systems included.

There is a wide variety of legislative proposals before the House and Senate which would help achieve the goal of balanced transportation systems, and reorient Federal transportation assistance policy toward allowing States and local governments greater choice in how such assistance shall be used. The sheer need for this approach is so clearly demonstrated and so widespread that the administration has drawn up and sent to Congress a proposal which would tap Federal Highway Funds for urban transit purposes.

In a more recent development, in the other Chamber, Senators KENNEDY and WEICKER, with numerous cosponsors, have introduced a bill to accomplish such a diversion, which is receiving considerable notice. This bill would make \$2.3 billion in 1974 available from the highway trust fund for whatever transportation need the respective States or local governments can demonstrate. If the authorities consider that the greatest need is for urban and/or commuter systems, that is where their allocation could be spent. For the years after 1974, the amount so allocated would increase from \$2.3 billion to \$2.8 billion each year.

This proposal contains a formula for making the allocation among the States which provides for one-quarter of the amount on the basis of area of the State, one-quarter on the basis of total population, and, of major significance, the remaining half on the basis of populations of metropolitan areas within the State. To protect the States which are smaller in geographic size, the bill further provides that no State shall receive less than one-half of 1 percent of the total to be allocated on the basis of area.

There is no exact counterpart of this bill presently before the House. But the Committee on Banking and Currency of which I am privileged to serve is currently considering the omnibus 1972 housing and urban development bill which contains very important provisions regarding the urban mass transportation program. I have been very instrumental in developing what is title IX of the pending housing bill as approved by the Housing Subcommittee, where I urged the Members to adopt these provisions. We are authorizing, for the first time, Federal operating subsidies for our urban transit systems around the country, both large urban transit systems, such as our Chicago Transit Authority and small town bus operations. If enacted, such a program of operating subsidies would keep the fares of the Chicago Transit Authority from rising any higher than

they already are, and would, in all likelihood, reduce the already burdensome fares which our citizens in Chicago must bear. This provision would also provide additional capital grant funds totaling \$2.9 billion of new money so that our Chicago Transit Authority could complete its subway connection to O'Hare International Airport. Chicago is probably the only city in the United States that uses highway rights-of-way to build its subway lines. A continuing use of Federal highway trust funds, as well as funds from the urban mass transportation program can continue to make Chicago a leader in providing its citizens with safe, adequate, and responsible urban transportation.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 8, 1972]

BETTER TRANSPORTATION OR JUST MORE HIGHWAYS?

The long, ferocious battle for control of federal highway policies and the \$4-billion-per-year highway trust fund is now focused on the Senate Public Works Committee, where this year's major highway legislation will be considered this week. In contrast to its counterpart in the House, the Senate committee has generally resisted the more outrageous requests of the highway lobby in the past, and has been relatively responsive to the need to weigh the social and environmental costs of roads before construction starts. At a time when metropolitan transportation networks—including both clogged streets and creaky mass transit system—are under severe strain, the committee has the opportunity to exert strong leadership in redirecting federal policy from the old, single-minded emphasis on building highways to a new, more flexible approach to serving total transportation needs.

In response to growing pressure to open up the highway trust fund to finance other means of moving people and goods, a committee draft bill now circulating around town proposes to set aside at least \$300 million per year "to encourage the development, improvement, and use" of public bus systems. These funds could be used for constructing bus lanes, fringe parking areas, and other useful facilities, and for the purchase of buses—but not for bus operating subsidies, and not for the purchase or operation of subways, commuter trains, streetcars or of anything else that runs on rails. Separate provisions would authorize an entirely new program of scenic roads, and push the states into a major effort to build bicycle lanes and trails.

In short, this is still very much a highway bill. The draft carefully steers away from any politically uncomfortable challenge to the oft-invoked sanctity of the highway trust fund, and leaves governors and mayors to scramble for bus subsidies and rapid rail transit aid before other congressional committees. Although it authorizes the creation of metropolitan regional transportation agencies, it denies those agencies a broad freedom to mix various modes of transportation. In this respect, the draft is more timid than the administration's proposals for bringing together urban highway and mass transit funds.

On the crucial question of planning procedures, the draft bill is alarming in its ambiguity. One of the greatest victories of the environmental movement has been the attainment of safeguards—requirements for public hearings, environmental impact statements, relocation programs, protection for parkways and historic structures, and the standing of citizens to sue—to keep highway bulldozers from demolishing other public values. The Public Works Committee has generally fostered such safeguards, but the draft bill proposes an entirely new alterna-

tive planning procedure which might enable states to wriggle out from under the detailed requirements of federal law. In addition, Senators Bentsen and Tower are pushing an amendment to permit the Texas highway department to proceed with a San Antonio project which has been blocked by federal courts. This move stirs up unhappy memories of the Three Sisters Bridge fights of the past. The committee and the Senate should resist both the moves to undermine the general protections now in force, and efforts to circumvent them by special exceptions.

An interesting bill introduced by Senators Kennedy and Weicker, with over 15 cosponsors, clarifies the choices now before the Senate. Without junking those highway projects already under way, the Kennedy-Weicker bill would permit state, local and regional governments to use future trust fund monies for either highways or mass transit, with the present environmental and relocation safeguards intact. This is a route toward sensible, comprehensive transportation planning which certainly should be explored.

SENATE JUDICIARY HEARINGS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Senator EDWARD KENNEDY has stated he is going to hold hearings Wednesday morning in the Judiciary Committee on the effect of U.S. bombing on civilians of North Vietnam. Upon learning of this I contacted his office and asked if I may be allowed to testify with regard to information I have concerning the effect on civilians injured by rocket and mortar attacks in South Vietnam by the North Vietnamese.

I have just been informed by Senator KENNEDY's office that under no circumstances will they allow anyone to testify who has not been in North Vietnam in the last 3 months and they will not expand the hearings to the injury of civilians in South Vietnam but only those in North Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that this is strictly a propaganda effort, and the press and this Congress should be made aware of what the Judiciary Committee's subcommittee is attempting to do.

REPORT ON TRIP TO PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOGGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this order to make a brief report on the trip that the distinguished minority leader (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) and myself have recently completed to the People's Republic of China. I do not intend to take more than a very small amount of the time which has been allocated to both of us.

(Mr. BOGGS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include the official report of Mr. GERALD R. FORD and Mr. BOGGS entitled "Impressions of the New China," an official House document.)

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

Mr. BOGGS. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. ALBERT T. Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of hearing the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader's report to the President and I have read their report, which they have made to the President and a copy of which they gave to me.

I am very happy to have had a part in making this trip possible. I do not think the House of Representatives has ever been better represented on a foreign mission or in any other kind of mission than the representation which was given by the two distinguished leaders in this House. I think they have rendered a tremendous service to their country, to the House of Representatives and to our entire effort to bring about a more peaceful and a better understanding in the world.

My congratulations to both of the gentlemen.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the distinguished Speaker.

I must say that without the Speaker, and I am sure the minority leader will agree with me, neither one of us would have had the privilege of making the trip. It was announced shortly after President Nixon's return from China that the distinguished majority leader and minority leader of the Senate would make a trip to the People's Republic of China. Thereupon the Speaker, representing the House of Representatives, the more populous body and the one we like to think of as more representative of the people of our country, insisted that the House should be represented. It was then that the President indicated through the channels of communication which he has to the Chinese Government that he would like to have Mr. GERALD R. FORD and myself visit China, and shortly thereafter we were officially invited by the Chinese.

Mr. Speaker, without your timely intervention, I would not be standing here today making this report.

Also I must say it was a great pleasure and privilege to travel to the People's Republic of China with my Republican colleague, the distinguished minority leader. I think it can be said without contradiction, and this will be evident from our report that we went not as the Republican leader or Democratic leader, although both our hosts and we were well aware of our party responsibilities, but as representatives of this body, the House of Representatives, and of the people of the United States.

Of course, I have always been very close to the minority leader personally, both he and his wife, and it was a great pleasure and privilege, indeed, to travel with him.

I might say we had a very fine group. I think it worthwhile to name those who went. Besides Mr. GERALD R. FORD and Mrs. Ford and Mrs. Boggs and me, we had:

Mr. William A. Brown, Deputy Director of the Office of Asian Communist Affairs, Department of State;

Dr. Freeman H. Cary, who is here with us as assistant attending physician to

the Congress, and who was of great help to all of us;

Mr. Bryce N. Harlow, known to all of us as a former counselor to the President; Robert T. Hartmann, legislative assistant to Mr. GERALD R. FORD;

Mr. Gary G. Hymel, my administrative assistant; and

The Honorable Harry Lee, U.S. magistrate of the eastern district of Louisiana.

Mr. Speaker, I might say Mr. Lee was the first Chinese-American official to return to the Chinese mainland since the revolution in 1949. Both his parents were born in China, and he had the great privilege of returning to the village where his parents were born and where he met with some relatives he did not know were alive.

We also had with us:

Mr. Frank Meyer, administrative assistant to Mr. GERALD R. FORD;

Mr. Paul A. Miltich, press secretary to Mr. FORD;

Mr. Day O. Mount, from the State Department;

Dr. Paul Sigmund, professor of political science, Princeton University; and

Mr. Eugene Theroux, special counsel to the Joint Economic Committee, also of my staff.

This staff group was one of the best ever put together. They made our trip and we are very grateful for their help, particularly in preparing the various reports.

Mr. Speaker, I shall make only a few observations and then I shall yield to the distinguished minority leader. I have already received permission to extend my remarks.

First off, even in a brief visit to China, some things are immediately self-evident. China is a huge country. One really does not realize how large it is until one gets there. It occupies exactly the same geographic position as we occupy on the opposite side of the globe.

Many of you will perhaps remember, as children growing up, your mother or father telling you that if you dug in the sand deeply enough you would eventually dig your way to China.

The minority leader recalled this experience in the course of a toast to Premier Chou En-lai, and, of course, it was received with great, good humor.

In truth and in fact, China is right below or right above us on this earth, whichever way one looks at it. Peking is at almost exactly the same latitude as Washington. Shanghai is at almost exactly the same latitude as my home city of New Orleans. Canton is at about the same latitude as Miami, Fla.

We traveled through much of China. We went to Shanghai and to Peking, and we went into the Manchurian cities of Shen Yang and Anshan. Ours was the first official American party to visit Manchuria since the revolution.

After Shen Yang and Anshan, we traveled to Canton. In all of these places we were well received. Most people living in these places had never seen an American, I am sure. A near majority of them were born after 1949 and have never known of America as more than a land of mystery. Yet, in all these places we were

received uniformly with great hospitality and great friendliness.

I came away with the very firm conviction that there is tremendous good will on the part of the Chinese people toward the United States throughout the length and breadth of China.

There are a few other just general impressions.

China is seeking to develop a nation. For the first time, really, in centuries, the country is united. It is united under a form of government we disapprove of, and united under a discipline that we would not tolerate in a free society, but nevertheless united. This makes for enormous potential, to have 800 million people motivated and striving to build a country.

Aside from these cities we visited, we went to communes and factories. We saw a commune way up in the northern part of China producing rice, which astonished me. We produce rice in Louisiana, Arkansas, and Mississippi and California in this country, but one would never dream of producing rice in Minnesota. Yet that is about the latitude where we were in Manchuria, where they were producing rice.

Of course, it is not hard to understand how they do it. They produce all these plants in hot houses and transplant them by hand, one by one, plant by plant, out into the fields. Only in a country which has 800 million people could one contemplate or imagine that type of hand labor, on that scale, in the colder regions, in the production of food stuffs.

About 20,000 people who lived in this particular commune. They had every service. They had a hospital. They had primary schools and middle schools. They had a commissary, as we would call it, a grocery, dry goods and hardware store. They lived in what can be considered, by Chinese standards, reasonably good houses.

Each one of them had a garden spot which was intensively cultivated. I happen to have an interest in gardening, and I was amazed at how much they could produce in just very small plots. What was not needed for the family was sold at the commissary. That money was available as a part of the earnings of the peasants who worked in that particular commune.

Members might be interested in knowing, as far as production is concerned, that each commune was given an assignment.

This particular one had so many bushels or pounds of rice it has to produce and deliver to the state, but what was produced over and above that belonged to the members of the commune and were sold. The proceeds were then distributed to the people who belonged to the commune. Those who worked the hardest received the most. This is much like a free enterprise concept.

In addition, they have savings accounts and are paid interest on the savings accounts. They were proud of their savings accounts. I asked a lot of people, both in the workers communes in the cities and in agricultural communes in the country whether or not they had savings accounts, and most of them said yes.

The country is a very clean country. The government maintains a constant campaign against filth. It is amazing to see no cockroaches, or rats, or flies or mosquitoes which, in the past, I am told, plagued all of China.

The people themselves are astonishingly healthy. I am not sure our people would take the discipline they take in order to obtain this health. About 6:30 every morning bugles blow wherever you may be and usually some song, one of those associated with the regime, is played over a loudspeaker. That means you get up and have a half an hour, whether you are 2 years old or 80 years old, to engage in exercises and calisthenics.

Dr. HALL, you may be able to recommend a program like that. The schoolchildren not only have that half hour at 6:30 in the morning, but they have another half hour or maybe an hour in the afternoon for basketball or volleyball or football or soccer, as we call it. So the people are generally very healthy.

Medical services are available almost everywhere. We, of course, were quite astonished at acupuncture. We actually saw several operations. One was the removal of an ovarian cyst from a woman of about 30 years of age. Another was the removal of a thyroid tumor from a woman of about the same age. Another was a simple appendectomy, and others included extraction of wisdom teeth from young men and women. In all these operations, the only anesthetizing devices were the acupuncture needles. In the case of a woman with the cyst in her right ovary, needles were inserted on each side of the abdomen, and in each ankle, and that was all.

We talked with her during the course of the operation. She sipped tea and felt no pain. In a relatively short period of time after the stitches, she sat up.

The one with the thyroid tumor was up even more quickly, and the doctor said in this particular type of operation the use of acupuncture had several advantages in that the danger of severing a nerve that controls the vocal cords or nerves that control speech could be eliminated because they could keep the patient talking all the time they were performing the operation.

In any event, it is something I think American medical leaders should look at.

Finally, just one or two other observations, and I shall yield to my distinguished colleague.

Let me give you a rather dramatic moment, to my way of thinking. We celebrated, Mr. Ford and I and the rest of the members of our party, the 4th of July this year, 1972, in the city of Canton. We were, of course, the first official Americans to be there in that country on that day in 25 years. We had completed our journey through China, and we were much impressed with what we had seen.

But of course we were 8,000 miles from home, and we reflected on the greatness of this Republic that we represent, and the essential freedoms set forth in the Declaration of Independence on the 4th of July, 1776, and what they meant not

only to Americans, but to people all over the earth who seek freedom in their lives and their work and politics. And yet—and I believe the minority leader will agree with me in this—we were concerned in that we saw in China a disciplined society, without any evident vice or corruption or prostitution, where 50 years ago many peasant families had to sell at least one girl into prostitution. In China, these problems are unheard of and undreamed of today; the drug trade and drug traffic is unknown—and yet 100 years ago a war was fought—the Opium War—because of the corruption of the Chinese people by some of our western friends.

We saw people dressing simply, without spending an enormous amount of money on material goods, being satisfied with the simple pleasures that make life worthwhile, but, most of all, we saw a disciplined people.

I think the great strength of the United States is the fact that we have different opinions and that we are not compelled to agree with one another. The idea that we should ever accept such a regimented society is something that each one of us would reject out of hand.

But I think it does point up a lesson that if we continue to be permissive in our country, or too permissive, and here comes a society that is dedicated, that is motivated, then down the road there could be a real question whether or not our country can continue to be a great power, successfully competing with that type of motivation and dedication.

Finally, there are many things that need doing in the course of normalizing relations with China. One is the establishment of better trade relations. We go into this at some length in our report.

As most of you know, I have served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee for a long time, and in my judgment there is a great opportunity for the opening of trade between our two nations, particularly in the high-technology areas. There has been a demonstration of that quite recently with the imminent Chinese purchase of the Boeing 707 jet aircraft from the United States rather than any aircraft purchase from Russia. There are so many things that they might receive in American machinery and technology and know-how that the opportunity is there to open trade with China.

I recommend appointment of a commercial commission similar to that which President Nixon established between our country and the Soviet Union. This could very well be in order with respect to the Peoples Republic of China. There are some other very important things in the general trade area that could be done to ease the tensions, such as the settlement of some of the claims that exist on both sides with respect to claimed private U.S. losses and frozen funds of the Chinese.

UNITED STATES-CHINA COMMERCIAL COMMISSION

One of the ways we can come to understand China better is through bilateral trade. I mentioned that some important steps in trade relations have already occurred—I am referring to the Chinese

purchase of the RCA satellite ground station for the President's visit, the current negotiations for the purchase by China of Boeing 707 aircraft, and the approximately \$5 million worth of Chinese goods purchased by American businessmen last spring at the Chinese trade fair in Canton. Even with these first encouraging steps, however, the level of Sino-American trade remains very small.

The most obvious reason for the relatively small amount of U.S. trade with China is, of course, nearly a quarter century of mutual isolation. In this period a variety of direct and indirect barriers to trade have grown up. These include our denial to each other of reciprocal most favored nation treatment; our own policies regarding export licensing and end-use; Chinese refusal to utilize American banking facilities, American seaports or American ships; and an absence of any agreements respecting air routes, commercial arbitration, patents and copyrights, reciprocal trade missions and trade fairs and, of course, the lack of diplomatic relations between our countries.

Naturally, these matters cannot be resolved overnight. The fact that no diplomatic relations exist between the United States and China makes progress especially difficult. Yet trade itself can help bring about more normal state relations.

I believe we can move forward on improving the climate for trade by establishing a public or quasi-public entity charged with exploring a resolution of these points I have mentioned. The language of the Shanghai joint communiqué encourages initiatives of this sort as a way of facilitating the development of trade.

As I indicated, a similar commission is now at work on United States-Soviet trade. That commission grew out of an agreement the President made on May 26 in Moscow, and some progress is evident in the form of the large private grain and petroleum agreements.

Another interesting precedent for such a Sino-American Commission is the agreement between the Chinese and Japanese which has enabled the Japanese to establish a commercial office in Peking. This has been done even though Japan not only does not have diplomatic relations with China but also recognizes, as we do, the Nationalist Government on Taiwan. A similar arrangement could be the product of efforts by the commission I am suggesting.

Finally, it is not only to produce a climate of understanding between us that the conditions for bilateral trade should be improved. China is a good potential customer for American technology and goods, but opportunities for American business will not be automatic. China is today able to turn to a number of other nations for these items: Japan, Germany, England, France, and the Soviet Union, for example. Thus, we must be competitive, and to be competitive we should begin to seek an improved political and economic climate.

As the conditions for bilateral trade improve, there hopefully will be opportunities for the United States to sell farm machinery and agricultural technology;

to sell techniques and perhaps whole plants we have developed for improved production of steel, fertilizer, computers, electronic products, chemicals, processed foods, petroleum, gas, and other minerals. In fact, since the range of current Chinese exports is relatively limited as far as the U.S. market is concerned, I believe we may look forward to a balance of trade measurably in our favor.

ACTION ON PRIVATE U.S. CLAIMS

The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission has certified nearly \$196 million in 384 claims by private American citizens, businesses, and religious organizations as a result of China's seizure of American-owned property more than 2 decades ago. The other side of this coin is that the United States at that time froze millions of dollars in Chinese assets held in certain banking institutions. I believe that the time has come for our Government to sit down with the Chinese to seek progress on the claims of our citizens. At the same time, we should expect to discuss with the Chinese side the matter of Chinese assets frozen by the United States. Perhaps these discussions could take place using existing channels of communication with the Chinese. If not, I hope the President will constitute a special negotiating team to begin work on this matter. Not only do our citizens deserve some action on their claims, but the resolution of the matter of these claims and on the frozen Chinese assets can remove a current obstacle to trade and to normalized relations between our two countries.

We recognize the Taiwan problem. The Premier talked to us about that. I think the joint communique issued in February is one that both our nations can subscribe to. I think that all of us know that the Indochina war must be resolved, and resolved as quickly as possible.

But, most importantly of all, and this is a thought that I leave with you, after traveling this vast land and seeing these people working, I am convinced that the Chinese are not looking outward; they are looking inward. They want to build their own country.

They are not, today, looking toward capturing or overcoming or conquering some other nation, in my judgment. Therein, I think, lies great hope for mankind, because between the two, between the United States of America and the People's Republic of China, live one-third of all the peoples who live on earth.

If the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) and I have made any contribution to the normalization of relations between these two great nations, I think our trip has not been in vain.

Finally, let me say to you, my colleagues, and especially to you, Mr. Speaker, we are very grateful for the honor and high privilege of representing this body on that trip.

Now I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express to my dear friend and colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, the majority leader, my appreciation for his very kind and generous remarks.

Last week I had an appropriate oc-

casional to indicate to him how I felt about the fine job that he did—and I would only reiterate today that in my judgment the United States could not have had better representation on this trip than that given by him on this trip to the Chinese People's Republic on behalf of the House of Representatives.

I would also like to express my deep gratitude to the distinguished Speaker of the House for without his role, the House of Representatives would not have had an opportunity to have two Members of this body to go to the People's Republic of China.

I believe what we did was constructive and I hope that the report which has been published as a House document will be read not only by the Members but by others because in it we make some observations and suggestions which in the long run I hope will be beneficial and helpful toward the normalization of relations between our two countries.

Let me take just a minute, if I may, to explain how the majority leader and I proceeded from the very beginning. We made a decision at the outset that we would make a joint report rather than separate reports, as our counterparts did in the other body.

The net result was that four members of the staff of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Boggs) and four members of my staff worked together, hand-in-glove. The report that we submitted to the President in writing and the report that has been prepared and made an official document is the handiwork of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Boggs) and myself and the eight members of our joint staff.

I believe both the report to the President and the report to the House are examples of very fine draftsmanship and substance. I hope at some later date the report to the President can likewise be made available to the membership as a whole.

In the report we set forth the itinerary. Incidentally we were the first Americans to go up to Manchuria in an official capacity. The two major cities in that area we visited were Shenyang and Anshan.

This was a part of China that had been occupied by the Japanese and had been the area that even in those early days was the industrial might of China—divided as it then was. Today it is the industrial base, and a very mighty industrial base with an even greater potential.

We saw firsthand a tremendous steel plant, which has become modernized. They do produce steel in great quantities, and they are becoming far, far more sophisticated in techniques and production methods.

It is interesting, however, that in China where we visited we were more graciously received and more warmly welcomed in Shen Yang and Anshan than we were in some of the other communities. Perhaps this was because in Canton, Shanghai, and Peking, foreigners are more prevalent. In the north where certainly no Americans have been such as we in an official capacity, we were a bit different and as a consequence the

response to our presence was far warmer, as I saw it.

I would summarize very quickly some very broad observations. I think the Chinese people are clean, healthy, strong, industrious, disciplined, and highly motivated. I have no personal recollection of hunger; any aimless wandering around, whether in the city or in the country. I never saw a single beggar.

I saw no evidence of vice, corruption, prostitution, gambling. I am told, as the majority leader said, that in certain of the major seacoast towns in early centuries in China all of these conditions were very evident and very prevalent. I would say that the Chinese people appeared to be happy, generally busy, and purposeful. They seemed to be reasonably contented.

It was quite interesting, an incident that Mr. Boggs did not mention, but one of the most dramatic things we saw, was a demonstration between Shen Yang and Anshan in a high voltage power station. Our hosts took us on top of what I think was a manmade hill, perhaps 100 or 200 feet high. We sat there on a hot, sunny day and saw several young ladies go up to these high voltage wires, move out on a trolleylike mechanism and prepare these high voltage lines for repair and actually carry out the repairing without any cutoff of 220,000 kilowatts of power. It was a fantastic demonstration.

I have checked subsequently since I have come back to the United States and since I am not an electrical engineer perhaps I do not describe it too adequately, but the technical people I have talked to here in America tell me they are not familiar with any comparable technique in the United States.

One interesting observation, these young ladies performed this very skillful technique, but there was a professional engineer who described it. In the course of his description he said that he had taught in one or more of their universities for a period of time, but under their procedure, under their way of life today people from the academic world after a period of time go back and work with the workers in the factories or in the fields, and people from other walks of life likewise after a period of time in their profession or their skilled occupation go back and work in the fields or in the factories for a period of several years.

This man indicated, this highly trained engineer who apparently developed this technique, that he had been able to develop it because he had left the academic world and gone back and worked with the people in the field who were the actual people who erected the transmission lines and did the other rather menial work.

As he was describing this experience I let my mind drift a bit and I hope I do not offend anybody—I do not intend to—but this does raise the question in my mind in America, if the system works so well there, should some of our professionals, should some of our intellectuals be given exposure to the workaday life and manual labor in our fields and in our factories? Maybe they in America could do a better job subsequently in the laboratory or in their classrooms if they have

had this limited but periodic exposure to manual labor. Again I hope I do not offend anybody, but I did think as this man was describing this procedure, maybe some lawyers occasionally ought to leave the courtroom and go back to work in the fields or in the factories. They might do a better job in their profession. Yes, even maybe a politician or two might do a better job in the legislative branch if occasionally we want back to the field or to the factory.

And now, with the deepest of apologies, I might say to my friends in the news media it might be helpful and beneficial to them if they were to let themselves be exposed periodically to work in the fields or in the factories.

Obviously the Chinese think it works and perhaps we can learn something from this cross fertilization, if that is the phraseology.

I would like to reiterate one point that the gentleman from Louisiana made. We make such an observation in our report on page 4 at the top of the page. We in America are completely convinced that our system of government is right, and I agree, and I came back from the trip more convinced than ever that our system of government is the best. We believe in individuality, we believe in freedom, and a great many lives have been lost and a great many sacrifices have been made to preserve our Government plus individuality and freedom in America.

But as the gentleman from Louisiana indicated, he never saw and I never saw more dedication and more discipline than we observed in China. Whether it is achieved by government edict, and I suspect it may be, or whether it is achieved by some other motivation, they have it. As they grow from 800 million people to a billion people probably in two decades, and as we grow from 205 million to maybe 240 or 250 million, their society in the wrong hands could be a challenge and a threat to us and perhaps to other nations throughout the world.

I do not think it is true today because my impression of their leadership is one of responsibility. As the gentleman from Louisiana indicated they are preoccupied now with their internal problems. They want to catch up and they are working hard to do so.

But let me put it in a personal perspective, and I have talked this way at home with our four children. We have three boys aged 22, 20, and 16, and a girl 15. They are typical Americans. They have the same ideas that most young people at that age have. They have grown up in a more permissive society than I did, and certainly in a more permissive society than my parents did. Of course some of this permissiveness we have seen in the last few years has grown at a more accelerated rate than in past American history.

I am not concerned about competition today between our country and China, but I am concerned about the competition two decades from now, when my four children are going to be faced with a billion people in China who from toddlers to the most aged have had this dedication and discipline.

They have been indoctrinated with a

total political dogma, contrary to ours. They have this spirit and this dedication and this discipline.

I believe our young people today, even with the growing permissiveness, so long as they are willing to sacrifice for individuality and freedom, can meet the challenge. But they cannot ignore it. That is the main thing; they cannot ignore it, because that competition is inevitable and it will be rugged.

I say again in closing, Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grateful not only for making it possible for us to go but also for the very kind and generous comments you made.

I thank the majority leader, his staff and my staff, and those others who accompanied us for the great contribution they made to what I believe was a very successful trip on behalf of the Nation, the President and the House of Representatives.

I hope and trust that if any Members of this body have questions they would like to ask now or at some later date they will feel free to do so.

Thank you very much.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I include the joint report by the minority leader, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, and myself on our mission to the People's Republic of China, June 23 to July 7, 1972.

IMPRESSIONS OF THE NEW CHINA

(Joint report to the U.S. House of Representatives by Majority Leader HALE BOGGS and Minority Leader GERALD R. FORD on Their Mission to the People's Republic of China, June 23 to July 7, 1972.)

INTRODUCTION

Our visit to the People's Republic of China, in behalf of the House of Representatives, was undertaken at the invitation of the quasi-governmental Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs (CPIFA) and with the encouragement of President Nixon. It was only the third visit to China by elected American officials in nearly a quarter century, preceded only by the President in February this year and by Senators Mansfield and Scott in late April and early May.

Our mission had two principal objectives: first, to learn as much as possible about China—its leaders, its people, its economy, its international and domestic objectives for the President and the House of Representatives; second, to contribute to better relations between our two countries, an objective not only mutually advantageous to the Chinese and American peoples, but also contributory to the relaxation of tensions throughout Asia and the world.

We have reported in detail to the President both verbally and in writing. This report to our colleagues is an elaboration of our report to him.

We do not pose as experts on China, or on Sino-American relations. All that we report must be evaluated in light of the views of others in and out of government who have devoted themselves to a study of China. We recognize as well as anyone that in a mere ten days in the vastness of China, we could do little more than become aware of the enormous amount of information and understanding we lack about that land.

We are reminded of the blind men who sought to learn about an elephant, each coming away with a very different impression, and none with a complete account. In order to enhance the usefulness of our report, then, we have prepared this report jointly, assembling and comparing our recollections together as we traveled and worked together on this remarkable journey.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR IMPRESSIONS

The questions most often asked of us since our return have concerned our general impressions of China and its people.

We find the most striking first impressions an American receives today in China are these:

The people appear adequately fed, clothed and housed and therefore are relatively content. Related to this is a pervasive discipline and motivation in pursuit of national goals of class consciousness, increased production, Marxist-Leninist (Maoist) awareness and collective effort to upgrade the quality of life.

Preoccupied with their tremendous struggle to advance since 1949, the Chinese multitudes seem oblivious to the fact that they lack in their lives the political liberty, social mobility, and individual orientation that we cherish in the United States. We did not detect, nor did we sense any real dissent.

The parts of the New China that we saw in the eastern regions seem a land united and well on the move toward development—a remarkable achievement when it is recalled that China at the end of World War II was economically prostrate, politically riven and alone, its population demoralized, dispirited and despairing.

So widely shared has been the progress since 1949, so improved the lifestyle of the average Chinese, that these people living, by our standards in relative privation, give every impression of counting their blessings, grateful for even modest progress, not restive with only the bare necessities of food, clothing, shelter and health.

The cities we visited—Shanghai, Peking, Shen Yang, Anshan and Canton—are strikingly clean. There is virtually no litter. There are no flies. There are no dogs. No animals or poultry run loose. Most buildings are well maintained. The virtual absence of passenger cars and the silent gliding of large numbers of bicyclists give an air of orderliness and peace to the streets. Only Canton still reminds one of the congestion and disorder of earlier days, and even there without the human distress that once engulfed the streets of Chinese cities.

Not one member of our party reported seeing even one Chinese who appeared to be suffering from hunger, or exposure, or who appeared to be socially crippled, homeless, idle, or uncared for. In cities Americans saw years ago as dirty and crowded with the hungry and the ragged, the poor and the begging, the sick and the lame, we saw bustle, cleanliness, and a disciplined purposefulness.

Despite these positive impressions, there are troubling impressions as well. Chairman Mao Tse-tung, despite rare public appearances, is ubiquitous: his presence felt everywhere. Enormous color portraits of the Chairman are found atop major public buildings. His portrait adorns the walls of virtually all public rooms, factories, classrooms and homes we visited. Quotations from Mao's writing—usually exhorting the population to greater production or increased vigilance—are spread over gigantic banners hung from public buildings, or lettered in white on huge red billboards. Radios and public loudspeakers give forth an undeviating fare of martial music, political instruction, and songs whose themes ordinarily extol the nobility of peasant labor, the heroism of factory workers, the decency and courage of the people's liberation army, and the omnipresence of outside hostile forces.

No non-Chinese newspapers, books, films or magazines are anywhere in evidence. Instead, all Chinese books, newspapers and magazines are State produced. "Literature" appears to consist entirely of dogmatic collections of news, stories or poems whose unalterable themes are those of overcoming obstacles, exercising vigilance, and performing acts of heroism in the struggle to meet factory or farm production goals.

The individual is important only as a tiny part of the whole; there seems to be no place for individual freedom to dissent, to disagree; to seek, discover or pursue alternatives. The political discourse is a scramble toward the center to avoid the perilous extremes of "ultra-leftism" or "ultra-rightism".

The highly organized system of child-care, from pre-school to afterschool—and the use of that system to inculcate in the children a veneration of the State and obedience to its leaders—is awesome in its possible implications for the future. Writing, art, music, dance, drama and even supervised play—all teach a complete devotion to the heroes, the tasks, the purposes and policies of the system.

Few observers have returned from China in recent months with impressions significantly different from these we have just mentioned. If we can assume these impressions are essentially correct, for the United States and the rest of the world the portents in the light of other known facts about China are no less than totally profound, and deserving of the most serious reflection by this Congress, our leaders, our institutions, and our people.

Time does not stand still. The world moves on, and changes. In less than two hundred years the United States moved from weak colonial status to the most powerful nation on earth.

China today is far from being powerful as compared to the United States and the Soviet Union. Her population of some 800 million needs to be fed, clothed, housed, cared for, occupied and satisfied, and this huge population is growing by some 20 million a year.

China's ability to meet its vast domestic needs requires all the energy, discipline and resourcefulness a people can bring to bear. It requires political stability at home. It requires freedom from external aggression, actual or even threatened, whether military, economic or cultural.

The views expressed to us by Chinese leaders that China is today preoccupied with her massive internal problems, that she has no present notions of international conquest or expansion, that her present aspiration is only to develop peacefully—these views we find credible for today.

We are therefore persuaded that, at present, the world has little to fear from China. On the other hand, from China's point of view, the world must be something of a threatening place.

But time will not stand still for China. No matter how weak she may be today relative to other nations, China is a land of vast human and natural resources.

If she can maintain political stability, if she can remain free from outside interference—what will China be like in another two or three short decades?

The answer is obvious. If she manages to achieve as she aspires, China in the next half century can emerge a self-sufficient power of a billion people—a nation whose agricultural output can provide for her population, whose industrial capacity can be enormous, whose military capability can be very substantial, with a people united in devotion and obedience to the State.

This last impression—of the reality of China's colossal potential—is perhaps the most vivid of our journey. As our small party traveled through that boundless land, this sense of a giant stirring, a dragon waking, gave us much to ponder.

There, in that nation where State-directed conformity produces unity of effort and purpose, and where self-indulgence and licentiousness of any kind are not tolerated, we reflected on our own country. We were troubled that, by contrast in our own nation, where people are free to live and work and choose and read and think and disagree as they please, there has been widespread divi-

sion, discord and disillusionment and a pervasive permissiveness straining the fibres of our national character.

In China an American is brought to hope that we will always have the self-discipline which fired our ancestors. In our own land of liberty and abundance and power—with all the material advantages that China lacks—there have been corrosive trends that have grown as our fidelity to old virtues has waned.

In disciplined, unified China, American visitors will wonder if our self-indulgent free society will be able to compete effectively fifty years hence with this totalitarian State, possessed of a population which dwarfs our own, with equal or greater natural resources, and with total commitment to national goals.

Such are the questions that occurred to us as we made our way in the Middle Kingdom that is China.

NORMALIZING RELATIONS

Last February, the U.S. and Chinese stated that "progress toward the normalization of relations between China and the United States is in the interest of all countries," that normalization "contributes to the relaxation of tension in Asia and the world", and further, the Chinese noted that "the Taiwan question is the crucial question obstructing the normalization of relations between China and the United States."

In discussions of these and related points with Chinese leaders, we received the very clear impression that China remains most interested in improved State relations with the United States, just as we are with China.

We also can confirm that the Taiwan question appears to remain the "crucial question obstructing the normalization of relations." On this question, it is well to recall the United States position in the Shanghai Joint Communiqué last February as follows:

"The United States acknowledges that all Chinese on either side of the Taiwan strait maintain there is but one China and that Taiwan is a part of China. The United States does not challenge that position. It reaffirms its interest in a peaceful settlement of the Taiwan question by the Chinese themselves. With this prospect in mind, it affirms the ultimate objective of the withdrawal of all U.S. forces and military installations from Taiwan. In the meantime, it will progressively reduce its forces and military installations on Taiwan as the tension in the area diminishes."

Since the February Communiqué, American troop levels in Vietnam have been measurably reduced. In the same period—in fact in the very midst of our visit to China—the chiefs of state of North and South Korea met together in a promising beginning toward a relaxation of tension. Finally, there has been a state of relative calm in the Taiwan Strait during this same period. We view these as the kinds of developments which in time will allow a progressive reduction of our forces and military installations on Taiwan, and we are confident that, regardless of the political results next November, the United States will do its part to see that the process of normalizing United States-China relations can go forward.

We fully support peaceful resolution of the Taiwan question by the Chinese themselves, and recognize that this goal is complicated by the fact that diplomatic relations currently exist between the United States and the Nationalist Government of General Chiang Kai-Shek but do not exist with the People's Republic of China. How this question can be ultimately resolved we do not know, but we look forward to the day when all Chinese can be represented in Washington.

In this respect, we found that our continuing diplomatic relations with the Republic of China are for the People's Republic of

China a particular barrier to normalized relations.

Chinese leaders called to our attention the fact that the war in Indochina is also an obstacle to improved relations between our countries. The Chinese position is well known. Fundamentally it is that Communist North Vietnam is a neighbor and friend whom China will not abandon. The Chinese insist that they have no territorial designs in Indochina, that they will not intervene in North Vietnamese affairs, and that they seek a neutral Indochina where no great power has hegemony.

Both of us support the systematic withdrawal and eventual end of U.S. involvement in Vietnam, and therefore we are optimistic that in reasonable time the Vietnam war will no longer obstruct the normalization of Sino-American relations.

Aside from the major questions of Taiwan and Vietnam, there are other ways in which progress toward normalized relations can proceed. These areas—trade and exchange of visits, for example—are discussed later in our report.

INDOCHINA

We have already mentioned that the conflict in Indochina obstructs improved relations with China. In our discussions with Chinese leaders we were not surprised to find that they regard the United States as the aggressor in Vietnam or that they expressed fraternal solidarity with the North Vietnamese. The Chinese view, as is well known is that the Vietnam conflict is a civil war whose roots are in mistaken United States foreign policy assumptions of the Dulles era.

It was also not surprising to us to hear that the Chinese will continue to give support to the North Vietnamese, although they laid considerable stress on their having not furnished combat ground troops.

The Chinese endeavored to persuade us that their challenge of domestic development is all-consuming; that they lack the ability and interest to wage external aggression; and that consequently we are mistaken if we are pursuing the conflict in Vietnam or maintaining military presence in Asia as part of a policy primarily intended to contain Chinese expansionism or subversion.

In reply to these views we reported to our hosts, and emphasized, that the American people and their leaders are in complete accord that the fighting in Vietnam should end, that American combat troops are being withdrawn and that the Vietnamese should peacefully determine their own future without outside interference.

We had extensive discussions with Premier Chou En-Lai on a number of subjects, including Indochina. At his specific request, we have reported his views on these matters to the President.

TAIWAN

To the Chinese leaders, Taiwan is simply a province yet to be "liberated". Among the most common slogans we noted on public walls, banners, billboards, and even children's jerseys was the slogan: "We will certainly liberate Taiwan." In the Shanghai Communiqué the Chinese reiterated their opposition to any form of "two-China" solution to the question of Taiwan.

Thus, as we have mentioned, the issue of Taiwan remains a major obstacle to the improvement of our relations with China. Although this problem must be solved by the Chinese themselves, it poses difficulties for the United States in view of our diplomatic relations and mutual defense treaty with Taiwan.

In this matter, as in Vietnam, we believe the Chief Executive in his conduct of foreign policy should have substantial latitude necessary to help, where he can, to bring the problem to a solution. Therefore we will reserve substantial public comment on this question. Here, as in Vietnam, we trust the

President will take into account the realities of the situation. We subscribe to the interest expressed by the U.S. side in the Joint Communiqué that the Chinese on each side of the Taiwan Strait will themselves settle this question.

In saying this we are not advocating "abandonment" of the Chinese on Taiwan. We simply recognize, as they do, that the situation which has existed for more than two decades has tended to create in the minds of many the inaccurate impression, to which neither the Nationalist Government nor the People's Republic of China subscribes, that there is not one China, but two.

The People's Republic of China uses such quasi-governmental organizations as the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs (CPIFA) and the China Council for the Promotion of International Trade (CCPIT) to advance Chinese interests where lack of diplomatic relations might otherwise be a barrier to international contact. Nevertheless, our hosts cited the Taiwan question on a number of occasions as an obstacle even to extensive people to people contact with us, and it is clear that the nature of our current relationship to Taiwan remains an obstacle to normalized Sino-U.S. relations. We therefore look forward to a resolution of this question.

SINO-SOVIET RELATIONS

Throughout their histories, China and Russia have been wary friends if not outright enemies. After 1949, we in the United States tended to regard the Sino-Soviet relationship as an international communist conspiracy to subvert and control the world. Yet, as we look back, we can see that sharp ideological differences and growing geopolitical hostility between China and the Soviet Union reduced the likelihood of their close cooperation in such a strategy.

By 1963, Sino-Soviet relations were publicly strained. In that year, for example, the Chinese newspaper People's Daily, in a significant editorial attack on Soviet policy and leadership, ridiculed Nikita Khrushchev as a "psalm-singing, table-thumping buffoon who belongs in the trash heap of history."

As early as 1960, of course, Soviet technicians and advisors resident in China to assist in industrial and agricultural development had been suddenly withdrawn. They left China with their plans, records and blueprints, leaving the Chinese understandably angry.

Today, normal State relations do exist between the U.S.S.R. and China. There is also a treaty of friendship between them. At the same time, Chinese and Soviet troops have clashed in bloody incidents along the border in Western China and over an island to which both lay claim in the Ussuri River north of Vladivostok. It is generally believed that the Soviets have more troops massed and more advanced weaponry poised along the border with China than they do in Europe. For its part, China, too, apparently has large numbers of troops deployed along the border.

In addition to their vigilance along the border with the U.S.S.R., the Chinese must be giving serious attention to the growth of Soviet influence in India—a nation with whom China also shares a common and disputed boundary.

Finally, the Soviets have helped supply, train and arm the North Vietnamese in an obvious effort to gain influence with still another nation bordering China.

These strains in Sino-Soviet relations suggest one of many possible reasons for current Chinese willingness to seek improved relations with the United States. Surely the Chinese are under no illusions that the long-standing and fundamental differences they have with us can be suddenly wiped away. Yet it is obviously in China's interest to work for a world in which there can be relatively peaceful relations with the United

States. In developing her domestic economy, it would be exceedingly disruptive for the Chinese to be required to be in a constant state of preparation against possible military interference by both the United States and the U.S.S.R.

Our conclusion that the Chinese and the Soviets are in a period of mutual tension should not be taken to mean that we have nothing to fear from possible joint Sino-Soviet designs. Obviously, for example, there is even now cooperation between the Soviet Union and China in furnishing the supplies which North Vietnam is using to wage war. Chinese railroads are carrying Soviet equipment. Moreover, the Soviets are still trading with the Chinese; at Peking Airport we noticed that two new Soviet IL-62 aircraft were parked in front of the main terminal.

Our recommendation in view of heightened Sino-Soviet tension is simply that the United States should, in its self-interest, carry forward the policy of improved relations with China. At the same time, we must be aware that after nearly a quarter century of mutual isolation, the United States and China have much to learn about each other, and a long distance to travel together, before sturdy foundations of trust and good faith are laid. Therefore we must continue to remain defensively strong and alert.

U.S. PRISONERS IN CHINA

In view of the concern expressed to us by many people prior to our departure, we were particularly interested in pursuing with Chinese leaders the matter of U.S. prisoners held in China. The United States Government is aware that there are three individuals who are currently prisoners of the Chinese. They are John Downey, Major Philip Smith, U.S. A.F., and Lt. Cmdr. Robert J. Flynn, U.S. Navy.

We appealed to Premier Chou En-lai and others on behalf of these men and their families, on humanitarian grounds, that they be accorded consideration with respect to treatment and release. We pointed out that favorable consideration by the Chinese would be an important indication to the American people of China's interest in normalizing relations.

Another high official with whom we met, Foreign Affairs Vice Minister Ch'iao Kuan-hua, made a special point of advising us that he thought Mr. Downey's mother would like to know that he is currently in good health. We were advised that Mr. Downey's case is different from that of Major Smith and Lt. Cmdr. Flynn, the two American fliers who were forced down over Hainan Island, and that the cases will be handled separately. Other than assurances that the Chinese would take note of our appeals it was not possible to obtain any further information or assurances about these three Americans.

In the context of our discussions regarding Mr. Downey and the two fliers, we also inquired about the truth of reports circulating in the United States from time to time that other Americans, captured in Indochina or elsewhere, are being held prisoner on Chinese soil. On this point the Chinese assured us that they are not aware of any Americans held in China other than the three just mentioned. Moreover, the Chinese explained that from now on, they expect to handle the matter of prisoners on a candid and above-board basis, utilizing the channels of communications that have evolved between our countries since the President's visit. We took this to be an assurance that the United States Government will be informed promptly if and when it develops that any other Americans are held on Chinese soil as prisoners or otherwise detained against their will.

TRADE

After informal trade discussions with political leaders and officials of the China Council for the Promotion of International Trade

(CCPIT), it appears to us that the Chinese side is prepared to have trade between our countries develop in some measure, but slowly. We did not find among our hosts the same high degree of enthusiasm for early and measurable increases in trade which has stimulated the interest of American businessmen. Indeed, in pursuing the matter of mutual contact generally, we at no point found the Chinese more reserved than in talks respecting bilateral trade.

China's foreign trade policy is governed by three fundamental considerations: first, trade should be conducted on the basis of equality and mutual benefit; second, trade must complement domestic objective of self-reliance; third, the cost of imports should not exceed the proceeds from exports.

These points by no means rule out an increase in Sino-American trade. As long as China believes it can accelerate technological development by trade, for example, it will use foreign exchange gained in exports to purchase sophisticated technology. It can achieve a trade balance by State planning, offsetting a trade imbalance with one nation by trade with others. While China could finance high-cost, high-technology imports with long-term credit, we found no indication that the Chinese have significantly altered their vigorous resistance to debt financing.

There appear to be a number of areas in which opportunities exist for U.S. exports to China. Obviously, these include advanced aircraft and satellite support technology—items China has already purchased. Other areas, too, coincide with China's plans for development. These include farm machinery and techniques; iron and steel production; on- and off-shore mineral and gas extractive methods; chemical fertilizer production; chemical production; improved breeding stock; food processing techniques, computers, copiers, and so forth.

It is important for us to bear in mind regarding exports to China, however, that there are few items even in the category of advanced technology which China cannot obtain from other sources. Japan, Germany, France, Britain and the Soviet Union are all important Chinese trading partners. We must therefore be sufficiently competitive or Chinese business will go elsewhere. By the same token, Chinese goods which have a market in the United States are also generally available to us from other sources. These include a variety of foodstuffs, handicrafts, minerals, light manufactures, and soft goods. We are not, therefore, trading partners essential to each other.

On the other hand, there is important political significance to increased Sino-American trade. The exchange of goods, like the exchange of people, can be a bridge to better mutual understanding and improved political relations.

Among serious obstacles to increased trade is the absence of normal State relations, yet Japan and the Federal Republics of Germany, though lacking diplomatic relations with China, have a higher volume of trade than does France which recognizes Peking. Thus, though diplomatic ties with China may be a condition precedent to any dramatic increase in the range and volume of goods traded, this is not to say that some significant trade cannot occur before that event. Obviously, some trade can itself play an important part in bringing about diplomatic ties. The imminent purchase by China of Boeing aircraft is a good example of a large transaction which required official U.S.-Government participation, at least to the extent the grant of a federally issued export license was required to make the transaction possible.

Nevertheless, the Chinese seemed to be telling us that before too long, if trade relations are to improve, progress will have to be made in resolving a number of items: the conflict in Indochina; the status of our relationship

to Taiwan; current tariff and non-tariff barriers; the current disagreements over frozen Chinese assets; claims of U.S. citizens for property seized by China; and U.S. policy respecting end-use and export licensing. Clearly further mutual effort must be given to the area of trade development and promotion.

We do not say that the Chinese are uninterested in pursuing trade with the United States. But it is important for us to bear in mind that the Chinese are very sensitive to the possibility of exploitation, and they are striving to be self-sufficient. In a recent speech the Chinese Vice Minister of Trade sounded a theme which we heard repeatedly during our visit, namely that "international trade should be based on equality and mutual benefit." In view of the experience of China in matters of trade with the West over the last 150 years, this is an understandable concern.

LAW AND JUSTICE

The legal system, an important part of any system of government, appears to be undergoing very fundamental experimentation. The legal profession itself has been abolished. Petty disputes and infractions are handled by the Revolutionary Committees in the communities in which the offenses or disputes occur. Behavior control seems to be based less on a fear of physical punishment or confinement than on persuasion, psychological pressures, public shaming and such re-education devices as political study and manual labor. There may be much for us to ponder with respect to the Chinese belief in the social re-educability of wayward citizens, and their claimed rejection of confinement in the rehabilitation process. There is also, unfortunately, a definite reluctance on the part of the Chinese to permit Western visitors access to information on their legal system as it relates to crime. While this is somewhat understandable in a society which is experimenting with the whole question of law and justice, we hope the Chinese will before long permit us to share in their search for better ways to deal with antisocial behavior.

POLITICAL STABILITY

In view of the complexity of the domestic Chinese political situation, a subject which has occupied the increasing attention of Sinologists in the West, we can offer only the most general observations.

Obviously, if the evident progress toward a united, productive and self-reliant China is to be sustained, there must be political stability, and whether such stability exists depends not only upon China's relations with its international neighbors, but perhaps more importantly on her ability to govern effectively at home.

As for the present, Chinese Communism appears fortunate to have among its senior leaders a man as worldly, tireless and adroit as Premier Chou En-lai. At an age when most men are relaxing in retirement, Chou seems a man of spring steel, abundant energy, high intelligence and great international sophistication. In giving credit to President Nixon for his bold initiative in opening the way for improved relations with China, we should not forget that Premier Chou and his associates were equally bold in that undertaking. The fact that a closed society which has made the United States anathema would be a party to this effort is as encouraging as it is remarkable. The Premier is certainly among the most seasoned and perceptive national leaders in the world today. The course of China's internal and external policies in the future will depend in large measure on how effective he is in transmitting his vigor and his outlook to younger leaders.

One final point is this: We have no way of calculating the political role played by the military in China today. It was not evident to us how much of a part the army has in provincial and municipal government. We

were advised prior to our visit that military personnel occupy top positions in the provincial and municipal Revolutionary Committees, but we were unable to confirm this. It may be noteworthy, however, that we met only the nonmilitary Vice Chairmen, but never the military Chairmen, of these Revolutionary Committees. These Vice Chairmen were also men and women of apparent energy and ability.

The Revolutionary Committees at the provincial, municipal, commune and factory levels have been the principal organs of government since the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. These committees are composed of representatives of the army, party cadre and masses. The smallest unit is apparently the Neighborhood Committee, which is constituted at mass meetings. There has apparently been no national representative unit functioning since the National People's Congress last met in early 1965.

Our Chinese hosts, in discussion of current political topics involving the United States, invariably assured us that they did not want their comments to be construed as an intrusion in our internal affairs. This is subject to the interpretation that by our own questions and observations we should take care not to intrude in their internal affairs. Naturally we intended no such intrusion by our curiosity then, nor do we by this report.

Despite Mao's frequently quoted maxims to "trust the masses" and "serve the people," and despite the political forms evolved to "consult the masses," the system of government in China is a pyramid whose decisions are made at the top. Perhaps never in history have so many been ruled so completely by so few.

EXCHANGES

Among the activities which holds the most promise for developing understanding between our two countries is people-to-people contact and exchanges. The Shanghai Communiqué took specific note of this fact. Both sides agreed that "it is desirable to broaden the understanding between two peoples" and that each side would undertake to "facilitate the further development of such contact and exchanges" in such fields as science, technology, culture, sports and journalism.

Our own visit, which was as graciously hosted as a visit could be, is a tribute to the sincerity of the Chinese in encouraging contact. And other Members of Congress will no doubt be pleased to know that Chinese leaders at the highest levels expressed a willingness to host other American political leaders on a bipartisan basis so long as the time and personnel are available on the Chinese side to accommodate them.

This last point highlights two interesting facts: first, the Chinese not only favor increased contact with the West, they already appear to have a very ambitious program of hosting foreign guests. This activity naturally puts a strain on their ability to supply interpreters and provide transportation, housing and other services to visitors. Second, the interest the Chinese have in encouraging visits to their country is a measure of their confidence that, once exposed to the New China, a visitor genuinely interested in truth and objectivity will return home favorably impressed. This is not a misplaced confidence. As we have mentioned, the clean streets, the friendly and hardworking people, the rich agricultural areas and the throbbing industrial cities are testimony to the successes of the New China in welding a nation out of the chaotic post-war period.

While China favors increased people-to-people contact, she seems much more interested in hosting visitors than sending her own citizens to the United States. There are three reasons for this. First, our recognition of Taiwan troubles the Chinese to such an extent that China is reluctant to expose her citizens to possible embarrassment from crit-

icism or ridicule by Americans or others who may question the legitimacy of their government. Second, there is a genuine fear of physical harm to Chinese citizens traveling in the United States. They have read our crime statistics. They are aware that the United Nations diplomat charged with the security of U.N. diplomats was himself mugged and robbed in New York. Finally, there may also be a reluctance on the part of the Chinese to expose their people to our way of life—political liberty, wealth, social mobility, and so forth.

The acceptance of the Chinese table tennis team in the United States has helped to dispel, we believe, the foregoing fears. Chinese leaders were unanimous in their appreciation for the warm and safe reception given their team, and we assured them that the American people will be equally courteous and enthusiastic hosts for other Chinese, whether official guests or visitors or a people-to-people basis.

Of all the areas of exchange, the Chinese appeared most interested in pursuing those in the medical field. This is an area in which the Chinese trade relations maxim of "equality and mutual benefit" has particular application. Chinese political as well as medical leaders expressed great interest in learning about American efforts in the fields of cancer, heart disease, and stroke. And, of course, the Chinese are justly proud of their remarkable achievements in acupuncture anesthesia and therapy. In this area, we have much to learn from each other for the ultimate benefit of our people, and so we are optimistic that contact in this area will be active.

In the field of journalism, the Chinese have been very cooperative in hosting American journalists and were especially so in hosting the media representatives who accompanied us. Naturally, there are more journalists who are seeking visas than the Chinese have yet accommodated, but this seems to be more a function of ability to handle numbers than any policy to restrict access of the American press corps. Our arrival in Peking, for example, was preceded by visits of journalists from The New York Times and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and a Washington Post journalist arrived during our mission.

The Taiwan question appears to be an obstacle to the establishment of news agencies in our respective countries, but we favor this and related steps toward improved communication, and we hope China will send more of her journalists to this country.

In the academic area, too, the Chinese seem reluctant to send students to American universities. This reluctance is related to the Taiwan question; China does not want her students exposed to harassment or ridicule at academic institutions which may also have Taiwan students enrolled. We sought to ease Chinese apprehensions on this point by stressing that we felt the atmosphere at U.S. colleges and universities would be one of interest, respect and hospitality to Chinese students and scholars. We also inquired about the possibility of long-term academic programs for American scholars in China. We did not get a great deal of encouragement on this point; the Chinese appear to favor shorter exchanges by more scholars rather than longer visits by a few.

We have mentioned our interest in sharing views with the Chinese on policy toward criminal elements. Perhaps exchanges of people working in this field would be possible.

We also favor programs which will bring our young people together; after all, it is with our youth and succeeding generations in mind that we seek friendship with China.

During our visit we were exposed to cultural and gymnastic programs which we believe would be very well received in the United States. Not only in table tennis do the Chinese excel. The music, dance and both

traditional and contemporary gymnastic events were so excellently done that we encouraged the Chinese to consider sending such troupes to our country.

Finally, Chinese leaders expressed an interest in sharing information and possibly exchanging people in the area of anti-pollution activity.

Having been part of the exchange process ourselves, we appreciate its importance in broadening understanding and we hope for an increase in contact in both directions.

ECONOMY

There are few areas more difficult to gain hard information about in a short visit to China than the national economy. Either there is an inadequate mechanism for gathering economic statistics, or such statistics as are gathered are simply not in any systematic or forthcoming way divulged to the general public much less to foreign visitors.

In view of the paucity of economic data, we were particularly pleased to have had prior to our journey copies of the excellent study by the Joint Economic Committee entitled *People's Republic of China: An Economic Assessment*, released late in May of this year, and also the hearings on that study which occurred in June just before our departure. We took this study with us and distributed copies to Chinese officials. We hope that we may have some eventual response from the Chinese side as to their assessment of information in the study.

We can offer only these generalizations about the Chinese economy as a result of our visit:

Production, both agricultural and industrial, was set back measurably by the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. The Chinese candidly admit this, and they do so without much evident regret. They apparently believe that a production setback was an acceptable price to pay for ideological renewal. Even so, among the most common slogans found on banners and posters in the cities, in the countryside and in factories is the exhortation to "Unite To Win Still Bigger Victories and Increase Production." We were also frequently advised that while the Cultural Revolution was necessary, future ideological and economically disruptive form.

Wages of factory workers and peasants are very low by American standards, but then so are prices. We saw no evidence that families in which the husbands worked were wanting for the necessities of life and, since many families appear to have both parents as well as some children employed, there is even the opportunity to save for such "luxury" items as radios, sewing machines, electric fans and bicycles.

Department stores and food stores appear well stocked with merchandise and busy with shoppers. The range of color and design of clothing and fabric was somewhat surprising in view of reports that the Chinese tend to dress primarily in gray or blue clothing. Most people do, in fact, dress in clothing of those colors, but children's clothing and women's blouses are beginning to show signs of color and decorations. It is of interest, though, that the decoration at least on children's clothing often serves political ends—for example, one of our party bought a jersey for a toddler which bears the popular Chinese slogan, "We Will Certainly Liberate Taiwan!"

All tillable land is used for agriculture. Crops are planted not only in areas close to the cities and, for example, up to the edge of airstrips, but also within the city limits. Only in rare instances did we see land given over to the relative wastefulness of grass.

Working conditions for factory workers are in major respects close to uniform throughout China. At both a jeep production facility in Peking and an iron and steel works in Anshan, for example, the work week is six

days, forty-eight hours, three shifts. Workers generally get one hour for lunch, though in the South the lunch hour is sometimes two hours. Retirement is at age sixty for men and fifty-five for women at seventy percent of salary. A worker's wage typically ranges in eight steps from approximately eighteen to fifty-five dollars a month. Housing for workers usually consists of small three-room apartments arranged in close proximity to the plants, and workers are charged two to five dollars a month rent. Day-care and week-care nurseries are available for children of workers at nominal charge. Medical care for workers is free, and children are covered for 50% of medical costs. Women are given fifty-six days maternity leave. The only vacation time with pay for workers occurs on the three or four national holidays, although some workers told us that they would be entitled to ten or twelve days of home leave to rejoin their families if their families resided a substantial distance away.

Working conditions for peasants working in communes are also, we were told, fairly uniform throughout China, varying only according to planting and harvest cycles. A typical day in the paddies and fields begins about six a.m. and continues to sundown with a long midday break for meals and relaxation. We visited two communes, the Red Star Commune near Peking and the August 1st Commune near Shen Yang. Each commune had its own nurseries, schools, medical facilities, machine shops, food and dry goods members share in the profit generated by their production. That is, the commune delivers a fixed percentage of its production to the State, deducts its own needs, then sells the balance to the State to earn revenue to purchase equipment and other necessities for the commune. Commune members share according to "work points" in the remaining balance of the proceeds. Also unlike factory workers, there seems from our limited observation to be a better chance for a commune member to own his own home. At both communes we met with homeowners who had built and furnished their own living unit from savings. Commune families we visited are also allowed to cultivate small vegetable plots and maintain a few ducks, chickens and pigs of their own. The sheer size of Chinese communes, if those we visited are typical, might surprise those Americans who have considered "living in a commune." The Red Star Commune has a population of 75,000 and the August 1st Commune has 20,000. Each commune is divided into households, then production brigades and finally into production teams. In the August 1st Commune for example there are 4,000 households, 15 production brigades and 73 production teams. This same August 1st Commune, though its primary production is rice, has 5,500 hogs, 800 work animals, and estimated million fish, 50,000 ducks, 63 tractors, 300 rubber wheeled carts, 87 wells, and 47 pump stations. A vast system of irrigation ditches carries water and fertilizer to the rice fields.

Looking to the future of China's economy, the fundamental reality seems to be that China has an immense and growing population to feed, clothe, house and care for, and that increased production is essential simply to keep pace with population pressures. Most projections show that the population of China will reach one billion by 1980.

This means that it is desirable for the pace of industrialization and of mechanization of agriculture to accelerate; it means that China must have political stability; and it means that the disruptions of the Cultural Revolution must not be repeated or not recur in such a form as will bring on a paralysis of industry or agriculture.

ENVIRONMENT

Air and water pollution appeared to be as much of a concern to the Chinese as to our-

selves, and they expressed interest in U.S. efforts at control and abatement.

Air pollution is an evident problem in industrialized areas such as Anshan, Shanghai, and Canton. Black smoke pours from factory chimneys with little apparent effort underway to stop it. Moreover, we understand that all cities undergo marked increase in air pollution in the winter months when the general public burns large quantities of coal for heat.

Water pollution is much less of a problem, for two reasons. First, the level of industrialization is relatively low, and therefore there is relatively little discharge of industrial waste into waterways. Second, the Chinese do not to any significant degree discharge human waste into rivers and streams—instead, human waste is collected, treated and used as fertilizer. This latter is an excellent example of serving a two-fold purpose of keeping waterways clear and clean and, at the same time, recycling waste to meet another socially important purpose.

The absence of motor vehicles in any large numbers in Chinese cities produces another positive environmental result. Not only is air pollution potential reduced, but there is virtually no noise pollution. The nearly silent swish of hundreds of bicycles is a far more liveable sound than the racing of hundreds of engines and the honking of hundreds of horns. Another positive environmental effort made by the Chinese is in the area of flood control. Extensive networks of dikes and irrigation canals have been constructed to tame Nature and serve agricultural objectives.

The Chinese follow another public policy worthy of our attention, and that is their policy with respect to dogs. We read just prior to our journey of the controversy in New York City between dog owners and non-dog owners regarding the deposit of dog waste on public ways. In China, dogs are simply forbidden from cities completely—we saw no dogs at all in any city we visited. The prime reason for this is protection of the public health, but of course in China a dog is also a non-productive consumer which the society declines to indulge.

The anti-dog policy is related in philosophy to the famous "Four Pests" campaign instituted after 1949. This campaign was an effort to exterminate flies, rats, mosquitoes and sparrows on the ground that these four pests jeopardized the public health and robbed the country of food. It is well to remember, particularly when we consider the hurdles we ourselves face in improving public sanitation, that before 1949 Chinese cities were notorious for their filth. Communicable disease was spread by rats, flies and mosquitoes, and large quantities of crops stored wheat, rice and other foodstuffs were consumed by rats and sparrows. Today, as we witnessed, the streets are almost spotlessly clean, flies have almost totally disappeared, and we were assured that crop and grain storage levels prove that rats and sparrows have almost vanished. The campaign continues today; many of us noticed young boys and girls who, going on about play or other business, held a fly swatter over their shoulders, at the ready. Another example of the pollution consciousness of Chinese, of course, are the white cloth face masks one sees covering the nose and mouths of cyclists and pedestrians.

EDUCATION AND CULTURE

It was evident during our visit that cultural and educational life in China continues to feel the effects of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution which convulsed the country between 1966 and 1969. "Struggle, criticism and transformation" is still in progress in evolving policy for the arts and schools.

We attended two cultural performances in Manchuria and Canton, saw a film version of

The Peking Revolutionary Opera, "The White Haired Girl." We also visited two kindergartens, two secondary (Middle) schools, and one university. It appeared in these visits that cultural and educational life is being reestablished in China on the basis of Chairman Mao's injunction that literature and art and all intellectual life must be related to the needs and interests of workers, peasants, and soldiers. Mao Tse-tung's "Talks at the Yen'an Forum on Literature and Art," published thirty years ago, was being widely studied at the time of our visit as a source of guidelines for literary and artistic expression.

On the stage and in films new or revised versions of productions of the Peking Revolutionary Opera combine a few traditional elements such as sword dances, with music that is vaguely reminiscent of Tschalkowsky and some first-rate ballet sequences to present highly moralistic and patriotic stories of peasant or workers heroes and heroines who are guided by Mao Tse-tung's thought to overcome the schemings of "class enemies," "despotic landlords," or Japanese invaders.

On the radio we heard little traditional music, with most musical programs restricted to excerpts from Peking Opera and a limited number of patriotic songs usually embodying specific references to Chairman Mao.

Foreign language bookstores contained only Marxist-Leninist ideological works and we were told that literary production had ceased during the Cultural Revolution. The classes in Chinese literature that we observed were devoted to the study of Mao's "Talks to the Yen'an Forum" or to ancient classics.

We saw no one carrying or reading the Red Book of Quotations from Chairman Mao, but reference was often made to the application of Chairman Mao's thought to the solution of practical problems. Slogans or quotations from Mao writings appear on billboards, on the front of buildings, and on special red concrete slabs erected at the entrances to courtyards, factories, and agricultural communes.

In a noticeable contrast to contemporary America was the obvious de-emphasis of sex, not only because of the homogeneity of clothing but also because the official policy views romantic attachments as an interference and distraction from dedication to one's work. The contrast with contemporary America was even more striking when we asked a group of university students in Canton whether they had any "special" girl friends. They replied, "We are too young for that!" When we asked their ages, they turned out to be 21 to 23 years old. Official policy discourages marriage before the age of 25.

What was left of organized religion seems to have been a casualty of the Cultural Revolution's campaign against the "Four Olds"—old thinking, old habits, old customs, and old traditions—and we are told that the Red Guards had raided and closed the churches after arms were discovered in a church and evidence produced that a churchman was a spy. When we asked to attend church services in Shanghai we were told that no churches were functioning. We saw several closed churches in Peking and Canton, including the former Roman Catholic Cathedral which was said to be used as an office now. "The White Haired Girl" contained elements linking Buddhism to the rule of landlords in pre-1949 China.

The Government is using education and culture to create a unified people. To this end, while songs and dances from border areas and ethnic minorities are presented, all instruction as well as all stage productions are in Mandarin, even in the Cantonese-speaking areas of southern China. At a cultural production in Canton, for example, we were puzzled to see the Chinese

characters for the words being sung on the stage flashed on the wall until we realized that nearly everyone in the audience was using them to understand what was being said. The written language is common, but spoken Cantonese and Mandarin are mutually incomprehensible. Some members of our party visited the Institute of Minorities in Peking where future leaders from such border areas as Tibet, Mongolia, and Hainan were being imbued with national values before returning to their native areas.

Since the Cultural Revolution, during which the universities and most secondary schools ceased instruction, the Chinese educational system has been reorganized and focused on the application of learning to the problems of peasants, workers, and soldiers—and on the direct exposure of students and teachers to those problems. Schooling has also been shortened and Mao Tse-tung's writings receive great emphasis at all levels.

The Chinese educational system begins with nurseries which are available to working mothers in the cities who have no relatives to care for their babies, from the time the children are three months old until the age of 3. The next stage is the nursery school for children from 3 to 7. We visited two such schools, one of which boarded children from six days a week at a cost of about \$5 a month. Like the Children's Palaces in Shanghai and Peking (massive playground complexes in which thousands of children participate) they use music, art, dancing and sports to emphasize patriotic themes and the thought of Mao Tse-tung. We did not visit any primary schools but were told that primary schooling lasts six years.

We did visit two secondary schools (Middle Schools), one on a commune and the other in an urban industrial area. Where secondary schooling had before the Cultural Revolution been divided into two three-year sections with many students discontinuing their education at the end of what we would call junior high school, all students are expected to complete schooling which has now been shortened to three or four years. This is followed by two years of work in the factories or fields. The students in the urban secondary school we visited were older than they would normally be at that grade level, because their school was closed for two years during the Cultural Revolution. Their curriculum has been revised to include such subjects as agronomy (in an urban area), two hours a week of political studies, work in a shop attached to a nearby factory, and two months a year (one in summer and one in winter) of work in factories accompanied by their teachers. Classes are held from 8 a.m. until 4:30 p.m. six days a week so that the class time is not shortened excessively. We were particularly impressed by the level of the ninth grade English class which we observed, which was conducted entirely in that language and in which the students demonstrated a high level of proficiency. Despite the fact that Shenyang is near the Soviet Union we were told that half the students chose English as their language elective, the other half choosing Russian. All classes had a high level of political content. Art classes sketched heroes and heroines from the Revolutionary Opera and music classes sang songs of the People's Liberation Army or in praise of Mao Tse-tung.

The university we visited, Sun Yat-sen in Canton, was less impressive. The Cultural Revolution seemed to have done serious damage to higher education. All universities were closed down and professors sent to work for periods of six months to two years in factories or fields. Courses have been reduced in length from 5-6 years to 2-3 years, and small entering classes are composed of those who have spent at least two

years in factories or fields or the army after Middle School, and who are recommended by their organizations. At Sun Yat-sen, only one class has been admitted since the Cultural Revolution, that one in December 1970. It is comprised of 550 students. Of that group, 90% are the children of peasants or workers and most of the rest came from the army. 20% are women. Half are members of the Communist Party and an additional 40% belong to the Communist Youth League (the Chinese equivalent of the Russian Komsomol). A new class of 800 students is about to enter and we were told that the percentage of party activists is equally high among them. The natural sciences library at the university appeared well-stocked with scientific books in English, French, German and Russian, as well as in Chinese, and a large variety of animal, bird and insect specimens were displayed in a university museum. It was a disappointment for us to be told here, however, as at other educational institutions we visited, that courses in political subjects were not in progress and therefore could not be visited.

We were told that the emphasis in instruction is placed upon self-study and group discussion, though we saw traditional style teaching being carried out. Despite press reports to the contrary, we were told that entrance examinations are being used in addition to secondary school records and recommendations, but a superficial impression was that the academic level of the university was not high. It should be noted that much of the technical education is carried out in specialized institutes which we did not see. The students received para-military training from the university and the army is represented here as elsewhere on a Revolutionary Committee which has run the university since the Cultural Revolution, and is supposed to include representatives of mass organizations as well. In the latter category we learned that each academic department has a worker assigned to it who is to advise the professors on the practical application of their teaching.

We interviewed a group of students in the dormitory where eight sleep in a large room on a double-deck bunks and study together at a large table as we entered, they were studying "Mao's Talks at the Yen'an Forum." They told us that they were students of Chinese literature and were preparing to be literary critics. On a typical day they arise at 6 a.m., like everyone else in China it seemed, do calisthenics and eat breakfast. This is followed by classes from 7:30 until 11:30. After the usual noon break for lunch and a nap, they resume classes from 3 until 5:30 p.m. This is followed by calisthenics and dinner, study from 7:00 until 9:30 and lights out at 10 p.m.

A new element in Chinese education since the Cultural Revolution is a vast network of May 7th Cadre Schools for the education and re-education of people in positions of responsibilities. Party, governmental, organizational, and intellectual leaders are supposed to attend these schools for periods of 1-6 months (we found at least one instance of a person who had been in such a school for three years. These schools are named for the date of the statement by Mao creating such schools at the beginning of the Cultural Revolution and are located on agricultural communes or, less often, in factories. The May 7th schools combine manual labor with the study of the works of Mao, and intensive discussion is given to the application of his thoughts to practical problems, in particular those facing peasants and workers. Mornings are spent in the fields and afternoons are devoted to study and discussion of Mao's principal works, especially "On Practice," "On Contradictions," and "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions among the People." There is also study of extracts from the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin pictures

of whom we saw in the back of classrooms while the ubiquitous picture of Mao was hung in front. Sometimes workers and peasants are interviewed or conduct class so that the "cadres" can learn about their problems. The schools operate to raise the level of political consciousness, to develop a sense of rededication to the ideals and thoughts of Mao, to prevent "elitism" among the middle level leadership and to re-educate, sometimes for rather long periods, those who appear to be inclined toward "revisionism." Here as elsewhere group pressures and psychological techniques are used which are not too far removed from those used by religious groups in the West.

It is understood that the leaders will return to those schools from time to time, but it was assumed by Chinese with whom we talked that this would not be enough to prevent the emergence of "revisionism." In the future further Cultural Revolutions but "in a different form" are seen as necessary. Whether they can be carried out without extremism and the adverse economic effects of the convulsion of 1966-69 no one would care to speculate.

FAMILY LIFE

It is well known that few societies have as great a traditional reverence for family ties as the Chinese. From our observations, there are serious strains on this tradition in China today, and they are primarily the result of the work patterns of the parents.

Today in China women enjoy, if that is the correct term, an equality with men. This means that they are politically and socially equal with men. They serve as members and officers of Revolutionary Committees from the neighborhood units upward. They also work side by side with men in the farms and factories of China. Only in the heaviest work at the most demanding jobs in the iron and steel plants at Anshan were women absent. But even there, in the hot, choking, dark and noisy caverns of industry, women could be found operating heavy equipment.

In the showcase communes and factories to which we were taken, we found no household where the wife and mother did not work at some job outside the home. We therefore assume not only that this is a widespread practice, but also that the employment of both parents is a practice favored and encouraged by the State.

As a consequence of this, children are in State care facilities for the most important years of their lives. From a physical care standpoint, these facilities for infants and pre-schoolers seem highly developed. The children seemed well-clothed, happy and sturdy. And the caretaker-to-child ratio seemed generally to be a very favorable four or five children to one adult. This is possible, of course, where the labor force is very large.

Many of these facilities are designed to care for children on a weekly basis, allowing the child to be with its parents only one day a week, since there is a six-day work week throughout the country. In other cases, children are deposited with the day care center at bed time and then picked up the following evening after work. Still other facilities, for older children, are set up to occupy and train youngsters after school.

In spite of the efficiency of this approach to child care, there are obvious grave implications. First of all, parents see their children far too infrequently. We sensed a certain sadness about this even among those parents who most vigorously praised the system. Second, the children at their most impressionable years are vulnerable subjects for active political indoctrination. "As the twig is bent," the saying goes, "so grows the tree." We witnessed the political education of children not yet three years old. In song and dance and art children are taught to give unquestioning gratitude and praise to the

State and its leaders, to the army, the workers and peasants.

It is true that where grandparents live at home the children are often in their care. But the direction of State policy seems to be to employ all those who are able to work, and the upbringing of the children therefore falls to the State.

HEALTH AND MEDICAL CARE

People of all ages seemed well nourished and healthy. Most seemed to be involved in strenuous farm or city labor, but seemed to enjoy and thrive on hard work. Dental care, however, seemed deficient, and the high incidence of cigarette smoking suggested a general lack of knowledge about the potential harmful effects.

In understanding medical care and delivery the key word is *relative*; that is, relative to what it had been prior to 1949. With that in mind and not comparing it to Western standards, a better conception of their progress in health and medical care can be understood.

During the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, medical schools were closed and medical journals stopped printing. Since that time the concept of "Serve The People" has favored medical education and health care delivery so as to insure quantity, perhaps at the expense of quality. The main changes that have occurred are these:

Shortened length of medical school from 6 years to 3 years; paring the curriculum from 36 courses to 15.

The graduates are not given a diploma and must work in the community for 5 years before being considered for specialty training.

Students must spend time in the communities obtaining experience and training "Barefoot Doctors."

Students are selected for the study of medicine, after high school and 2 years of work, by their fellow commune or factory workers. Selection is based on their political motivation, intellect and proven willingness to work.

As at all levels of Chinese society, periodic physical work in the commune is demanded of medical students.

Former specialists are the backbone of the medical facilities.

Students must be single and may not marry.

Doctors start out at a salary of 32 yuan per month (\$14.40), and may advance through 8 levels of pay based on political motivation, quality and quantity of work.

The entire post Cultural Revolution university program is in an experimental stage, since no class has yet graduated from this new program.

Nurses are trained only in hospitals. They have an 18-month training period, make \$9.50 per month, and must also serve in local communities.

Barefoot Doctors are the backbone of the medical care system since 80% of the population is rural and agricultural. Their training period is only about 2 months, though it is updated weekly by additional one day training sessions in commune hospitals and periodically by an extended stay in a more advanced center. Barefoot Doctors are also selected by the commune.

Each factory, commune or farm has medical care readily available, albeit minimal at times. Each branch of medical training and care is a mixture of Western and traditional. In many respects this whole system resembles the concept of regional medical programs in this country.

Acupuncture, the remarkable technique for operation without anesthesia, was performed before Christ was born and we saw gold acupuncture needles dating back to 133 B.C. Its usefulness as a form of treatment remains uncertain, in the opinion of the

American physician who accompanied our group. However the Chinese use it widely for therapeutic relief of headache, gall bladder disease, peptic ulcer, heart disease, deafness and a variety of other ills. We observed three major surgical operations—appendectomy, removal of an ovarian cyst and thyroid tumor—and three tooth extractions, performed using acupuncture anesthesia.

Acupuncture anesthesia, which was begun in late 50's appears to be a highly significant medical advance. Having seen it used for thyroid, ovarian, appendicidal and dental surgery, and having seen the patients, talking, drinking tea, eating orange slices during the procedure, and having observed the patients hop off the operating table at the conclusion of surgery impressed even the most doubting cynic. The technique of needle insertion is said to vary with each type case, but the needles may be stimulated electrically (6-9 volt DC at 90-120 cycles/min) or by up and down rotatory manual stimulation. Even chest surgery is possible without endotracheal tube by first introducing an artificial pneumothorax prior to surgery on the lung to be operated. The obvious advantages to acupuncture anesthesia are:

Safety—no depressant anesthetics or liver toxins are needed.

Anesthesia can be given inside the operating room, thereby shortening the operation;

No recovery room time is needed—the patient has reacted at the end of surgery; Less training and skill are needed by the anesthetist;

The patient is able to cooperate during surgery—i.e. talk during thyroid surgery (vocal cord), move during brain surgery and so forth.

There appeared to be less bleeding.

A commune doctor demonstrated the acupuncture technique on the hand of our delegation physician and the hand was anesthetized within 15-20 seconds. We understand that this form of anesthesia is now being used in at least three U.S. hospitals. Precise needle placement doesn't seem to matter for the anesthesia effect to be complete. The jamming of pain circuit transmission by needle—electric stimuli seems to be the most accepted theory, and we believe it will be a widely used technique in the United States before very long.

The hospitals themselves were clean and orderly, adequately staffed, not over crowded and properly located. By our standards their equipment was very antiquated—this observation includes operating room, X-ray, lab, wards, delivery, central supply, and so on. A surprisingly large number of the surgeons were women.

The Chinese diet, which consists of far lower quantities of animal fats and sugar than our own, combined with the exercise the Chinese get as they hike, walk and work at manual labor on the average far more than we do every day, has helped produce a population which is lean and strong in appearance.

ITINERARY

June 26

10:20 a.m.—Arrivals in Shanghai. Luncheon meeting with municipal and provincial officials.

1:20 p.m.—Departure for Peking.

4:00 p.m.—Arrival in Peking.

7:00 p.m.—Dinner hosted by the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs (CPIFA) and meeting with CPIFA officials.

June 27

Morning.—Palace Museum and Exhibition of Excavated Historical Relics.

Afternoon.—(1) Meeting with Mr. Chiao Kuan-hua, Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs; (2) The Central Institute for Nationalities;

(3) The Summer Palace; and (4) The Peking Zoo.

Evening.—Sports Performances.

June 28

Morning.—(1) No. 3 Hospital of Peking Medical College (acupuncture anesthesia); (2) The Red Star People's Commune.

Afternoon.—(1) The Peking Arts and Crafts Factory; (2) The Peking Dongfanghong Automobile Plant; (3) Meeting with representatives of the China Council for the Promotion of International Trade.

Evening.—Meeting and Dinner with Premier Chou En-lai.

June 29

Morning and Afternoon.—The Great Wall and Ting Ling Museum.

8:00 p.m.—Departure for Shenyang.

9:30 p.m.—Arrival in Shenyang Meeting with municipal and provincial officials.

June 30

Morning.—Departure for Anshan—high tension live-line demonstration (on the way).

Afternoon.—Anshan Iron & Steel Works.

Evening.—Acrobatics Performances.

July 1

Morning.—Return to Shenyang—Rice-growing People's Commune (on the way).

Afternoon.—(1) Transformer Factory; (2) Middle school and Kindergarten; (3) School for Deaf and Mute and Kindergarten.

Evening.—Dinner with local officials.

July 2

8:30 a.m.—Return to Shanghai prevented due to adverse weather; aircraft diverted to Peking.

July 3

Morning.—Departure for Canton.

Afternoon.—Tour of Canton. Meetings with municipal and provincial officials.

Evening.—Dinner with local leaders.

July 4

Morning.—Sun Yat-sen University and Medical College.

Afternoon.—Workers Housing Complex, Middle School, Children's Palace.

Evening.—Cultural Performance by Canton Troupe; Fourth of July Dinner for CPIFA, hosted by Mr. Boggs and Mr. Ford.

July 5

Morning.—Departure for Hong Kong by rail.

HOSTS AND HOST ORGANIZATION

Our formal host in China was the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs (CPIFA). This is a quasi-governmental organization used to extend hospitality to persons, such as our party, from nations with which China does not have diplomatic relations. Premier Chou En-lai is Honorary Chairman of the CPIFA.

The gracious hospitality provided by the CPIFA included a remarkable successful effort to schedule in a very short time a wide variety of experiences in diverse places according to our interests and desires. As anyone who has had a part in arranging visits of this sort is aware, a high degree of skill and patience is essential, and our hosts never failed us. Our safety was assured with the great care of our drivers and, particularly, with the skill of our aircraft crew. Finally, of course, no account of our journey would be complete without testimonial to the extraordinary cuisine whose variety and excellence greeted us three times daily.

We would like to express our warmest thanks to the CPIFA, particularly to Chang Hsi-jo, President of the CPIFA, to Chou Pei-yuan, Vice President of the CPIFA, to Chou Ch'iu-yeh, Secretary General of the CPIFA, who accompanied us on our journey, to the CPIFA provincial and municipal representatives in the areas we visited, to our drivers, guides and guest-house staffs, and most especially to the uniformly friendly, helpful and

competent young men and women who were assigned to us as interpreters. The warm feeling we developed for the people of China is in no small measure attributable to the unfailing good humor and uncommon courtesy of these individuals.

NEW CHINA NEWS AGENCY DISPATCHES

The following official dispatches were released by the New China News Agency in connection with our visit:

PEKING BANQUET WELCOMES HOUSE LEADERS BOGGS AND FORD

(S261946 Peking NCNA International Service in English 1935 GMT 26 Jun 72 B.)

PEKING, June 26, 1972 (Hsinhua).—The Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs gave a banquet here this evening for Hale Boggs, Democratic leader of the U.S. House of Representatives, and Mrs. Boggs, and Gerald R. Ford, Republican leader of the House, and Mrs. Ford.

Among the guests at the banquet were members of their party: William A. Brown, Freeman Cary, Bryce Marlow, Robert Hartmann, Gary Hymel, Harry Lee, Frank Meyer, Paul A. Miltich, Day O. Mount, Paul Sigmund and Eugene A. Theroux.

Present were Kuo Mo-jo, Vice-Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress; Chang Hsi-jo, President of the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs; Chiao Kuan-hua, Vice Foreign Minister; and Chou Pei-yuan, Vice-President of the Institute. Before the banquet, they met Hale Boggs and Gerald Ford and their wives and the other American guests and had a friendly talk with them.

Present at the banquet and meeting were Chou Wen-chin, Assistant Minister of Foreign Affairs, Ju Yu-chih and Lin Chiao-chih, members of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress, and leading members of organizations concerned, including Chou Chiu-yeh, Yu Li-chun, Wang Ti-cheng, Wang Tung, Wang Hsiao-l, Hu Hung-fan, Chien Ta-tung and Ma Yu-cheng.

The American guests arrived here by air this afternoon on a visit to China at the invitation of the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs. They were met at the airport by Chou Pei-yuan and others. Chou Chiu-yeh, Secretary General of the host organization, had made a special trip to Shanghai to meet the American guests and accompanied them to Peking.

During their halt in Shanghai, the American guests were greeted at the airport by Geng Kuo-chu, council member of the host organization.

PREMIER CHOU EN-LAI HOSTS U.S. LEADERS

(Peking NCNA International Service in English 2047 GMT 28 Jun 72 B.)

PEKING, June 28, 1972 (Hsinhua).—Chou En-lai, premier of the State Council, Chang Hsi-jo, president of the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs, and Chiao Kuan-hua, vice-foreign minister, this evening hosted a dinner for Hale Boggs, Democratic leader of the U.S. House of Representatives, and Mrs. Boggs, and Gerald Ford, Republican House leader, and Mrs. Ford, and their party.

The members of their party attending the dinner were: William A. Brown, Freeman Cary, Bryce Harlow, Robert Hartmann, Gary Hymel, Harry Lee, Frank Meyer, Paul A. Miltich, Day O. Mount, Paul Sigmund, and Eugene A. Theroux.

Present at the banquet were Chou En-lai, vice-president of the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs, and leading members and staff members of organizations concerned Chou Chiu-yeh, Wang Ti-cheng, Wang Tung, Hu Hung-fan, Ma Yu-cheng, Chi Chao-chu, Tzu Chung-yun and Chao Ching-tien.

After the banquet, Premier Chou En-lai and others met the U.S. House leaders and their party.

U.S. HOUSE LEADERS LEAVE PEKING FOR TOUR OF OTHER AREAS

(Peking NCNA International Service in English 1651 GMT 29 Jun 72 B.)

PEKING, June 29, 1972 (Hsinhua).—Hale Boggs, Democratic leader of the U.S. House of Representatives, and Mrs. Boggs, and Gerald Ford, Republican House leader, and Mrs. Ford, and their party left here by air this evening on a visit to other parts of China in the company of Chou Chiu-yeh, secretary-general of the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs.

Seeing them off at the airport were Chou Pei-yuan, vice-president of the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs, and his wife; Hu Yu-chih, member of the standing committee of the national people's congress; and leading members of organizations concerned Wang Tung and Wang Tsiao-l.

BOGGS, FORD END VISIT, LEAVE CANTON FOR HOME

Peking NCNA International Service in English 1508 GMT 5 Jul 72 B.)

CANTON, July 5, 1972 (Hsinhua).—Hale Boggs, Democratic leader of the U.S. House of Representatives, and Mrs. Boggs, and Gerald Ford, and their party left here for home by train today at the end of a visit to China.

They were seen off at the railway station by Chou Chiu-yeh, secretary general, and Shao Yun-sheng, council member, of the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs; Kao Chao-lan, professor of Chungshan University; and leading members of Chinese organizations concerned, including Hu Hung-fan, Tsu Kuo-chen and Cheng Chien.

The U.S. guests arrived in Canton on the morning of July 3 after touring Peking, Shenyang and Anshan. They were honored at a banquet given that evening by Wang Shou-tao, vice-chairman of the Kwangtung Provincial Revolutionary Committee.

While in Canton, the American guests visited a factory, a school and a children's palace and went sightseeing in the city. Hale Boggs and Mrs. Boggs, and Gerald Ford and Mrs. Ford gave a reciprocal banquet yesterday evening.

COMPOSITION OF THE DELEGATION

Majority Leader Hale Boggs and Mrs. Boggs. Minority Leader Gerald R. Ford and Mrs. Ford.

Mr. William A. Brown, Deputy Director, Office of Asian Communist Affairs, Department of State.

Dr. Freeman H. Cary, Assistant Attending Physician to the Congress.

Mr. Bryce N. Harlow, Business Executive, former Counselor to the President, Aide to Mr. Ford.

Mr. Robert T. Hartman, Legislative Assistant to Mr. Ford.

Mr. Gary G. Hymel, Administrative Assistant to Mr. Boggs.

Honorable Harry Lee, United States Magistrate, Eastern District of Louisiana, Aide to Mr. Boggs.

Mr. Frank Meyer, Administrative Assistant to Mr. Ford.

Mr. Paul A. Miltich, Press Secretary to Mr. Ford.

Mr. Day O. Mount, Administrative Officer, Department of State.

Dr. Paul Sigmund, Professor of Political Science, Princeton University, Aide to Mr. Boggs.

Eugene A. Theroux, Esq., Special Council to the Joint Economic Committee, Aide to Mr. Boggs.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

DISHONORING A GOOD NAME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from New Hampshire (Mr. WYMAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, former Supreme Court Justice Tom Clark is a good man. His contributions to this country on the judiciary and in the Bar Association have been substantial. His life has been dedicated to public service and he has earned public confidence and respect because of his record.

Not so with his errant son Ramsey, who, trading on his father's name, which was the main reason for his appointment to the high position of U.S. Attorney General some years back, now dishonors this name and disgraces his country as well in one fell swoop by knowingly giving aid and comfort to the Communist forces in North Vietnam.

There can be no question of Ramsey Clark's calculated intent to do just this. He had to design to travel to North Vietnam. He had to arrange the conferences with the Communist leaders there. He had to plan what he would say and reflect on it at length during the long trip home. And what he said by any standard was a mouthful of subversive garbage at a time when this country's Government is trying to end the war through negotiations with these same Communists.

Ramsey Clark said in Vietnam, among other things, that:

I do know that in human terms the bombing I've seen is without justification no matter what the cause and purpose.

He also said in San Francisco on his return that:

If we'd elect George McGovern President instead of President Nixon that they'd release some U.S. prisoners on January 20 and the remainder three months later!

How does he know this?

Because, he said, the Communists told him so.

Why did they tell him so?

Because they know McGOVERN has publicly committed himself to a policy of begging, not fighting, and to a massive reduction of existing U.S. military and naval capabilities if elected President.

Clark knows this too. At least he is not dumb. He is a former Cabinet officer, who knows exactly what he is doing and saying.

All of which makes the infamy of his conduct and statements all the greater.

It is a personal tragedy for Tom Clark, but it is also a truly disgusting exhibition of subversion in action—not because of criticism of the war—but because of actions deliberately taken and words deliberately chosen to encourage the enemy to continue to hold out on the chance McGOVERN may be elected in which event they would get what they want in South Vietnam without having to negotiate any commitments whatever.

Apparently it is to no avail to suggest that Ramsey Clark ought to be ashamed of himself for he is unashamed, unabashedly so.

This man's conduct is detrimental to negotiations for prisoner release and an end to the war that have been officially underway for many, many months now and he knows it.

It is too bad that Ramsey Clark felt he had to return to America at all, for the record of much of his public life demonstrates that in many respects he is working to divide and polarize this great country, whatever may be his perverted concept of a world revolution for a new social order.

His recent performance in Hanoi and San Francisco is a shocking, shameful, shabby exhibition of deliberate subversion whatever may be the motive. Combined with his subsequent public appeal for the election of a particular candidate for public office in November, it is exposed in an even more contemptible light as a politically motivated bit of grandstanding by an ex-Cabinet officer who perhaps aims for another Cabinet post should his man win election in November.

But trifling with the national security, undermining the national morale, helping the enemy's morale, and delaying an end to the war through official negotiations is a pretty high price to pay for a shot at another Cabinet post.

DISASTER RELIEF APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HEINZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support of H.R. 16254. This bill, the supplemental appropriation for disaster relief will provide the assistance which is desperately needed by the flood victims of Hurricane Agnes. I am hopeful that the \$1.5 billion appropriated by this legislation will help to relieve the despair which the victims of this disaster are experiencing. Although the passage of this legislation provides visible proof of Congress, deep concern for the welfare of the disaster victims, it does not relieve the Congress of its responsibility to safeguard the lives and property of the citizens of this country. Today's unanimous vote for this bill will help relieve the present suffering, but let us not forget that we must also take action to protect our citizens from future disasters.

This needed protection can only be guaranteed through the establishment of comprehensive statewide disaster preparedness plans. H.R. 16312, the Safe States Act of 1972, which I introduced on August 10, 1972 provides for the mandatory development of disaster preparedness plans which must be in compliance with minimum Federal standards formulated by the Office of Emergency Preparedness. This bill also provides that any State which does not meet these standards will not be eligible for any Federal disaster relief assistance. I feel that the stringent measures contained in this legislation are justified. The passage of H.R. 16254 will bring the total of new appropriations for disaster relief to \$2 billion for fiscal year 1973. Therefore I believe that Congress is justified in insisting that needless loss of life and property damage does not occur as a result of a lack of preparedness on the part

of the States. I urge my colleagues to review the provisions of the Safe State Act on page 27683 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to assist in bringing about the speedy enactment of this legislation.

LAIRD WITHHOLDS "REALISTIC" PRICE ON LITTON SHIPBUILDING PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, Defense Secretary Melvin Laird is insisting that the Nixon administration will hold inflation below 3 percent this year and has forced the Navy to reduce by more than \$90 million the estimated cost of Litton Industries' 30-ship DD-963 destroyer program.

Mr. Laird is guilty of using the make-believe dreams of success of the President's so-called fight against inflation as an excuse to withhold realistic estimates of the cost of this \$2.1 billion destroyer program from the Congress.

Mr. Laird's silly and meaningless maneuver is outlined in a General Accounting Office report which I am publicly releasing today.

It should be noted, Mr. Speaker, that the wholesale price index is expected to rise 5.2 percent in 1972 and that wages in the shipbuilding industry may rise as much as 15 percent. But Mr. Laird insists that the Nixon administration will hold inflation below 3 percent.

Claiming that inflation will drop below 3 percent is a meaningless gesture that distorts the real cost of the program, particularly since both the contractor and the Navy agree that the cost will be at least \$90 million higher than current estimates.

Litton Industries, the contractor, currently predicts that it will cost the Government \$438 million in inflation charges to build the 30 high-speed destroyers that will be used to escort American attack aircraft carriers. But the Navy is being forced to keep its estimate down to \$346.2 million and this is the figure officially reported to Congress.

It is this lack of realism in estimating costs that eventually results in billions of dollars of cost overruns which were recently reported by the GAO in a report on 77 major weapons systems.

In 1971 the Government paid Litton Industries more than \$21 million in inflation charges despite the Navy's prediction that the cost would be less than \$19 million. These inflation payments are based on Bureau of Labor Statistics' indexes which theoretically reflect increased costs in labor and material in a particular industry.

Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly clear that this destroyer program is a disaster which probably will cost the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars in cost overruns.

Fortunately the Congress this year plans to cut more than \$330 million from the Navy's \$610-million request for seven of the 30 DD-963 destroyers. It is expected that the Navy will late this year

or early next year decide whether to cancel the program or not.

"MANNY" RIDGELL DIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn of the death of A. Emanuel "Manny" Ridgell last Sunday evening. Manny, serving as House Office Buildings Superintendent, was one of the Hill's most trusted and admired officials. Few men were as dedicated to their jobs as Manny, and it was his dedication to his job that made our jobs that much easier.

Manny was working on the Hill for 16 years before he received his appointment as superintendent. In 1932, at the age of 20, he began as a House messenger. He steadily moved up through the ranks and in 1947 he was appointed assistant superintendent, 1 year before he was promoted to superintendent. His career was marked by an outstanding performance of his duties and outstanding relationships with the Members. Besides having the responsibility of assigning office space to the Members, Manny's duties involved the maintenance, operation, and mechanical care of the House Office Buildings and the subway to the Capitol. In his 24 years on the job, he gained the respect of all the Members for his honesty and intelligence.

Manny was a model American—a good family man, a religious and hardworking person who sought to serve others. We who have worked with Manny over the years know of his quick wit and willingness to use it. In his sometimes thankless job of handling the whims of 436 Congressmen, this was a necessary element for maintaining an even and pleasant personality.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my deepest sympathy to the surviving members of his family—his wife, Mary, their daughter Sister Mary Ann, and their sons Charles and Father John Ridgell—and to his fellow citizens to whom he meant so much and who he so nobly served.

SOUTH AFRICA AND THE GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE (GATT)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DIGGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I wrote to the State Department about South Africa's persistent violation of the rules of GATT in maintaining and tightening its import quotas against foreign goods. I pointed out that their claim to having balance of payments problems was not justified, in view of the healthy surplus of the first half of 1972, and the use of this surplus to withhold South African gold from the free market, driving up the speculative price.

South Africa is already under great pressure from the international community, and I am concerned that the U.S. delegation at GATT should do nothing

to defend South Africa. If it did, this would create a dangerous precedent for many other countries, which can claim to be at least as much in need of concessions as South Africa.

I also asked the State Department for confirmation that the United States will continue to support the International Court of Justice's opinion on South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, as it relates to South Africa's claim to represent Namibia in an international organization such as GATT. There, it benefits from most favored nation treatment for all exports from the international territory of Namibia. I pointed out that this is illegal and have asked to be informed on what action the U.S. delegation is taking to challenge South Africa on these grounds and to end its illegal representation of Namibia in GATT.

I wish to insert for the benefit of my colleagues the text of my letter to the State Department:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 14, 1972.

HON. WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I wish to express my concern at the persistent violation of the rules of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) by the Republic of South Africa. For a number of years, South Africa has been maintaining import quotas, as well as a range of other non-tariff barriers, which contravene the letter and the spirit of GATT. Of particular concern to the auto industry are the "local content" regulations for motor vehicles, which in effect have deprived the industry here of the South African export market, and forced the companies concerned to invest in assembly plants inside South Africa, where they are taking advantage of labor conditions that would be completely intolerable in the U.S. context. This is just one example of an important U.S. export item being excluded from the South African market, with a consequent loss of the balance of payments benefits, and of valuable jobs in certain industries.

Although at one time South Africa had exemption under Article XII of the General Agreement, which allowed the excuse of balance of payments difficulties to be used to justify import quotas, this defense had to be abandoned at the beginning of 1970. There was strong pressure on South Africa to dismantle its controls, and bilateral negotiations with the major trading partners were undertaken. However, it seems that South Africa was not prepared to offer any *quid pro quo* for the higher import tariffs that it was seeking, and the negotiations seems to have resulted in deadlock. Far from attempting to come to terms with the requirements of its trading partners under the Agreement, in November, 1971, South Africa imposed a very stringent tightening of the existing import quotas. This is a unilateral action which we cannot afford to condone, since it openly defies the understood norms of international trade; strongly inhibits U.S. exports to South Africa, especially of manufactured items; and provides a bad example which, if widely followed, would do great damage to the flow of international trade at a particularly difficult time for the U.S. balance of payments.

Although many members of GATT are from time to time in breach of the General Agreement, South Africa is a particularly persistent offender, and I am anxious that all appropriate pressures should be brought to bear on the country. I understand that the issue of its import restrictions, and application for balance of payments justification under Article XII, are under active con-

sideration at the moment, and I should like to have an assurance from you that there will be no effort on the part of the U.S. delegation to reduce the already considerable pressure on South Africa, when its import restrictions come before the annual meeting in September.

Since the United States is a member of the balance of payments committee of GATT, this issue is clearly one that must be faced without equivocation. It would be illogical and inconsistent to allow South Africa to defy the rules, since the United States has recently benefited from the application of GATT sanctions. When the European Economic Community imposed obstacles on the import of chickens from the U.S., in line with its protectionist Common Agricultural Policy, the U.S. pressed hard within GATT for some redress. It obtained this, through the appropriate GATT processes, in the form of compensatory restrictions on certain items of European origin. In the case of the African states associated with the EEC through the Yaoundé Convention, the U.S. has made loud protests about the "reserve preferences" allocated to European goods by the African states, in return for the concessions which they have for their own products in the European market. This issue has been stressed out of all proportion to our concern about South Africa's violation of the principles of international trade.

The immediate issue is, of course, whether or not South Africa qualifies for exemption from the normal regulations because of balance of payments difficulties. There has already been strong objection to this claim by a number of countries, and the South Africans appear to be coming under increasing pressure on this. They have even announced their intention of abandoning this line. Looking at the facts of the situation, this is understandable. At the same time as South Africa is contending within GATT that balance of payments difficulties justify stringent import restrictions, it is using the healthy balance of payments which it has had since the beginning of this year in order to withhold newly-mined gold from the free market, thus driving the price even higher—to the detriment of international monetary arrangements, and particularly to the stability of the dollar. The U.S. Government cannot accept South Africa's use of a balance of payments surplus, within the context of the International Monetary Fund two-tier price system and its 1969 agreement with South Africa, while simultaneously allowing South Africa to plead balance of payments difficulties in order to extract concessions from GATT at our expense.

South Africa's balance of payments has been in surplus for the first two quarters of 1972, and this surplus is rising. Gold and foreign exchange reserves are rising steadily, and stood at R695.5m. (about \$980m.) in mid-June. Dr. Diederichs, the Minister of Finance, told the South African Senate in June that the balance of payments was showing a favorable trend, and that further prospects, particularly on the export side, looked promising. He added that import control and devaluation had begun to show an effect on imports in recent months. If such a promising situation can be used to justify the degree of violation of GATT rules that South Africa is presently displaying, then the flood-gates would be opened for a large proportion of other GATT members to take the same line.

When the import quotas were tightened in November, 1971, the Minister of Economics, Mr. S. L. Muller, promised a full review in May. In late July, a certain easing of the controls was announced. However, the South African Ambassador in Geneva is reported as saying, "I feel that South Africa has gone as far as it can at present in relaxing its import restrictions." There is even a debate

going on in South African business circles about the possibility of increasing the controls on some items.

I should, therefore, like to know the policy of the United States Government towards South Africa's position in GATT, with regard to the considerations mentioned above. If it should come to the point of threatening South Africa with suspension from the organization, can I assume that our delegation will support such a step?

There is a further point relating to South Africa's membership of GATT which I wish to raise. South Africa purports to represent Namibia in a number of international organizations. The United States supported U.N. General Assembly Resolution 2145 of 1966, and has accepted the Opinion of the International Court of Justice on this issue, affirming that South Africa's occupation of Namibia is illegal. As applied to GATT, therefore, South Africa has no legal right to represent Namibia, as it purports to do at the moment, and no right to obtain Most Favored Nation treatment for exports originating in Namibia. I should like to know what action the United States is taking to end South Africa's illegal representation of Namibia in GATT.

I would appreciate receiving, at an early date, a response to the points raised herein. Sincerely,

CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Africa.

POLLUTION BILL TO AID SMALL BUSINESS AND THEIR EMPLOYEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. HARRINGTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing with 20 cosponsors a bill entitled the "Small Business Pollution Abatement Loan Assistance and Workers Readjustment Assistance Act."

The concept of the legislation is that small businesses should be able to receive some assistance in meeting the new—and much needed—stringent pollution standards. Small businesses which are required to tie into a municipal facility or to build their own pollution abatement facilities may not be able to do so without going out of business, and many of these marginal companies are in economically depressed areas. A second section of the bill provides that when a company goes out of business because it cannot obey the new pollution laws, the workers will receive adjustment assistance—100 percent of salary for 52 weeks, relocation allowances and job training.

Frankly, I do not believe that any of us in the Congress had intended to legislate small business out of existence, and it seems to me that the time has come to offer some safeguards to small businesses which are having difficulty obeying the new pollution laws.

The Council on Environmental Quality reported last week that the smaller firms, and not the large corporations, are jeopardized by inability to pay the cost of pollution control devices.

The Washington Evening Star and Daily News in an editorial last week cited this finding of the CEQ report and called for a creative national program to help

these small businesses. The bill being introduced today is such a program.

The CEQ report estimates that for the industries studied, jobs lost range from 50,000 to 125,000 over the 1972-76 period.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this point to quote directly from the CEQ report dealing with the problems of small businesses. The points made are well worth contemplating and the bill we are introducing today is a solid solution to the problem:

EXCERPTS FROM "THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF POLLUTION CONTROL"—A SUMMARY OF RECENT STUDIES

MICROECONOMIC IMPACT

Accordingly, some firms will earn lower profits, some will curtail production, and some firms and plants will be forced to close.

There are approximately 12,000 plants currently operating in the industrial activities studies. Of these it is expected that approximately 800 would close in the normal course of business between 1972 and 1976. It would appear from the contractors' evaluations that an additional 200-300 will be forced to close because of pollution abatement requirements. Many of these additional closings would appear to involve plants that were vulnerable for other reasons and, hence, that were likely to have closed anyway a few years later.

These plant closings and production curtailments will have both direct and indirect impacts. The direct impacts include the loss of jobs and reduced value of equity. An indirect impact is that related (customer and supplier) firms will be forced to close or reduce production. For example, farms which have marketed their produce to a cannery that closed might be unable to find new markets for their produce. Another indirect impact is that the communities where such plants are located may suffer local recessions—an impact which will be most severe in one-plant towns.

The studies suggest that direct job loss attributable to environmental regulations in the affected industry activities examined may range from 50,000 to 125,000 jobs over the 1972-76 period. These figures represent approximately 1% to 4% of total employment in the industry activities studied. The direct average annual unemployment created in these industries represents .05% of the 1970 total national work force. However, the studies suggest that these estimates could be substantially higher if the economy is not at full employment.

While the total plant closings in the industries in which plant closings might have a community impact appear to be about 150, the data presented are not in sufficient detail to determine the number of these communities that will be significantly impacted.

It is important to note that the figures reported in the preceding paragraphs apply to the industrial activities studied; neither the positive nor negative impacts on other industrial activities have been included. However, in a general sense these other impacts are considered in the macroeconomic study.

FRUIT AND VEGETABLE CANNING AND FREEZING

In this case, up to half of the small plants in the industry, or one-third of all plants, were expected to be forced to close. Of the 1,200 plants included in the industry directory, therefore, 400 might be forced to close because of pollution abatement costs. Thus, the addition of pollution control costs was expected to lead to the additional closing of 100 plants, or 8.3% of the total. In addition,

closing of the other plants was expected to occur some years earlier than otherwise.

It was estimated that the closing of 400 plants would result in the loss of jobs by approximately 28,000 employees. The displacement created by the 100 plants that were estimated to close because of pollution controls would be one-fourth of that number of 7,000. Many of these would be in small towns and rural areas where reemployment would not be readily available.

PULP AND PAPER MILLS

It was estimated that an additional 60-65 mills would be forced to close with the imposition of abatement regulations. These additional closings were expected to result in the loss of 16,000 jobs by 1976. Many of the shut downs are likely to be in rural areas where they would have significant community impact.

A precedent has been set for the bill being introduced today. The Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 which is still before the Conference Committee contains a provision originally introduced by former Congressman Morse and myself authorizing funds for loans to small businesses who without such assistance are likely to suffer substantial financial loss by complying with Federal water pollution guidelines. This is a good first step, and it seems but a logical extension to apply similar loan assistance provisions to assist compliance by small firms with any Federal or State pollution abatement requirements, whether they be air, noise, solid waste or water pollution problems.

This bill provides grants to small business to plan for the building of the facilities. Too often, the initial cost of the plans is prohibitive and businesses fail at the extent of that expenditure. These grants cannot exceed \$100,000 or 100 percent of the cost. Once a plan has been accepted, the plant is eligible to receive a loan under the act. This loan will be at about 4 percent interest rate and for 30 years. If the EPA Administrator approved the plan, the Secretary of Labor is authorized to make loans not to exceed \$500,000 or 100 percent of the cost of the project.

In the same vein, there will be marginal small plants which do close down because they are unable to meet the costs even with a loan. If that happens, the workers will be jobless through no fault of their own. Therefore, I am proposing a system of adjustment assistance which will provide workers with 100 percent of their salaries for 52 weeks after the plant closes and also with a relocation allowance and job retraining.

Workers over 60 years of age would be eligible for an additional 13 weeks of compensation.

The bill defines a small business as one which is independently owned and operated employing 1,000 or less persons.

I realize that the Public Works-EDA bill which we will consider tomorrow contains some provisions for aid to industries and assistance to workers. But these provisions fall far short of the program envisioned by the bill. The EDA bill provides only \$100 million in loan money and

no grant money for planning. Workers would be eligible for only 60 percent of their salaries. And, from what I can tell, none of the loan money may be used for the capital costs of tying into a municipal sewerage system—often a much less expensive way of cleaning up the environment.

The Public Works-EDA bill applies only to firms in depressed areas. But there are many firms in other areas of the Nation which have the same needs. Clearly the time has come for a national commitment to preserving small businesses and the environment at the same time. This bill if enacted would do just that.

I include at this point a brief analysis of the legislation:

ANALYSIS OF BILL

TITLE I—ASSISTANCE TO SMALL BUSINESSES

Under this act a small business firm is defined as a business concern which is independently owned and operated, and which employs not more than 1,000 employees.

Planning grants and loans

An application by a small business firm for a loan or planning grant should be filed with the Secretary of Labor. The Secretary of Labor must evaluate the application for a planning grant and act on it within 60 days after it is filed. Planning grants not to exceed \$100,000 or 100 percent of the cost of preparing a plan would be available to qualifying small business firms.

If the Secretary of Labor approves the application for a planning grant, the small business firm would have 180 days to submit a plan. This plan must detail the Federal or State laws relating to pollution abatement with which the industry must comply, its proposals for meeting such requirements, and the estimated cost. The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to whom the plan must ultimately be submitted to may assist the small business firm in preparing the plan.

The E.P.A. Administrator must approve or disapprove a plan within 30 days after it is submitted. If the E.P.A. Administrator approves the plan, the Secretary of Labor is authorized to make loans not to exceed \$4,500,000 or 100 percent of the cost of the project. If the E.P.A. Administrator rejects the plan, the small business firm has 60 days to cure the defects. These loans may be made either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lenders.

It is unlawful under the act to use the loan funds for any purpose other than meeting the costs incurred by the small business firm in complying with State or Federal pol-

lution abatement laws. Violators are subject to a \$25,000 fine or imprisonment for 5 years, or both.

\$4 billion is authorized to carry out this title.

TITLE II—ASSISTANCE TO WORKERS

In those cases where environmental necessities do force a marginal plant to shut down, the bill sets up a program under the auspices of the Secretary of Labor to assist the adversely affected workers.

Part A—Readjustment allowances

Readjustment allowances equal to the workers average weekly wage over the last six months of his employment are provided for. The amount of readjustment assistance that each worker receives however will be reduced by any amount of unemployment insurance he is receiving or training allowance under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, or the Area Redevelopment Act. Subject to the following two exceptions, the readjustment allowance payments shall not exceed 52 weeks. Workers over 60 years of age would be eligible for an additional 13 weeks of compensation. Adversely affected workers who are in the process of completing training approved by the Secretary of Labor would be eligible for an additional 26 weeks of compensation.

Part B—Training

In order to assist these workers in securing new employment, the bill includes job training, counseling, and placement services. It is hoped that this will help such workers readjust with minimum reliance on adjustment payments. In those cases in which the training facilities are not within commuting distance of the worker's home, the Secretary of Labor is authorized to provide each individual not more than \$5 a day to defray transportation and subsistence expenses. Any worker who without good cause refuses to accept or continue such job training shall not thereafter be entitled to readjustment allowances.

Relocation allowances

Relocation allowances include all reasonable and necessary moving expenses as determined by the Secretary of Labor. Three criteria must be satisfied in order for a worker to receive relocation allowances: the Secretary of Labor must determine that such worker cannot reasonably be expected to secure suitable employment in the surrounding area; the worker must obtain a bona fide offer of employment; and the employment must afford a reasonable expectation of long-term duration in the area in which he wishes to relocate.

Agreements with States

The Secretary of Labor is authorized to enter into agreements with any State, or State agency to receive applications for, and

provide assistance, counseling and job training under this act.

THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1972

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

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, on August 2, 1972, the Committee on Public Works ordered reported H.R. 16071, the Public Works and Economic Development Act Amendments of 1972. This legislation is expected to be considered on the floor this week.

One of the existing EDA programs to be expanded and improved by H.R. 16071 is the public works impact program—PWIP. The PWIP program was first added to this act in the 1971 amendments. It is designed to move ahead rapidly in areas which are eligible because of threatened or actual high unemployment, a concentration of low income, or substantial outmigration with combined direct grants and supplementary grants up to 100 percent of the cost of a project. The type of projects to be assisted concern basic public works projects which are ready to be constructed and hence create immediate useful work to the unemployed and underemployed in an eligible area.

EDA accepted this challenge and all of the initial fiscal year 1972 funds appropriated for this purpose, as well as the supplemental funds, had been totally obligated by spring of this year. These funds stimulated 203 projects which resulted in an estimate of almost 11,000 jobs. Seventy-six percent of these were filled by the unemployed or underemployed in the project area. All but four of the projects are either under construction or complete.

The speed with which EDA responded and the apparent success led to the committee's decision to expand this program in H.R. 16071.

Knowing of the Members' interest in the Public Works and Economic Development Act and in the public works impact program created under that act, I am herewith submitting the list of projects approved under the PWIP program for fiscal year 1972:

FISCAL YEAR APPROVED PWIP PROJECTS

Region	Number of projects	EDA cost	Total cost	Percent EDA funding	Estimated number of employees		
					Unemployed/underemployed from project area	Total	Estimated man-months employment
Atlantic.....	41	\$13,032,700	\$21,842,750	60	2,174	2,819	8,794
Southeastern.....	39	8,556,105	13,253,259	65	1,837	2,559	7,844
Rocky Mountain.....	19	5,043,400	5,874,000	86	588	900	2,823
Midwestern.....	28	7,127,400	9,487,500	75	802	1,075	4,370
Western.....	40	7,449,900	9,272,000	80	1,678	1,928	5,126
Southwestern.....	36	6,450,300	7,797,625	83	1,055	1,492	5,491
Total.....	203	47,659,805	67,527,134	71	8,134	10,773	34,448

Note: Estimated number of unemployed/underemployed from project area = 76 percent.
Estimated number of total employees

FISCAL YEAR 1972 APPROVED PWIP PROJECTS

Location and project description	EDA cost	Total cost	Percent EDA funding	Estimated number of employees		Estimated man-months employment
				Unemployed/underemployed from project area	Total	
ATLANTIC REGION						
Connecticut:						
Middleton—Storm sewers	\$370,000	\$462,500	80	91	111	805
Enfield—Public works garage	400,000	500,000	80	40	79	196
Terryville—Town hall	600,000	939,000	64	50	50	315
State total	1,370,000	1,901,500	72	181	240	1,316
Delaware: Georgetown—Independent park improvements	350,200	437,750	80	35	50	100
District of Columbia—Recreation center	600,000	943,000	64	75	105	500
Maine:						
Eastport—Hospital additions	110,000	137,500	80	12	14	50
Mattawamkeag—Park and recreation facilities	367,000	367,000	100	74	79	188
State total	477,000	504,500	95	86	93	238
Maryland:						
Princess Anne—Water/sewer line extension	366,000	479,000	80	21	27	135
Crisfield—Water system improvement	428,000	535,000	80	15	21	105
State total	794,000	1,014,000	78	36	48	240
Massachusetts:						
Newburyport—Fire substation	84,800	106,000	80	36	38	42
Plymouth—Sanitary sewer extension	187,500	375,000	50	52	54	151
Palmer—Water mains	129,600	162,000	80	9	13	100
Greenfield—Storm and sanitary sewers	305,000	569,000	54	24	36	218
Lowell—School renovations	600,000	2,755,000	22	450	470	1,000
State total	1,306,900	3,967,000	33	571	611	1,511
New Hampshire: Franklin—Water systems improvements	563,600	704,500	80	34	53	150
New Jersey:						
Atlantic Highlands—Municipal garage	87,200	109,000	80	23	30	34
Camden—Street improvements	182,000	182,000	100	20	23	67
Matawan—Municipal garage	32,000	40,000	80	25	25	55
Cape May Point—Water system improvements	100,800	126,000	80	27	38	55
Plainfield—Street paving	200,000	250,000	80	10	10	60
Asbury Park—Convention hall improvements	361,600	452,000	80	34	36	130
State total	963,600	1,159,000	83	139	162	401
New York:						
New York—Arts center	600,000	2,000,000	30	259	557	630
Utica—Park and playground improvements	260,800	326,000	80	32	33	135
Buffalo—Street improvements	624,000	780,000	80	125	130	900
State total	1,484,800	3,106,000	48	416	720	1,665
Pennsylvania:						
Philadelphia—Renovate museums of art	400,000	625,000	64	35	35	250
Uniontown—Infirmary	600,000	2,332,000	25	20	160	149
Montrose—Renovate courthouse	144,000	180,000	80	13	13	134
Braddock—Street improvements	397,000	397,000	100	24	25	94
Tyrone—Water facilities, access road	290,400	363,000	80	19	25	65
State total	1,831,400	3,897,000	47	211	258	692
Puerto Rico:						
Barceloneta—Drainage athletic field	26,000	32,500	80	23	31	31
Fajardo—Recreation facility	120,760	170,000	71	38	50	120
Arecibo—Fire station	200,800	251,000	80	50	55	150
Arroyo—Industrial park expansion	100,500	201,000	50	26	36	150
State total	448,000	654,500	68	137	172	451
Rhode Island: Smithfield—Police station	237,600	297,000	80	36	40	90
Vermont: Springfield—Sewer system expense	80,800	101,000	80	6	7	20
Virginia: Saltville—Water system improvement and collection system	640,000	800,000	80	65	83	530
West Virginia:						
Elkins—Airport terminal	\$264,000	330,000	80	33	37	162
Philippi—Bridge	196,800	246,000	80	34	39	108
New Martinsville—Bridge	240,000	300,000	80	35	40	159
Rock Branch—Regional industrial park	966,400	1,208,000	80	38	47	321
Philippi—Water distribution system	217,600	272,000	80	6	14	140
State total	1,884,800	2,356,000	80	146	177	890
Atlantic region total	13,032,700	21,842,750	60	2,174	2,819	8,794
SOUTHEASTERN REGION						
Alabama:						
Bayou La Batre—Water systems	370,500	370,500	100	24	30	240
Roanoke—Recreation building	288,000	360,000	80	135	162	172
Livingston—Hospital addition	300,000	699,384	43	50	50	312
New Brockton—County office building	350,000	587,000	60	116	243	560
State total	1,308,500	1,716,884	76	325	485	1,284
Florida:						
Blountstown—Courthouse	335,000	1,155,200	29	55	126	432
Bonifay—City hall	137,600	172,000	80	33	57	340
State total	472,600	1,327,200	36	108	183	772

Location and project description	EDA cost	Total cost	Percent EDA funding	Estimated number of employees		Estimated man-months employment
				Unemployed/underemployed from project area	Total	
Georgia:						
Little Ocmulgee State Park—Golf course expansion.....	135,000	168,750	80	38	42	247
Greensboro—City hall complex.....	56,800	71,000	80	18	18	42
Thomson—Fire station.....	36,800	46,000	80	9	10	60
Ludowici—Recreation park water improvement.....	172,800	216,000	80	83	83	246
Vienna—City hall and service complex.....	72,000	90,000	80	9	13	78
Mayfield—Water, sewer and recreation area.....	200,000	261,600	67	46	48	55
Lakeland—Courthouse.....	229,600	287,000	80	116	183	134
State total.....	903,000	1,140,350	79	319	397	862
Kentucky:						
Sebree—Municipal building.....	128,000	160,000	80	40	70	128
Hindman—Water and sewer improvement.....	620,000	620,000	100	39	48	300
Frenchburg—Sewer system.....	370,000	440,500	84	30	45	325
Booneville—Courthouse.....	302,000	353,000	86	46	49	120
State total.....	1,420,000	1,573,500	90	215	212	873
Mississippi:						
Bay St. Louis—Airport administration building.....	64,880	81,100	80	25	25	12
Greenville—Airport terminal.....	302,400	378,000	80	79	145	143
Woodville—Bridge and roadway.....	200,000	250,000	80	25	37	12
Conehatta (Choctaw Indian)—Multipurpose building.....	289,725	289,725	100	20	29	218
Marks—Public library.....	108,000	135,000	80	28	33	32
Tunica—County office building.....	125,200	156,500	80	16	26	87
State total.....	1,090,205	1,290,325	85	193	295	504
North Carolina:						
Holly Ridge—Water supply improvement.....	192,000	240,000	80	25	73	120
Hertford—Water system.....	211,000	211,000	100	24	40	45
Burlington—Water/sewer line.....	80,000	100,000	80	13	40	47
Morgan Place—Water/sewer line.....	216,000	270,000	80	23	35	178
State total.....	699,000	821,000	85	85	188	390
South Carolina:						
Bennettsville—Municipal complex.....	280,000	418,000	67	28	113	293
Charleston—Passenger terminal.....	350,000	1,200,000	29	69	80	616
Saluda—Detention facility.....	160,000	200,000	80	24	33	297
Orangeburg—Recreation facility.....	320,000	400,000	80	40	42	315
Charleston—Recreation facility.....	52,800	66,000	80	33	40	42
Columbia—Fire station.....	120,000	150,000	80	48	106	55
State total.....	1,282,800	2,434,000	53	242	414	1,618
Tennessee:						
Huntsville—Welfare building.....	114,400	143,000	80	27	27	45
Memphis—Storm drain.....	60,000	75,000	80	16	16	64
Dickson—Public library.....	220,000	275,000	80	49	65	207
Centerville—Library.....	160,000	200,000	80	77	77	105
Lawrenceburg—Courthouse.....	300,000	1,600,000	19	100	119	797
Elizabethton—Drainage improvements.....	525,600	657,000	80	81	81	323
State total.....	1,380,000	2,950,000	47	350	385	1,541
Southeastern region total.....	8,556,105	13,253,259	65	1,837	2,559	7,844
ROCKY MOUNTAIN REGION						
Colorado:						
La Jara—Sewer extension.....	75,000	75,000	100	7	10	22
Montrose—Industrial site.....	306,400	383,000	80	8	50	75
La Veta—Water treatment plant.....	208,000	260,000	80	14	32	80
State total.....	589,400	718,000	82	29	92	177
Iowa: Black Hawk County—Secondary road improvement.....	119,200	149,000	80	24	63	89
Kansas: Wichita—County fire station.....	276,000	345,000	80	20	20	27
Missouri:						
Louisburg—Vocational-technical school.....	458,400	573,000	80	38	45	390
Springfield—Sewer line.....	268,000	335,000	80	5	13	88
Hayti—Nursing home.....	588,000	735,000	80	71	142	235
State total.....	1,314,400	1,643,000	80	114	200	713
Montana:						
Philipsburg—Sewer lines.....	\$100,000	\$125,000	80	14	14	70
Crow Indian Reservation—Fencing and management facilities.....	310,000	310,000	100	45	45	134
Hill County—Construct 12-mile road.....	420,000	525,000	80	46	46	350
State total.....	830,000	960,000	86	105	105	554
Nebraska: Santee Sioux Tribe—Recreation camping area.....	145,000	145,000	100	29	29	132
North Dakota:						
Burnstad—Roadway.....	103,200	129,000	80	20	57	62
La Moure—Remodel city building.....	106,400	133,000	80	16	32	84
State total.....	209,600	262,000	80	36	89	146
South Dakota:						
Yankton (Intertribal Indian Council)—Community center.....	231,000	231,000	100	30	30	203
Pierre—Street improvements.....	368,800	461,000	80	39	100	270
State total.....	599,800	692,000	87	69	130	473

Footnotes at end of table.

FISCAL YEAR 1972 APPROVED PWIP PROJECTS—Continued

Location and project description	EDA cost	Total cost	Percent EDA funding	Estimated number of employees		Estimated man-months employment
				Unemployed/underemployed from project area	Total	
ROCKY MOUNTAIN REGION—Continued						
Utah:						
Ute Indian Reservation—Water lines.....	205,000	205,000	100	16	20	80
Goshute Indians—Multipurpose community building.....	100,000	100,000	100	120	120	48
State total.....	305,000	305,000	100	136	140	128
Wyoming: Fort Washakie (Wind River Reservation)—Tribal administration center.....	655,000	655,000	100	26	32	384
Rocky Mountain region total.....	5,043,400	5,874,000	86	588	900	2,823
MIDWESTERN REGION						
Illinois:						
Robbins—Community building.....	252,000	252,000	100	34	70	130
Omaha—Water system.....	182,000	182,000	100	15	29	85
Pembroke—Village hall.....	239,500	239,500	100	20	20	144
East St. Louis—Fire station.....	224,000	224,000	100	8	12	90
Charleston—Fire station.....	186,400	233,000	80	36	36	85
Effingham—Recreation center.....	104,000	130,000	80	11	32	50
State total.....	1,187,900	1,260,500	94	124	197	584
Indiana:						
Clinton—Grandstand facilities.....	88,000	110,000	80	17	17	45
Gary—Park and recreation area.....	128,000	160,000	80	28	28	78
Santa Claus—Town hall.....	160,800	201,000	80	49	54	84
Austin—Municipal building.....	133,600	167,000	80	49	56	77
State total.....	510,400	638,000	80	143	155	284
Ohio:						
Logan—Water line improvements.....	80,000	100,000	80	8	9	17
Chillicothe—Water and sewer.....	323,200	404,000	80	20	25	265
Logan—Sewer line.....	140,800	176,000	80	14	14	44
Dayton—Sidewalks and curbing.....	240,000	300,000	80	18	30	120
Caldwell—Sanitary sewer extension.....	42,400	53,000	80	8	8	11
Chillicothe—Amphitheater.....	385,600	482,000	80	32	53	100
State total.....	1,212,000	1,515,000	80	100	139	557
Wisconsin:						
Sister Bay—Water and sewer.....	403,500	1,307,000	31	10	31	620
Oshkosh—Street improvements.....	320,000	400,000	80	42	45	150
Park Falls—Water main extension.....	128,000	160,000	80	13	14	36
State total.....	851,500	1,867,000	46	65	90	806
Midwestern region total.....	7,127,400	9,487,500	75	802	1,075	4,370
Michigan:						
Munising—Community building remodeling.....	127,200	159,000	80	30	30	305
Traverse City—Vocational-technical center.....	452,800	566,000	80	55	55	250
Village of Delour—Water system.....	596,800	746,000	80	18	37	189
Benton Harbor—Industrial park.....	302,400	378,000	80	88	97	155
West Branch—Street and bridge reconstruction.....	366,400	458,000	80	50	60	125
Caro—Garage.....	480,000	600,000	80	35	49	205
St. Ignace—County jail.....	332,000	415,000	80	62	119	480
State total.....	2,657,000	3,322,000	80	338	447	1,709
Minnesota:						
Eveleth—Sports memorial building.....	626,400	873,000	80	27	39	390
Gilbert—Sports recreation center.....	81,600	102,000	80	5	8	40
State total.....	708,000	885,000	80	32	47	430
WESTERN REGION						
Alaska:						
Mettlakatla Indian Community—Municipal building.....	293,000	293,000	100	38	38	240
Fairbanks—Curbs and sidewalks.....	88,000	110,000	80	30	30	63
Nikolaevsk—Access road.....	104,000	130,000	80	25	25	50
Pilot Point—Airport.....	96,000	121,000	80	30	42	126
State total.....	581,000	654,000	89	123	135	479
American Samoa—Water system improvement.....	530,000	530,000	100	270	270	570
Arizona:						
Cocopah Reservation—Community building.....	\$20,000	\$20,000	100	17	19	13
San Carlos Reservation—Boundary fencing.....	48,000	48,000	100	15	15	90
San Carlos Reservation—Timber improvements.....	121,000	121,000	100	40	40	200
Fort Apache Reservation—Forest thinning.....	280,000	280,000	100	36	36	432
State total.....	469,000	469,000	100	108	110	735
California:						
Modesto—County warehouses.....	73,600	92,000	80	29	29	125
Crescent City—Convention center.....	520,000	650,000	80	61	84	359
Ontario—Fire station training center.....	283,200	354,000	80	207	230	136
Patterson—Remodel city hall.....	80,000	100,000	80	12	14	46
Tule River Reservation—Community center.....	235,000	235,000	100	25	62	85
Calexico—Public park and recreation facility.....	88,000	110,000	80	30	40	62
Nevada City—Waste disposal system.....	74,000	148,000	50	34	34	37
Quincy—Community room and library.....	280,000	350,000	80	15	17	86
San Diego—Curbs and sidewalks.....	600,000	750,000	80	37	66	282
Salinas—Agri-park.....	248,000	310,000	80	31	31	167
Richmond—Child care facility.....	200,000	340,000	59	26	55	128
Banning—County office building.....	288,000	568,000	51	27	53	185
Santa Rosa—Industrial park.....	200,000	250,000	80	15	24	100

Footnotes at end of table.

Location and project description	EDA cost	Total cost	Percent EDA funding	Estimated number of employees		Estimated man-months employment
				Unemployed/underemployed from project area	Total	
California—Cont.						
Anderson—Police department building	44,000	55,000	80	36	52	21
Loyalton—Park and recreation facilities	76,200	130,000	59	28	28	36
Pala—Community center	60,500	60,500	100	13	13	25
State total	3,350,500	4,502,500	74	626	832	1,880
Idaho: a						
Pierce—Community center	218,000	218,000	100	60	60	160
Farragut State Park—Water system improvement	113,200	141,500	80	24	25	100
Fort Hall Reservation—Rodeo complex improvement	113,000	113,000	100	15	15	80
State total	444,200	472,500	94	99	100	340
Nevada: Caliente—Water system improvement						
	122,400	153,000	80	16	20	44
Oregon:						
Pendleton (Umatilla Indian Reservation)—Multi-purpose building	533,000	533,000	100	77	77	230
Medford—Street, park improvement	124,000	155,000	80	11	13	54
Grants Pass—Fire station	180,000	225,000	80	49	60	100
State total	837,000	913,000	92	137	150	384
Washington:						
Port Townsend—Restoration—city hall	133,600	167,000	80	30	30	103
Coleville Indian Reservation—Timber stand improvement	128,000	128,000	100	70	70	250
Seattle—Swimming pool	375,000	750,000	50	52	60	161
Renton—Street department building	36,000	45,000	80	14	14	19
Uk—Recreation development and improvement	98,000	98,000	100	11	11	28
Port Orchard—Parking facilities expansion and courthouse improvement	96,000	120,000	80	23	23	50
Wellpinit—Ceremonial grounds improvement	166,000	166,000	100	21	26	45
Bellevue—Municipal building addition	83,200	104,000	80	78	78	38
State total	1,115,800	1,578,000	70	299	311	694
Western region total	7,449,900	9,272,000	80	1,678	1,928	5,126
SOUTHWESTERN REGION						
Arkansas:						
Wheatley—Community center building	178,400	223,000	80	37	51	115
Lonoke—3-building municipal complex	242,000	315,000	80	22	68	180
Van Buren—Municipal complex	328,000	410,000	80	10	36	203
Cotton Plant—Community building	88,000	110,000	80	41	50	66
Big Flat—Water system	135,000	168,750	80	27	43	138
Flippin—Water system improvement	80,000	100,000	80	20	33	141
Augusta—County services building	315,000	315,000	100	76	166	488
Altheimer—Water system expansion	61,600	77,000	80	6	14	24
Lake Village—County jail and courtroom	88,000	110,000	80	23	38	70
Pine Bluff—Sewer improvements	390,800	390,800	100	22	32	220
State total	1,906,800	2,219,550	86	284	531	1,645
Louisiana:						
Leonville—Municipal building	48,160	60,200	80	9	12	45
Arcadia—Water system improvement	160,000	200,000	80	53	61	236
Winnsboro—Sewage collection system	116,000	145,000	80	14	19	114
Baton Rouge—Paving access road	120,000	150,000	80	30	30	60
De Ridder—Water/sewer facilities	600,220	750,275	80	55	79	642
State total	1,044,380	1,305,475	80	161	201	1,097
New Mexico:						
Springer—Municipal complex	134,640	182,000	80	14	14	24
Roswell—Air industrial park	276,000	345,000	80	50	50	300
Mora—Jail and courthouse	320,000	320,000	100	22	28	100
State total	730,640	847,000	86	86	92	424
Oklahoma:						
Seminole—Community recreation building	220,000	275,000	80	30	40	70
Wetumka—Multipurpose municipal building	216,000	270,000	80	41	47	90
Idabel (Choctaw Indian Tribe)—Community center building	211,200	264,000	80	46	46	120
Tuskahoma—Restore national capitol	140,000	140,000	100	32	44	75
State total	787,200	949,000	83	149	177	355
Texas:						
Del Rio—Fire station	96,000	120,000	80	81	102	299
Uvalde—Storm drain improvement	80,000	100,000	80	14	18	121
Zapata County—Street paving	28,000	35,000	80	12	12	67
Teague—Street paving	56,000	70,000	80	8	17	102
Rosebud—Water transmission line	76,000	95,000	80	14	14	42
Crystal City—Water system improvement	36,000	45,000	80	14	18	126
Elgin—Water transmission line	324,000	405,000	80	10	14	112
Karnes City—Public library	576,000	595,000	80	12	14	10
Caldwell—Street improvements	72,000	90,000	80	19	26	113
Brenham—Street paving, drainage, water main	76,000	95,000	80	25	34	102
San Ygnacio—Water tower repairs	22,400	28,000	80	8	9	20
Austin—Park improvements	600,000	750,000	80	100	122	696
Atlanta—Street improvements	372,000	465,000	80	46	77	159
Devine—Municipal building	66,880	83,600	80	12	14	10
State total	1,981,280	2,476,600	80	374	491	1,970
Southwestern region total	6,450,300	7,797,625	83	1,055	1,492	5,491

NOTES

PWIP Projects Not Yet Under Construction:

1. Washington, D.C. 01-11-00570. Being redesigned for a larger gymnasium. Advertising scheduled for August 4, 1972. Bid Opening scheduled for Aug. 14, 1972.

2. Crow Indian, Reservation, Mont. 05-11-01275. Force account project, Indian Tribe changed administration—problems within tribe delaying project.

3. Logan, Ohio, 06-11-00830. Land acquisition problems.

4. Caldwell, Ohio, 06-11-00834. Land acquisition problems.

NATURAL GAS

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, on August 3, 1972, the Federal Power Commission released its "Statement of Policy Relating to Optional Procedure for Certifying New Producer Sales of Natural Gas."

Before analyzing the workings of the new giveaway, I should like to examine the assumptions made by the Commission in issuing the order.

The four Commissioners acted, they say, because of a "worsening of the gap between natural gas demand and supply." The data on which they base this judgment comes from two principal sources:

First, a report prepared by the Bureau of Natural Gas entitled: "National Supply and Demand 1971-1990." But the Commission is deceiving the public. It implies that the report was prepared independently by a Government bureau when in fact the data on which it is based is, by the Commission staff's own admission, supplied by the American Gas Association. And, although this trade association can hardly be considered a disinterested party, the Commission staff does not even spot check the figures for accuracy;

Second, from data supplied by the Future Requirements Committee. This group in which the Commission placed such unquestioning faith, is made up entirely of industry representatives.

Further, for increased prices to be justified by the Commission as a means of stimulating gas supply, the shortage would have to be shown to be price elastic. This the Commission has not done.

Clearly, no regulatory commission can fulfill its public interest responsibilities when its assumptions are so ill-considered and untested.

I am not saying that a shortage does not exist or that supply is inelastic with respect to price. I am maintaining that the Commission has no way of knowing the true situation. However, some figures recently referred to by Chairman Swidler of the New York Public Utilities Commission ought to compel the Commission to take a hard second look at industry claims:

INITIAL ANNUAL VOLUMES UNDER NEW INTERSTATE AND INTRASTATE CONTRACTS, LARGE PRODUCERS, PERMIAN BASIN AREA, 1966-70

[Billions of cubic feet at 14.65 p.s.i.a. and percent of total (in parentheses)]

Year	Interstate	Intrastate	Total
1966.....	149.0 (83.7)	29.0 (16.3)	178.0
1967.....	60.4 (78.2)	16.8 (21.8)	77.2
1968.....	20.0 (12.8)	136.1 (87.2)	156.1
1969.....	29.4 (16.7)	146.4 (83.3)	175.8
1970 (6 months).....	10.3 (9.1)	103.1 (90.9)	113.4

These figures detail the dedication of newly committed natural gas to the interstate and intrastate markets.

What they show, in the words of Chairman Swidler, is that:

In 1968, when the shortage of available gas first appeared, there took place a dramatic reversal of the relative position of the interstate and intrastate market.

An examination of these figures reveals that if the producers had continued to dedicate the same share of new gas during the entire period as it had in 1966 billions of additional cubic feet would have been available in interstate commerce.

I quite agree with Chairman Swidler when he says:

What the data suggests is that the crisis has been caused in large measure by the diversion of gas to intrastate sales... which would otherwise have entered interstate pipelines.

The significant fact, I might add, is that much of the gas used intrastate is employed in low-priority uses like boiler fuel, when new customers in New England are being refused service.

Therefore, I strongly disagree with the FPC's action in this case. The appropriate solution would have been to seek statutory authority to regulate intrastate sales, with their clear and direct effect on interstate commerce, and to conduct an independent and thorough evaluation of the natural gas supply situation. Following this, the Commission would have been able to establish area rates which truly represented the public interest.

There is another aspect of this decision which is equally harmful to the public interest: the administrative procedure adopted by the Commission to deal with natural gas regulation.

Section 4 of the Natural Gas Act requires that—

All rates, and charges made, demanded, or received by any natural gas company * * * shall be just and reasonable.

The Commission has historically seen fit to implement this phrase through cost, plus fair rate of return regulation using the mechanism of area rate proceedings. This procedure has been upheld by the Supreme Court and is generally conceded to avoid the unmanageable burden of individual proceedings for every application.

It permits a thorough investigation of the costs associated with producing natural gas in a manner that, properly employed, balances the interests of consumers and producers.

The new optional procedure, however, short-circuits this established method in favor of a showing that the price sought by the producer serves the public convenience and necessity. No longer will the price charged for natural gas be related to the cost of service.

If the Commission were to vigorously pursue regulation under the "public convenience and necessity" standard consumers might very well be protected. But anyone who is aware of the regulatory workload and the quality of utility regulation at the FPC knows that this loosely defined phrase may easily permit a completely legal robbery of the country's gas consumers. The Commission possesses neither the staff nor the desire to adequately protect the public under the new optional procedure.

Perhaps the most harmful aspect, though, is the exemption of the producers from refund obligations. Under the new rules, 6 months after the application for a rate exceeding the area rate ceiling has been filed, the producer is allowed to charge the higher rate without being obligated to refund the money should the Commission subsequently find the rates excessive. I might remark that this is akin to legalizing robbery if the thief manages to escape the authorities for 6 months.

I urge the Commission to reconsider this crucial policy decision and to replace it with one which truly serves the public interest. Such a policy would be a return to area rate regulation after a thorough investigation of the natural gas supply situation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mrs. ABZUG (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. CLANCY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for August 14 through August 16, 1972, on account of a death in the family.

Mr. LENT (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for August 16, 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. YOUNG of Florida) to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HORTON, on August 16, for 15 minutes.

Mr. WYMAN, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. HEINZ, today, for 5 minutes.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MAZZOLI), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. KOCH, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIGGS, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARRINGTON, today, for 5 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, notwithstanding it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$722.50.

Mr. MAHON to include tables and extraneous matter with his remarks made today on H.R. 16254 and House Joint Resolution 1278.

Mr. ROUSSELOT to extend his remarks on the conference report on H.R. 9092 following Mr. GROSS.

Mr. HILLIS to extend his remarks on the conference report on H.R. 9092 following Mr. ROUSSELOT.

Mr. Diggs and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$807.50.

Mr. PURCELL.

Mr. STAGGERS, and to include a letter sent to the Comptroller General of the United States, during general debate on S. 3824.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. YOUNG of Florida), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. McCLOSKEY.

Mr. ARCHER.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. DELLENBACK.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona.

Mr. BOB WILSON in two instances.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas in two instances.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. SHRIVER in two instances.

Mr. SCHMITZ in 10 instances.

Mr. KEATING.

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho in three instances.

Mr. WYATT.

Mr. BURKE of Florida.

Mr. KEMP in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MAZZOLI), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. ROE in two instances.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

Mr. PUCINSKI in five instances.

Mr. BADILLO.

Mr. REES.

Mr. BEGICH in four instances.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.

Mr. STEED.

Mr. HUNGATE in two instances.

Mr. SYMINGTON.

Mr. REID.

Mr. PURCELL in six instances.

Mr. OBEY in six instances.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON in two instances.

Mr. CORMAN.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in three instances.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia in five instances.

Mr. PIKE.

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. 3524. An act to extend the provisions of the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1964, as amended, to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 6957. An act to establish the Sawtooth National Recreation Area in the State of Idaho, to temporarily withdraw certain national forest land in the State of Idaho from the operation of the United States mining laws, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13324. An act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1973 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce, and for related purposes.

H.R. 15692. An act to authorize for a limited period additional loan assistance under the Small Business Act for disaster victims, to provide for a study and report to the Congress by the President setting forth recommendations for a comprehensive revision of disaster relief legislation, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 596. An act to require that international agreements other than treaties, hereafter entered into by the United States, be transmitted to the Congress within 60 days after the execution thereof.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On August 14, 1972:

H.R. 2131. An act for the relief of the Howrey Lumber Co.;

H.R. 15417. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15586. An act 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.

On August 15, 1972:

H.R. 6957. An act to establish the Sawtooth National Recreation Area in the State of Idaho, to temporarily withdraw certain national forest land in the State of Idaho from the operation of the U.S. mining laws, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15692. An act to authorize for a limited period additional loan assistance under the Small Business Act for disaster victims, to provide for a study and report to the Congress by the President setting forth recommendations for a comprehensive revision of disaster relief legislation, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 16, 1972, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2252. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force experimental, development, test, and research procurement actions of \$50,000 or more during the 6 months ending June 30, 1972, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2357; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2253. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2254. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on Federal efforts to combat drug abuse; 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. BROOKS: Joint Committee on Congressional Operations. Report on improving fiscal and budgetary information for the Congress (Rept. No. 92-1337). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOLIFIELD: Committee on Government Operations. Report on regulation of food additives—Nitrites and nitrates (Rept. No. 92-1338). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DULSKI: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service H.R. 11255. A bill to amend the age and service requirements for immediate retirement under subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-1339). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 15580. (Rept. No. 92-1340). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee: Select Committee on Small Business. Report on small business and the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (Rept. No. 92-1341). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee of conference. Conference report on S. 3726. (Rept. No. 92-1342). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1093. A resolution providing for the considerations of H.R. 13514. A bill to enable wheat producers, processors, and end-product manufacturers of wheat foods to work together to establish, finance, and administer a coordinated program of research, education, and promotion to maintain and expand markets for wheat and wheat products for use as human foods within the United States (Rept. No. 92-1343). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1094. A resolution providing for the consideration of conference reports on the same day reported (Rept. No. 92-1344). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1095. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 14847. A bill to amend the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 to increase from 50 to 75 percent the U.S. share of allowable project costs payable under such act; to amend the Federal

Aviation Act of 1958 to prohibit State taxation of the carriage of persons in air transportation; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-1345). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1096. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 12114. A bill to declare title to certain Federal lands in the State of Oregon to be in the United States in trust for the use and benefit of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon (Rept. No. 92-1346). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1097. A resolution providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 1227. Joint resolution approving the acceptance by the President for the United States of the Interim Agreement Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on Certain Measures With Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (Rept. No. 92-1347). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1098. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 16071. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (Rept. No. 92-1348). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRODYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 16355. A bill to repeal section 453(d) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 16356. 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. ESCH (for himself, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BELL, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. FISH, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. GUDE, Mr. BLACKBURN, and Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin):

H.R. 16357. A bill to provide for the use of certain funds to promote scholarly, cultural, and artistic activities between Japan and the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (for herself and Mr. GUBSER):

H.R. 16358. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. High Court of Settlement which shall have jurisdiction over certain labor disputes in industries and other enterprises affecting interstate commerce and the public interest; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BELL, Mr. BINGHAM, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. OBEY, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.R. 16359. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Labor to provide financial and other assistance to certain workers and small business firms to assist compliance with State or Federal pollution abatement requirements; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. FRASER, Mr. OBEY, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BRADEMANS, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, and Mr. HELSTOSKI):

H.R. 16360. A bill to require a study of the practices, policies, and procedures of all Government agencies relating to the availability of certain goods and services through Federal supply and service sources, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit certain grantees and contractors of Government agencies to procure certain goods and services through Federal supply and service sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. FRASER, Mr. OBEY, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REUSS, and Mr. ROY):

H.R. 16361. A bill to require a study of the practices, policies, and procedures of all Government agencies relating to the availability of certain goods and services through Federal supply and service sources, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit certain grantees and contractors of Government agencies to procure certain goods and services through Federal supply and service sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. FRASER, Mr. OBEY, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. NIX, Mr. CONTE, Mr. ROE, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. RUNNELS, and Mr. ASHLEY):

H.R. 16362. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide for the use of excess property by certain grantees; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 16363. A bill to require a study of the practices, policies, and procedures of all Government agencies relating to the availability of certain goods and services through Federal supply and service sources, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit certain grantees and contractors of Government agencies to procure certain goods and services through Federal supply and service sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. FRASER, Mr. OBEY, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BRADEMANS, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. GUDE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, and Mr. HELSTOSKI):

H.R. 16364. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Service Act of 1949 to provide for the use of excess property by certain grantees; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. FRASER, Mr. OBEY, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REUSS, and Mr. ROY):

H.R. 16365. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide for the use of excess property

by certain grantees; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 16366. A bill to authorize and request the President to issue annually a proclamation designating August 26 of each year as "Women's Rights Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLIS (for himself, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. WINN, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. McDADDE, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. GUDE, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. QUIE, Mr. HUNGATE, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. SISK, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. FASCELL, and Mr. MELCHER):

H.R. 16367. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to liberalize the provisions relating to payment of disability and death pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HILLIS (for himself, Mr. KING, Mr. MYERS, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BELL, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. THONE, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. KEMP, Mr. HANNA, Mr. OBEY, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. BRAY, and Mr. O'KONSKI):

H.R. 16368. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to liberalize the provisions relating to payment of disability and death pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HILLIS (for himself, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. LATTI, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. BLANTON):

H.R. 16369. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to liberalize the provisions relating to payment of disability and death pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 16370. A bill to insure periodic congressional review of tax preferences, and other items which narrow the income tax base, by providing now for the termination over a 3-year period of existing provisions of these types; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MALLARY:

H.R. 16371. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that one-half of any social security benefit increases provided for by Public Law 92-336 be disregarded in determining eligibility for pension or compensation under such title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 16372. A bill to create a national system of health security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 16373. A bill to provide adequate mental health care and psychiatric care to all Americans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REID:

H.R. 16374. A bill to prevent aircraft piracy by requiring the use of metal-detection devices to inspect all passengers and baggage boarding commercial aircraft in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. ABOUR-EZK, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Mr. PODELL):

H.R. 16375. A bill to insure international cooperation in the prosecution or extradition

to the United States of persons alleged to have committed aircraft piracy against the laws of the United States or international law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 16376. A bill to terminate the Airlines mutual aid agreement; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.R. 16377. A bill to provide for the maintenance of a register listing the names of certain persons who have had their motor vehicle operator's licenses denied or withdrawn and to allow more efficient use of that information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 16378. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in Los Angeles County in the State of California; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. St GERMAIN (for himself, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, and Mr. STOKES):

H.R. 16379. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish national parks or national recreation areas in those States which presently do not have a national park or national recreation area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWENDEL:

H.R. 16380. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and assist the several States in carrying out a program of animal health research; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN (for himself, Mr. KEITH, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. DANIEL

of Virginia, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DERWIN-SKI, Mr. DU PONT, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. KING, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MCKEVITT, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MOSHER, and Mr. St GERMAIN):

H.R. 16381. A bill establishing a Council on Energy Policy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN (for himself, Mr. KEITH, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. STEELE, Mr. VEYSEY, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.R. 16382. A bill establishing a Council on Energy Policy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.J. Res. 1286. Joint resolution to waive the requirements of section 431(b) of the General Education Provisions Act and section 495 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in the case of rules, regulations, guidelines, instructions, and application forms for student loans under the guaranteed student loan program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Con. Res. 686. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the accounting and return of all American prisoners in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER:

H. Res. 1099. Resolution amending the rules of the House with respect to the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SISK (for himself, Mr. BOLING, Mr. YOUNG of Texas, Mr. SMITH of California, and Mr. LATTA):

H. Res. 1100. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide for the use of electronic equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

419. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the preservation and protection of an archaeological site, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 16383. A bill for the relief of Matias J. Rubang and his wife, Ignacia C. Rubang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. Res. 1101. Resolution referring the bill H.R. 16353 entitled "A bill for the relief of the Cuban Truck & Equipment Company, its heirs and assigns" to the Chief Commissioner of the U.S. Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

271. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Kenneth R. Statler, Richmond, Va. et al., relative to clemency for Lt. William L. Calley; to the Committee on Armed Services.

272. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. E. L. Adams, Greenville, S.C. et al., relative to the agreements negotiated by the President in Moscow; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

273. Also, petition of Mrs. Charles Quick, Baltimore, Md. et al., relative to victory in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MONROE COUNTY CLERK CLOYCE MENEFEE

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would call to the attention of my colleagues Monroe County and its county clerk Cloyce Menefee of Holiday, Mo., in the Ninth District which recently received recognition in the Santa Barbara News-Press:

[From the Santa Barbara (Calif.) News-Press, July 24, 1972]

A TOWN'S TRADITION WORKS FOR MCGOVERN
(By Kevin P. Phillips)

PARIS, Mo.—Paris, France, and this small Missouri farm town are worlds apart. Here the phone booth in front of the county courthouse smells of hay and Purina chows, and Main Street looks like a Sinclair Lewis reject. No Confederate monument stands guard, but people hereabout fought with the South during the Civil War, and the drive-in movie down the road in Audrain County is named "Little Dixie."

In most ways, Paris, Mo., typifies the conservative, tradition-oriented U.S. countryside. Therefore, it may come as a shock that Paris—and Monroe County, Mo.—are almost

certain to join Bella Abzug and Jerry Rubin in casting their November votes for Sen. George McGovern.

The reason? Quite simple. Monroe is Missouri's banner Democratic County. This northeastern part of the state, known as "Little Dixie," was settled between 1810 and 1830 by Virginians, Kentuckians, and Tennesseans. Counties, towns, streets, hotels: they all seem to be named for the "Virginia dynasty" of Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and James Monroe. Pro-Confederate during the Civil War, Monroe County voted heavily Democratic thereafter. More recently, Monroe Countians have remained loyal enough that Catholic Al Smith beat Herbert Hoover 3:1 in 1928 and Adlai Stevenson whupped Dwight Eisenhower by the same ratio in 1956.

Not that local party leaders have much good to say about George McGovern. On the contrary. Even so, they shrug, "he's the Democratic nominee," and they expect to be able to carry the county for him in November. There is an important political lesson in this: that the wheels of American political realignment grind exceedingly slow. When the votes are finally counted next fall, George McGovern will undoubtedly owe a lot more of his support of plain old tradition than his young "New Politics" zealots suspect (or will admit). And similarly, the much touted "youth vote" will probably fall well short of the New Left's cohesive expectations.

Now for the converse. Any Nixon strategist driving through Monroe County—rural, con-

servative and Southern-oriented as it is—would have every reason to picture it as a snap for Richard Nixon to carry against a man like George McGovern. But the President got only 30 percent of the county vote in 1968, and local estimates credit him with just 35-40 percent in November. Under these circumstances, is the idea of a 1972 realignment valid?

I think so. Realignment in U.S. politics is mostly a matter of 7 percent in one county and 12 percent in another. To be sure, a few volatile constituencies will swing 25-50 percent on a single issue (especially the isolationist upper Farm Belt and the race-conscious Deep South). But by and large, America's major political shifts have been built on a nickel here and a dime here.

In this context, Monroe County does have a story to tell. First of all, local Democrats generally agree that some of George McGovern's views are quite unpopular. Privately, some will hint that a "disaster" could have occurred even in Monroe County if the South Dakotan hadn't selected Missouri's popular young Sen. Thomas Eagleton as his running mate.

Secondly, Democratic politics do expect Nixon to gain over 1968, inevitably setting a GOP presidential record in the process. More than ever before, the Republican Party is getting active—and organized—in Monroe County. If the national Democratic Party continues to move in the McGovern direction, local leaders admit, Monroe County will continue to move toward the GOP.

Third, current voter interest augurs well